Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6, 591-599
2024
Publisher: Learning Gate
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131

People-centeredness in the context of sustainable development of the country: Issues of cultural policy and ensuring intellectual security

Vitalii Kotsur[1*], Oleg Bobina[2], Iryna Shapovalova[3], Iryna Vorchakova[4], Nataliia Sugatska[5]
[1]Department of Public Administration, Hryhorii Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav, Pereiaslav, Ukraine; kotsurv@ukr.net (V.K.).
[2,3,4]Department of Psychology, Philosophy and Social and Humanitarian Sciences, Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding, Mykolaiv, Ukraine; oleg.bobina@nuos.edu.ua (O.B.) iryna.vorchakova@nuos.edu.ua (I.V.)
[5]Department of Humanities, Mykolaiv Institute of Law at National University "Odesa Law Academy", Mykolaiv, Ukraine; sugatska@ukr.net (N.S.)

Abstract: The study attempts to comprehend today notion and paradigm of people-centeredness (anthropocentrism), which shaped today due to the emergence and rapid evolution of sustainable development paradigm, changing all spheres of humanity life. It is shown, in particular, that new anthropocentrism implies new cultural policy, based on intellectual capital protected by intellectual security, gaining increasingly important role.

Keywords: *Anthropocentrism, Biocentrism, Cultural policy, Intellectual security, SDGs, Society.*

1. Introduction

The action of man in the world around him has always played an important role in the development of philosophy and understanding of the modern world. The meaning of the principle of people-centeredness (anthropocentrism) changed over time and depended on the understanding of the essence of man both from the side of humanitarian ideas of various philosophical schools and teachings, and from scientific knowledge about man, the results of his self-knowledge and self-awareness.

Anthropocentrism and biocentrism reflect the main, most expressive trends in environmental ethics of our time, but not the only ones. In addition to anthropocentrism ("light green ethics") and biocentrism, there are also left biocentrism, ecocentric ethics ("dark green"), moderate green ethics (intermediate), deep ecology, earth ethics, ecofeminism, and other types of environmental ethics (Taback and Ramanan, 2013). From the position of anthropocentrism, man is the only important goal and value of the existence of the whole world, his needs and interests are higher than all other existing ones. In biocentrism, nature must be freed from human claims to dominance; the goal of human life and the existence of the human race is the restoration of "primordial" nature. As a result of these attitudes, anthropocentrism is the basis of technicism identified within the philosophy of technology, and biocentrism is the basis of anti-technicism (Unuigbe, 2020).

However, biocentrism, which fundamentally denies scientific and technological progress and the already existing technosphere, can be characterized as a dead-end path in the development of environmental ethics, in which the need for social development is questioned. Deep ecology is a real chance for the co-evolution of the biosphere and society, for the embodiment of the noospheric concept, because deep ecology recognizes the equality of man and nature, their equivalence as separate elements of the world. A new, emerging type of environmental consciousness can rightly be called sociobionic (Witoszek and Muller, 2017). In essence, this is a paradigm of ecologically oriented anthropocentrism.

The concept of environmentally oriented anthropocentrism, developed on the basis of the theory of interaction between nature and society as distinct and interpenetrating entities, is based on the idea that,

* Correspondence: kotsurv@ukr.net

in order to overcome technocratic thinking, it is necessary to include all components of the socio-ecosystem in the value system.

The concept of ecological culture of a socio-ecosystem is based on the idea that a socio-ecosystem is the unity and interaction of a socio-system and the eco-environment (natural system), a qualitatively special state of the world, which is the result of global evolution and a necessary condition for human existence. The core of the socio-ecosystem is the sphere of interaction between society and nature, the mode of existence of which is human activity. The ecological culture of the socio-ecosystem covers the sphere of relations between man and society towards nature, being a way to optimize human activities, the purpose of which is to optimize the functioning of all spheres of the socio-ecosystem. In the sphere of socio-natural interaction, it means improvement of the human-natural world, the entire "production-consumption" system in a direction that would ensure the progressive development of both the social itself and the natural (Birkeland et al., 2018). In the field of the natural system, this involves the reconstruction of the natural world in order to optimize the process of interaction between nature and society. In the sphere of the social world, these are transformations that lower the level of necessary reconstruction of the natural, requiring appropriate scientific, spiritual, and moral justification.

It is possible to overcome technocratic thinking through socio-economic and technological transformations at the level of all spheres of the socio-ecosystem, which are based on special cultural values designed to change the vector of technocratization of thinking to its ecologization (Alieksieienko et al., 2022). This, in turn, involves the development and implementation of appropriate cultural policies, as well as ensuring intellectual security, to prevent "sliding" into the extremes of crude anthropocentrism or left-wing biocentrism (it should be noted that biocentrism is aggressively active, which makes it similar to the crude anthropocentrism of the times of the first industrial revolutions).

2. Literature Review

An analysis of various concepts of society's moral attitude towards nature shows that there is a wide range of concepts describing the relationship between man and nature: from nature-centric to anthropocentric. Moreover, in the antithesis "naturocentrism - anthropocentrism", the objective characteristics of both are discarded, each of them is considered in the context of either exclusively apologetics or exclusively criticism. It does not take into account that modern man will continue to master nature and use it in his activities. In addition, the ultimate goal of social activity is a person, including indirectly, through the preservation of the natural environment of his existence (Kryshtanovych et al., 2022; Kryshtanovych et al., 2023a; Kryshtanovych et al., 2023b). This determines, in our opinion, the limitations of the nature-centric approach to understanding the role and place of man in the world.

The relationship of man to nature turns out to be connected with morality because it is also the relationship of man to man. In this context, in our opinion, the actualization of anthropocentric attitudes is legitimate; in the modern meaning, anthropocentrism becomes environmentally oriented. The concept of "ecologically oriented anthropocentrism" means anthropocentrism focused on the conservation of the ecosystem, which is emphasized by many authors (Shoreman-Ouimet and Kopnina, 2015).

Developing the concept of environmentally oriented anthropocentrism, today the scientific community and expert practitioners focus on anthropocentrism rather than nature-centrism (especially its extreme manifestation), because namely a man includes nature in his system of values and is called upon to preserve it (Droz, 2022).

The idea of the need to optimize the functioning of the three levels of the socio-ecosystem makes it possible to define the person himself as a subject and to show the socioanthropic orientation of this process. Today, man has changed and acquired a new quality in relation to the world. His collectivist action, or social solidarity theory, should underpin the theoretical development of solutions to environmental problems (Bassey, 2020).

In the process of socio-natural interaction, people and society must take into account the socio-natural laws of optimal correspondence between society and nature - the law of cyclicity in the use of

Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6: 591-599, 2024
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131

planetary substances, the law of renewability in the use of energy, the law of complexity in the use of information (Kopnina, 2020). Undoubtedly, it is possible to overcome the environmental crisis only based on the priority of the values of preserving the biosphere; the understanding that we put into the definition of environmentally oriented anthropocentrism does not in fact contradict this principle and even lies at the basis of this theory. The anthropic principle is also based on this, according to which a person cannot imagine himself not being included not only in natural, but also in cosmic processes (Kopnina, 2020).

The theory of environmentally oriented anthropocentrism, which defines the axiological foundations of the ecological culture of the socio-natural ecosystem, includes the ideas of new humanism and environmental ethics (Kryshtanovych et al., 2021a; Kryshtanovych et al., 2021b).

New humanism presupposes, firstly, the voluntary recognition by each person of the principles and criteria of a new ethics, which reflects a moral attitude towards all living things (the founder of the Club of Rome A. Peccei spoke about this) (Griggs, 2009). Secondly, defining the attitude towards man as the highest value while at the same time being an eco-oriented form of worldview, the task is to comprehend the unity of humanity and the possibility of jointly overcoming the environmental crisis on the basis of collective interaction.

In addition, scientists argue that the sustainability of social development, especially during periods of change, is achievable only if cultural factors are included in its strategies. The very phenomenon of sustainable development at this stage should be considered primarily as a new quality of universal human culture, which at the personal level should be embodied in the implementation of the most important components (motivational, cognitive, relational, activity) and personal functions (ecologically oriented, cognitive, meaning-forming). system-forming, regulating and, therefore, should be manifested in the corresponding personal formations and environmentally appropriate behavior of the individual, professional, including in environmentally problematic situations (Comfort, 2023).

Culture and human rights, culture and governance, culture and territory, culture and social inclusion, and culture and economics were the five pillars of sustainable human development that were covered under Agenda 21. The genuine wealth of nations may be significantly increased if the interaction between those five dimensions is planned with consideration, intelligence, and vision (Kuzmin et al., 2023). Every city has the chance to construct a long-term vision of culture as a pillar of their growth by using Agenda 21 for Culture as a guide for public cultural policy. The successful execution of cultural development initiatives that provide communities direction, prosperity, and a sense of identity also rely on a component that may be difficult to come by but is essential to the projects' success: a style of government built on reputable and fruitful interactions between the political elite and civic society (Hajek et al., 2011).

Numerous attempts to conceptualize and express a "place" for culture in sustainability or sustainable development have been spurred by the traditionally inadequate position of culture in major policy texts for sustainable development. This has led to a broad range of opinions and definitions. The ideas and frameworks that have developed throughout time to place culture in sustainable contexts have shown significant flexibility and a growing variety of approaches, as Duxbury et al. (2017) point out. Flexibility is becoming a liability in the formulation and promotion of policy, even if it can permit substantial alterations and adaptations of conceptual structures and frameworks to specific situations (whether political, cultural, economic, or geographic).

Since the middle of the 20th century, there have been numerous international attempts to incorporate culture into frameworks for sustainable development. These efforts have been motivated by the difficult task of striking a balance between the inherent value of culture and the prevailing policy streams, justifications, and larger societal and environmental issues. As a result of these efforts, there is a long-lasting legacy of policy declarations, guiding principles, and other initiatives that support the role of culture in sustainable development. This legacy is characterized over time by a growing number of actors participating in these discourses and, concurrently, by a diversification of concepts, arguments, and methodologies. The area of cultural policy, which encompasses a wide range of values, strategies,

Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6: 591-599, 2024
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131

roles, and justifications, has occasionally interacted with these discourses, shaped by the dominant discussions and ideologies of the period. The primary paths of cultural policy, however, have often been positioned "separately" from these discussions. Currently, cultural policy has the difficulty of playing quite distinct functions in the context of sustainable development. These many responsibilities frequently overlap and coexist. Therefore, it is critical to explain their differences and why. Semantics accounts for most of the differences: in these circumstances, culture and sustainability simply have different meanings.

It should also be noted that the modern global systemic crisis of human civilization, which is a harbinger and, possibly, the beginning or continuation of a bifurcation change in the socio-economic relations currently dominant in the world, requires increased attention to the theoretical and practical problems of ensuring the security of social development both locally and at global levels. An important but often overlooked component of this security is intellectual security.

Some sources view intellectual security as the protection of products of mental activity. In others, an equal sign is placed between intellectual security and intellectual property. In third sources, the concept of intellectual security includes not only the protection of the products of mental labor, but also the rational use, reproduction and improvement of the quality of the mental ability of people that determines their activities. The last definition seems to us to be the most adequate for the landscape of sustainable development.

Human intelligence, as it is known, is formed in accordance with the laws of genetics, and therefore it is appropriate to talk about the genetic roots of intellectual security. Genetics and intellectual security are interconnected: on the one hand, a violation of the country's intellectual security leads to genetic consequences for the people, the results of which are difficult to imagine, on the other hand, the state and changes in the gene pool of society have a direct impact on the intellectual security of the state. It is therefore clear that intellectual security and sustainability are closely related, especially in the context of ESG.

3. Results

"Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs", according to the World Commission on Environment and Development report, which was established by the UN in 1983. This is the first definition of sustainable development. The statement continues, "the strategy for sustainable development, in its broadest sense, aims to promote harmony between humans and between humanity and nature" (Jha, 2004). Two key tenets form the foundation of this definition:

- Harmony between nature and humans (respect for the "ecological limits" of the earth);

- Harmony among human beings (i.e., social cohesion). This definition makes the social dimension very visible right away, but the cultural dimension is not as clear-cut: "the pursuit of sustainable development requires a social system that provides for solutions for the tensions arising from disharmonious development [and] implies a concern for social equity between generations, a concern that must logically be extended to equity within each generation" (Dallaire and Colbert, n.d. p. 8).

Three perspectives have been presented by Dessein et al. (2015), outlining how culture is primarily positioned in relation to sustainability and its overall function in each scenario (refer to Figure 1, where culture is represented by the darker colored circles). These concepts, which have been further developed as "culture in sustainability", "culture for sustainability", and "culture as sustainability", offer a single framework for arranging many discourses and analyzing prevalent conceptual problems. According to the first depiction, "culture in sustainability", culture plays an independent and autonomous function in sustainability, serving as its fourth dimension. According to this method, cultural sustainability is comparable to ecological, social, and economic sustainability, each of which is made up of interrelated sustainability characteristics. The second depiction emphasizes the mediating function that culture plays in achieving ecological, social, and economic sustainability. It is titled "culture for sustainability". The third portrayal, "culture as sustainability", views culture as both a tool and a prerequisite for achieving

Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6: 591-599, 2024
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131

sustainability's overarching goals. According to this method, culture encompasses all other aspects of sustainability and turns into the main issue or paradigm of sustainability.

Figure 1.
Three approaches for exploring culture-sustainability relations.
Source: (Dessein et al. 2015, p. 29).

Scholars have been examining the relationships between culture and sustainability, leading to a variety of descriptive and normative findings. For instance, Nassauer (1997) contends that "cultural sustainability must support landscape ecology", and that the best way to attain ecological quality is to foster both an appreciation of the natural world and our aesthetic sense. According to Garcia-Mira, Sabucedo, and Romay (2003), culture acts as a bridge between environmental factors and human behavior, which in turn promotes sustainable development. Some argue that culture is "the fundamental element of sustainability, which supports, interconnects and overarches the traditional three pillars of sustainability", while others (e.g. Nurse, 2006) suggest it should be included as a fourth pillar in the sustainability matrix, alongside the social, economic, and environmental pillars (Auclair and Fairclough, 2015, p. 7). Isar's (2017) critical assessment of culture's ill-defined "relationship with development" and "sustainability" draws attention to how flexible these ideas are. Complex and complicated patterns of linkage, wherein norms and everyday behavior constitute culture and shape how distinct people interpret the past, behave in the present, and envision the future, are reflected in the difficulty of disentangling these notions. Ideas of progress and development interventions have always been based on cultural presumptions and hierarchies, as noted by Radcliffe and Laurie (2006, p. 231).

Because of the SDG framework's extreme ambition, implementing it will need a very daring strategy. The moment has come for institutions across the nation to mainstream culture into all 17 SDGs, building on the overwhelming evidence of its importance to a wide range of policy areas. The document contains evidence on how culture plays a transversal role in attaining the SDGs "*Implementing Culture within the Sustainable Development Goals. The Role of Culture in Agenda 2030*", building, in particular, upon the impact review "The Value and Values of Culture" by Culture Action Europe and inputs from CAE membership and partners.

In addition to providing inquisitive, interrogative, and critical perspectives on the world and its systems, culture fosters the capacity to recognize and assess contemporary, complex issues that call for interdisciplinary and transversal solutions in order to be comprehended and addressed. Economic, environmental, and social factors often form the three-pillar paradigm on which the sustainability idea is built. These days, academics stress the need of a cultural pillar for the usefulness of culture in shaping communal narratives, uniting communities, and promoting diversity - all of which are critical components of sustainability. It is true that culture has a transforming power that is essential to creating a sustainable future for all.

Culture is highly relevant for implementing each of the 17 SDGs, and it is a connecting link in the triad of ESG.

Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6: 591-599, 2024
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131

Furthermore, a revitalized aesthetic appreciation of environment is necessary for social transformation. Brady (2006) argues that a value for nature that is both beautiful and practical already permeates daily activities. For instance, Volvo Australia openly aims to include environmental awareness into their marketing campaign. Cultural policy should support valuing the environment from an aesthetic rather than a utilitarian standpoint, which is essential for creating an environmental ethic (Irvin, 2010). A sustainable quality of life must be prioritized over the stand-in for unrestricted material expansion, which calls for the advancement of environmental ethics and aesthetics. This necessitates a multi-scale, multi-generational strategy that involves teaching people in all areas of life and future generations, including families, local community leaders, governments, investors, and multinational politicians. Specific life situations require specific approaches; thus, the recommendations can only be broad. Therefore, the only environment in which this ethics can be properly shaped and implemented is one of intellectual protection.

Intellectual capital is a strategic asset for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, as Secundo et al. (2020) correctly assert. It also promotes sustainable growth and the creation of technological policy. The following is how Secundo et al. (2020) construct other highlights: 1) Research on the meaning and implications of intellectual capital for sustainable development is a promising area; 3) Technology policies for innovation and sustainability must focus on IC for the identification of strategic goals and actions; 4) Intellectual capital components can nurture sustainable development in the private and public sectors. Moreover, as the digital era and the widespread use of technology applications develops, IC has a big influence on social and economic development that is based more and more on information and creativity. Competitivity, reputation, richness, and sustainability - all of which prioritize citizens, quality of life, and the creation of a more sustainable society - have made managing and implementing IC practices crucial.

Accordingly, intellectual security should be directed on maintaining and development of this capital.

Based on the scientific and philosophical research of scientists, we can say that disputes over the right to the existence of anthropocentrism in the formation of environmental consciousness are acquiring a new color. Man is not just the central figure of the world; man is the central figure of thinking about the world. Anthropocentrism is defined as a philosophical movement that is a multifaceted and centering scientific concept. In fact, man is a natural and logical part of the Universe, one with it, and anthropocentrism is an integral human trait. The mentality, the system of perception and interpretation of everything around us, the motivation of actions, both in practical and spiritual activities - everything is based on anthropocentrism. Man is a complex system. It is considered as a living system that integrates the physical and spiritual, natural and social, hereditary and lifetime acquired properties. As a living organism, man is included in natural, biosphere connections. Therefore, interpretations of anthropocentrism solely in a negative light raise certain objections. In our opinion, no matter how one-sided its implementation may be, it remains a kind of "archetype of culture", without which it not only cannot develop, but also exist. The stereotype of understanding anthropocentrism as a source of environmental problems does not imply a solution to this problem at a deep, essential level. One should comprehend that man always stands at the center of the universe. And therefore, it is important to note that anthropocentrism, as the most important way for man to center the nature around him, must take the path associated with the discovery of the highest form of culture of thinking, which is now asserting its power in the practical construction of modern human society on a reasonable basis.

4. Discussion

Today there is no topic more important than ecology, since modern societies, uncontrollably progressing in the economic sphere, have come into conflict with nature, threatening the extinction of not only the human species, but also all life on our planet. At the same time, modern philosophy in its study of the essence and purpose of man strictly follows the traditions of Western philosophy, which developed in the Middle Ages and was supplemented in modern times by ideas about man as a

Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6: 591-599, 2024
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131

conqueror of nature, a kind of creative force that surpasses everything around. However, this old philosophy does not correspond to the changed circumstances on a planetary scale and requires serious rethinking, primarily from the point of view of anthropology and the doctrine of society (Kryshtanovych et al., 2023c).

The theoretical justification for a new paradigm of thinking, the need to form a different human attitude towards the world and create a fundamentally new philosophy, starting from the mid-20th century, has been offered by representatives of deep ecology. The term "deep ecology" was coined by the Norwegian philosopher and ecologist Ame Naess in 1973, who emphasized that ecological science, concerned only with facts and logic, cannot answer ethical questions about how people should live. This requires "ecological wisdom" (Valera, 2019). A core tenet of deep ecology is biospheric egalitarianism - the belief that humans should respect the environment, viewing it as having certain basic moral and legal rights to life and flourishing, regardless of its instrumental capabilities for use. Naess believed that what was needed was not a reform of the existing society, but an essential, deep change in the type of civilization, in the process of which man himself would change, and science would rise to wisdom. A necessary condition for the worldview of a new society is the awareness that the Earth is alive and all beings are an integral part of it and have the right to life.

Also, deep ecology separates itself from the rest of the environmental movement by emphasizing that the traditional environmental movement is "shallow", it does not fight to change the very foundations of civilization, but only against pollution and resource depletion within the existing system, which is insufficient (Bender, 2003). From the point of view of deep ecology, it is impossible to protect nature from the destructive effects of humans using with superficial, exclusively technological measures. Shallow ecology believes that it is possible to reconcile conservation and industrial production without questioning the foundations of Western societies. Deep ecology sees the cause of all ills within man himself, selfish, enjoying the constant growth of comfort and level of consumption, convinced of his right to ruthlessly exploit the world around him. The impending ecological catastrophe is therefore a consequence of the deep spiritual crisis engulfing humanity. Deep ecology involves replacing capitalism with a form of economic development, the main goal of which is the combination of economic and technological progress with the preservation of the environment, that is, in a fundamental sense, it seeks to apply the anthropological content of this teaching to the actual needs of the transformation of philosophical knowledge at the present stage of development.

Although the ideas of deep ecology themselves are quite utopian, nevertheless this direction offers a conceptual vision of a new anthropocentrism, which involves the transformation of cultural policy in the direction of caring for the environment and society, as well as active civic participation (ESG), and on the other hand, intellectual security, ensuring favorable conditions for the development of social capital (Kononenko et al., 2023).

Also, advancing culture's role in sustainable development is seen as social change through cultural policy (Rayman-Bacchus & Radavoi, 2019).

Even if the majority of nations acknowledge the importance of culture to sustainable development, many industrial and industrializing economies still have daily behaviors that are incompatible with the principles of any conception of sustainable development. Although there are several explanations for this (financial, technical, institutional, etc.), there is always a risk of viewing these governments as merely acting carelessly, which undermines any chance of collaboration. Declarements made in national policies that culture is essential to sustainable development will not, by themselves, bring about societal transformation. These declarations made in public must be transformed into social change plans and initiatives that respect cultural variety and work well on a global scale. Consequently, it is doubtful that these modifications could be made without guaranteeing intellectual protection.

From the standpoint of a systems approach, it is appropriate to talk about intellectual security in several aspects:

- As an integral part - a subsystem of a higher level, which is national security;
- As a complex multi-level system, including its subsystems (components) of a lower order;

Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6: 591-599, 2024
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131

- As an internal or external state or position of the country, in which there are no real and potential threats to the intellectual interests of the individual, society, and the state, and, if they arise, - a system of measures to ensure the protection or defense of carriers of intelligence and the products of their mental labor.

In this regard, it is advisable to represent intellectual security in the form of a complex system that includes at least subsystems of three levels. Intellectual security, like national security, can be external and internal and is based on three basic concepts: intellectual interests, intellectual threats, and intellectual protection.

5. Conclusions

The concept of new people-centeredness, new anthropocentrism, based on the values of sustainable development, is extremely significant for the modern world, since it pays close attention to the value and importance of man as a central figure in social decisions and development. In the future, a new, "sustainable" anthropocentrism can continue its development and evolution in accordance with changing conditions and challenges. One perspective may be a deep understanding of the role and significance of humans in the digital age, where technology and network communication play an increasingly important role in people's lives (Kryshtanovych et al., 2023d; Kryshtanovych et al., 2024). In addition, a broader integration of humanistic anthropocentrism, based on the intellectual security provided by sustainable cultural policies, with ecological and biocentric approaches is possible in order to create a more comprehensive and balanced basis for the sustainable development of human society.

References

[1] Alieksieienko, T., Kryshtanovych, S., Noskova, M., Burdun, V., Semenenko, A. 2022. The use of modern digital technologies for the development of the educational environment in the system for ensuring the sustainable development of the region. International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning 17(8): 2427-2434. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsdp.170810

[2] Auclair, E., and G. Fairclough. 2015. Living between past and Future." In Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability, edited by E. Auclair and G. Fairclough, 1-22. Routledge.

[3] Bassey, S. 2020. Technology, environmental sustainability and the ethics of anthropoholism. International Symposium for Environmental Science and Engineering Research (ISESER2020) at the Süleyman Demirel Culture Center Uncubozköy Yerleşkesi, Manisa, Turkey. https://socialspacejournal.eu/20%20numer/Technology,%20environmental%20sustainability%20-%20Bassey.pdf

[4] Bender, F. 2003. The culture of extinction: Toward a philosophy of deep ecology. Humanity Books.

[5] Birkeland, I. et al. 2018. Cultural sustainability and the nature-culture interface: Livelihoods, policies, and methodologies. Routledge.

[6] Brady, E. 2006. Aesthetics in practice: Valuing the natural world. Environmental Values 15(3): 277-291.

[7] Comfort, K. 2023. A global humanities approach to the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. Routledge.

[8] Dallaire, G. and Colbert, F. n.d. Sustainable Development and Cultural Policy: Do They Make A Happy Marriage? ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy. https://cercles.diba.cat/documentsdigitals/pdf/E140060.pdf

[9] Dessein, J., K. Soini, G. Fairclough, and L. G. Horlings, eds. 2015. Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development: Conclusions from the COST Action IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

[10] Droz, L. 2022. Anthropocentrism as the scapegoat of the environmental crisis: a review. Ethics in Science and Environmental Policies 22: 25-49.

[11] Duxbury, N., Kangas, A., and De Beukelaer, C. 2017. Cultural policies for sustainable development: four strategic paths. International Journal of Cultural Policy 23(2): 214-230.

[12] Garcia-Mira, R., Sabucedo, J., and Romay, J. 2003. Culture, environmental action and sustainability. Hogrefe & Huber.

[13] Griggs, E. 2009. The new humanism. BiblioBazaar.

[14] Hajek, O., Noosak, J., and Bednar, P. 2011. Local Agenda 21 and culture: Lessons from the Czech Republic. Culture and Local Governance 3(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.18192/clg-cgl.v3i1.187

[15] Implementing Culture within the Sustainable Development Goals. The Role of Culture in Agenda 2030. n.d. Culture Action Europe. https://cultureactioneurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Implementing-Culture-in-Sustainable-Development-Goals-SDGs.pdf
[16] Irvin, S. 2010. Aesthetics as a Guide to Ethics. In Aesthetics Today: A Reader, edited by R. Stecker and T. Gracyk, 370-377. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
[17] Isar, Y. R. 2017. 'Culture', 'Sustainable Development' and Cultural Policy: A Contrarian View." International Journal of Cultural Policy 23 (2): 148-158.
[18] Jha, A. 2004. Sustainable development: Concepts and strategies. AdhyayanBooks.
[19] Kopnina, H. 2020. Anthropocentrism: Problem of human-centered ethics in sustainable development goals. In: Life of Land (pp. 48-57).
[20] Kryshtanovych, M., Golub, V., Kozakov V., Pakhomova, T., Polovtsev, O. 2021a. Socio-Ecological Effect of Public Management of Green Development in the Context of the Philosophy of Modern Ecology. WISDOM 19(3): 114-126. https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v19i3.493
[21] Kryshtanovych, M., Kryshtanovych, S., Stepanenko, L., Brodiuk, Y., Fast, A. 2021b. Methodological approach to determining the main factors for the development of creative thinking in students of creative professions. Creativity Studies, 14(2), 391-404. https://doi.org/10.3846/cs.2021.14806
[22] Kryshtanovych, M., Antonova, L., Filippova, V., Dombrovska, S., Pidlisna, T. 2022. Influence of COVID-19 on the functional device of state governance of economic growth of countries in the context of ensuring security. International Journal of Safety and Security Engineering 12(2): 193-199. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsse.120207
[23] Kryshtanovych, M., Polovtsev, O., Liubetska, M., Lukashevska, U., Dubin, D. 2023a. Modeling the planning of the potential for sustainable development of the region in the system of public administration of social security. International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning 18(3); 757-762. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsdp.180311
[24] Kryshtanovych, M., Kupchak, V., Voronov, O., Larina, N., Humeniuk, A. 2023b. Formation of social leadership in the system of public safety and security through the use of modern modeling techniques. International Journal of Safety and Security Engineering 13(2): 317-324. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsse.130213
[25] Kryshtanovych, M., Kiyanka, I., Ostapiak, V., Kornat, L., Kuchyk, O. 2023c. Modeling effective interaction between society and public administration for sustainable development policy. International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning 18(8): 2555-2561. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsdp.180827
[26] Kryshtanovych, M., Kiblyk, D., Dzyanyy, R., Kovalskyi, M., Primush, R., Nazarenko, T. 2024. Formation of drivers of sustainable development: Administrative and legal support to ensure information security. International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning 19(4): 1611-1619. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsdp.19043
[27] Kononenko O., Ivanchenko A., Gaivoronska T., Khitrova T., Semenko S., Kuzmin V. 2024. Psychological and Social-Communication Aspects of HR Management Career in Wartime, Including Stress, Motivation, Will and Efficiency of Working Conditions, Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială, 84, 206-223.
[28] Kryshtanovych S., Inozemtseva, O., Voloshyna, O., Ostapiovska, I., Dubrova., O. 2023d. Modeling the Effective Digitalization of the Education Management System in the Context of Sustainable Development. International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning 18(5): 1507-1514. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsdp.180521
[29] Kuzmin V., Gaivoronska T., Khitrova T., Velykzhanina D., Kazannikova O., Kuzmina M. 2023. Communicative and Psychological Aspects of Professional Career Development: Exploring the Differences. Revista de Cercetare şi Intervenţie Socială, 81, 129-147.
[30] Nurse, K. 2006. Culture as the Fourth Pillar of Sustainable Development. Institute of International Relations, Trinidad and Tobago: University of the West Indies.
[31] Radcliffe, S., and N. Laurie. 2006. Culture and Development: Taking Culture Seriously in Development for Andean Indigenous People. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 24(2): 231-248.
[32] Rayman-Bacchus, L., and & Radavoi, C. 2019. Advancing culture's role in sustainable development: social change through cultural policy, International Journal of Cultural Policy, DOI: 10.1080/10286632.2019.1624735
[33] Secundo, G. et al. 2020. Sustainable development, intellectual capital and technology policies: A structured literature review and future research agenda. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 153: 119917.
[34] Shoreman-Ouimet, E., and Kopnina, H. 2015. Culture and conservation: Beyond anthropocentrism. Routledge.
[35] Taback, H., and Ramanan, R. 2013. Environmental ethics and sustainability. CRC Press.
[36] Unuigbe, N. 2020. Eco-anthropocentrism and sustainable development in Nigeria's Niger Delta region. GRIN Verlag.
[37] Valera, L. (2019). Depth, ecology, and the deep ecology movement: Arne Næss's proposal for the future. Environmental Ethics 41: 293-303.
[38] Witoszek, N., and Muller, M. 2017. Deep ecology. Brill.

Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology
ISSN: 2576-8484
Vol. 8, No. 6: 591-599, 2024
DOI: 10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2131