

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

THE HUMAN WORLD

Diego Gessualdo Sabádo de Souza

PhD in Clinical Psychology (PUC-SP);
Master in Philosophy (UFPA); Specialist
in Higher Education Teaching (UEPA);
Graduated in Psychology (UNAMA);
Graduated in Philosophy (UFPA);
Professor at the Department of Philosophy
and Human Sciences at UEPA.

Zakiee Castro Mufarrej Hage

PhD in Clinical Psychology (PUC-
SP); Master in Clinical Psychology
(PUC-SP); Specialist in Person
Centered Approach (Faculdade
Inspirar); Graduated in Psychology
(UMAMA); Professor at CESUPA.

All content in this magazine is
licensed under a Creative Com-
mons Attribution License. Attri-
bution-Non-Commercial-Non-
Derivatives 4.0 International (CC
BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: The article reflects on the idea of humanizing the world and naturalizing the human. We reflected on the elaboration of proposals for the construction of an environmental Ethos that allows taking care of the Earth. Starting from the anthropological theory about how indigenous natives of Brazil understand the relationship between human beings and the world through the culture-nature duality. The philosophical incursion is based on the notion of caring for the environment and on the possible paths for this care based on the referrals and responses of Environmental Psychology as an area of Psychology that is dedicated to the study of the Person-Environment relationship.

Keywords: Environmental Psychology; Environmental ethos; World; Human; Culture.

THE ESSENCE OF PHILOSOPHY AND THE ORIGIN OF PHILOSOPHY AS NEEDS OF THE PRESENT TIMES

The only function left for philosophy in our contemporaneity is to reflect on the world, on the sciences, on the arts, on spirituality, on every action and every ideational construction that human beings perform or can perform. Well, this single function is, in short, everything. That is why Heidegger (2008b) used to say that to philosophize is to say the same about the same thing, exactly because we always renew our understanding of philosophizing itself. To think the same about the same is to never leave existence without the support of philosophy. Philosophy, therefore, is prior to all science as objectifying knowledge of the world, it is the foundation of this very science, as it is, at the same time, bank and river where science navigates and is what provides the raw material for building the scientific vessel. Thus, philosophy is always a thought of principle, founding and engendering the world, reality, truth (HEIDEGGER. 2008b). It is only because

in the openness to philosophical thought we, human beings, are open to the most original understanding that thought can reach, that philosophy assumes this fundamental status in our existence.

But when we talk about contemporary philosophy, what marks does it bring that differ from previous philosophy? Is this former a strictly temporal mark? And why did we start this Environmental Psychology text talking about the essence of philosophy anyway? We are in contemporaneity, that is to say, in our present time, marked and dated temporally today, the second decade of the 2000s, the beginning of the 21st century. But what does that mean? Philosophically, it just wants to demarcate that the current ways of being-in-the-world carry a history in their baggage. So, what differentiates philosophy today is exactly that there was one yesterday. So, the mark that our current philosophizing brings is exactly the history of philosophy itself, always suspended over us when we are willing to philosophize. Therefore, the previous philosophy is marked temporally, historically, but not only it, ours as well, this means that the essential mark of philosophizing is incompleteness. Philosophy is always incomplete, unfinished, insufficient, because as a way of being-in-the-world of human existence, it mirrors finitude itself, and finitude is the mark of our incompleteness, our incompleteness and our insufficiency.

But why, after all, are we making these initial comments about philosophy in this text? Precisely to show that philosophical reflection, as a way of being-in-the-world, always responds to the temporal, epochal, historical call of the present moment in which we live. Philosophy is a response to what the world asks of us, therefore, the willingness to philosophical thinking is a genuinely human and necessary existential action, without philosophy there is no science, there is no art, there is no world and there is no humanity.

Thus, reflecting on Environmental Psychology becomes urgent, and this urgency cries out from our world, it is an epochal, historical request of our present time. It is today's demands that require us to think philosophically about the human relationship with the world, between the person and the environment in which he or she exists. That we rethink our ways of inhabiting and caring for the planet.

The proof that the reflections of Environmental Psychology are inserted in this complex game of the space-time here-now where human existence is launched is the following statement that states: Environmental Psychology could not have arisen in Antiquity, nor in the Middle Ages, nor in the Modern Age, it is a child of our time, of our contemporaneity. If this self-evident statement still needs explanation, just reiterate that Environmental Psychology arises from the contemporary demands of the relationship between human being and world, person and environment (MOSER. 2004) as we will see later.

Now, it is obvious that humanity could not problematize global warming without centuries of alterations caused by human beings in the climate having originated this demand, this clamor requesting a response. We could not think about the questions of Environmental Psychology before these questions ask for answers.

For this reason, at the beginning of this reflection, these comments on the nature of philosophizing fit here. Let us now move on to defining the problem: environmental education needs, in order to reach the degree of satisfaction that translates into effective results, to reframe the relationship between human beings and the world, between people and the environment. This reframing permeates the reconstruction of identities, the re-elaboration of new world actions and

the sharing of solid environmental values. Identity, actions and values compose a way of being-in-the-world, and it is exactly the ways of being of people in this world that is our shared world that need to be reframed.

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY ABOUT NATURE AND CULTURE

To begin this reflection, we will use a theory of Anthropology, which probes, in a comparative way, the meanings of human existence from the vision that humanity itself has of itself. The understanding of what nature is and what culture is is the foundation of the way of understanding existence, this existence is always existence in a world, therefore, to reflect on the understanding that humans have of the nature that is their nature and of the culture that is their culture is to reflect on the world inhabited by the human itself, and on the relationship of this human with the world.

So, we have the difference between nature, on the one hand, and culture, on the other. Nature is that which founds, synonymous with essence and foundation, that which originates something and makes this originated thing remain essentially what it is. To change the essence of something is to destroy this something and make something else out of it. Nature is, then, the essence of the thing.

Culture, in turn, is composed of all the activities of meaning and meaning that human beings develop: truths, laws, values, beliefs, history and memory, future projects, worldviews, production of material and artistic goods, all of this makes up a culture in the link between the "I" and the other, of the person with the community in which he or she is inserted. This way, culture cannot exist without the gathering of human beings, without the construction and origin of society.

What is our nature and what is our culture?

Answering this question is fundamental in Environmental Psychology. How do both, nature and culture, relate to each other and can they help in the reflection about the renewal of the human relationship with the world, person and environment, in the construction of scientific knowledge of Environmental Psychology? Let's do this from a very special anthropological theory.

In the work ``Sobre a Inconstância da Alma Selvagem``, anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (2002) presents a series of essays on Brazilian indigenous peoples and on their relationship with the Europe that docked here during the great navigations. His work stems from anthropological, historical and archaeological research, the book features nine essays and an interview, and his theses earned him the rank of founder of a new anthropological school.

In the essay entitled ``O Mármore e a Murta``, the author reflects on the supposed volatility of indigenous beliefs, given the need for catechization. The natives who seemed to adhere faithfully to the precepts of Christianity when faced with the cross, who shed true tears over the story of the crucified, on the same day returned to their paintings and rituals.

Here is the image of the inconstancy of the wild soul, as the Portuguese came to understand it. In the metaphor, the Europeans take the place of hard and immutable Marble, resistant, beautiful and firm, and the indigenous people the place of the plant that grows without control, without recognized roots, in a random and confusing way. However, Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (2002) finds another path of reflection, inverts the senses and meanings of what was understood by the essence of the wild soul and elaborates his anthropological thesis that would even be recognized by Claude Lévi-Strauss.

There is always a hard lump in every society, the hard lump is that which does not change,

which cannot be undone, which cannot be eliminated without this elimination causing the extinction of that society, of everything it was, became, is, and will be.

The hard core of our so-called civilized societies, daughters of a Greek philosophical construction, which placed rationality as a guide and goal, is humanity itself, or, as Eduardo Viveiros de Castro says, Human Nature. This is what does not change, amidst the infinity of existing and possible existing cultures. We are, then, a society that has a single nature, human nature, and diverse cultures.

Eduardo Viveiros de Castro's thesis (2002) is exactly the one that says that trying to understand the indigenous people who inhabited Brazil at the time of discovery from this lens is a mistake, since human nature is not the hard core in indigenous societies.

For Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (2002), what is immutable for the indigenous societies of Colonial Brazil, what cannot be eliminated without causing the collapse of society itself, is exactly culture. This culture was based on a strong belief that the word created the future, and that this entire future was structured on revenge, consummated in war.

Through the word, in rituals, the indigenous gave life to time, built time, and in war they consummated what the word had prophesied. This culture of war, revenge and the word, once "de-meaning", caused the ruin of indigenous peoples.

What interests us in this thesis by Eduardo Viveiros de Castro is exactly the understanding that: while Europeans, and we, people of Western civilization, have a single nature, human nature, and diverse cultures, indigenous peoples had a single culture and diverse natures, not just human nature.

In other words, we have an essence, what founds and originates the Western human is the notion of humanity that he

carries, linked to fundamental concepts such as freedom, transcendence, language, corporeity, temporality, spatiality, rationality, emotionality and many others.

All these foundations make up the human being and consequently human nature. The way human beings have found to manifest, experience, interpret and explain all these characteristics of their uniquely human nature makes up the infinity of cultural modes existing in the world.

But this traditional understanding of the relationship between nature and culture is only for us, children of “civilization”. The native Indians of Brazil did not exist under this Western philosophical “truth”. For them, the rituals, values, tradition, laws, the whole set of activities that make sense of the world that made up their culture was what could not be changed, it was what founded existence, while human nature, with its peculiarities, its scope and limits, was just one more possible nature among others.

For the indigenous natives of Brazil, culture as a hard lump, as a foundation, had the task of maintaining control among the many possible natures, so that human nature would remain governing the life of each individual in the tribes and the existence of the tribes themselves as societies.

There is an inversion in the game between nature and culture in the way of being-in-the-world of the indigenous natives of Brazil. For the European human, human nature is what remains regardless of which culture one follows or which culture one comes from. A culture can be changed, renewed, forgotten or even built from scratch, without it affecting human nature, precisely because culture comes from the characteristics of nature as the essence of human beings.

For the indigenous natives of Brazil, the existential foundation is not human nature, but culture itself. It is culture that means and

gives meaning to the world and through it human existence remains possible. Without it, without the Tupi-Guarani culture, the human disappears, because human nature cannot remain.

For the Tupi-Guaranis, keeping human nature under control was a task that demanded rituals, sacrifices, tasks and self-control. The indigenous peoples who lived here understood that the whole world had different natures, and that in each existing entity all natures inhabited, even if only one stood out and gained reality each time.

We understand this if we look at the indigenous legends that persist until today, it is common in these legends to hear narratives of anthropomorphic creatures, or the narrative of men and women who transmute into other beings, or even narratives in which trees, rivers, mountains, speak and feel as men and women do.

Let's take the legend of Açai, for example, where the Indian Jussara gives rise to the tree that has the açai clusters. Or even the legend of Guaraná, with two eyes watching us. We have the legend of the Dolphin, the animal that comes out of the water, turns into a man and seduces women, Saci, Curupira, Matinta Pereira herself, old and bird at the same time.

All these and many others always bring the hybrid relationship between natures, where human nature is one among other natures. In every living being, and all beings, in the Tupi-Guarani culture, have life to some degree, animal nature, vegetable nature, mineral nature, human nature and all other forms of physical and metaphysical nature are present. There is no understanding of death as an end, dying is just no longer being human nature as the main nature, dying and being a river, or air, or sky or forest.

If we understand this, it becomes easier to understand the relationship between this and what we seek in Environmental Psychology.

There is no superiority of human nature over animal, vegetable, mineral, etc., in humans the mineral, vegetable and animal are present in equal strength.

THE LAND WITHOUT EVIL IS BUILT IN A CHANGE OF LOOK

The indigenous native of Brazil looked at the river and saw in it the brother that the tribe had lost. The look that humanizes the world is the same that makes man part of all of nature, part of a single system, of a single organism pulsating with life.

This new look holds a beautiful secret and presents us with a key that can allow new proposals for intervention in Environmental Psychology, in the sense that, as we have different natures, the ethics that govern the relationship between men expands towards the rivers, the seas, the forests, the fauna, the atmosphere, etc., thus achieving an extremely necessary globality for the care of the environments in which we live.

This thesis of the relativity of natures can also be approximated to the Tupi-Guarani legend of the Land without evil (Yvy marã e'ỹ). The Earth without evil was something equivalent to what we understand today as the Christian Paradise, with the fundamental difference that it could be reached while still alive. The Tupis-Guaranis narrated that access to Earth without evil was not that difficult, before men became corrupted. After this corruption, the divinity sent a great rain that removed the Earth without evils to the middle of the great sea, making access difficult, but not impossible.

When the Portuguese arrived in Brazil, after the initial contact period, when the relationship between indigenous people and whites became complicated, entire tribes abandoned their lands, guided by their leaders, the Karaí, in search of the Land without evil.

Within all this mythical understanding,

what is important for our reflection is exactly the description of this Land without evil: a place where the river is clear, arrows fly and reach the target by themselves, and where men and women live in harmony with nature.

If we think that the indigenous people were right that finding the Earth without evil was possible in life, we can start to ask ourselves why we can't too, find/build our Yvy marã e'ỹ. And this question unfolds into another, what can and must we do to build our Earth without evil?

For Heidegger (2008a), in a text entitled "Building, Dwelling, thinking", in the first paragraph he writes: "It seems that it is only possible to inhabit what is built. This one, building, has that one, dwelling, as its goal. But not all constructions are dwellings".

In this text, Heidegger (2008a) exposes the importance of reflecting on the essence of Dwelling, and his text ends by saying exactly that, that one of the most urgent tasks of humanity is to build a world from the understanding of the essence of Dwelling, as well as the task of thinking about the world itself so that we can Dwell in it.

To inhabit the world, or if we want to, inhabiting the planet, making it our common home, our dwelling, is an essential task, Pope Francis himself (2015) makes this appeal in his Encyclical *Laudato Si*, where the need for care for this common home, which is the planet, is addressed. To inhabit the Earth, to make it our common home, is, therefore, to build our own Yvy marã e'ỹ, our Land without evil. And Environmental Psychology can and must help in this task, humanizing the world and naturalizing man.

CREATE THE WORLD AND TAKE CARE OF THE EARTH

For Hannah Arendt (2007), the Earth demarcates the limits of our existence, of our finitude, even though all science movements

are aimed at breaking these limits. The planet's barriers, for the author, echo the very barriers of our condition. The human condition, then, is closely linked to planet Earth as the place that makes our life possible.

In truth, there could be no human being without planet Earth, as it is the planet that provides the conditions for our existence. Not taking care of the planet is playing with chance, with something like destiny, and playing with human existence itself. Going beyond the limits of planet Earth means wanting to go beyond the limits of humanity itself, and science, from Quantum Physics to Neuroscience, has been working hard on this path.

The reflection of the human condition linked to the advances of these sciences is also very welcome, but it is not the objective of this article. It is important for us to understand that human beings and planet Earth are co-belonging and together form what we name existence and world.

We inhabit planet Earth. Not because we are placed here as something occupying a place in space. If we were like that, we wouldn't dwell, we'd just be there. Dwelling presupposes meaning, giving meaning, making this locus our home, our home. If, as Arendt (2007) pointed out, the human condition is demarcated by the limits of planet Earth, then it is precisely in the possibility of inhabiting this planet through care for it that humanity is structured. But what is caring for the planet? Before talking about care, we need to weave a few more paragraphs about this existence that creates the world and about this world itself.

Man is the creator of the world, this thesis by Heidegger (2006) exemplifies and illustrates this relationship between human beings and the planet. The world is exactly the totality of senses and meanings that the being endowed with reason attributes to planet earth. For there to be a world, planet Earth

must be there, as a structuring base, just as human beings must be there so that we can build the semantic universe that constitutes our world.

Felix Guatari (1996) calls these structures semiotic activities that make up existence in societies and shape cultures. Semiotic activities are all actions, values, truths and narratives of existence present in a culture, as we have seen previously. It is in these activities that the senses of the world are established, we can even say that it is in semiotic activities that we human beings build this very world in which we inhabit.

To build the world is to inhabit the Earth, but only to the extent that we take care of this semiotic construction. Caring is worrying about something and with something. At all times we are occupying ourselves with the things of the world, occupying ourselves is the most commonplace and everyday way of our existence (SABÁDO. 2018). When I am busy, I use beings in some way, handling cutlery at lunch, writing a text with a pen or pressing keys on a computer, turning the key in a door lock, stepping on the sidewalk as I walk, attentively watching a class being taught at school, listening and babbling the lyrics of a song, laying my head on the pillow to sleep. To be occupied is, in short, to make use of the things of the world, and we do this all the time.

To worry, in turn, is to stop our being in an instant prior to the use of things, it is to put oneself in a previous state of being occupied. Concern launches us, in this stopping before the occupation, in the genuine understanding of ourselves in the world. He who is concerned with himself takes care of himself (SABÁDO. 2018), therefore, he who is concerned with the world takes care of the world.

The relationship between self-care and quality of life occurs exactly in the fact that self-care is a person's previous look at themselves that enables the balance of all their spheres

of life, thus, taking care of oneself is seeking balance, is seeking quality of life (SABÁDO. 2018). Reflection on caring for the world can follow the same reasoning.

Taking care of the world as a preoccupation with the world is a stopping prior to being occupied with the things of this world. This means that we need to reflect on our semiotic activities, on our constructions of meaning and meaning in the world, in order to renew and reframe them.

But is taking care of the world the same as taking care of the Earth? Let's not waste too much time on this question. The earth is the necessary and structuring locus that demarcates the existence of the human being, only on the concrete basis of planet Earth can we exist, only because we exist as beings there on Earth can we inhabit the Earth and create the world. So, taking care of the Earth is possible through the creation of a world like that one, providing senses and meanings that form culture.

But not all creating the world is care, on the contrary, as we said, the most common and commonplace is the occupation and not the pre-occupation of care. And it was exactly the use, the careless occupation that brought us, in our present time, the need for concern and care for the Earth. The demands of Environmental Psychology arise exactly from this need to be concerned, urgently, with the world we create, they arise from the need to find means for a sustainable use of the Earth, and sustainable use comes from the concern that is the care for the Earth.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL ETHOS

Foucault (1979), narrating the trajectory of the origin of contemporary medicine, explains state medicine in Germany, French social medicine and the medicine of the poor in England, details the emergence of the first

concerns with the health of cities, arising from the necessary health care to prevent and combat diseases and thus maintain people's health. These studies were not focused on the relationship between the person and the environment in the scope of Environmental Psychology studies, but they show exactly how social demands require answers from human thought to solve problems that are, as we have already written, historical, epochal, temporal.

The ways of being-in-the-world are characterized by the forms of responses to the solicitations of this same world. Responding to requests means being aware of the demands of each era. In other words, the way in which semiotic activities are carried out, the way in which the meanings and social and historical meanings of the human being's relationship with the world are understood and responded to characterize the time and present time of a society or even of a social grouping interconnected by their own values.

Environmental Psychology works exactly with these structures of sense and meaning present in the world we build. Once raised to the level of science, or area of psychological science, it claims, as an object of study, the person's relationship with the environment, and the environment is exactly this semantic whole, the whole endowed with senses and meanings that we call world. World that we create and that we must take care of.

According to Moser (2004) Environmental Psychology arises and develops from the particular demands of each country. This is how in Anglo-Saxon countries the demands of architecture give rise to reflections on the relationship between the environment and people, and in Latin America it is the social problems that give rise to this interdisciplinary reflective area that has psychology as its theoretical starting point.

The development of Environmental Psychology over the years has broadened its

reflective scope, but it is always the demands of the world that call for contributions from the area. Currently, in this new century that is heading towards the end of its second decade, what the world is increasingly asking for reflections, problematizations, satisfactory answers and possible solutions is the need to care for the environment in which we live.

Environmental Psychology has the task of helping other sciences and areas of knowledge with their theoretical and practical contributions so that we can save the planet, and there is no other way to put it: taking care of the Earth is the cry we need to hear, the demand that urges and cries out for us is the salvation of the earth.

The reflective starting point of Environmental Psychology is the relationship between person and environment, according to Moser (2004) it is this characteristic that guarantees the interdisciplinarity of the area, the fruitful dialogue with other sciences such as geography, architecture, history, medicine, anthropology and all others that in some way touch on their research and investigations in this person-environment relationship. And not only that, this starting point, the person-environment relationship, allows us to think about the notion of well-being and quality of life in its primordial subjective locus.

It is environmental psychology that highlights the living conditions in large urban centers and, consequently, the living conditions in the world as a whole (MOSER. 2004). This links well-being with sociocultural identities and with the formation of these identities, and leads us exactly to the outcome: caring for the planet is caring for the identities formed in the person-environment relationship.

But how can we actually reach this conclusion? The person structures himself in the demarcations that he makes of himself in the world, as we have already mentioned twice in this article, the world is every

semiotic construction arising from human activities (Guatari. 1996). It is the human who builds the world, and the human, as we have already written, can only build the world on the material basis that we call planet Earth. It is from this urgent demand that we care for the earth in the name of our own future that efforts in Environmental Psychology have developed around the world.

The task of Environmental Psychology, said philosophically, is to enable the foundation of a real Environmental Ethos. Ethos is a Greek word that refers us at the same time to custom, habit and the notion of place, space, locus of habitation, it means house, or even the house where we build our customary existence. This space where the environmental Ethos can and must emerge is based on the intrinsic human capacity to spatialize the world.

Spatializing the world is part of corporeality and the human act of creating the world (HEIDEGGER, 2001). For the German philosopher, our body does not only occupy this physical space in which we find ourselves, in fact, in the very act of thinking or talking about a distant place, our own world expands.

We spatialized the world and our body is there, in the place we speak of: we feel the breeze in a field, the smell of grass, or the brackish wind on the beaches of the river in Pará, for example. In this construction of the world, we give meaning to each thought, in a magical game of memory and imagination, and this is to give meaning to the spatial locus, semiotically characterizing each physical space is to spatialize the world. When we think, remember or even imagine other places, we are here and there at the same time.

This philosophical notion of Heidegger (2001) can be linked to the concept of appropriation of space, which is very important in Environmental Psychology to understand reflections about the relationship between person and environment. According to Pol

(2002), the appropriation of space occurs in a dual understanding of action-transformation, carried out by the person-environment dyad.

In the relationship we have with the space where we live, our brands, the symbols, the meanings attributed to the space and the things that are in it, mark our appropriation of this space. It is the semiotic activities, the various constructions of the world and spatializations of this world that determine the space that is “mine” and the space that belongs to the “other”. It is this way of appropriating space that also determines whether our relationship with this space will be healthy or not.

The space we live in, our dwelling, within this understanding that spatializing the world and being-in-the-world is part of our primordial “I”, of our way of being in this world with ourselves, with others and with the world itself, makes the very semiotic activities of existing in the spatialized world keep traces of our identity.

If existence cannot exist in emptiness, then every identity must be formed in a space endowed with existential meanings. It is only here that we can build the Environmental Ethos. In the creation of the world that is a continuous construction of meanings of the world itself. It is in human existence that building enables dwelling (HEIDEGGER 2008a). This construction of meanings that we call culture is the soil where we can build the environmental Ethos.

But an Ethos cannot be built without understanding and reframing the values and beliefs that drive an identity in a culture. Environmental Psychology is very interested in reflection on these individual and collective action engines. A value or a belief, passed and perpetuated socio-historically, guide the existence of humanity.

But the perpetuation of a value or a belief is an illusion, and throughout history we can pick up endless examples of beliefs and values

that have been reframed with the march of history and the renewal of societies. For Steg (2012), values are desired goals that guide people’s lives and beliefs are the engendering of these values, absorbed by the person, so that this person leads his life according to these beliefs.

According to Steg (2012) beliefs can be more malleable, whereas values are much more rigid and lasting, although not perpetual or immutable. Even based on values, beliefs can change more easily over time. For this reason, the environmental Ethos must be a value formed and absorbed by people, and not just a belief that leads them to take care of the space where they live.

We enter the field of environmental education. It is through it that we see the possibility of building an environmental Ethos. To achieve this, we need to work, through Environmental Psychology, on the relationship between Consensus and Action.

According to Bassani (2012), communities are formed by individuals, these individualities act from their own interests, therefore, any project or proposal necessary for the improvement of the community needs to be accepted by the so-called social consensus. Only consensus can allow moving on to action so that all community members are integrated with each other in relation to the objectives.

The construction of the environmental Ethos cannot do without this path: reframing people’s values, creating solid environmental values that allow the conduct of life within sustainable environmental parameters, and this is achieved through education, not an education that is only individualized, but an education that aims at building a consensus.

This is the path that environmental education projects must take, always having as their goal and objective the formation of an environmental Ethos that allows care for the world we live in, this world that is

construction of meanings, which is a set of semiotic activities, and which is only possible because there is a spatial locus called planet Earth that we must take care of.

TO HUMANIZE THE WORLD AND NATURALIZING THE HUMAN

For Moser (2004) Environmental Psychology is, above all, a psychology of space insofar as it analyzes people's perceptions, attitudes and behaviors in relation to the space in which they live. And it is here, in this perceptive, ethical and behavioral intersection of the human in relation to the space where he lives, builds and from which he is built, that the humanization of the world and the naturalization of the human that started this article is possible.

To humanize the world is done through the naturalization of the human, at the same time that this naturalization of the human is done through the humanization of the world. This circle does not translate a mere rhetorical construction, on the contrary, it shows exactly all the originality that there is in the engendering of human being and world, world and nature, nature and human being.

To humanize the world means, ultimately, transposing the ethical care existing in relationships between humans to the relationship with nature, modifying preexisting values, building solid environmental values. This educational action can promote the necessary care with this nature and can help to fulfill the sustainable objectives that Environmental Psychology aims for.

Naturalizing the human, in turn, means understanding that the human being is also part of this nature, he is not a separate entity that exists and relates to nature separately, the history of philosophy and humanity has gradually, gradually, separated man from his natural state and launched him to the level of something else. The lord of nature, the one

who holds the power of knowledge, which will allow dominion over all of nature, proclaimed by philosophers and scientists of modernity, needs to be deconstructed to make way for the natural human who must return.

Only if we once again understand the human as an integral part of nature will we be able to build the environmental Ethos to jump the Earth. For the reframing of the values that govern societies, as well as the teaching and absorption of solid environmental values, requires this implication and belonging of the human to what nature is. Taking care of the world requires this pre-occupation that comes from holding on to what we are for a while, it demands reflection and it demands love.

The writer, singer and composer from Macapa, Zé Miguel de Souza Cyrillo bequeathed to humanity a declaration of love for the planet that translates into art everything that we try to philosophically expose in this article. The human relationship with nature and the need to care for the Earth must be forged in love and driven by this love to what is nature in the human and human in nature. The song is called Perola Azulada, and goes like this:

I already learned to fly inside you
Anchoring in space when feeling tired
bones of the journey

I already learned to live like you live naked
A macaw Indian chief cultivating aurora
Light from your tiara

I love you, my beloved land
My hut, my igloo, my home
I love you, blue pearl
Bead on God's necklace, hanging
Blessing, my mother

I already learned to swim in your blue sea
Worship the water, man, fish, water
illuminated fountain

I already learned to be part of you
Respect the life in your belly
How many more will learn

I love you...

Art has the ability to express through feelings much more effectively what symbols, logic and reason attempt. Zé Miguel's song expresses exactly the task of Environmental Psychology expressed in this article, building an environmental Ethos is to make people learn to be part of nature, learn to respect life in the womb of this mother Earth, that is to love the earth, and, as we have already written, love for the Earth is necessary for us to take care of it.

This common house where we live contains huts, igloos, stilt houses, shacks, huts, apartment buildings, mansions and all kinds of housing. To understand planet Earth as the immense house we live in makes us take care of it. The feeling of belonging can be an engine for transforming values and absorbing environmental values. Dwelling is caring, caring is loving, loving is living in this common house we share.

If we are not, as existential beings, just human, and if there is a river and a forest in us, taking care of the planet is also taking care of ourselves. To love the world, in this

sense, is to love the human naturalized, and the nature of the world humanized. Caring like preoccupation is love. To humanize the world and naturalize the human, then, is to make room for love. Loving the Earth is the way to the future, helping to fulfill this need of our present time is the task of Environmental Psychology.

If we are made of river and forest in the same way that we are body and soul and pulsating spirituality, if we are made of time and freedom in the same way that we are made of cities and asphalt and concrete and art and sports and religion and everything, if each and every semiotic world-building activity forms us in our most intimate identity, if we are the very world that we build, then taking care of yourself is taking care of the world, loving yourself is loving the world.

To be human is to be world, human nature is compartmentalized into many natures, not in the mystical way as the Tupis-Guarani natives of Terra Brasilis believed, but precisely in the human capacity to mundanize the Being and thereby humanize all existence.

William Shakespeare once wrote that we are made of the stuff of dreams, and it is in the dream of the future that we must deposit the efforts of research in Environmental Psychology, a dream that can and must materialize today, in the change of attitude, values and behaviors in relation to the planet, in the construction of an environmental Ethos that allows naturalizing the human in the humanization of the world and humanizing the world in the naturalization of the human.

REFERENCES

- ARENDDT, Hannah. (2007). *A condição humana*. 10 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.
- BASSANI, Marlise A. (2012). "O consenso e o agir na educação ambiental" In: HAMMES, Valéria S. (org.) *Educação ambiental para o desenvolvimento sustentável: Proposta metodológica de Macroeducação*. v. II. Brasília: Embrapa, (3ª ed), p. 199-203.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. (1979). *Microfísica do poder*. Organização e tradução de Roberto Machado. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal.
- FRANCISCO, P. (2015). *Carta Encíclica Laudato Si*. São Paulo: Editora Paulinas.
- GUATARI, Felix. ROLNIK, Suely. (1996). *Micropolítica: Cartografias do Desejo*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. (2008a). *Construir, Habitar, Pensar*. In *Ensaio e Conferências*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (2008b). **Introdução à Filosofia**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (2006). *Os Conceitos Fundamentais de Metafísica: Mundo, Finitude e Solidão*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. (2001). *Seminários de Zollikon*. ed. Medard Boss. São Paulo: Educ. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- MOSER, Gabriel. (2004). *La psicología ambiental: del análisis a la intervención dentro de la perspectiva del desarrollo sustentable*. In Eda T de Oliveira Tassara *et al* (editores). *Psicología e Ambiente*. São Paulo: Educ.
- POL, Enric. (2002). *El Modelo Dual de La Apropiación del Espacio*. Universitat de Barcelona.
- SABÁDO, Diego. (2018). *Sentidos e significados do cuidado de si realizado por psicoterapeutas: reflexão sobre individualização, cuidado de si, qualidade de vida e fazer psicoterápico (Tese de Doutorado)*. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.
- STEG, L.; GROOT, J. I. M. (2002). *Environmental Values*. The Oxford Handbook of Environmental and Conservation Psychology: Oxford Library of Psychology. New York, p. 81-92.
- VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. (2002). *O Mármore e a Murta*. In *A Inconstância da Alma Selvagem e Outros Ensaio de Antropologia*. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify.