

Back to Ethics: Ecological Ethical Dilemmas and Restoration in the Era of Big Data

Yan Liu

School of Marxism, Zhejiang Normal University 321004, China

Abstract: The rapid development of information technology marks the arrival of the era of big data, and in the era of big data, the abnormal ecological ethics of man and nature alienated by the logic of capital highlights the body-centered and ecological imperialism under the digital existence, which points to the basic problems of "human thinking set in ecological practice" and "ecological governance responsibility". Ethical diseases must be solved with ethical prescriptions. Facing the two ethical problems, we should adhere to the basic stand of Marxist ecological ethics and absorb the essence of western environmental ethics. Specifically, in the innovation of embodied paradigm, we should change from "data" to "life"; In the transformation of thinking paradigm, we should change from "anthropocentrism" to "non-anthropocentrism"; In the transformation of responsibility ethics, we should change from "solipsism" to "otherness". In the transformation of human existence mode, we should change from "I think" to "true existence".

Keywords: Big data era; Ecological ethics; Repair.

1. Introduction

"Big data" characterized by the rapid development of information technology has broken through the "human scale". Xie Wen pointed out in his book "The Age of Big Data" that in the era of big data, mankind has the first opportunity to deeply explore the essential laws of the universe. However, in the era of big data, ecological ethical issues are often ignored. In 1962, American biologist Rachel Carson pointed out the pain caused by DDT insecticide to organisms in her book *Silent Spring*, denounced the arrogant idea of human attempts to "control nature", and called for ecological issues to be paid attention to and effective actions to be taken. This is where the problem of ecological ethics begins. So what kind of ethical relationship is "healthy"? How should we deal with all kinds of ecological ethical problems? These are big questions that we need to think about.

2. The Ecological Ethical Dilemma in The Era of Big Data

The era of big data has brought unprecedented profound changes to various fields of today's society. For nature, which has experienced a variety of social forms, the era of big data has provided a new social environment for the self-development of today's nature. However, we can see that the ensuing ethical problems emerge and have complex forms.

2.1. Embodied alienation: body-centrism under the existence of data

Bacon regarded nature as an inanimate substance, Kant proclaimed "artificial legislation of nature," and Nietzsche elevated the human body to superhuman status. The undispellable cloud of body center has led to the prominent ethical problems of body center in the era of big data.

First, under the digital existence of technological rationality alienation, human embodied power over nature. In the era of big data, People's Daily bodies are digitized, and technical rationality occupies a dominant position in the green economy. In the era of big data, economic dominators no

longer work clumsily like the pre-industrial society, but replace it with large-scale industry, fine and data-oriented farming. However, under the domination of technical rationality, modern people's physical ability is revealed, and they naturally think that their bodies can override nature by virtue of the power of data, resulting in the awkward reality of the binary opposition between man and nature. As Marx pointed out in 1844 *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, man and nature should be mutually objective existence, but man uncontrollably exploited nature, and the subjectivity of nature was dissolved.

Second, the illusory digital consumption landscape that the individual body is addicted to in the era of big data. The French situationist Guy Debauw, who proposed the concept of "landscape society," argued that the control of the production process in capitalist society has now given way to the dominance of consumer display. In the pre-data era, the ecological economy has not yet been rolled out in shopping malls, cinemas and other places, and now the "cloud green" symbol that can be seen everywhere unconsciously controls people's minds through the role of digital images, confusing and hypnotizing them to "green consumption" to meet people's social needs and realize others' recognition of "me". The digital consumption landscape of ecological economy under the "landscape society" makes people mistake themselves as the subject of natural consumption, but ignore the logos-like body centralism behind it.

2.2. Evasion of responsibility: ecological imperialism

Ecological imperialism is a new ethical threat to the development of ecological economy in the era of big data. "Ecological imperialism" is different from "traditional hegemonic discourse". [1] It is not just a "zero-sum game" and "egotism" in international exchanges based on the powerful military and economic power of the West, but an organic combination of policy, discourse, economic and technological supply, etc. with distinct colors of international ecological hegemony and exclusionistic discourse and system. It is the international spokesperson of "ecological rationality",

"ecological reality" and "ecological colonization". [2] For example, the Bush administration announced its withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol on the grounds that the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global climate change was "unclear" and failed to require developing countries to undertake emission reduction obligations, and Trump suddenly announced its withdrawal from the Paris climate Agreement. Ignoring the fact that the United States accounts for one quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions, the United States attempts to shift its ecological responsibility to others, which is a naked "ecological imperialism" under the post-modern international society. In other words, ecological imperialism and its realization mainly depend on the establishment and recognition of the institution and discourse system of the ecological international hegemonic discourse by Western powers.

Exploring the nature of capitalism at the level of its system, we find that the ecological logic of eco-imperialist centralism is contrary to the logic of capital. In the era of big data, ecological capital strives to separate cost and profit space and only occupies "ecological surplus value". When it comes to the stage of ecological imperialism, the inherent contradictions of capitalism will erupt into periodic ecological crises, which Western countries cannot solve. Some Western powers have resorted to the ecological imperialist means of "capital export", "garbage into the ocean", "labor cost control" and "international convention withdrawal" to carry out hegemonic ecological colonization of other countries, so as to transfer domestic ecological contradictions and cover up the global ecological ethical crisis. Moreover, in the era of big data, their means are more diverse and poor. As Harvey puts it: "Capitalism has only one solution to its pollution problems: move them around." [3] For example, after China refused to accept "foreign garbage", the eco-imperialist countries directly transferred the garbage to their less developed countries or regions, or even discharged it directly into the sea.

3. Back To Ethics: Repair Ethics with Ethics

In the face of the emerging digital existence of body-centrism and ecological imperialism, can only rely on the liberation of labor and political innovation is the real solution to its dilemma? How can we become better "class subjects" when facing ecological ethical problems? We must return to ethics, that is, stick to the stand of Marxist ecological ethics, absorb the essence of western environmental ethics, and promote the innovation of human embodied paradigm, the transformation of responsibility thinking and the sublimation of ethical concepts. [4]

3.1. Innovation of Embodied paradigm: from "data-oriented" to "life-oriented"

In the whole discussion dimension of the history of philosophy, "body" is not a very common concept. Since Plato's idealism pitted the "body" against the "mind," in the Middle Ages, Scholasticism argued that the "body" became an obstacle that needed to be overcome through the earthly existence of heaven. Although Descartes' "I think, therefore I am" elevated the status of the body, the body as the sensibility has always been subject to reason. The first person who really justified the name of the body was the irrationalist philosopher Nietzsche, who noticed that the potential of the

human body could make it evolve to the "superman", thus achieving the "eternal reincarnation". The existentialist philosopher Sartre was very concerned about the "physical pain" of the reality.

Today, the reality of the body is replaced by "big data", and the construction of body symbols is the home of data. Thus, in the operation of eco-capitalist economy, the body of workers is transformed into a series of numbers. In the operation of green economy in the era of big data, people and nature are simplified into symbols and standards, and the result is that people's own life experience is obscured.

Marx believes that man manifests his essential power in the object through labor. However, in the digitized labor relations, human labor is essentially alienated labor dominated by numbers, and there is a distorted relational labor process between human and objective objects, which wipes out human freedom. In this labor relationship, human body and mind are the most harmed: on the one hand, human mind becomes invisible and no longer pays attention to natural moral issues; On the other hand, the body does not exist as the real body of the human being, the body becomes the virtual body, becoming the intelligent gear on the production line of the data machine.

The ethical shift of the body in the era of big data is "life", what is "life"? Husserl put forward the concept of "life world" in "The Crisis of European Science and the Phenomenology of Transcendence", and Habermas's "life world" theory draws on Husserl's "life world" concept as part of his theory. Habermas believes that the world composed of communication behavior is the life world, and the life world, as a field for people to carry out public life, must precede the real world specialized in scientific research and scientific practice. Habermas's "life world" has its transcendental and mysterious nature, while environmental philosopher Cricot put forward the concept of "Earth ethics" in his book *The Home of All Sentient Beings: Defending Earth Ethics and Ecological Civilization*. Its most prominent feature is to give moral status to the life community itself and its internal members. In the past, human beings always appeared as "conquerors" in the face of ecology. However, in the requirements of "earth ethics", human beings and nature are naturally "community", and the "body" in "earth ethics" is a positive turn to the real ecological "living world". [5] The daily "life" of the body requires us to stay away from the dream of "big data", return to nature, review the natural social emotions of animals, and eliminate the ecological alienation ethic with the help of the "life" body.

3.2. Paradigm shift: from "anthropocentrism" to "non-anthropocentrism"

Human thinking determines the way of human ecological practice. Marx's theory of "the priority of nature" in "German Ideology" or Kant's theory of "man is teleological", which is right and which is wrong? In the modern society after the Age of Enlightenment, "anthropocentrism" has always occupied the mainstream argument. Is "anthropocentrism" really centered on "all mankind"? Or some citizens of the West? Or is it the capital behind the rhetoric? "Anthropocentrism" in the field of green economy directly throw to us the ecological ethical problem is: the center of ecology must really be "human"?

Some scholars believe that "it is because of this narrow anthropocentrism that ecological problems are caused, so they propose that we should get out of anthropocentrism." [6] his

leads to the emergence of non-anthropocentrism with a distinct symbiosis idea, which "requires human choice not only to come out of the egocentric concept, but also to return to nature and integrate into nature." [7] on-anthropocentric advocates "symbiosis", expanding human abstract feelings to the natural dimension. Nature is not cold nature, and human beings need to achieve "symbiosis beauty" at the spiritual level, which does not mean that human beings only claim from nature, but human beings need to coexist with nature with noble feelings like treating others. Non-anthropocentrism has abandoned the extreme thought of dualism of subject and object, carried out the spirit of great love into the field of nature, and realized the true "great harmony" between man and nature.

Therefore, we must resolutely oppose anthropocentrism, which places human beings above non-human beings in nature. Human beings cannot be the center in the relationship between human and nature, but can only become the subject, and this "subject" has distinct ethical responsibilities. Only when human beings bear the moral responsibility to nature bravely and solve ecological problems with the help of technical rationality can they become the real "class subject".

3.3. Transformation of responsibility ethics: from "solipsism" to "otherness"

Responsibility thinking determines the subject of ethical practice of "who will govern ecological issues" in the era of big data. Traditional deontology and utilitarianism have a common problem of lack of ethical responsibility, and both have the ethical characteristics of "solitarism". In the era of big data, "deontology" is manifested as the universal constraint of virtual ethics, but data ethics are unreal, and the final implementation is still dominated by "I", and it is empty without actual interests. "Utilitarianism" emphasizes "moral usefulness", and "morality" is for the actual happiness of the vast majority of people. However, "utilitarianism" does not give specific answers on how to coordinate more potential ethical conflicts between "human interests" and "ecological interests" (or, as ecological others) in the era of big data, and even annihilates "personal interests" among "interests of others". For example, the United States develops a "low-carbon economy" to achieve the overall reduction of its carbon emissions, but it does not pay attention to the current situation of the international division of labor, and finally fails to bring due benefits to some unemployed people in the United States. Both "deontology" and "utilitarianism" have not given effective ethical answers in the era of big data, and both have the characteristics of false or real "solipsism". In the face of the lonely dilemma of responsibility ethics, where should we go?

Contemporary environmental ethics has its circumstances, complexity and diversity. Under the post-modern social circumstances, "solipsism" can no longer adapt to the complex and changeable ecological ethics in the era of big data. Ancient Chinese philosophers have long been aware of the importance of "the other", the Book of changes says, "related to astronomy, to observe the changes of time; Related to humanity, in order to become the world "" wealth into the way of heaven and earth, complement the appropriate phase of heaven and earth". "Xunzi" said, "when the grass and trees are Ronghua, then the axe Jin does not enter the mountains, it is not born, and it is long." These ancient wisdom all reflect that the ancient Chinese philosophers have maintained the contemplation and reverence of "the other" since ancient

times. Arrhenes' deep ecology also lays great emphasis on the responsibility thinking of "the other". In the modern western environmental ethics, nature is a living thing, not a cold dead thing. However, in the era of big data, "data alienation" has become a new form of "alienated labor" referred to by Marx. However, in the ecological practice of "data alienation", workers do not feel personal pain, but they take pleasure in it. They do not care about the ecological pain of being "the other." Establishing the ethical thinking of caring for "others" helps us to break the shackles of the traditional responsibility ethics of "solipsism".

"The other" is a kind of "distance thinking". The "other" and the "I" are destined to be kept at a distance. Linus Blomqvist, Nordhaus, Shellenberger: "To protect nature by moving away from nature," [8] Therefore, Blomqvist believes that nature, as "the other", is also distant from human nature, and people should not only "embrace nature", but also appropriately "alienate nature". In the Manuscript, it is not difficult to find that Marx believed that man and nature were "natural symbiosis". Marx described the natural symbiosis between species as a relationship of power and obligation, which anthropomorphized the natural relationship. On the one hand, man can survive in nature and build his own aesthetic kingdom by relying on nature; on the other hand, Nature can also be better protected and developed because of human's transformation practice. However, man and nature are not always bound together. "Close embrace of nature" and "appropriate alienation from nature" refer to the reality of harmonious coexistence between human beings and nature. Therefore, we should not only respect the laws of nature and take appropriate measures, but also adhere to sustainable development and the principle of appropriate use, and always adhere to the harmonious coexistence of man and nature in the first place of social development, rather than taking excessive actions to fish in nature for the sake of one-sided development of man. And "appropriate distancing from nature" to allow nature to recover and develop itself, and to exclude the practice of excessive intervention, is sometimes the best way.

The international governance thinking of ecological ethics in the era of big data should also break through the "solipsistic" thinking and reach the "otherness" thinking of international cooperation. [9] Ecological governance in the era of big data is global, and human beings have entered a "community" society, but this "community" society is still a "risk society" as Baker said, and "biological crisis" always threatens the survival and security of human beings. Countries must reach a consensus on the value of "global governance", resolve the crisis of trust, and promote cooperative governance with each other. Only by effectively improving the governance capacity of domestic green issues and advocating international cooperation at the economic level can we achieve the realm of caring for "others" and achieving "self".

3.4. The transformation of human existence mode: from "I think" to "true existence"

Man does not rely on "cogito" and is in a solipsistic existence. Descartes' "cogito" natural philosophy is opposed to Aristotle's theory of nature. Descartes believed that all material things are machines governed by the same mechanical laws, even the human body, and this dualistic view later became the fundamental European method of thought. Therefore, man and nature are separated by nature

duality, and man becomes the "other" opposed to nature, and nature must reflect the desires of others and be governed by them, and "cogito" requires that ecology should not exist outside of me, that is, humanized nature.

However, in the era of big data, "cosi" has gradually been "fragmented", the existence of "Cosi" has been cut by the paradigm of data flow, and modern people's hurried industrial life, why give "Cosi" a quiet world? How can we give the existence of the "other" a real place to exist?

Man must poetically inhabit the earth and reconcile with the earth, which is the true way of self-existence. Heidegger expressed the true meaning of ecology in "The Origin of Works of Art", only in accordance with the "truth of existence" this source of survival, people can have the true sense of "habitation", such people can truly exist in the natural land. This is the interpretation of the meaning of the word "ecology". It is based on this meaning that the word "ecology" in the contemporary context embodies the salvation of the alienation of "homeless" and the real revival of humanity, and also embodies the beautiful ideal of contemporary people to protect all things in their historical existence. Therefore, the realistic concern of "authenticity" is to realize the beautiful ecological ideal of human survival, not only limited to the improvement of ecological problems, and ecological ethical dilemmas and themes in the era of big data can be overcome

and sublimated accordingly.

References

- [1] An Baoyang, Weng Jianding. The ethical deficiency of network information in the era of big data and its countermeasures [J]. *Research on Dialectics of Nature*, 2015 (12).
- [2] Cao Jindong. On the Principles of Information ethics [J]. *Jiangxi Social Sciences*, 2003(10).
- [3] David Harvey. *Justice, Nature and Geography of Difference* [M]. Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2015.
- [4] Liu Fusen. The theoretical dilemma of naturalistic ecological ethics [J]. *China Social Science*, 1997(3) : 45-53.
- [5] Liu Hong. Ontology of Big data [J]. *Dialectics of Nature Newsletter*, 2014,36(6) : 115-121.
- [6] Qin Mingxing, A Survey of Anthropocentrism, *Trends in Philosophy*, 6 (1997), pp. 19-21.
- [7] Nie Zhenzhao. From Anthropocentrism to Human Subject: A Way to Solve the Ecological Crisis. *Foreign Literature Studies*, No. 1, 2020, pp. 22-33.
- [8] *Global Science*, vol. 11, 2015, pp. 1-3.
- [9] FRODEMANR. The policy turn in environmental ethics [J]. *Environmental Ethics*, 2006, 28(1) : 3-20.