GEOSCIENCES

The Unsustainable Sustainability

SUZI H. THEODORO & OTHON H. LEONARDOS

Abstract: Over the last four decades, and particularly after Rio-92, discussions on environmental sustainability have expanded and been incorporated in many legal texts, in public policies and in the practices of daily life for a portion of the world's population. Despite this progress, achieving a more sustainable development is a goal that has yet to be realized, mainly due to economies that favor a predatory development, masquerading as sustainable, which turn a blind eye to the social, environmental and cultural limits of the planet's many different regions, and ultimately threatening the continued existence of human life on Earth. The guiding question of this paper is the incapacity of the sustainability model adopted in discourse, in business and in contemporary society. This paper is a test study and questions political ownership and the transmutation of the concept of sustainable development in discourse and daily life over the last few decades. Ultimately, we hope to draw attention to some of the hits and misses of this divergent sustainable development which claims to be modern. Overall, this paper is more about asking questions than finding answers.

Key words: Crises, domination, ethics, justice, unsustainability.

INTRODUCTION

A large part of the scientific community, intellectuals and idealists who work toward building new methods of socio-environmental justice have realized they have failed. Their aspiration of developing environmental sustainability has shifted from feelings of optimism to feelings of frustration. Conflicts over food production, over mining, energy and infrastructure are evidence that this issue is a long way from being resolved as economic interests[1] strongly outweigh the need to preserve/conserve the environment.

It is important to remember that the concept of sustainability was originally based on, and in conjunction with, principles of ethics and socio-environmental justice, as two sides of the same coin, which should guide the collective values for a fair and equal society. Following this idea, all things share a common origin, making all creatures and beings on the planet interdependent (Chardin 1955). This collective interdependence evolves according to the arrow of time. In this concept, the point Ω (omega) of complete connection between all beings, towards which the evolutionary process is heading, is still very far away. We can only envisage its final goal. Pierre Chardin believed in a human union within Nature, one which goes beyond togetherness, beyond the workings of a hive, a colony or an anthill. Human beings, more evolved, would better understand their origin, their role and their destination. Here, the collective interspecies justice is a fundamental role.

---

[1] Economic growth, which synthesizes the levels of development, ends up a euphemism for "degradation" when it incorporates the idea that it is an end to itself (Vargas 2004).

Even though we are currently taking a step backward in terms of justice, or a lack of it, this process will not necessarily drive planetary evolution into chaos or to its end. It can, though, carve out more turbulent paths since justice, especially the kind that mediates socio-environmental issues, tends to generate deep-seated injustices. However, when parts of the life system are concealed for the supposed "common good", other more ethical pathways might end up being excluded or disregarded (Romano 2001).

This notion holds that the "common good" cannot be determined by one group of people or by sectors of a society as the desires and aspirations of the global collective are as diverse as its very nature. It is impossible to determine what is best for a group of people who live in misery or whose lives are at risk when other groups already live in safety and enjoy the benefits of citizenship. The aspirations of political refugees, for instance, are quite different from those who live in tropical forests, or those who live in countries where democracy and safety is not an issue.

Taking into consideration the subtle differences that build up our concepts of truth and justice, it is our understanding that an initial misconception about the establishment of sustainable development could be attributed to the way it was proposed and how it was built or subverted. Notwithstanding, given the need to establish a democratic model of development/coexistence due to the limited natural resources on Earth, many of the perceptions and interests are still subliminal and are rarely shared with society, which could benefit from the benefits or obligations of a successful model. This largely follows what Santos (2016) believes which is that when one group proposes to define the reason of existence of another group, which they do not belong to, they might actually spread arguments which tend to subjugate, oppress or even disqualify the other.

During the 1970s and 1980s the development, proposal and understanding of the concept of sustainable development was conceived within an imbalance of power. The domination by specific groups that articulate themselves on speeches of justice and ethics over other groups (that have small to none voice or are unable to adopt a position) was prevalent, and since its inception has been the cause of profound injustices and atrocities (Theodoro 2015).

Assuming that this "original misconception" might have existed, how does one address environmental sustainability if its initial stages act as a developmental barrier for part of the population? The actual concept of environmental sustainability has much more to do with preserving natural resources rather than conserving them, which makes natural resources somewhat unavailable to those parts of the population that are still trying to reach minimum levels of development. Therefore, how does one impose limits on the population living in tropical forest regions from using their local natural resources in the name of preservation? In the same way, how does one prevent natural resources from being used in countries that have mining and water resources in areas that, due to their biodiversity, should remain untouched? How can we combine traditional knowledge with empirical knowledge to maintain natural systems?

These questions have yet to be answered, but there are a few proposals are pushing for a new developmental model based on factors and indicators other than the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or the Human Development Index (HDI) as these are based on a nation's economic development which is nowhere near sustainable and tends to transgress the planet's support

limits. Salvaging or redefining concepts of ethics and justice could be keys to a new beginning.

The paper is divide in two parts: 1 - Origin of the sustainable development concept and how it became a tool for domination and 2 - How the search for strategic natural resources led to the weakening of the concept.

DISCUSSION

Interlacing concepts and distortions of sustainable development

Historically, society as a whole has always gone through processes of adaptation and renovation either institutional, legal, social, economic, cultural and/or religious. These processes result in, or are the results of, disputes related to many issues. Over the last few decades, the areas where these disputes have been the most significant are in the preservation or the use of natural resources and energy geopolitics. The discourses and clashes over these issues may have masked objectives which may have been not so clear, and are almost always antagonistic, such as trying to dominate certain resources or strategic regions. Therefore, potential or actual crises turn into intense disputes or clashes, or even war, and rarely bring about any compromises for the future of society. In many cases, the issues are about social, cultural, economic or scientific/technological positions that have resulted from ideological guidelines. In situations when science is considered and listened to their theories, hypothesis, concepts and methodologies are taken as truthful (even in transient situations) and supported by ethical standards. However, when economic interests are involved, pragmatic and fast attitudes are nearly always ahead of ideological and ethics questions and in contrast prevail when scientific issues are considered (Theodoro et al. 2011).

Many of these debates are on social, cultural, economic and scientific positions which are often based on ideological guidelines and directions. The theories, hypotheses, concepts and methodologies of the sciences, when listened to and taken seriously, become truths (even if transitory) which are upheld by ethical standards. Yet looking at economic interests, we can see they are generally dissociated from ideologies (in contrast with the sciences) and are temporally or spatially transitory, in contrast with the sciences, and are rarely full of justice. (Theodoro et al. 2011)

Attempts at mediating so many diverse interests has led to establishing principles and obligations employing laws and regulations, which are thus imposed on the collective to control confrontations, behaviors and actions of individuals under the accepted principles for that particular period in society. Such laws are understood as norms that, in theory, are established to make social cohabitation easier. These laws condition not just the decision-making process of individuals, but also how these individuals can live with the restrictions of general norms which are placed upon them. This view summarizes the idea of path dependence, where decisions one faces at a single moment in time limit the possibilities for future changes (Couto 2013).

Yet changes do happen, and they lead to evolutionary mechanisms (Chardin 1955). Looking back at the purpose of norms, regulations, accords, treaties and laws in society one can ascertain that they have adapted and evolved – not always in a positive fashion – over the course of time. Nevertheless, their obligation of establishing rights and responsibilities for the collective is improving by encompassing more of the overall desires of the society (even though these desires can be erroneous and manipulated).

But how does one unequivocally express or summarize the collective and legitimate desires

of society? Thinkers like Rousseau (1712 – 1778) believe that general desires should essentially involve a social contract; in other words, a free association of intelligent human beings who intentionally decide to create a type of society which they obey. For Rousseau, a social contract is the only legitimate foundation for a community that wishes to live under the premises of human liberty. He does not believe that obedience means servitude or apprehension since general desires will always be following the common good.

However, if you look at the common good, it is a kind of generalization or a measure of what is best for a community and/or a society. It just so happens that the common ground is reached through agreements, which hold the best arguments and receive the most votes, and ultimately becoming laws. Even though laws convey common determinations and agreements, they are not able to placate all the various interests. Even when agreements are reached, there are always other groups who are in opposition to the majority. This difference of interests brings about conflicts that usually arise due to particular demands that were not addressed by–majority agreements. Hence, we need to use the conventions and the laws to include what does not reflect the common desire.

The history of conflicts and wars throughout civilization shows us that agreements are often transitory and focus much more on certain groups maintaining their dominance over others than collective justice itself. Nowadays, this domination is evident in the alarming number of migrants who, with no life perspectives in their own countries, set out in search of "paradises" that usually do not meet their expectations. They cannot see that these "paradises" created the situations which led them to leaving their own countries, and that the greed for the rich resources in their regions is the root of many of the conflicts.

Despite this dichotomy of modern conflicts being subliminal, it is a fundamental reason for a lack of truth, ethics and social justice – principles that should go hand in hand. But what is ethics? How does it establish itself? Has it changed throughout the process of building society? Finding the answers to these questions has been a life-long goal for many thinkers starting with Plato in Ancient Greece, who spent a great deal of time theorizing about these thought provoking issues, built on the understanding of each era. The goal of Platonic ethics, based on the idea of order or fairness that exists, was to conduce man towards doing good deeds, a behavior that exists in balancing out diverse elements that strive for the same goal. From that point is where the almost always tumultuous relationship between ethics and politics originates.

Consequently, it is impossible to talk of sustainability in its current developmental model without considering or discussing principles or concepts related to ethics, to social justice and to politics. Ethics is a word of Greek origin with two meanings. The first comes from the Greek word ethos meaning "character". The second defines, and somewhat guides, what we currently refer to as a set of rules, principles or ideas that guide or account for the actions of a person or group, or the systematic study of arguments on how one should act (Carvalho 2010). This definition comes very close to the concept of law, which, as previously mentioned, refers to a set of norms and rules established to make collective cohabitation easier.

Ethics and justice are understood as a set of habits, attitudes, thoughts and cultural forms acquired over time and, therefore, the concepts and principles attached to them have evolved with society. Romano (2001) argues that justice is based on the ethics of different periods and is built around the principles of those who dominate. As an example, he looks at the role of

women over throughout history. He attributes the injustices and oppression suffered by women to the consolidation of masculine ideas that were based on ethics to express their philosophical premises. He believes these premises resulted in the forms of domination, which were strengthened over time, causing a multitude of inequalities and oppression for women.

In this regard, Aguiar (2000) argues that the sustainability of traditional peoples was destroyed by the emerging state, which depreciated fertility rights to the point where dominators and the dominated reduced women to the role of reproducers (a lesser being). And paraphrasing Galeano (2013), the lie was repeated so much that it became true for these women and their daughters and their daughters' daughters....

Breaking this entrenched system of (mostly white) male domination has been an arduous task that triggers huge disputes – which involve cultural, religious, economic, educational and political principles that are deeply rooted in society. The struggles take place in various fields – from the political, through the educational, to the institutional – in all the levels that involve social organization (Pinto 2010). However, lot of male leadership and other sectors of society remain demonstratinghas been huge difficulties in accepting female protagonism, along with male collaboration in making of social change (Moreira et al. 2018). Some victories have been achieved over time, but much remains to be done.

More recently, women (especially coming from developing countries) have accumulated a more extensive workload; in comparison to men, they receive lower income and hold less public and business management posts, despite having higher levels of education (Brazil 2015). This greater access to education expands possibilities, increases the level of information and encourages critical awareness, which tends to result in better life choices. This empowerment

has been consolidating groups that were previously considered vulnerable from an economic and social point of view (such as the women farmers' movement in the Margaridas' March, or the black women communities on the outskirts of big cities). In this way, access to education, information and participation become powerful tools for transforming society. And even despite periodic setbacks, this process seems to be definitive in order to make society more just.

Despite these achievements, in light of current standards, one cannot compare what used to be ethical in ancient Greece or medieval Europe to current models of social coexistence. Apart from the female cause, another example is a hunting that was allowed or encouraged as a sport in some European countries up to the last century. Now, it is not ethical and it is illegal in most places. To the present standards, animals are part of our greater web of life that are vital to humankind survival.

Besides, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the enslavement of people, the use of racial or ethnic connotations and economic interests were permitted, encouraged and legalized. They were a way of promoting economic development. Nowadays, this is illegal and unacceptable, and if it does occur, it is punishable by law.

Notwithstanding the evolution of concepts and paradigms[2], discussions on justice and ethics have always been included with a large dose of ideology, turning their presuppositions to transitory truths, which adapt to the geopolitical needs of each era. For Aguiar (2000), paradigms,

---

[2]The paradigms form the nucleus of our ideas and feelings, they act as a program in our spirit, as a principle of cohesion and coherence that grants legitimacy and a nature of truth to our convictions, blinding us to other possibilities, invalidating and excluding them from our understanding of the real world. Thus, we tend to reject the divergent and the unknown, the differences and the revolutionary possibilities, for an inability to integrate truth arguments about what we deny (Morin 1998).

like social reproduction, change over time. They are altered as new human experiences and new problems emerge; they are contested, modified or abandoned and then substituted by other more suitable paradigms that fit the new demands of the world.

Thus, the first proposals for a more sustainable model of development were put forth in the postwar period. During the 1960s and 1970s, especially in Europe and the United States, discussions on the impacts of pollution, ecosystem degradation and over consumption of natural resources mobilized part of society, particularly groups of scientists, intellectuals and some business owners. The crisis reached such heights that old models could no longer meet the population's expectations.

It was these concerns (not free from domination ideologies) that led to the formation of the group called "Club of Rome", an organization that had discussed some challenges facing humanity, including the impracticability, over the long run, of the existing model of industrial growth. These discussions resulted in a proposal for limiting growth by reducing the use of natural resources. This report proposed zero growth as a way to stop the environment imbalances generated by the prevailing standards of development. However, this report did neglect the strong connotation of domination and maintaining of power in the international geopolitical scene as it criticized third-world countries (or underdeveloped/remote ones) for their high levels of poverty and misery, in opposition to the high levels of development in European and North American countries. If this report had been put in practice, the countries deemed as underdeveloped would have been kept just suppliers of raw materials, and even worse, they would have had to manage the environmental problems that come from

predatory exploration of natural resources (Theodoro & Barros 2011).

Afterward, other groups (including United Nations initiatives), presented proposals for a new model of development to replace economic growth *strictu sensu*, even if that meant mixing divergent rationalities and identities. In 1987, the Brundtland Report called on a mutual understanding and a spirit of intergenerational responsibility. It was this report that introduced the term Sustainable Development as a basis for discussing and reorganizing developmental politics. Its recommendations and conclusions led to the creation of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, 1992, leading to important action plans such as Agenda 21 and Conventions on Climate Change and Biodiversity, and the Earth Charter.

Two decades later and after the discovery that the planet's resources are still in jeopardy, Rio 2012 aimed to examine again the efficiency of the current model of sustainable development as the natural resources were still being consumed and increasingly put at risk, especially water, soil and the biodiversity of life that is dependent on them. All figures pointed to the biodiversity being in danger. This danger was directly related to the human race's continuity on this planet, independent of where that may be. Are we looking at an evolutionary leap? Are we looking at the extinction of the human race?

In an attempt to address this the United Nations (UN) defined 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which all countries should meet by the year 2030 (ONU 2015). This decision was reached by an assembly of 150 countries, all of which were committed to using action plans, targets, public policies and programs to accomplish these goals. If all the countries, individually, promote actions to reach these goals

we will most certainly make the world more fair and sustainable.

But there were many barriers which hinder progress and were strongly influenced by economic and geopolitical interests in the production of food, mining and controlling water resources. Also, there is clear evidence that many countries are adopting a more liberal view of business and the market, which goes against social justice, benefit sharing and development, none of which were sustainable.

Coupled with this tendency, representatives of more than 150 countries present at the UN Climate Change Conference in Morocco determined that the goals set in Paris, 2015, should be mandatory for all participating countries. This compromise made it possible to establish mechanisms for reducing the greenhouse effect and toxic gas emissions and measures for limiting anthropic actions on climate systems. Despite this such historic agreement, that places new obligations on all people, it appears that the world of politics and economy are moving in the opposite direction, or on a parallel track that appears to ignore the sustainability of the system and, ultimately, their own survival!

Nowadays, at a time when neoliberalism appears to be imposing on democratic states, ruining social achievements or guarantees of protecting fragile ecosystems, it is the agreements that strive for the common good that are at stake because geopolitical interests supersede those of the collectivity – which in this case are neither consistent nor cohesive.

Resource control and the waning concept of sustainability

Although understanding sustainability is not dominant, it shows that a part of society is blind. This blindness, more than just a problem of perception, does not allow society to see that the web of life sustaining us and allowing for our

continued existence on the planet is at risk. How much more time will it take for us to realize and break apart from this unsustainable development model? Will we be able to find a balance within the web of life? Moreover, will human beings even have the chance to evolve in the direction of Teilhard de Chardin's omega and contribute to the growth of the noosphere?

Who will remain? Just the traditional peoples who treat Mother Earth as sacred? Or will it be contemporary colonizers (internal and external) who oppress, divide and share natural resources like wasteful owners who want to extract as much as possible and do so using the discourse of sustainability as a mask to hide its atrocities? Are societies in the world aware of this hypocrisy? Are we all blind?

Even though the Earth has its own life cycle which includes geological changes caused by earthquakes, volcanoes or extreme weather, humanity cannot turn a blind eye to the fact that something dramatic is happening and that it is quite possible that these changes may lead to the extinction of humankind or another level of interaction with Earth. Even though we cannot guess how much change will occur and how it will manifest, there is no reason to doubt the outcome. As Chardin questioned, would this outcome be the prime opportunity for human evolution? Could there be something beyond this? What is outcome? Anxiety? Fear? Extinction of our species? An apocalypse full of suffering and pain or renewal of our species? Where do we go?-

Our understanding over time has been that preserving natural resources, particularly forests, the wilderness and water resources, is a condition to the continued survival of many species on Earth, especially humans. Despite sounding obvious, this statement is not one that all contemporary society agree with. It is highly likely that to reach another model, societies would need to replace their current processes of

competition with more collaborative and solidary forms of coexistence. This involves building a culture of social treaties for the common good or at least for avoiding disaster, as suggested by Lopes et al. (2010).

One of the most praised bestsellers of 2017 – The Doughnut Economics – argues that Economics should meet Ecology half way. In this book, the author envisions a change of goal from Gross Domestic Product - GDP to her doughnut model. On this model, she states that the safe and just space for humanity lies halfway between the social foundation of human well being and the ecological ceiling of planetary pressure (Raworth 2017). This halfway meeting with ecology marks in her graph both the maximum limits where the Homo economicus might stay and the minimum limits under which Nature may be destroyed to guarantee human well being. But even if this well intentioned doughnut discourse prevails over the command of The Free Market, political decisions should almost always be influenced by the one percent richer who control present-day economic trends in most countries, despite of the good local examples given by the author.

Most countries ignore that Natures' resources are finite and continue suffering from an evergrowing devastation process. Now, with increased perceptions of climate changes associated with CO_2 growing levels in the atmosphere, it becomes obvious that CO_2 (along with other harmful) emissions must be reduced. According to the last 2018 UN report, previous attempts to limit fossil fuels emissions up to 2020 are bound to fail, as well as the goal to keep the temperature increase below 1.5°C. We do not yet know switch off the command *devastate* - trade mark of present times. Meanwhile experts in economics and environmental/ecological sciences start to question which discipline was the most relevant.

May we therefore glimpse better days for our kind? Or are we facing what the Greeks called "Apocalypse"[3] - a period of renovation after an intense disaster? Could we upgrade into a species above the one that call themselves sapiens, a species wiser and more affectioned towards web's life? Would we be then marching towards Teilhard de Chardin Omega's Omega point as well as increasing the sphere of planetary conscience - the noosphere[4]?

While this objective may seem like a utopia for current democracies, one way toward shaping new paths might be by taking new or readapted theories and scientific premises and using them to create new hypotheses, concepts and methodologies. Even if these premises or theories are transitory, they will be able to shine light on a level of development and social, economic, cultural and environmental justice which closely mirrors the desires of a society in constant change. But to achieve this, a true real advancement in knowledge is necessary, one that surpasses the old or hidden truths of justice. We need to distance ourselves from what we all perceive to be obvious or apparent (Souza 2017).

Even though a lack of consensus is common within the sciences, which theoretically makes it difficult for politics and government to get a handle on new principles and concepts, this lack of consensus acts like a carrier of models of coexistence that make social life possible. While other matrices for explaining the world are valuable (Aguiar 2000), understanding current society is essential to establishing new rules include moral, ethical and social values.

Leff (2001) suggests that, in the new millennium, the predominant model of rationality

---

[3] Apocalypse is an ancient Greek word that means rebirth after a period of widespread destruction.

[4]Term conceived by the famous Russian geochemist Wladimir Vernadsky for the conscience sphere who also gave present-day concepts of lithosphere, hydrosphere, atmosphere and biosphere.

still seeks to understand the world and its crises in a compartmental and fractioned way, with uniform solutions. However, the complexity of conflicts and articulations derived from this, in conjunction with the diversity of applied arrangements, transposes the field of technical and scientific knowledge or political-economic actions, opening up a space where a wide range of rationalities meet.

Aguiar (op.cit.) adds to this line of thought when he states that one person's heaven can be another's hell as similarity and identity go hand in hand with contradiction and difference. He suggests that human being behavior and reactions within a universal genesis are influenced by externalities, which are subject to human interference. He stresses, however, that the same human beings who destroy and tear each other apart in unproductive disputes or in the name of primary beliefs also write a contradictory plot.

It is exactly within this contradiction that environment questions stand out, breaking barriers and forcing a new process of social construction. The search for a new level of understanding mankind relationships with the natural environment might lead to contrasting rationalities and identities that put the established truths in question. Leff (2001) underlines that the perception of the ecological crisis shapes the concept of environment. Here, a new vision of human development can be inserted to reintegrate the values and potentials of nature, of social externalities, of subjugated knowledge and the complexity of the world, all of which are denied by a mechanistic, simplified, one-dimensional and fragmented rationality that conducted the modernizing process of the planet. He believes that environment knowledge includes diversity, new ethical values and esthetics, and synergetic potentials generated through the articulation of ecological, technological and cultural processes.

Thus, we are now at a critical point where we need to establish a strong civilization pact which can mobilize us in the opposite direction of the current, and obvious, unsustainable development we live in. Only then, might be enough significant change to mobilize or slow down the corrosion of the human ecosystem! But not the planet itself as has been commonly repeated by lay men. Having the property of *autopoiesis*, human beings may extinguish themselves or even his closer life system, but as part of the biosphere, they are not able to destroy the entire biosphere and certainly not the Earth whose evolution have been going on for 4,5 billion years.

The centrality of economy as a rational guide for social life and all its ramifications – the idea of progress, the obsession with productivity, the efficiency and idea of limitless growth, the infinite technological progress – have all resulted in heated conflicts and disagreements. Yet, sustainability must be built on a different base from the existing model of development as the lack of it is the central cause of social, economic and ecological crises.

CONCLUSIONS

Change always brings about conflict between the new, which looks for space and the old, which does not want to accept new realities. These transitions bring to light complex problems of difficult solutions which the available instruments and tools are not able to solve. Following Leff's proposals, the complexity of situations and its articulations translate into a set of arrangements that transpose the field of scientific-technical knowledge and political-economic actions, opening up a space where different rationalities meet. The search for a consensus or favorable mechanisms facilitates what Rousseau referred to as a social contract, which he believed to be

the only legitimate base on which society would be able to attain liberty and justice; in other words, collective ethics.

Even though many writers and thinkers consider the environmental issue to be a modern phenomenon, it has been an important factor for over more than a century now, influencing political-economic decisions across the world. And while development has made life easier for most people, bringing improvements to health and longevity and creating opportunities for consumption and well-being, it has also brought about opportunistic diseases, unknown and increasingly dangerous viruses, and in particular, the deterioration of the natural environment and mankind's relationship with nature.

In such win/lose scenario human beings are moving toward an uncertain future in terms of sustaining life as we know it today. The only certainty is that conflicts and disagreements will be increasingly more violent and cruel as natural resources will become scarcer or more contaminated. How can we change the current course of development that is so economically efficient and improves the quality of life for the top few percent of the richer population, but at the same time runs the risk of leading to our extinction? The answer to this and many other questions about our future coexistence with nature cannot be fully answered now, as we are still living a period where concepts and practices are changing and fractured.

However, we cannot give up! We cannot do as top singer Raul Seixas when he sings "Stop the world, I want to get off!" (Raul Seixas was a Brazilian musician who wrote many protest songs in the 1970s). There is no other Earth on which we can start all over. So it's time to think about mechanisms and alternatives for reconciling the different and diverse cultures, customs and beliefs. While we may be, on one side, traditional peoples who see the Earth as sacred, and on the other, colonizers who own the land and the Earth and use and consume it with no consideration for its sustainability, it is time to think about where we are going. In this clash between sides, the greatest risk we run is not understanding that the "myth" of sustainable development, which we naively believe we are building, has become insufficient and a difficult goal to achieve. However, we must remember that many ancient myths like Gilgamesh in Mesopotamia or Erysicton from ancient Greece and Rome had already warned us about a future where nature will renew itself if threatened. The world does not need to stop, just be rid of those who fall outside the web of life.

There comes images of golden, black and bronzed-skinned youths running along the beach, running through the forest - they are Amazonians who belong to a new species that plays, respects and loves one another. They are Children of Nature and no longer call themselves Homo sapiens sapiens. Here Nature follows the arrow of time in the direction of love and not greed. These youths have native blood and a native soul. They love the Nature where their grandparents are, who lived with Nature in the heart of the forest but had to leave because the colonizers came and terrorized them, forcing them to flee, bringing what they dreamed of to life (Leonardos 2017).

REFERENCES

AGUIAR R. 2000. Os filhos da flecha do tempo: pertinências e rupturas. Brasília. Letraviva, 357 p.

BRAZIL. 2015. Relatório Anual Socioeconômico das Mulheres (RASEAM) http://www.spm.gov.br/central-de-conteudos/publicacoes/publicacoes/2015/livro-raseam_completo.pdf. (Acessado Out/2018).

CARVALHO LL. 2010. Moral, o direito, a ética e a moralidade administrativa. http://www.fucamp.edu.br/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/9-A-moral-o-direito-a-%23U00c3%23U00a9tica-e-a-Luciano.pdf.

CHARDIN PT. 1955. O Fenômeno Humano. São Paulo: Editora Cultrix, s/d, 392 p.

COUTO CG. 2013. Instituições Políticas (Originalmente publicado no dicionário de Políticas Públicas). FUNDAP, p. 486-490.

GALEANO E. 2013. Trilogia Memória do Fogo. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira.

LEFF E. 2001 Saber ambiental; sustentabilidade, racionalidade, complexidade e poder. Metrópolis/RJ. Ed. Vozes, 2ª edição.

LEONARDOS OH. 2017. VI Congresso da Sociedade Internacional de Ecopsicologia – Biofilia e Memória Ancestral, Uruguai.

LOPES C, SACHS I & DOWBOR L. 2010. Riscos e oportunidades em tempos de mudanças (coletânea). Instituto Paulo Freire, 272 p.

MOREIRA SLM, FERRERIA AP & SILIPRANDI E. 2018. Memórias das mulheres na agroecologia do Brasil. In: Sánchez GPZ, Vargas GC & Siliprandi E (Eds), Agroecología en feminino. Reflexiones a partir de nuestras experiências. La Paz. SOCLA, p. 61-74.

MORIN E. 1998. O método 4: as ideias – habitat, vida, costumes. Porto Alegre, Sulina.

ONU. 2015. https://nacoesunidas.org/conheca-os-novos-17-objetivos-de-desenvolvimento-sustentavel-da-onu/. Acessado em Abril, 2015.

PINTO CRJ. 2010. Feminismo, história e poder. Curitiba. Rev Sociol Polit 18(36): 15-23.

RAWORTH K. 2017. Doughnut Economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist. Penguin Random House, London, 372 p.

ROMANO R. 2001. Contra o abuso da ética e da moral. Educação & Sociedade, ano XXII, nº 76, Outubro/2000. http://www.revistas.usp.br/revusp/article/view/13858/15676.

SANTOS BS. 2016. A difícil democracia: reinventar as esquerdas. São Paulo: Boitempo, 220 p.

SOUZA J. 2017. A elite do atraso: da escravidão à Lava Jato / Jessé Souza. Rio de Janeiro: Leya.

THEODORO SH. 2015. Lobby e ética: como conciliar interesses na construção das leis? Monografia defendida na Fundação Getúlio Vargas. Brasília. 67 p.

THEODORO SH & BARROS JC. 2011. Política nacional do meio ambiente: conquistas e perspectivas. In: Theodoro SH (Ed), Coletânea Os 30 anos da Política Nacional de Meio Ambiente: conquistas e perspectivas. Editora Garamond/UnB, p. 15-32.

THEODORO SH, DUARTE LG & LEONARDOS OH. 2011. Sociedade, ciências e políticas ambientais: o lócus de encontro de interesses e disputas. In: Theodoro SH (Ed), Coletânea Os 30 anos da Política Nacional de Meio Ambiente: conquistas e perspectivas. Editora Garamond/UnB, p. 15-32.

VARGAS GM. 2004. Políticas ambientais: atores e escalas. www.unbcds.pro.br/cursovirtual. Acessado em Maio, 2015.

SUZI H. THEODORO[1]
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4659-269X

OTHON H. LEONARDOS[2]
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5842-1375

[1]Programa de Pós-Graduação em Meio Ambiente e Desenvolvimento Rural, Universidade de Brasília, Área Universitária 01, Vila Nossa Senhora de Fátima, Planaltina, 73345-010 Brasília, DF, Brazil

[2] Professor Emérito da Universidade de Brasília, Av. Italia 405, Tibery, 38405-056 Uberlândia, MG, Brazil

Correspondence to: **Suzi Huff Theodoro**
E-mail: suzitheodoro@unb.br

Authors contributions

Suzi Huff Theodoro: Conceptualization, original draft preparation; writing, editing, reviewing and validation.
Othon Henry Leonardos: Conceptualization, Reviewing, Validation.