

PERCEPTIONS ON NATURE THROUGH THE EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE NORTH AND SOUTH

ABARTAL, K.^{1*} – BOUTKHIL, S.¹

¹ *Department of English Studies, Mohammed I University, Oujda, Morocco.*

**Corresponding author
e-mail: Khalidabartal[at]gmail.com*

(Received 17th June 2023; accepted 10th September 2023)

Abstract. This study claims that epistemologies of the North and South hold contradictory perceptions vis-à-vis nature. Studying these perceptions is the interest of this present paper since it argues that Northern epistemologies adopt an objectifying visualization of nature compared with Southern epistemologies which hold an earthly centered and biocentric attitude regarding nature. This paper starts from the belief that nature is indispensable for the existence of Man on this planet and, hence, must be preserved for the coming generations. For epistemologies of the North, the research analyzes the work of Descartes who talked about *res extensa* and *res cogitans*, Rousseau who discussed the importance of the social contract in the organization of modern societies and Adam Smith who contributed in the development of capitalism. For epistemologies of the South, it refers to terms like pantheism which claims that God is everywhere, *sumak kawsay* or *Pachamama* which consider nature and earth as a mother that cares for her children. Utilizing the comparative approach in critiquing the two epistemologies, the research concludes that epistemologies of the South and the North must interfere and interact to learn from each other. This is very important for the development of knowledge in general and the preservation of nature in particular.

Keywords: *nature, epistemologies of the north, epistemologies of the south, extraction*

Introduction

Recently, nature is seriously threatened by the development that humans have reached in science in nuclear weapons, chemical products or genetic engineering for example. Due to this progress, some people still believe that nature is an object that was created, only, for exploitation by ‘rational’ humans. This perspective is, however, opposed by others who believe that nature is sacred and must be treated with respect. Existing research though very sparse and mostly from Latin America (Mignolo, 2017) think that coloniality still “infects our minds and makes us ‘see’ what the rhetoric of Western modernity wants us to see” (Mignolo, 2017) and, consequently, a need for a decolonization process is urgent. This is because the perception of nature is influenced by the Western theorization of the term which is based on the celebration of reason and the neglect of nature. Consequently, decolonization necessitates a new world system that can replace the European universalism (Wallerstein, 2006).

This system is known as the epistemologies of the South (de Sousa Santos, 2018; 2015) which provides an alternative to Northern epistemologies and modernity. In general, epistemologies of the South are critical of how nature is seen as an object to be exploited by humans. Santos echoes that “epistemologies of the South proposed in this book are an invitation to a much larger experience of the world as one’s own and thus to a much broader company in the task of transforming the world into a more equal and more diverse world.” Said differently, epistemologies of the South struggles for “a world in which different worlds will fit comfortably, to use the Neozapatista Subcomandante Marcos’s slogan” (de Sousa Santos, 2015). One finds a clear

resemblance between this definition and how the native inhabitants of America understood the relationship between them and nature before the arrival of Europeans. They considered nature as an inhabitant with a soul that should be used just for survival. In fact, many of them were pantheists who believed that God is within nature and not independent from it. In this case, Levi-Strauss recalls how several thousand Cuahuila Indians never exhausted the natural resources of a desert region in South California, in which today only a handful of white families manage to subsist. They lived in a land of plenty, for in this apparently completely barren territory, they were familiar with no less than sixty kinds of edible plants and twenty-eight others of narcotic, stimulant or medical properties (Lvi-Strauss, 1996).

For Santos, Baruch Spinoza's definition of God as nature which existed, exists and will exist is highly celebrated. Spinoza differentiates between *Natura naturans* (Spinoza, 1996) which refers to an infinite essence or God that is the cause behind the existence of finite things and *Natura naturata*, to attack Europeans' Cartesian perception of nature. On the contrary, Santos shares the concepts used by Latin Americans in their reference to nature like: Pachamama (mother earth) found in the Ecuadorian constitution, Sumak Kawsay (living well) written in the Bolivian constitution and highly regarded by Santos who sees it as the perfect alternative for the Northern objectification of nature. One can take the example of article 71 which grants nature rights just like any Bolivian citizen or the example of Swadeshi used by Ghandi to talk about nature's rights. This Swadeshi is similar to "the ideas of sumak kawsay and Pachamama of the indigenous peoples of the Andes" (de Sousa Santos, 2018). Consequently, the research relied on this theory in providing the alternative for preserving nature and life in general in this planet. Besides this theory, the study was approached through the use of postcolonial ecocriticism. Nevertheless, a group of people, indeed, enjoyed such rights at the expense of others and nature.

In fact, Western modernity -which is vital to epistemologies of the North- is thought to be a myth (Dussel, 1995) and needs to be redefined. As such, nature must be central to any new attempt to talk about modernity. The need for a new definition of modernity is derived from disappointment since people expected the latter to improve the conditions in which they live like ending all diseases, providing jobs for everyone and eliminating poverty and crime. Hence, in this research I attempt to examine how epistemologies of the North and the South have perceived nature starting with epistemologies of the South's theory which provides a different perspective toward nature. In other words, it seeks to attack the Eurocentric understanding of nature and provide an alternative to it. This alternative is urgent since the Northern epistemologies hold an anthropocentric-extractivist attitude toward nature under the banners of modernity which led and will lead to horrible ecosystem-crises. I start this paper with talking about the postcolonial ecocriticism since it clarifies the relationship between Northern and Southern epistemologies since the latter considers Northern colonialism as the main reason behind its epistemologies' decadence. Then, I study how the Northern epistemologies taking the example of Descartes' 'cartesian', Jean-Jack Rousseau's 'the social contract' and 'capitalism' perceive nature. The study shows how they focused more on reason and abandoned nature, consciously or unconsciously, in their philosophies and writings. Later, I move to investigate how the South's epistemologies view nature through three examples: 'Pantheism', 'Sumak Kawsay' and 'Pachamama'. Through these epistemologies the research reveals the importance nature plays in the life of Southerners.

The postcolonial ecocriticism

It is likely to question the relationship between postcolonial criticism and ecocriticism. In fact, “ecocriticism examines the representation of and relationships between the biophysical environment and texts, predominantly through ecological theory” (Mason et al., 2013) while postcolonialism voices the non-human victims of colonialism’s atrocities since colonizers viewed “nature and the animal ‘other’ as being either external to human needs, and thus effectively dispensable, or as being in permanent service to them, and thus an endlessly replenishable resource” (Huggan and Tiffin, 2015). Hence, this approach believes that the colonizer had an objectifying perspective toward nature being available for exploitation by Man. This exploitation is, also, ascribed to the belief that they regarded themselves as separate from -but superior to- nature or what is called ‘speciesism’. Worse still, this “prioritisation of one’s own species’ interests over those of the silenced majority is still regarded as being ‘only natural’. Ironically, it is precisely through such appeals to nature that other animals and the environment are often excluded from the privileged ranks of the human, rendering them available for exploitation” (Huggan and Tiffin, 2015).

This imperial-hierarchical attitude toward nature must be overridden according to postcolonial ecocriticism theory. If Ngugi talked about ‘decolonizing the mind’, this theory proposes decolonizing the perception toward nature through changing the anthropocentric visualization with earth-centered perspective that considers nature to be as important as humans. This anthropocentric attitude is because of the colonizer’s Eurocentric perception of the world. The colonizer never tried to learn from the indigenous cultures especially their respect toward nature and thought in return that such practices represent “indigenous cultures as “primitive”, less rational, and closer to children, animals and nature’ (Huggan and Tiffin, 2015). In many colonies like Australia and North America, colonizers were not so much enthusiastic to learn about the other indigenous cultures since they tended to conceive themselves “as conferring (or imposing) the gifts of civilisation upon the benighted heathen with little or no interest in receiving his or her philosophical gifts in return” (Huggan and Tiffin, 2015). One can take the example of the Indians who practiced specific rituals when hunting and after hunting. These rituals are an expression of respect toward the prey and the spirit they believed inhabited such bodies. On the reverse, settlers mocked such practices and believed that animals are an object that can provide food, clothes and means of transportation. Now that the research finished with the methods, it moves to talk about the theories, it moves to tackle the approach used in this research.

The study is approached by the discourse comparison method that was firstly used by Freiburger (2019) which is seen as another method of comparative approach. This approach focuses on the heterogeneity of readings concerning a significant phenomenon. Working on case studies, this paper believes that discourse comparison approach to be very important for it is “first and foremost, a reminder of how much we might achieve through comparison. Comparing and contrasting are essential analytical moves” (Bartlett and Vavrus, 2016) in studying and understanding an issue. In general, this approach enables researchers and readers to understand clearly the studied topic through critiquing it from different angles. Consequently, this article relies on this approach since it studies nature from Northern and Southern binoculars. In addition to the discourse comparison, the study relies on the text analysis method to critique the

writings of the analyzed writers. This method enables this research to study the perspective of some Northern and Southern writers vis-à-vis-nature.

Epistemologies of the north: An extractivist vision

Cartesian vs nature

Descartes is known as the father of modern rationalism since he dedicated his life to understand the nature of reason. Known by his ‘Cogito, ergo sum’ (I think, therefore I am), Descartes introduced what is known as the radical dualism which perceives the world as composed of ‘res cogitans’ and ‘res extensa’. In his *Meditations on Philosophy*, he started his journey with doubting everything he was taught about sciences. For him, the aim was to question the ways through which scientists have reached certain results or what is known as ‘epistemology’ (Lalander, 2014). Yet, this research is interested in his differentiation between ‘res cogitans’ or thinking thing and ‘res extensa’ or extended thing. The first one is thought to be possessed by humans only since they are the only creatures capable of reasoning. Without it, humans wouldn’t feel being different from nature in general. The mind, echoes Descartes, is “a complete thing, which doubts, understands, wills, and so forth, although I deny that there is anything in it that is contained in the idea of body. Therefore there is a real distinction between the mind and the body” (Descartes, 2018). The second one ‘res extensa’ is thought to be the other unreasonable things like rivers, stones or animals. For Descartes, “stone is a substance, that is to say, a thing capable of existing by itself, and likewise that I am myself a substance, then although I conceive myself to be a thinking and not an extended thing, and the stone, on the other hand, to be an extended and not a thinking thing, so that there is a very great difference between the two concepts” (Descartes, 2018).

Interesting further, Descartes sees his body as part of the extended things. In other words, reason is separate in the way that it (res cogitans) can exist outside the physical body (res extended). For more illustration, Descartes asserts: “I have a body, which is very closely conjoined to me, yet because, on the one hand, I have a clear and distinct idea of myself, in so far as I am a thinking and not an extended thing, and, on the other, a distinct idea of the body, in so far as it is only an extended and not a thinking thing, it is certain that I am really distinct from my body, and can exist without it” (Descartes, 2018). The reason is, then, “a complete thing, which doubts, understands, wills, and so forth, although I deny that there is anything in it that is contained in the idea of body. Therefore, there is a real distinction between the mind and the body” (Descartes, 2018). Through the mind we can question and understand the extended things and our existence. This dialectic or dualism of existence has been questioned by philosophers since the beginning: do we exist, first, and then think or we cannot exist without thinking which means that thinking precedes our existence. For Descartes, it is the mind that enables us to question and doubt our existence unlike the extended things which cannot question such things. Consequently, res Cogitans is distinct but superior to res extensa in the way it allows humans to harness nature and have a free will to do evil or good. This supremacy has been attacked by many researchers (de Sousa Santos, 2015) who accused Descartes of minimizing the role of nature. This minimization can be seen in considering nature as the ‘other’ or an ‘object’ (a mechanistic conception) that can be exploited by humans since it was created to serve them. Considering humans as the center of the world at the expense of nature under the pretext that humans are intelligent

is clearly insane. Nature is indispensable to humans because they cannot exist without it. So, being intelligent means understanding this fact and; then, treating nature as part of the self that we belong to and we rely upon to survive.

In the end, Descartes influenced Europe and the whole world starting from the seventeenth century and his ideas were understood and developed by philosophers and thinkers after his death. Yet, this research does not hold him to be a culprit who asked people to objectify nature but argues, in contrast, that his time was different from nowadays. Nature was not threatened with nuclear weapons or climatic changes back then, for instance. Hence, Descartes' thoughts must be developed by humans nowadays since they mark the beginning of a new era in the history of philosophy. Besides Descartes, the research discusses the 'social contract' of Rousseau.

The social contract: Rousseau as an example

Rousseau believes that the need for a social contract is derived from the fact that humans cannot be governed by coercion or physical violence. Any state using force to make people obedient should never stay in power and will dissolve eventually. Rousseau who was born in Geneva and, then, moved to Paris, started his great work the Social Contract with affirming that "Man was born free" (Rousseau, 1994) and will never, subsequently, be enslaved by another person or political entity. He, then, regarded the family as a small society that its members agree upon a contract. The father plays the role of the ruler who manages the affairs of his family and the children as the people who have to obey their ruler. The children obey the father in exchange for protection, shelter and food while the father is paid through the love he receives from his off-springs and the feeling of control he has over them. Social contract is, then, an agreement between people to move "from the state of nature to the civil state [which-] produces in man a very remarkable change, replacing instinct by justice in his behaviour, and conferring on his actions the moral quality that they had lacked before" (Rousseau, 2008). For Rousseau, what man, in fact, "loses by the social contract is his natural freedom and an unlimited right to anything by which he is tempted and can obtain; what he gains is civil freedom and the right of property over everything that he possesses" (Rousseau, 1994). In the natural state, Man is following his instincts and fighting for survival. His property is not guaranteed and his 'family' is not safe without his protection but in the civil society, his property is secured and his fellow men's as well. When choosing the civil society, a ruler is either chosen or is imposed on the people. For Rousseau, when people are satisfied with their ruler, they become one body that "is impossible to injure one of its members without attacking the body, and still less to injure the body without its members being affected" (Rousseau, 1994). They will, for instance, defend their societies against invaders and respect the general will that they agree upon.

This general will is seen as necessary to keep the society as one body. It represents the public benefit that will benefit all the citizens and not, only, an individual "for each individual can have, as a man, a personal will that is contrary or dissimilar to the general will that he has as a citizen" (Rousseau, 1994). What if a citizen disobeys the general law? For Rousseau "the social pact should not be an empty formula, it contains an implicit obligation which alone can give force to the others, that if anyone refuses to obey the general will he will be compelled to do so by the whole body; which means nothing else than that he will be forced to be free" (Rousseau, 1994). This general will must be respected by the sovereign, as well, since it is the voice of the people. Rousseau

attacked the belief that kings-being God's representatives on earth have the ultimate authority to do what they want without the consent of the people. In this case, he bluntly urges people to revolt against their ruler since he has broken the social contract. This contract places power in the hands of the people and not the ruler since people, as mentioned above, were born free and can never be ruled by coercion or force. Finally, this research sees that Rousseau focused on the relationship between Man vis a vis Man and neglected their relationship with nature. The freedom that he was seeking is deficient without taking nature into consideration for how can humans be free while harming nature? Therefore, it is urgent now to call for a natural contract that grants nature more rights that will aid in keeping its graciousness on humans. Just like Descartes, Rousseau wrote in the eighteenth century and no one should accuse them of being anthropocentric writers. In general, humans must stop blaming their ancestors for their present problems and start thinking for alternatives to the damage that was done to nature. This is what humans have all to think about away from any evasion from responsibility to what is happening to the planet.

Capitalism and nature

Capitalism means a society with free markets owned and controlled by individuals without much involvement from the state. So, what is known as laissez-faire calls for the privatization of all the state sectors and is vital to capitalism. Capitalism was highly influenced by the writings of Adam Smith who affirmed that it is based on profit. He explained how "it is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest" (Smith, 1977) which is profit. Further, competition is of great importance for the stability of the prices, asserts Smith, and the state must stand against monopolies. This free competition is what he calls the 'invisible hand' that guarantees reasonable prices for the citizens. Yet, this study has no intention of discussing capitalism but tries to elucidate its association with the extractivist vision toward nature. It believes that capitalism benefitted from colonialism which provided raw materials and new markets for trade. Nevertheless, it is thought that capitalism is the main reason or the 'culprit' behind the destruction of nature. For Kovel, the "capitalist system is wrecking nature" and we have to "clarify what capital is and what nature is, to understand capital's enmity to nature, to understand it as not just an economic system but in relation to the entire human project, to see its antecedents and consequences" (Kovel, 2007) which are the deterioration of the world ecological system. Capitalism encouraged the colonizers to destroy the indigenous land and extract as much as possible. For example, some "settlers arrived with crops, flocks and herds, and cleared land, exterminating local ecosystems, while human, animal and plant specimens taken to Europe from these 'new' worlds were, by contrast, few and often inert in form" (Huggan and Tiffin, 2015). The killing of animals for ivory was, also, very common in Africa. Additionally, digging the land for extracting the mines like gold and copper contributed in ecological crises.

To conclude, in this part I tried to investigate the claim that Northern epistemologies are based on a materialistic heritage that viewed nature an object that can be usurped by humans excessively. I started with Descartes who differentiated between humans with a mental capacity and the rest which doesn't possess such ability. Then, with Rousseau I showed how there was a focalization on Man and a marginalization of nature. Finally, capitalism was seen as responsible for the irrational exploitation of nature and the main sponsor of colonialism that usurped the indigenous' land. More importantly, this

research does not make the analyzed writers exclusively responsible for the nowadays destruction of nature. It believes in the importance of contextualizing the ideas of the writers and not blindly embraces anything they say. Therefore, Westerners are, nowadays, responsible for the ecological crises in the world and not their ancestors. Humans have reached a high stage of technological development and, hence, should be critical toward the inherited knowledge and subject it to revision. In the coming paragraphs, I will try to examine how epistemologies of the South regarded nature and the differences between the two.

Epistemologies of the south: A bio-centered vision

Pantheism and ecology

Pantheism is the belief that God is not separate from nature but can be seen everywhere. According to Owen, “pantheism (which is derived from the Greek words for 'all' and 'God') means, strictly, the view that God is everything and everything is God” (Owen, 1971). Pantheism was the Indian Americans’ doctrine before the coming of the White settlers. They venerated nature and used it to hunt or gather food for survival but never for sports like the White man. Additionally, “animals were respected as equal in rights to humans. Of course, they were hunted, but only for food, and the hunter first asked permission of the animal’s spirit” (Harrison, 1997). More interestingly, “among the hunter-gatherers the land was owned in common: there was no concept of private property in land, and the idea that it could be bought and sold was repugnant” (Harrison, 1997). This special estimation for nature that the pantheists of North America had toward nature believing it was a part of God helped preserve nature through seeing it as the center of the world just like humans. In general, the pantheist, echoes Levine, “views the opportunity to interact with God-as-nature as an ethical religious pursuit compatible with a sound understanding and respect for the natural world” (Harrison, 1997). This feeling of belonging to one community-in which animals, for instance, are humans’ neighbors in this world and not inferior to them-developed a ‘primitive’ environmental ethics. Thanks to these ethics, “people would be less likely to permit unfettered pollution to take place ... acid rain would not be seen as merely an inconvenience, but as a travesty against a holy manifestation” (Levine, 1994). Said differently, humans and nature become one body that what damages one affects the other and vice versa.

To conclude, pantheism’s perspective toward nature is nature-centered because it abhors exploiting it for profit like capitalism rather it believes that it should be used for survival, only. When settlers, first, came to America, they mocked the natives’ culture and thought it was based on superstition and tried to impose theirs on them. This ethnocentric claim contributed in muting the natives’ epistemologies which cherished nature. Still, modern pantheism insists on the importance of teaching children to project themselves as part of nature. In addition to pantheism, this paper tackles the Sumak Kawsay project which seeks granting nature numerous rights similar to humans in the constitution.

Nature in the eyes of Sumak Kawsay

The term Sumak Kawsay was developed by Latin American intellectuals-like Quijano and Mignolo-which literally means ‘good life’. This term was adopted by Ecuadorian and Bolivian constitutions in 2008 and 2009 to become the first

constitutions to grant nature rights (Lalander, 2014). Sumak Kawsay aims to protect nature through providing an alternative to capitalist-extractivist policies with more bio-centered utilization of nature. The Bolivian constitution, for example, prohibits “the manufacture and use of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons on Bolivian territory [...] as well as the internment, transit and deposit of nuclear and toxic wastes (Max Planck Institute, 2009)” but affirms, in return, that the “state, shall assume control [...] [of] exploration, exploitation, industrialization, transport and sale of strategic natural resources through public, cooperative or community entities, which may in turn contract private enterprises and form mixed enterprises” (Max Planck Institute, 2009). Sumak Kawsay never advocated for not using nature but calls for a rational and state-controlled policy that would empower the economy and, hence, benefit the people without harming nature.

This can be exemplified in the Yasuní ITT project in Ecuador which was presented in 2007 by Alberto Acosta, the minister of energy and mines, as “an alternative to the developmentalist-extractivist capitalist model of development that is today prevalent in Latin America and Africa and, actually, in most of the global South” (de Sousa Santos, 2015). Through this project, Ecuador suggests a co-responsibility toward the environment-especially the Amazonian forests-between advanced and less advanced countries. Ecuador relies heavily on oil exports but it vouches to leave unexploited “oil reserves estimated at 850 million barrels in three blocs of the National Amazonian Park of Yasuní, one of the richest biodiversity regions of the planet, on the condition that the more developed countries reimburse Ecuador by half the income Ecuador would surrender as a consequence of this decision” (de Sousa Santos, 2015). These 850 million barrels are expected to add €4 billion to €5 billion to the Ecuadorian budget, but the latter affirmed that €2 billion is enough as a compensation for them. The two billion will be invested in the renewable energy, forestation and other projects associated with environment. In the end, Sumak Kawsay is a concept that was imported from the American natives’ culture and perception toward nature. This asserts that the natives never thought of nature as a source for profit but as a companion that can help humans survive. In the coming paragraphs, the research will tackle another concept named Pachamama which is, also, a great defender of nature.

Pachamama and nature

This concept is found in the culture of the Quechua people who believe nature to be the mother earth deity (Howard-Malverde, 1995) that take care of her children: humans. So compared with the settlers’ anthropocentric language, the Quechua people had no term for environment since they considered it a goddess that must be worshipped. The Ecuadorian constitution, for example, assure that “nature has the right to be restored. This restoration shall be apart from the obligation of the State and natural persons or legal entities to compensate individuals and communities that depend on affected natural systems” (Max Planck Institute, 2009). Unlike capitalism, in this regard, the state has the exclusive right to use nature for the benefit of all people. The state guarantees, as well, the protection of all species from extinction and the preservation of the ecosystem cycles. In general, Sumak Kawsay and Pachamama are practical alternatives to capitalism and the anthropocentric-extractivist agendas. They remind humans that the first right they have to focus on is the right to live and not to earn more profit. The right to live, then, requires taking serious procedures to preserve nature being vital to the existence of humans on this planet. With the development and

progress science reached, nature is in great need for innovative ways of life. A new cosmopolitan culture that is based on interdependence between nature and humans where the two benefit from each other. What is interesting in Pantheism, Sumak Kawsay and Pachamama is their realistic attitude toward nature in the way they don't hold a utopian perspective against the exploitation of nature but call for more rational usage of it. This non-European perception is more beneficial to humans compared with the excessive exploitation of nature which will harm them. For that reason, the research sees that epistemologies of the South see nature from more bio-centric eyes compared with the Northern epistemologies which are anthropocentric.

Conclusion

In this research, I tried to study how nature is perceived by epistemologies of the North and the South. For epistemologies of the North, on the one hand, I chose Descartes (Cartesian), Jean-Jack Rousseau (the social contract) and capitalism as cases of study to conclude, finally, that these epistemologies hold a superior perspective when dealing with nature. They see that nature is a 'thing' that humans have the right to exploit as they wish. On the other hand, I selected three indigenous (native Americans) concepts of understanding nature which are Pantheism, Sumak Kawsay, and Pachamama to affirm that their visualization of nature is more bio-centric. They see nature as an integral part in the existence of humans on this planet. Consequently, these Southern epistemologies represent an alternative to Northern epistemologies. Nevertheless, this study does not aim to attack specific epistemologies and mesmerize others rather it seeks to rebuke specific-negative humans' attitudes toward the environment. In other words, the anthropocentric vision toward nature that many capitalist societies have toward the environment is not because of the writings of Descartes or Rousseau but because of greed. Following the British historian Hurbert Butterfield, what Descartes, Rousseau and Smith said centuries ago must be contextualized and critiqued to learn from and not adopt it passively in the present (Butterfield, 1931). Simultaneously, what the indigenous held as self-evident vis-à-vis nature must be critiqued and developed for preserving nature and Man. As an alternative, this research believes in the great importance of intersection between epistemologies and knowledges. This interconnection-besides moving beyond the traditional dichotomies, North/ South-would guarantee that epistemologies of the North will abandon its Eurocentric and abyssal line and learn from the epistemologies of the South while the latter will adopt many terms and concepts developed by the Northern epistemologies. To conclude, preserving nature means preserving the future of the human species on this planet. Subsequently, one has to think of nature as a vital source for survival if they cannot consider it a partner that shares the existence with them.

Acknowledgement

This research is self-funded.

Conflict of interest

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest involve with any parties in this research study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bartlett, L., Vavrus, F. (2016): Rethinking case study research: A comparative approach. – Taylor & Francis 140p.
- [2] Butterfield, H. (1931): The Whig Interpretation of History. – Electronic Library of Historiography 82p.
- [3] Descartes, R. (2018). Meditations on First Philosophy with Selections from the Objections and Replies (M, Moriarty, Trans.). – Oxford University Press 330p.
- [4] de Sousa Santos, B. (2018): The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the South. – Duke University Press 392p.
- [5] de Sousa Santos, B. (2015): Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide. – Routledge 284p.
- [6] Dussel, E. (1995): The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of “the Other” and the Myth of Modernity, trans. – Michael D. Barber, New York: Continuum 215p.
- [7] Freiberger, O. (2019): Considering comparison: A method for religious studies. – Oxford University Press 256p.
- [8] Harrison, P. (1997): Native Americans: A pantheist spirituality of nature. – World Pantheism Official Portal. Retrieved from:
<https://pantheism.net/native-americans/>
- [9] Huggan, G., Tiffin, H. (2015): Postcolonial ecocriticism: Literature, animals, environment. – Routledge 306p.
- [10] Kovel, J. (2007): The Enemy of Nature: The End of Capitalism or the End of the World? – Zed Books 345p.
- [11] Lalander, R. (2014): Rights of nature and the indigenous peoples in Bolivia and Ecuador: A Straitjacket for Progressive Development Politics? – Iberoamerican Journal of Development Studies 3(2): 148-172.
- [12] Levine, M.P. (1994): Pantheism, ethics and ecology. – Environmental Values 3(2): 121-138.
- [13] Lvi-Strauss, C. (1966): The savage mind. – University of Chicago Press 290p.
- [14] Mason, T.V., Szabo-Jones, L., Steenkamp, E. (2013): Introduction to postcolonial ecocriticism among settler-colonial nations. – Ariel: A Review of International English Literature 44(4): 1-11.
- [15] Max Planck Institute (2009): Bolivia (Plurinational State of) 2009. – Oxford University Press 96p.
- [16] Mignolo, W.D. (2017): Coloniality is far from over, and so must be decoloniality. – Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry 43(1): 38-45.
- [17] Owen, H.P. (1971): Concepts of Deity. – Palgrave Macmillan 185p.
- [18] Rousseau, J.J. (1994): Discourse on Political Economy and the Social Contract (C, Betts, Trans.). – Oxford University Press 256p.
- [19] Rousseau, J.J. (2008): Discourse on political economy and the social contract. – Oxford University Press 216p.
- [20] Smith, A. (1977): An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. – Chicago University Press 754p.
- [21] Spinoza, B. (1996): Ethics (E. Curley, Trans. & Ed.). – Edinburgh University Press 193p.
- [22] Wallerstein, I.M. (2006): European universalism: The rhetoric of power. – New Press 128p.