

ON GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZENSHIP IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ANTHROPOCENE AND THE DEEPENING ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

ANNA MRAVCOVÁ, Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Economics and Management,
Institute of Marketing, Trade and Social Studies, Nitra, Slovak Republic

MRAVCOVÁ, A.: On Global Environmental Citizenship in the Context of the
Anthropocene and the Deepening Environmental Crisis
FILOZOFIA, 78, Supplement, 2023, pp. 75 – 89

The Anthropocene period has brought an unprecedented expansion of civilisation and enormous technological advances leading to a highly interconnected world. However, all this has come at the expense of the environment. The exploitation of nature along with the reckless and predatory life of humans have gradually led to the emergence of a global environmental crisis which, even with all the means and decades of efforts of the world community, has not been solved or even necessarily mitigated. The paper seeks to highlight and examine the significance of the emerging concept of environmental citizenship in the context of Anthropocene and the deepening environmental crisis, building on the fundamental features of classical citizenship, mainly its unifying potential, which led to the rise of its global dimensions. The emphasis is also partially focused on environmental political responsibility, which is in line with our core concept. Findings point to the growing potential of environmental citizenship to avoid the catastrophic predictions based on maintaining the current status. We argue that environmental citizenship should be seen as a possible basis for a necessary change in the organisation of society, which inevitably requires an active political approach.

Keywords: Global environmental citizenship – Anthropocene – Environmental crisis – Political environmental responsibility

Introduction

Humanity is currently facing many serious global problems and challenges. These are increasing in intensity despite all the efforts of the international community. Several of these processes occur naturally, but most of them are caused by humans and their “god complex,” which seeks to demonstrate the superiority of humans over everything in the world, including nature. The contradiction between nature and culture (Pechočiaková Svitačová, Moravčíková 2021) is thus deepening, and human beings have gradually become the dominant category in all substantial changes in the world. Many experts classify this process as a new geological epoch called the Anthropocene. It is also the

one in which the most significant source of the persistent and deepening environmental crisis can be seen.

The term Anthropocene “denotes a new geological and climate epoch created by humans with all their activities. The concept of the Anthropocene has its origins in the idea that because of industrialism, urbanization, and exponential growth of the human race in the last two centuries the extent of our influence on the environment has reached such a level that people have become a geological and climate force” (Sťahel 2019, 340 – 341). This new geological epoch is appearing very unstable in comparison with the previous Holocene period and its relative climatic stability. At the same time, however, many warn that this is only a transitional period to a potentially much worse state (Sťahel 2019). In this context, it is assumed that global environmental citizenship can play an important role in combating the environmental crisis and its catastrophic consequences, as its important aspect is the ability to take environmental responsibility for individual and collective actions towards the common environment and thus move to real and necessary change.

The term “Anthropocene” itself was first introduced in 2000 when P. Crutzen and E. Stoermer highlighted that we are currently living in an epoch when the global environment is shaped at some level by humanity, rather than vice versa. They used the word “Anthropocene” as a call to action for environmental sustainability and responsibility (Crutzen, Stoermer 2000).

The Anthropocene is so significant in scientific circles as it is considered to be a geological phenomenon comparable to some of the great events of Earth history. However, the main difference is that the driving force behind these global changes is human behaviour and action, particularly in the social, political, and economic sphere (Zalasiewicz et al. 2011). Even “the Earth system hypothesis within the Anthropocene concept states that humanity has already modified the Earth system in ways that are not only complex, but these changes are irreversible to some extent (and most of the available data confirms this)” (Leinfelder 2020, 3 – 4).

Now, it depends on our future actions, how far the new Earth system will differ from that of the Holocene. This also strongly depends on our ability and willingness to change our attitude and understanding of our position and role in a world whose future – its preservation for life – is literally in our hands. Even though nature has a great regenerative capacity (we saw it also at the beginning of the global pandemic), some of the consequences of long-term human predatory approach are already permanent, but we can still change a lot.

The paper aims to examine the significance of the still evolving concept of global environmental citizenship in the context of the Anthropocene and the deepening environmental crisis, building on fundamental aspects of the classical citizenship

concept, in particular its unifying element, which has contributed to the emergence of its global dimensions. The focus is also partially on environmental responsibility, especially its collective and political aspect, which is in line with our core issue. Environmental citizenship is becoming a necessity, driven by responsibility for the whole to which we all belong. The findings point to the growing potential of this concept to avoid the catastrophic predictions based on maintaining the current state. Environmental citizenship should be seen as a possible basis for a necessary change in the organisation of society, which inevitably requires an active political approach. In this context, it will also be explored and justified why global environmental citizenship is a relevant response to the environmental crisis in the Anthropocene. This question will be answered through particular arguments on the very nature of the Anthropocene, the environmental crisis as one of its consequences at the same time, and the development of citizenship concepts as branches which have emerged from the need to respond actively to the worsening state of the environment, to the fact that humans are the main contributors to this degradation, and that humans must therefore be the primary agents of remediation.

Although discussions on global environmental citizenship have been ongoing for a long time and have become relatively established in scientific circles, they are now increasing in intensity and becoming highly topical again. Among other things, this is mainly due to the worsening state of the environment, alarming predictions for the future, and the shortening time for possible remedy and avoiding worst-case scenarios, where there is a growing need to appeal to people and their crucial involvement in the process. A significant milestone for the renewal of lively and intense discussions on the need for an emphasis on environmental citizenship has also been the struggles for global environmental justice, which have intensified greatly since 2019, and subsequently the global pandemic COVID-19, which has highlighted the strong global interconnectedness of humanity.

I. The Deepening Environmental Crisis as the Consequence of the Anthropocene Epoch

Even though humans have always influenced their local environment, in the past the environmental consequences of their activities did not reach a global scale. As a milestone of the beginning of change the industrial revolution and the mentioned transition from the Holocene to the Anthropocene is often considered.¹ Humanity has become an independent global geological force. One of the main characteristics of the environmental crisis is therefore precisely the complexity of human impact on ecosystems (see also Martin et al. 2015). Thus, as M. Jafari and many others claim, the scientific understanding

¹ However, the industrial revolution is only one of many possible beginnings of the Anthropocene (Lewis, Maslin 2015).

of the environment is very important here and helps identify the whole spectrum of environmental problems. The solutions to these problems must be, however, constructed not only on the basis of facts, but also on the basis of the aspects of humankind experience – emotions, the sense of belonging and responsibility, etc. (Jafari 2013).

As St'ahel states, the human strategy of production, accumulation and consumption of surplus, the implementation of which is currently reaching the limits of natural resources and nature's ability to absorb the generated pollution, is the reason for the emergence of the global environmental crisis (Suša, St'ahel 2016). Similarly, S. Krno sees the cause of this crisis in humans, stating that the result of the contemporary era is that citizens have become homogenized, unilaterally oriented persons, addicted to excessive consumption with high, unified artificial consumption habits (Krno 2007, 433). According to the above, the current environmental crisis is the result of humankind's activity and the aforementioned need for the superiority of humans, who had already stopped perceiving nature as a necessity for their survival. This has overwhelmed them and turned their greatness into a defeat of nature.²

Despite the persistent denial of the existence of the environmental crisis or climate change by many people in many spheres (including politicians and even scientists), there is an overwhelming scientific consensus that the environmental crisis is real, which is confirmed by the data. Thus, not only are there reasons for being worried, but more importantly, the data show that the state of the environment is already alarming and catastrophic predictions are becoming very real and close.

The primacy of economics and development (which is also the basis of the sustainable development concept) and the idea of the unlimited expansion of production and consumption without regard for the real environmental costs and consequences (Oosthoek, Gills 2005) prevent taking truly effective actions against this crisis. As S. Clayton and A. Brook and many others have argued, in the 21st century it is important for everyone to understand the causes of climate change, as well as other human-induced environmental problems, because it is the collective impact of human behaviour and actions that is degrading the environment (Clayton, Brook 2005), and only a radical change in the functioning of human societies can make a change.

Humans are egotistic beings with great power ambitions, which they no longer translate only into their relationship with other humans, but also with nature. However, they are now facing the consequences of their behaviour which are leading

² There is also a scientific consensus about human beings as the cause of the environmental crisis in the Anthropocene, which is supported, for example, by the report, IPCC: *Climate Change 2022 – Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, Sixth Assessment Report on Climate Change: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability* (Pörtner et al. 2022, 7).

to the destruction of their world. It is a high time to also understand the greatness and power of humans in the direction to save the world from the catastrophe.

II. Moving to Global Dimensions of Citizenship

In the context of the ongoing environmental crisis, it is crucial to look for effective solutions that deliver real improvement. Humanity needs to open its consciousness to the realities the world is facing and change its thinking and behaviour to a pro-environmental one. First and foremost, it is necessary to understand the common belonging to the world – everyone is part of it, and today everyone can really act globally.

In this context, the institution of citizenship is also gaining in importance. Citizenship as such disposes of an important unifying element – the potential to bring people together within a particular society. According to J. Carens (2000, 166), it is the so-called psychological dimension of citizenship that influences the strength of the collective identity of a given community. The potential of the institution of citizenship thus lies in the fact that when many citizens express a strong sense of belonging to the same community, social cohesion is strengthened, and a shared identity can motivate others to actively participate in the life of a given society. Citizenship today necessarily goes also beyond the legal recognition (González-Valencia, Ballbé, Ortega-Sánchez 2020) and has an ability to mobilise people to strive for a better life of the community. As a result of ongoing global processes which allow people to act with global impact, the term “global citizenship” has been intensively emerging mainly in recent decades (although the global citizenship concept is not new and can be found as far back as antiquity, and in the context of globalisation and global problems it takes on a different, primarily ethical and moral dimension, more than political and legal one), taking on the positive elements of the institution of citizenship, but moving towards a kind of universal inclusiveness and transnationality. In this context, global citizenship is understood as citizenship “beyond the nation-state” (O’Byrne 2003) which focuses on people’s responsibility towards the world. Citizenship in the sense of being part of the whole world affects people’s personal identity. Although the term global citizenship is not understood mainly as formal citizenship, but as a moral category³, it must be emphasized that moral values always operate within political power relations (Veugelers 2011).

Global citizenship is mostly associated with global responsibility in the sense that all people are citizens of the world, and everyone should therefore understand the extent of their own responsibility. Thus, global citizenship is perceived primarily as a way of

³ Also, according to Kant, all rational beings are members of one moral community. They are equivalent to citizens in the political sense in that they have the common characteristics of freedom, equality, and independence and that they live according to their own laws. Their common laws, however, are the laws of morality, which have their basis in reason (Kant 1996).

thinking and behaving. It implies a specific perspective on life and a belief that each individual can make a change (Young, Commins 2002). We assume that global citizenship has the potential to become an important unifying element in individual societies. By its very nature, it can contribute to greater justice, sustainability and equality, while respecting diversity. Global citizenship, then, can be defined as a global justice project⁴ that seeks to resist the pressures of the current era of prosperity and encourages individuals and whole societies to participate in the new knowledge economy by focusing on critical engagement with structures and relationships that tend to exclude and marginalise. It further seeks to transform the foundations of societies into more just and equitable ones by focusing on a socially and politically empowered public sphere (Mravcová, Šeben Zařková, Pechořiaková Svitařová 2017).

The global understanding of citizenship is a progressive idea (which is why it does not always meet with understanding or recognition. It is still a rather controversial concept associated with a high degree of abstraction). As W. Al Saadi states, it refers to the tendency of the contemporary international community to deal with broader horizons in the sense of involving citizens of countries in global processes of organizing, developing, and creating international cooperation of a specific kind, whose actors are individuals themselves as citizens transcending national borders (Al Saadi 2022). The goal of global citizenship is then, according to M. Golmohamad (2008), to conceptualize human relations beyond monetary values and restore a positive framing of global relations. In addition, it “entails being aware of responsibilities beyond one’s immediate communities and making decisions to change habits and behaviour patterns” (Schattle 2009, 12).

Being a global citizen is not just about pure belonging to the world as a whole. It is the result of active and sustained thought, energy, and effort. Being a national citizen often requires no action other than being born to someone or somewhere. As global citizens, we are not only born, but we must consciously become such citizens. When we accept our identity as global citizens, we also understand our responsibility for our actions. Hence, global citizenship cannot be tied to *jus de sanguis* or *jus de soli*, nor can it be a status granted to an individual by the state. It must be understood as a right and a moral imperative, as belonging to global politics and the world community along with belonging to the national level (Golmohamad 2008).

⁴ Environmental citizenship is thus an essential global justice project that has a significant place and mission today to overcome stereotypes and exclusions of different groups from citizenship itself, as it highlights the need for universal inclusiveness, focusing on the global responsibility of all individuals to protect the common planet (UNESCO 2014). It makes people equal as subjects, obliged to take responsibility for their actions towards the environment as well as subjects who should be entitled to benefit from the environment equally – regardless of differentiating factors and allowing all others to do the same – including future generations.

Within this context, R. Israel states, that the global citizen is a person who identifies as part of an evolving global society and whose actions contribute to the constitution of its values and practices (2012, 161). It can be stated that the global citizen is one who takes responsibility for the common good. The most obvious and transparent example of what we all share and depend on is the environment (Michelfelder 2007, 20).

The term “global” is becoming widely accepted in the environmental context, although citizenship is still mostly associated with the national level. In this context, the slogan “think globally and act locally” is also gaining in importance. The local and the global are strongly interlinked and interdependent and can no longer be universally separated.

III. Environmental Dimension of Global Citizenship and Environmental Responsibility

Already in 1993, there was a belief that “Promoting global citizenship is a practical strategy to support sustainable development” (Baha’i International Community 1993). This belief is particularly relevant in the environmental context, with an emphasis on the fundamental understanding that environmental sustainability requires a profound change in attitudes (see also Dobson, Sáiz 2005, 157).

Environmental citizenship as a citizenship with a global reach is, like global citizenship, associated with a high degree of abstraction and can be perceived in different ways. Therefore, a person adopting environmental citizenship understands his or her belonging to a global whole and sees not only themselves and their surroundings but seeks a more global view of their existence. It requires a positive identification with a common humanity and provides a space for critical engagement with others and the world (Golmohamad 2008, 524).

As part of the change in attitudes A. Dobson and D. Bell call for behavioural change (2006, 4) as part of or as a consequence of political responsibility for achieving sustainable development. We are therefore of the opinion that the concept of environmental (or ecological or green) citizenship is at the core of the sustainability model. In this context, the argument that will always be relevant is emphasized – we are all inhabitants of the same planet, and its sustainability is of great importance to everyone.

Environmental citizenship as such can be understood in terms of claiming a new category of human rights – environmental rights – and respecting that everyone should be able to benefit from these rights equally. This perception is thus based on rights as well as obligations in the sense of active and responsible relationships between citizens, societies and the environment. As J. Barnett et al. (2015) claims, this concept highlights the necessity to look beyond the satisfaction of one’s immediate interests and to consider the well-being of the wider society as well as the needs of future generations.

There are different perspectives on environmental citizenship, and some views may be even contradictory or incompatible. But looking at the very essence of the concept, we consequently perceive the environmental citizen as a citizen of the ecosystem, and thus a kind of prerequisite for building the non-harming ecosystem principle (Latta, Garside 2005, 5) as well as for developing a personal and collective critical environmental consciousness.

Environmental citizenship can be categorised variously according to its implementation. On this basis, the following types of environmental citizens can be identified here (tab. 1).

Table 1 Types of Environmental Citizens

| Types of Citizen | Personally Responsible | Participative | Socially Responsible (“green” citizen) |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Characteristic | Behaves responsibly without questioning why | Behaves responsibly and takes action | Critically reflects on social justice and takes action accordingly |
| Example | Recycles waste | Distributes flyers on recycling | Discusses with others in local forums whether the recycling scheme saves energy and negotiates how best to improve recycling scheme for benefit of the community |

Source: Levinson et al. (2020)

From the above mentioned classification, it can be seen that it is the socially responsible citizens who actively and determinedly seek to live a way of life that is compatible with a more sustainable society: they recognise a responsibility to live sustainably so that others have a similar possibility to live well – they understand their duty to act fairly, and their responsibility to do so transcends both national and species boundaries (Levinson et al. 2020). Cosmopolitan environmental citizenship thus creates a greater sense of interconnectedness and interdependence on a global scale (Beck 2010), while in its essence stressing the necessity of transforming individual societies and states into so-called green or sustainable societies that should be governed in a way that respects the ecological and environmental limits of the Earth (Humphreys 2009, 180). Such a state or society would reflect intergenerational, interspecies, and transnational needs – this presupposes that citizens would be aware of the limits of the environmental space as well as of responsibilities that transcend borders and generations (we can see that not only in the context of the analysis of the

concept of environmental citizenship, but also overall, today, the rights and duties of states and their citizens clearly transcend national borders).

Citizenship, therefore, can no longer be limited on the basis of belonging to sovereign states. Citizens need to be understood as members of a community, united by characteristics other than their relationship to a sovereign political entity, in particular the common world, which is becoming increasingly fragile and requires people to understand this reality and to transform it into their thinking and actions.⁵

The concept of environmental citizenship essentially redefines the relationship between humans and nature and emphasizes that environmental protection is everyone's responsibility, including governments, the private sector, as well as individuals, and is based on making life decisions to minimize negative impacts on the environment (Meerah, Halim, Nadeson 2010). The goal is not only to change people's attitudes and behaviour, but also to encourage personal participation. The environmental citizen is therefore expected to behave in a way that mitigates the consequences of the environmental crisis by acting with consideration of other people and all living organisms. We also agree with Dobson, who identifies environmental citizenship as pro-environmental behaviour in both the public and private sectors, based on a belief in equal distribution of environmental benefits, as well as participation and joint development of sustainability policies (Dobson 2010, 6). Dobson also claims that local initiatives have a special potential. Every human act has an impact on the environment, including the local ones. The goal of the environmental citizen is then to minimize the negative ecological footprint and live sustainably so that others can live well (Dobson 2007, 280 – 282). R. Wonicki also supports the emphasis on the importance of local initiatives and opposes the fears of some people that environmental citizenship, as a type of global citizenship, implies a threat of loss of national identity. He argues that it certainly does not require a rejection of the values and duties of local communities or of the importance of national identity. In the case of the environment, the duty and responsibility towards the local community and towards the global community can be seen as equal (Wonicki 2019, 59). Considering the emergency of the environmental issues, this kind of citizenship is very much needed as, in our opinion, it can contribute to mitigating current environmental problems and can help prevent the creation of new ones.

Of course, in this context, there are also many critical perspectives on the very definition of global environmental citizenship, but also on its effectiveness or possibilities. For example, criticisms have been raised about the fact that most scientific work on environmental citizenship preserves the traditional model of citizenship,

⁵ The concept of citizenship has undergone significant developments and enormous changes since its establishment. It now bears little resemblance to its origins. For a closer historical overview of the various fundamental changes in the citizenship concept, see Mravcová (2023).

masking the specificities of gender inequality while depending on a gendered division of labour that exempts citizens from participation in the public sphere. Criticism in this direction also comes from feminists, who point out that the very notion of “citizen” has, from its inception until recently, in fact been attributed only to men – single, adult, and property-owning. Therefore, as many criticize, citizenship was infused with the values and experiences of white wealthy men (Lister 1997). Women were deprived of citizenship status because they were not considered to be autonomous persons (i.e., they were just property) and also, for example, because political involvement might interfere with their duty in their households. Environmental citizenship is often criticized for adopting this traditional model (MacGregor 2007). Also, for example, M. Mellor (1992) writes that throughout most of their development, the “greens” have lacked a vision that adequately integrates ecological sustainability and social justice. Similarly, the critique applies to other groups who have been or are actually excluded from the traditional model of citizenship, such as children, migrants, poor people, etc. Because many proponents of environmental citizenship overlook other spheres and, for example, diminish the issue of social citizenship rights, they do not focus on certain categories of human rights, claiming mainly environmental rights and, above all, environmental obligations and issues, so that these rights can be extended to future generations or the non-human world (Lister 1997). Also, rights that protect workers from exploitation and unsafe environmental conditions are increasingly important in a global market that relies on cheap labour (Ehrenreich, Hochschild 2003; Murphy 2006). Despite many criticisms, the importance of global environmental citizenship is enormous. It is essential to overcome the traditional model full of discrimination against many groups in societies. There is no more space for this. Every single individual in the world needs to understand their role in this world and in the process of saving the environment – for themselves, their children, their families, for all, and preserving a place to live for those who come after us. We must all individually and collectively, personally, and politically take on this responsibility without strict and blind adherence to literal formulations in definitions and theories, but with an understanding of the very essence and intention of the concept of environmental citizenship.

In the context of the above, we believe that environmental responsibility in its various dimensions (such as individual, collective, political, and global) is one of the most apparent concerns of global environmental citizenship. Members of the community thus have obligations towards the Earth and its global environment in terms of interdependence, even when being a member of the community does not itself imply any conditions or obligations (see Attfield 2002).

Although environmental responsibility has an important individual dimension, in the context of addressing global environmental challenges and future threats, such as

environmental security as well as other important areas, it is important to perceive environmental responsibility primarily as a political and legal category (see also, Sťahel 2015). Already in Antiquity, Aristotle was aware that because of human nature, achieving real and effective changes in any area is possible mainly through political regulations and laws, arguing that we need laws, “[f]or the many obey the governance of necessity more than of speech [logos], and of punishments more than of what is noble” (Aristotle, *EN* 1180a5). Also H. Jonas (1997), who initially defined responsibility, as well as its environmental dimension, mainly as a moral and ethical category and emphasized its individual aspect and value, gradually became sceptical about the ability of humans to voluntarily limit their freedom and accept the necessary environmental responsibility for some abstract common good. Later, therefore, he also inclined to emphasize the role of the state and political power as instruments for taking effective action and achieving results through laws, regulations or coercive measures. I. Dubnička expressed it even more clearly when he stated that “moral imperatives do not move the crowd” (Dubnička 2007, 399), especially when they are in conflict with economic and political imperatives. He also considered state interventions such as agreements, regulations, laws, and other systemic measures to be more effective (Dubnička 2007). A similar view is presented by Sťahel, who also stresses, in the context of dealing with environmental crisis, that political and legal means can be most effective in overcoming it or mitigating the environmental threats arising from it (Sťahel 2015).

The importance of the role of the state in environmental responsibility and action is therefore undeniable. Its interventions can be highly effective and successful in bringing about positive change through a variety of coercive measures and, in particular, through the political power it possesses.⁶

However, with the current level of interconnectedness of the world, there is a need to go further and recognise the importance of political environmental responsibility not only within individual states, but also within the international community as a whole. Therefore, global environmental responsibility as a fundamental norm in international relations is becoming widespread (see also Falkner 2020). This is also reflected in the intensification of the network of international rules, agreements and organizations and the universalization of the principle of environmental citizenship, which expects states to engage in global efforts to address global environmental degradation (Falkner 2020, 24). It means not only that every state has a responsibility and an obligation to behave environmentally friendly and sustainably, but also that remediation and effective

⁶ As an example, there are also numerous studies showing that government rules and regulations – i.e., forms of coercion – reduce emissions, waste or other environmental problems at a significantly higher level than the actions of individuals, because these regulations are enforced under the threat of sanctions, and thus, they are implemented by more individuals.

regulatory control in the form of political and legal rules are important issues that need to be effectively adapted to collective threats and to addressing unacceptable environmental behaviour (see also Mason 2005).

Conclusion

As Jonas (1979) stated, the present situation is without precedent in human history. The Anthropocene system has brought the world to an imminent threat with possible catastrophic consequences. Returning to the Holocene is no longer naturally feasible, but to avoid a much worse scenario than the Anthropocene, we need to change our societies from the foundations and on a more radical scale than the concept of sustainable development offers. There is still too little attention being paid to alternative futures that are truly compatible with the limits of our planet.

We still do not have enough knowledge either of the Earth's global environmental systems or of all the real consequences that the Anthropocene and the environmental crisis may have. However, national interest should not be involved in efforts to reveal them, nor should development be the dominant category.

Humanity has the power not only to affect and create, but also to destroy the life on Earth. With such power comes great responsibility. Therefore, in order to avoid an environmental or complex catastrophe, we must adapt our economic and social systems to environmental imperatives and reverse our deep-rooted assumption that progress through the unlimited use of resources is desirable. This requires conscious political leadership and a willingness to accept a reality that does not yet immediately affect our generation, but we must also take responsibility for those who come after us and enable them to live at least a relatively good life.

The presented text suggests that global environmental citizenship can indeed be seen as a relevant response to the environmental crisis in the Anthropocene, based on the demonstrated knowledge. Firstly, this type of citizenship has the possibility to eliminate stereotypes and various forms of exclusion in societies and in a way to give all people in the world a common identity and a consciousness of a common goal, common and equal rights, and common threats that they need to face individually and collectively. However, at the same time, as shown above, active environmental citizenship is essential to prevent environmental collapse, to prevent catastrophic predictions for humanity and the planet, it is essential to reduce the unsustainable predatory attitude of humans in the Anthropocene.

In this context, we believe that global environmental citizenship, together with political environmental responsibility, can be considered as a fundamental impulse for the above, as well as for rethinking our role as part of the Earth system, which should not be seen as a resource to be exploited, but as a necessary basis for our survival.

Bibliography

- AL SAADI, W. N. I. (2022): *The Philosophy of "Global Citizenship" and its Problems Within the Development of the International Poison for the Individual*. Mosul: University of Mosul. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28342.37449>
- ARISTOTLE (2011): *Nicomachean Ethics*. Transl. R. C. Bartlett and Susan D. Collins. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- ATTFIELD, R. (2002): Global Citizenship and the Global Environment. In: Dower, N. – Williams, J. (eds.): *Global Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- BAHA'I INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY (1993): *World Citizenship: A Global Ethic for Sustainable Development. A Statement by the Bahá'í International Community to the 4th Pacific Islands Leaders Conference, 14 June 1993*. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.bic.org/statements/world-citizenship-global-ethic-sustainable-development>
- BARNETT, J., DOHERTY, B., et al. (2005): *Environmental Citizenship: Literature Review*. Bristol: Environment Agency.
- BECK, U. (2010): Remapping Social inequalities in an Age of Climate Change: For a Cosmopolitan Renewal of Sociology. *Global Networks*, 10 (2), 165 – 181. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0374.2010.00281.x>
- CARENS, J. H. (2000): *Culture, Citizenship, and Community. A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CLAYTON, S., BROOK, A. (2005): Can Psychology Help Save the World? A Model for Conservation Psychology. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 5 (1), 87 – 102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2005.00057.x>
- CRUTZEN P. J., STOERMER E. F. (2000): The "Anthropocene." *Global Change Newsletter*, 41 (12), 17 – 18.
- DOBSON, A. (2007): Environmental Citizenship: Towards Sustainable Development. *Sustainable Development* 15, 276 – 285. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.344>
- DOBSON, A. (2010): *Environmental Citizenship and Pro-environmental Behaviour*. London: Sustainable Research Network.
- DOBSON, A., BELL, D. (2006): Introduction. *Environmental Citizenship*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 3 – 17.
- DOBSON, A. VALENCIA SÁIZ, Á. (2005): Introduction. *Environmental Politics*, 14 (2), 157 – 162. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644010500054822>
- DUBNIČKA, I. (2007): *Kultúra a environmentálna kríza*. Nitra: UKF.
- EHRENREICH, B., HOCHSCHILD, A. R. (2003): *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. London: Granta.
- FALKNER, R. (2020): Global Environmental Responsibility in World Politics. In: Hansen-Magnusson, H. – Vetterlein, A. (eds.): *The Rise of Responsibility in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 101 – 124.
- GOLMOHAMAD, M. (2008): Global Citizenship: From Theory to Practice, Unlocking Hearts and Minds. In: Peters, M. A. – Britton, A. – Blee, H. (eds.): *Global Citizenship Education*. Leiden: Brill, 519 – 533. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087903756_034
- GONZÁLEZ-VALENCIA, G., BALLBÉ, M., ORTEGA-SÁNCHEZ, D. (2020): Global Citizenship and Analysis of Social Facts: Results of a Study with Pre-Service Teachers. *Social Sciences*, 9 (5), Article 65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9050065>
- HUMPHREYS, D. (2009): Environmental and Ecological Citizenship in Civil Society. *The International Spectator*, 44 (1), 171 – 183. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03932720802693101>
- ISRAEL, R. (2012): *Global Citizenship: A Path to Building Identity and Community in a Globalized World*. San Bernardino: Create Space Independent Publishing Platform.

- JAFARI, M. (2013): Challenges in Climate Change and Environmental Crisis: Impacts of Aviation Industry on Human, Urban and Natural Environments. *International Journal of Space Technology Management and Innovation*, 3 (2), 24 – 46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijstmi.2013070102> (Available at: <https://www.irma-international.org/article/challenges-in-climate-change-and-environmental-crisis/99689/>)
- JONAS, H. (1979): *Das Prinzip Verantwortung. Versuch einer Ethik für die technologische Zivilisation*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag.
- KANT, I. (1996): *K večnému mieru*. Bratislava: Archa.
- KRNO, S. (2007): Fenomén Sibír a Homo sapiens. In: Dubnička, I. (ed.): *Kultúra a environmentálna kríza*. Nitra: UKF, 433 – 443.
- LATTA, A., GARSIDE, N. (2005): Perspectives on Ecological Citizenship: An Introduction. *Environments*, 33 (3), 1 – 8.
- LEINFELDER, R. (2020): The Anthropocene: The Earth in Our Hands. *Refubium*, Freie Universität Berlin, 19 Feb 2020. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/refubium-26459>
- LEVINSON, R., PARASKEVA-HADJICHAMBI, D., et al. (2020): Political Dimensions of Environmental Citizenship. In: Hadjichambis, A. CH. et al. (eds.): *Conceptualizing Environmental Citizenship for 21st Century Education*, 17 – 28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20249-1_2
- LEWIS, S., MASLIN, M. (2015): Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature* 519, 171 – 180. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14258>
- LISTER, R. (1997): *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
- MACGREGOR, S. (2007): No Sustainability Without Justice: A Feminist Critique of Environmental Citizenship. PSA Conference, Bath – April 2007. [Online.] Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20120118201046/http://www.psa.ac.uk/2007/pps/MacGregor.pdf>
- MARTIN, A. et al. (2015): *Responding to the Environmental Crisis*. Nagoya: Nanzan University Institute for Social Ethics.
- MASON, M. (2005): *The New Accountability: Environmental Responsibility Across Borders*. London: Earthscan.
- MEERAH, T.S.M., HALIM, L., NADESON, T. (2010): Environmental Citizenship: What Level of Knowledge, Attitude, Skill and Participation the Students Own? *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (2), 5715 – 5719. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.933>
- MELLOR, M. (1992): *Breaking the Boundaries: Towards a Feminist Green Socialism*. London: Virago Press.
- MICHELFELDER, D. (2007): Global Citizenship and Responsibility. *Macalester Civic Forum*, 1 (1), article 8.
- MRAVCOVÁ, A., ŠEBEN ZAŤKOVÁ, T., PECHOČIAKOVÁ SVITAČOVÁ, E. (2017): *Globálne občianstvo v terciárnom vzdelávaní*. Nitra: SPU.
- MRAVCOVÁ, A. (2023): Toward Environmental Citizenship: The Concept of Citizenship and Its Conceptualization in the Context of Global Environmental Challenges. *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, 59 (1), 69 – 90. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21697/spch.2023.59.A.04>
- MURPHY, M. (2006): *Sick Building Syndrome and the Problem of Uncertainty: Environmental Politics, Technoscience and Women Workers*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- O'BYRNE, D. J. (2003): *The Dimensions of Global Citizenship: Political Identity Beyond the Nation-State*. London: Frank Cass. DOI: <https://doi.org/0.4324/9780203009321>
- OOSTHOEK, J., GILLS, B.K. (2005): Humanity at the Crossroads: The Globalization of Environmental Crisis. *Globalizations*, 2 (3), 283 – 291. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747730500409454>
- PECHOČIAKOVÁ SVITAČOVÁ, E., MORAVČÍKOVÁ, D. (2021): Towards a New Global Development Paradigm and Restructuring the Economy into a Sustainable. *Danube*, 12 (3), 212 – 223. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/danb-2021-0014>

- PÖRTNER, H. O., ROBERTS, D. C., et al. (2022): *IPCC: Climate Change 2022 – Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844>
- SCHATTLE, H. (2009): Global Citizenship in Theory and Practice. In: Lewin, R. (ed.): *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*. London: Routledge.
- ŠTAHEL, R. (2015): Environmentálna zodpovednosť a environmentálna bezpečnosť. *Filozofia*, 70 (1), 1 – 12.
- ŠTAHEL, R. (2019): Sustainable Development in the Shadow of Climate Change, *Civitas – Journal of Social Sciences*, 19 (2), 340 – 341. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15448/1984-7289.2019.2.31971>
- SUŠA, O., ŠTAHEL, R. (2016): *Environmentální devastace a sociální destrukce*. Praha: Filosofia.
- UNESCO (2014): *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing Learners for the Challenges of the 21st century*. Paris: UNESCO.
- VEUGELERS, W. (2011): The Moral and the Political in Global Citizenship: Appreciating Differences in Education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9 (3 – 4), 473 – 485. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605329>
- WONICKI, R. (2019): Global Environmental Citizenship: The Polish Approach to Ecology. In: Mádlo, G. (ed.): *Is Planet Earth Green?* Leiden: Brill, 57 – 63. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9781848881181_007
- YOUNG, L. M., COMMINS, E. (2002): *Global Citizenship: The Handbook for Primary Teaching*. Cambridge: Oxfam.
- ZALASIEWICZ, J., WILLIAMS, M., HAYWOOD, A., ELLIS, M. (2011): The Anthropocene: A New Epoch of Geological Time? *Philosophical Transactions A*, 369 (1938), 835 – 841. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2010.0339>

Study has been supported by the Erasmus+ KA2 Strategic Partnerships project no. 2020-1-PL01-KA203-081980 – Teaching Sustainability in Higher Education in the Field of Economics and Management (SUSTA).

Anna Mravcová
Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra
Faculty of Economics and Management
Institute of Marketing, Trade and Social Studies
Tr. Andreja Hlinku 2
949 76 Nitra
Slovak Republic
e-mail: anna.mravcova@uniag.sk
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7404-5215>