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Hello. I am Viktoriia Hamaiunova and I am doing a PhD in Law. My provocation is related to blind spots in the field of environmental protection and intergenerational justice.

Nature and its laws remain a mystery to man due to several circumstances. Human senses and thinking are limited. For example, a person cannot see other planetary systems or objects of quantum physics. According to Kant, the human brain cannot imagine the infinity of the universe in space and time. Man knows the history of a relatively small amount of space in a relatively small amount of time relative to the size and age of the universe. However, these restrictions do not stop mankind from reorganizing the environment and trying to control it.

Changes in nature have always been a concern for mankind. However, the incomprehensibility of nature remains a significant problem for the adoption of a plan of action. The impossibility of a human being to fully understand nature as a whole is automatically compensated by the acceptance of certain axioms as certain postulates, which are taken for granted without evidence and serve as starting points for further logical judgments. Thus, the completeness of the picture is achieved. In his perception of nature, a person starts not only from logical judgments, but also from ethical and ideological concepts. The following example can be given to illustrate this phenomenon. The medieval peasant, who felt dependent on the weather for his chances of avoiding hunger, was afraid of getting lost in the thickets of the forest and of being attacked by wild animals, was inclined to perceive the deterioration of the weather or climate as God's punishment for sins. However, a modern resident of a metropolis who observes nature in artificially created parks, with domestic plants and domestic animals, that is, in everything that needs human participation for life, feels his own responsibility for natural disasters.

In recent decades, the situation has become more complicated. We are in an age of the Anthropocene, an era that intensely, almost violently, rejects structure. It isn't simple instability, it's a reality that seems to actively resist efforts to understand what is going on. Modern futurist Jamais Cascio describes the modern world as a BANI world - Brittle, Anxious, Nonlinear, and Incomprehensible. Situations in which conditions aren't simply unstable, they're chaotic. In which outcomes aren't simply hard to foresee, they're completely unpredictable. Or, to use the particular language of these frameworks, situations where what happens isn’t simply ambiguous, it’s incomprehensible. In a Nonlinear world, cause and effect are seemingly disconnected or disproportionate. Perhaps other systems interfere or obscure, or maybe there’s hidden hysteresis, enormous delays between visible cause and visible effect. In a nonlinear world, results of actions taken, or not taken, can end up being wildly out of balance. Small decisions end up with massive consequences, good or bad. Or we put forward enormous amounts of effort, pushing and pushing yet with little impact.

For example, climate disruption is a nonlinear problem. We see around us, with growing intensity and frequency, real-world examples of the impacts of global warming-induced climate change… and we’re barely up one degree Celsius over pre-industrial levels. Here’s something that not a lot of people know: what we’re seeing now is primarily the result of carbon emissions up through the 1980s. The global climate system is marked by inertia, which means that the consequences don’t become manifest immediately. That's the ‘hysteric’ element to our climate — a long, at least in human terms, lag between cause and full effect.

That means that even if we had fully subscribed to the Kyoto Protocols twenty years ago, we would likely still be seeing the kinds of climate chaos now underway. And it means that we could stop putting any carbon emissions in the atmosphere right now and we’d still see additional warming for at least another generation, and continued high temperatures for

There has always been uncertainty and complexity in the world, and we have devised reasonably effective systems to figure out and adapt to this everyday disorder.

In my observation, the inability to obtain sufficiently reliable information about nature is often filled with categorical imperatives (commands which expresses a general, unavoidable requirement of the moral law how it was formulated by Kant) in discussions about environmental law and intergenerational justice. These commands are used as axioms (rules accepted without evidence) are hidden assumptions which supposed to provide a way to evaluate moral actions and to make moral judgments and are widely used to argue the need for certain actions of mankind to protect the environment.

What are modern categorical imperatives that undergird the concepts of ‘environmental protection’ and ‘intergenerational justice’ are currently exist?

What are the underlying norms and values of your analysis of a ‘tyranny of the contemporary’?

What are the pros and cons of using categorical imperatives in an argument about intergenerational justice?

Thank you.