The basic aim of the paper is to prove that the present ecological crisis has its source in the scientific and technical revolution of the 17th century. In keeping with that the author makes reference to the Aristotelian conception of nature, and discusses its ecological aspect (global and hierarchic character, submission, collaboration and cooperation). Then he gives some reasons why this vision of nature has been negated. These reasons are: scientific, philosophical, religious, economical and social. He devotes much attention to the scientific and philosophical aspect. It embraces a lot of transformations (resolutiveness, compositiveness) which have brought about the change of the conception of science and philosophy (physical and mathematical legalism, reductionism and mechanicism).

Those changes had their bearing on the change of the image of cosmos from the teleonomic image to the mechanistic (cosmos is a mechanism after the pattern of a clock which is governed by the laws of mechanics). As a consequence of such an image there was a particular vision of nature in which the boundary between abiotic and biotic was done away with. A quantitative approach to nature has contributed to the deprivation of its qualitative, sacral and hierarchic character.

The mechanistic vision has not only embraced cosmos and nature but also man. This problem is particularly exposed in the paper. The author looks on man’s place in this image of the world from many points of view. He emphasizes man’s new position to himself and to nature. He points at ecological consequences of man’s new autonomy towards the world, new life style and new morality. As a result of those transformations “new” psyche of man has been built, his ties with nature destroyed, a new philosophy of life worked out and natural morality established.

The final part of the paper contains some conclusions which should be taken into account in the ecological and global vision of nature.
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