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Abstract

Environmental ethics is human-wise behavior related to all components of the environment. Environmental ethics talks about human behavior towards nature and the view of the universe, including nature, humans, and other living things. A moral view is needed to know the relevance of the theory of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. Students must know which theories can benefit human life and how to maintain a balance between nature and humans. Belief in the theory will bring up pros and cons; therefore, the relevance that can be found from the two theories is education that understands environmental ethics as a balance. Relevance gained trust in these two theories will bring up pros and cons. We found out students in Indonesia had their main criticism towards each philosophical thought. We also found that the emerging technology and modernisation has been an issue on the debate. A better environmental ethics understanding would serve a better goal of balancing both view of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism.
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INTRODUCTION

Economic development tends to be ambiguous towards nature and the universe's life, making humans continuously exploit nature. The birth of environmental ethics is based on philosophers' efforts to find clues to human behavior in realizing environmental morals. Philosophers of environmental ethics succeeded in dividing two views that emphasize between humans and nature, namely Shallow Ecology Ethics and Deep Ecology Ethics.

Environmental ethics is wise human behavior that deals with all components of the environment. Environmental ethics talks about human behavior towards nature and the view of universal life, which includes nature, humans, and other living things. The problem that arises in environmental ethics always concerns the relations of human behavior towards nature and all life. Environmental ethics has always discussed subjects and objects between human life and nature, but these two things must be more balanced. Environmental ethics is a relatively young field of study. Since about the 1930s, scientists and environmentalists began to worry about the impact of human activities on Earth. Interest in this issue grew in the 1960s and 1970s when environmental ethics emerged as an academic field in its own right. At this time, it is still challenging to find a study program that specifically discusses environmental ethics issues because this field of study demands fieldwork, so there are scarce enthusiasts.

Environmental ethics is fundamental because these studies require people to consider how their behavior affects other humans and the environment. When people realize the impact of their behavior, it is expected to change their behavior of indifference to the environment. For example, people may decide to recycle their domestic waste to be given or used as animal feed and plant fertilizer, not to cut down trees, not to smoke, or not to use pesticides, refuse to use plastic materials, or become a cadre of environmentalists, who will explain how to manage the environment and make environmental ethics as part of the behavior of daily living. The environment has always been an issue in the development of environmental ethics. The philosophers of the 1980s brought out their views through the study of literature and culture. The most famous views are anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. These two views are the main pillars of existing theories on environmental ethics. "Theory and Ecology" undergoes varied views, giving rise to continuous pros and cons. The theory raised until now is based on human behavior in interacting with the environment. Meanwhile, ecology always pays attention to the moral, cultural, and life values of living things other than humans.

Some philosophers in academia conclude that anthropocentrism and ecocentrism must be balanced in practice. The anthropocentrism view is known as superficial ecological ethics, which is a view of the environment and all its components that exist to meet human needs. This theory views that humans have the highest position compared to other living things. This makes humans the focal point of all systems in the universe, meaning humans do not care directly about humans. Meanwhile, ecocentrism emerged with a view that saw the importance of understanding the environment as a whole of life that supports each other so that all elements have the same meaning and meaning. This theory demands behavior that is not human-centered but centered or focused on living things concerning balancing environmental problems.

Student has been the focus of attention in several previous studies on environmental ethics. Some of them examined the issue of environmental ethics in the pre-school experience of high school students (Gürbüzoğlu Yalancı & Gözum, 2019), the responsibility of environmental ethics of secondary school students (Mahat et al., 2022), and examining the
implementation of environment ethics paradigm for university students (Gurbuzoglu-Yalmanci & Aydin-Beytur, 2023; Miloradova & Iskhov, 2015; Yamaphat et al., 2021). Miloradova and Iskhov (2015) revealed that the environmental ethics that students got at the university only worked when they moved to a professional setting after graduation. In contrast, Gurbuzoglu-Yalmanci and Aydin-Beytur (2021) argued that how students were trained and educated in their home country has been an essential factor contributing to their perspective on environmental ethics. In supporting this argument, Gürbüzoğlu Yalmanci and Gozum (2019) also discovered pre-school experience with an intense environmental ethics education did impact the daily life of high school students. By implementing a particular learning model of education, Yamaphat et al. (2021) believed that university students might gain more knowledge on environmental education as long as three factors are fulfilled: the teacher's capability to adapt to the interest of students, learning and teaching strategies, and a suitable learning spaces that accommodate the use of modern technology, (Zulika Hapsari et al., 2022). In this context, those papers indicated that the educational background in the past, the local setting, and the learning process at the university have been fundamental to understanding environmental ethics.

We would like to replicate the idea to study a specific case study of Indonesia. University students in Indonesia are an interesting object to be discussed in this paper because they are most likely to implement their knowledge at university through real action and are well respected by society. There is a belief that university students are the agents of change that may reform the social structure, even the government. The mass demonstration of students in 1998 toppled the long reign of Soeharto’s administration and has been a legacy of successful stories of the university student movement.

In Indonesia, community service based on what they learned in courses has been an embedded program at every university for the last two decades. The students had to spend a month living with the community to do some projects. They may deal with economic development and environmental protection dilemmas during their projects. In the framework of Kampus Merdeka policy during the second term of the Joko Widodo administration, the students must perform more community services for up to six months. We argue their vital position as connectors from the university, the knowledge production center, to society must be prepared with a holistic understanding of environmental ethics.

Therefore, examining student's point of view is necessary to conduct a theoretical analysis to determine the relevance of theories in environmental ethics. Theoretical analysis requires criticism or views from everyone; the views proposed must follow anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. Ambiguous views will bring new pros and cons to both theories. Therefore, students must balance between human interests and environmental understanding. These two aspects become analytical materials that are tested for relevance, need views that understand questions that do not yet exist, and can answer these questions.

**METHODS**

This paper utilized a literature review as its method. Literature review uses secondary data sources, such as books and literature on environmental ethics and data-gathering methodologies. Anthropocentrism and ecocentrism, the two fundamental perspectives in human and environmental studies, are examined in this article. The most effective method we have found for combining studies on students' environmental attitudes with pro-environmental
activity is literature reviews. The work adopts a broader perspective by constructing and synthesizing many literature evaluations, summarizing and combining various criteria, including how to apply them in pro-environmental behavior research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The discourse of environmental ethics was born from a response to the phenomena of natural destruction. Environmental ethics seeks to find sources of problems and solutions to natural damage that occurs. According to Sonny Keraf, there are three environmental ethics theory models: anthropocentrism, biocentrism, and ecocentrism. Of these three theories, anthropocentrism is the source of the current environmental crisis. A profitable life is a life that is balanced between the aspects of living beings and non-living beings. As long as the Earth is present in the universe's life, humans are living beings who are the rulers and focal points of life on Earth. Humans have achieved many things; humans use everything around them for the welfare of life on earth. The phenomenon can be felt at any time. Namely, humans have time, technology, industry, and happy life on Earth. It becomes a question of whether today's humans only want to take advantage of existing natural resources or profit from the existence of non-human living things. It is strange, but this often happens in our lives; understanding the desire for well-being is always a reason for humans to act according to their will. Human views greatly influence how humans act; what happens if these views cause imbalances on Earth?

1. The view that places humans at the center of nature is called anthropocentrism

Anthropocentrism is an understanding in which nature is the center of exploitation only for the benefit of humans. They assume that there are natural resources. They focus their attention on how they control those natural resources for the benefit of humans. The desire to extract wealth and natural resources began in the mid-19th century, when humans no longer ignored the importance of preserving nature but only thought about how to drain natural resources. Isn't that important to understand? This is done based on the view that anthropocentrism makes some humans begin to feel selfish and oriented to the basis of satisfaction.

a) Deepening the Perspective of Anthropocentrism

An environmental ethics paradigm called anthropocentrism contends that humans are at the core of the cosmos. This point of view claims that man was the only reason the world was created. According to the anthropocentric perspective, humans are above and apart from nature. Man is considered the master of nature, capable of altering it. This point of view gives rise to attitudes and actions that are destructive and exploitative of nature and the environment. This point of view leads people to use nature at will to satisfy their demands, oblivious to the need to protect it. This anthropocentric mentality, which has profit as its primary motivation, can be linked to the "capitalist economy." Massive amounts of natural resources are used without considering the effects on the environment or the possibility of contamination because doing so will result in additional costs that are deemed undesirable. The increasing environmental damage will be impacted if capitalism's industrial activities are disregarded. Consequently, the anthropocentric perspective is believed to be the main reason for the current environmental degradation.

According to anthropocentric ethics, moral principles are unique to humans. We, therefore, have no obligation to the natural world, although we can be claimed to have
Anthropocentrism will cause nature to suffer, and people will be held responsible for nature’s outbursts. In addition to the dance metaphor of life, anthropocentrism is an anthropological tool for describing human/non-human interactions. Even if anthropocentrism renders the human viewpoint immensely favorable, the perspective is always seen as having negative empathy. When the theoretical perspective is applied in reality, many things are attained. However, those who lack environmental ethics would cause nature harm. Understanding anthropocentrism requires drawing a line between mind and desire; if this line can be drawn, nature won’t be sacrificed for anthropocentrism, but if desire overpowers the mind, anthropocentrism will be harmful to nature.

b) Man’s position concerning nature

Humans have an essential role in the sustainability of nature. According to Doglas Jonh Hall, a theologian from Canada, the position of man towards nature sparked three concepts of thought: Man above nature, a man in nature, and a man with nature. The views that emerge are:

1) Humans are above nature. From this thought emerged anthropocentrism, which prioritizes human interests without thinking about the impact in the form of damage to nature. This view only focuses on human welfare and comfort by utilizing nature arbitrarily.

2) Man in nature, this thought views that man is part of the existing creation, which needs and interdepends on each other creation. However, this thought has different from the first thought. In this second thought, humans seem to be degraded and considered as if they were just machines. Because this view equates humans with nature.

3) Man with nature, this thought explains that man is neither above nature and dominates it nor is it degraded. Man lives with all other creations, even with all forms of differences. Man does not exploit nature at will but by safeguarding and assuming based on solidarity that needs and needs each other.

These two points explain how the view of anthropocentrism in environmental ethics students are pretty familiar with anthropocentrism as an unbalanced and contra theory. Therefore, this theory has the opposite of the theory of ecocentrism. Anthropocentrism is a school that views humans as the universe’s center, and only humans have value. At the same time, nature and everything in it is only a tool for satisfying the interests and needs of human life. Humans are considered to be outside, above, and separate from nature.

2. Ecocentrism emerged as a continuation of the theory of Biocentrism

The theory of ecocentrism emphasizes breaking the way of viewing anthropocentrism, which limits the validity of ethics only to humans. Ecocentrism places or focuses on each biotic (living thing) and abiotic (non-living) component in one related position. Furthermore, the new paradigm of environmental ethics, namely biocentrism ethics and ecocentrism ethics, emerged to respond to the previous ethical paradigm, which stated that humans are the center of the universe and have the right to control the universe. The ethics of Biocentrism holds the view that every life and living thing has value and is valued in itself. This understanding has the following points of view. First, nature has value in itself (intrinsically) independent of human interests. Second, nature is treated as moral,
whether beneficial to humans or not, because nature is a moral community. That is, life in this universe will be respected just as humans respect the social system contained in their lives. In comparison, ecocentrism ethics has a broader view. According to this understanding, similar to Biocentrism, the struggle to save and care for the natural environment does not only prioritize respect for species (living things only) but equal attention to all life. This means that this ethic applies to all components of the environment, the entire ecological community, both living and dead. Ecocentrism or Deep Ecology acts in two domains, namely the practical and philosophical realms. Nature has a whole of organisms that need each other, support each other, and need each other so that the life seen by ecocentrism is accepted in a balanced way. The emphasis of ecocentrism theory is:

a) **The human race is a part of nature**

This emphasis is necessary since humans will continue to depend on nature for survival. Many things in nature can be used, but many things must be preserved. Humans have always been part of nature because Earth's basic laws govern them. Consequently, man is a part of nature. Humans may not hold the same significance level as nature, yet they frequently have the right to use it.

Man and his way of life are very reliant on nature. Natural conditions govern both the formation of culture and its mobility, which is nevertheless constrained and governed by natural factors on Earth's surface. The natural world is a physical setting comprising the Earth, water, air, and other natural elements. It encompasses many habitats with various plants and animals, including forests, mountains, lakes, seas, and grasslands. Natural occurrences like weather, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions are also included. The resources required for human survival are found in nature. Starting with food, water, and raw resources, and also plays a crucial part in preserving the ecosystem's balance.

b) **All beings have the right to live equally**

The second emphasis aims to realize a balanced life for the benefit of all living beings. The resulting balance can give rise to the view that nature or other living things are on the same ladder as humans. Nature and man have the same rights as other living things, meaning humans are forbidden to edit their rights and think about all other components of life. Humans are one of the living things on earth that are always side by side with other living things, not only with animals and plants but also with various other types of microorganisms, such as protozoa, bacteria, and archaea. Although all organisms have different characteristics, they have some similarities, namely, both descended from one ancestor and live. This is the reason these organisms are called living things. All living things have the right to depend on the world and balance the life that exists in the world.

c) **Concern for nature and all its components**

The third emphasis is a response to the previous two emphases, namely the suppression of feelings towards an event. If people still have feelings, they will try to find ways to balance desires and feelings. Empathy, in theory, is essential to raise. With this empathy, humans use desires that affect the mind and feelings that influence the mind to act. The value of being sensitive to the environment is significant to always
exist in life. Sensitivity will bring awareness that will directly help balance between humans and nature.

d) Nature management policies oriented to all creatures
The fourth emphasis is an application of the previous emphasis, the need for nature management policies to be oriented to all creatures on earth to maintain balance. Nature management is used to balance the relationship between humans and nature, and the effort is a process of orientation in life. Management policy will be material for human evaluation to utilize and maintain nature, which balances living and non-living things. Natural resource management should be oriented towards overcoming environmental damage and recovering state losses due to destructive investments. Of course, it is not enough to impose administrative sanctions in the form of fines, and there must be criminal threats that can deter destructive companies. From this statement, this is one of the management policies for nature.

e) Humans must not control nature and must use it sustainably
The last emphasis is anticlimax, an aspect of consciousness for humans in paying attention to nature and living things other than non-humans. Humans have a responsibility to nature, and from that responsibility comes sustainable opportunities to use nature. Nature will benefit, as will humans who use nature to help life on Earth. In utilizing natural resources, humans must be based on the principle of ecoefficiency, meaning that utilizing natural resources must not damage the existing ecosystem. Besides that, the extraction of natural resources must also be done efficiently for the continuation of human resources. Utilization of Natural Resources.

A moral view is needed to know the relevance of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism theories. Students must know which theories can benefit human life and how to maintain a balance between nature and humans. Belief in the theory will bring up pros and cons. Therefore, the relevance that can be found from both theories is education that understands environmental ethics as a balance. However, is it enough to use moral views to know the relevance of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism theories? We argue that the answer is no. Our finding revealed that students who study environmental ethics will think and be in the circle that the environment is a human responsibility. A moral view will be a one-sided point for students, and it will continue to be done if students have a concept of environmental ethics that is more likely to be heavy on ecocentrism. Various theories with different philosophical backgrounds very much study environmental ethics; in fact, students will consider that environmental ethics theory is wise behavior to preserve the environment, but it is undoubtedly unfair to other theories.
Historically, the theory of anthropocentrism first existed and has been used by humans. Meanwhile, the theory of ecocentrism emerged later but has enormous empathy for people who study environmental ethics. If you look at the world now, students known as the golden generation because they continue to study confusing things will argue that the world is currently in an environmental crisis. Then, what will happen? Yes, that would be a massive empathy for ecocentrism or any other theory that discusses the future of the environment for the world. If reasoned, the theory of anthropocentrism brings many benefits to humans and nature. The theory of anthropocentrism is studied with only one word, that of man. Meanwhile, the theory of ecocentrism is only studied with two words, namely, humans and environment. Biocentrism is more focused on the living elements of the environment, whereas anthropocentrism holds that humans are superior to all other organisms. Ecocentrism, on the other hand, is a viewpoint that is interested in the ecosystem as a whole. Anthropocentrism focuses on humans, biocentrism on all other living things, and ecocentrism on the biosphere. Humans are prioritized by anthropocentrism, biotic variables are seen as essential by biocentrism, and biotic and abiotic factors are seen as equally significant by ecocentrism. That is how anthropocentrism and ecocentrism vary from one another.

A reason founded on rational facts will support the theory of anthropocentrism, whereas an empathic mind will support the theory of ecocentrism. Nothing on this planet was created by humans using the resources the planet provided. When you consider the surroundings, that is what now occurs. The rationality of man and the environment is brought about via theory. People with an anthropocentric position tend to be avaricious and demand tyranny and satisfaction. That, however, is only one drawback of the anthropocentrism theory. The environment, dubbed a victim of this idea, is still there on earth, and anthropocentrism makes all human accomplishments genuine. Humans always use land, rivers, woods, mountains, and other surroundings to accomplish their objectives. It is challenging to eradicate anthropocentrism; it will always be a central theme in human thought. At this point, humanity will primarily support the ecocentrism theory and make environmental ethics seem natural. Students can analyze and make appropriate judgments if they are familiar with environmental ethics or have studied various theories. Relevant judgments for anthropocentrism and ecocentrism theories are not based on moral views or wise behavior regarding humans and the environment.

3. **Too narrowly formulates "active relationship theory"**

   Too narrowly formulates "active relationship theory" would make it seem that textuality can only partially take and eventually incorporate reality. Criticisms arising from the ethical theories of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism often become open polemics in the case of a problem widely recognized as serious. Then what does it have to do with the relevance of the student concept to environmental ethics?

   a) **How students understand the concept of environmental ethics**

      It is no longer a secret that students have a role as agents of change. In addition, students, as intellectuals, also have a great responsibility to protect the environment. Everything learned in college will be helpful if applied in community life by helping to solve problems for a better life. Students are expected to be changemakers for the better. To meet such expectations, students are confident they can make changes in future life, including environmental factors. Students who study environmental ethics
or students who do not study environmental ethics are required by the government to be able to protect the environment. Then how can students realize such demands? Students who have the opportunity to study environmental ethics must learn various concepts from environmental ethics. Environmental ethics has many things that must be deeply understood and applied to real life. We start talking about theory again as above, but we will allude to theory according to the student's point of view. One of the crucial things to discuss is, the goodness of anthropocentrism for humans and the goodness of ecocentrism for humans and nature. From this sentence, it is clear that people who read will think that the theory of ecocentrism is beneficial, balanced, and positive. So, will students abandon the theory of anthropocentrism and use the theory of ecocentrism as the initial procedure for realizing environmental ethics? The way students understand environmental ethics can be based on facts, theories, and actions of reality that exist today. How to do it? Yes, by criticizing as did previous philosophers. Genuine criticism will create new ideas, rational actions, and comparisons.

1) The first criticism is directed at the theory of Anthropocentrism.

Environmental damage (crisis) continues to occur so far; one of the contributing factors is a misconception (paradigm) that refers to the ethics of Anthropocentrism. As a result of this perspective, it has led humans to behave in a certain way, both toward others and toward the natural environment. The paradigm of Anthropocentrism holds that humans are the center of the universe and only humans have value. At the same time, nature and everything in it is only a means of satisfying the interests and needs of human life. Anthropocentrism is a theory of man's relationship with the environment that views humans as the center of the system of the universe. Humans and their interests are considered the most decisive in the order of ecosystems and policies taken concerning nature, directly or indirectly. The highest value is the man and his interests. Only humans have value and get attention. Everything else in the universe will only receive value and attention insofar as it supports and interests man. Therefore, nature is only seen as an object, tool, and means for fulfilling human needs and interests. Nature is only a tool for the achievement of human goals. Nature has no value in itself. Anthropocentrism will be the target of negative criticism from its readers, such as students. If anthropocentrism remains the mastermind of environmental destruction, then the theory cannot be used as a foundation for environmental ethics. An anthropocentric worldview based solely on rationality will lead to alienation. It separates man from his nature, from his environment. This also violates the true nature because the environment in which humans live will never be separated from humanitarian problems. The ethics of anthropocentrism are very partial to humans; there are so many things that humans have obtained by relying on the theory of anthropocentrism. One of the most straightforward examples is technology. The help of nature and humans on top of making technology from ancient times to the present makes human life balanced. Have you ever thought that technology based on human desires can help nature? If answered with facts, then the answer has been that so many technologies today help nature continue to grow. That is a positive if you use the theoretical view of anthropocentrism. However, such an excellent initial wish would only be good if done continuously without considering
environmental ethics. Humans who have achieved their desires will look for new achievements again and bring up harmful desires for the environment. Therefore, it is inevitable that the theory of anthropocentrism will be good at the beginning but slowly destroy both humans and the environment.

2) The second criticism is directed at the theory of ecocentrism

Ecocentrism will be the target of positive criticism and reasonable steps to realize environmental ethics. Man's separation from nature is undeniable when modern lifestyles are increasingly inseparable from the demands of the times. Modern lifestyle is closely related to rationality and technology that helps human life. Technology solves social or physical problems that can arise in society (Kilbourne & Carlson, 2008). Then, the assumption of modern society that the use of technology answers rationality. However, such rationality cannot be equated with the movement of nature. The movement of nature cannot be faced with mere rationality but requires a process to recognize nature. Anthropocentric becomes a narrative in observing how humans form ecosystems and also causes threats to ecosystems (Lidskog & Waterton, 2016).

The culmination of the implementation of this narrative is the occurrence of climate change. For some, climate change is considered a myth, but in scientific studies, climate change is a natural phenomenon. Relying on anthropocentric, the rush of economization of natural resources refers to using nature as an object of exploitation. In this observation came new terms such as "sleeping land", "control", and "exploitation." In this point of view, it is human who rules nature. Nature is an object that can be squeezed to support human life. Economic and political factors play a role in this narrative. The environment cannot talk about itself. It is humans who will interpret it. Knowledge of the natural environment will not appear and reveal itself if there is no process of encounter. It is only possible if the environment is always placed as an object of exploitation.

For this reason, it is necessary to look more holistically through self-awareness. The thing worth paying attention to is building awareness that human life depends entirely on nature. Behavior towards nature reflects the general behavior of modern man today. Understanding the relationship of humans with nature today may be considered unpopular. Fundamental is the need to build a balanced relationship between humans and nature. Even every human living on this earth has a debt to repay the kindness of nature, which is intended for the balance of life, the good of humanity, and the sustainability of the lives of the next generation. Therefore, ecocentrism is always positive for the environment. Students with environmental awareness will rely on the theory of ecocentrism to realize the environment.

b) Environmental ethics as the ultimate goal of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism

Students who have understood and criticized the two theories above must prove the natural role of realizing environmental ethics in the community. From the perspective of environmental ethics, the destruction of nature is not just a technical problem but a crisis of human morals towards the universe. Humans are not spared from biological needs, but at the same time, not all are tied to biological needs alone. The human environment is not given by nature but must be built and developed by humans in culture, so human needs develop together and within the culture. From the description
above, in building a humane environment in culture, humans are oriented to their interests and needs (self-egoism), not nature’s. The natural environment is explored and exploited to benefit its for human needs and easily monitor it. In processing nature, humans create tools that can help tame natural phenomena by applying laws that apply in science, known as technology. Changing the natural environment into a human environment, often termed an artificial environment, humans are more oriented to their own needs and interests than the interests of nature.

In the same way, human used technology for their purposes. There is a belief in modern man that nature can provide all human needs without limits, so there is an opinion that says that the evolutionary development of human needs is much faster than the evolution of human awareness about the limitations of nature. This is what causes the environmental catastrophe that environmentalists fear.

The root of many environmental problems comes from the existence of a frontier mentality entirely rooted in human civilization, even still honed today, because advances in communication and information technology add to it. Something specific in man is the presence of intellect, (Prancisca, S., Nurani, L. M., & Chappell, 2023). The meaning of intellect is a critical attitude and a desire to ask questions and investigate. The intellect dispels the naïve belief that early humans were integrated into reality. Man eliminates natural relationships but does not eliminate them by placing others in their place. Even the intellect pretends that by its strength and by the tools at its disposal, it can construct and manifest its proper, rational form.

The modern mind produces objectivity from the subject. The role of the subject, in this case, of course, man, establishes what is called reality and what is called truth. Man confesses only one truth if he has investigated it himself. It is more than that; it is only what you produce. The subject (of course, except in realism) does not hold that outside of consciousness. The mind imagines a reality. On top of this fact, a new world was built, a second world, that is, a world depicted by signs and symbols. So, the modern mind based on and believing in oneself is a matter of the most correct method. Then the problem of method, which means the path the mind takes to achieve the goal, is a fundamental problem for philosophy and modern science.

Environmental ethics is a separate discipline that discusses the relationship between humans and their environment. It is also inseparable from their concern about the moral status of living things (biotic) and non-living (abiotic). As a separate discipline, the theory of environmental ethics is very developed in Western countries because environmental issues have been very vocal, and most humans have also felt the danger of environmental damage. As applied ethics, this discipline provides hope for environmental improvement from the moral aspects of humans who are required to maintain the totality of the ecosystem of the universe, where humans are an integral part that cannot be separated.

CONCLUSION

Historically, environmental ethics is a concept which based on a wise human behavior that deals with all components of the environment, including nature, humans, and other living things. The philosophers of the 1980s brought out their views through the study of literature and culture with the most famous views are anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. Debate on these two school of thought in environment studies led to bipolarity in viewing the world. When
viewed from a student's point of view, it is necessary to conduct a theoretical analysis to determine the relevance of theories in environmental ethics. Relevance gained trust in these two theories will bring up pros and cons. We found out students in Indonesia had their main criticism towards each philosophical thought. We also found that emerging technology and modernization has been an issue on the debate. A better environmental ethics understanding would serve a better goal of balancing both view of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism.
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