

Review of: "Sustainable Prosperity and Circular Economy in the Care of Mother Earth — The Blue Kiss"

Artur Myna¹

¹ Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Lublin

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject of the reviewed paper, "Sustainable Prosperity and Circular Economy in a Context of *Eco-Feminism and Its Implications for the Development of Women's Skills, Abilities, and Capacities Now Included in the Circular Economy*," is of great significance.

However, there are **concerns that refer to the paper**:

1. The paper consists of "*proposal of new perspectives on the protection of Nature, circumscribed to innovation and sustainable prosperity, and biomimicry as a process to be taken into account in the search for efficient solutions to the complex problems represented by the Social and Ecological Rule of Law*". The work stresses that law is a fundamental tool for progress, development, and life. In the paper, there are considerations of international treaties and conventions, including the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the Millennium Development Goals". References are also made to the environmental law of the European Union, including the European Green Deal "*that protect, maintain, and enhance Europe's natural capital. Protect people's health and well-being from environmental risks and impacts*". "*This proposal democratically incorporates transformation factors in the social pact, where the population satisfies its needs through demands on public authorities and private institutions, respecting ecological conditions, economic growth, and social justice in circular processes of products and services*". That is to say, "*the form of State that proposes to apply the principle of economic and social solidarity in order to achieve sustainable development, with the aim of seeking substantial equality among citizens, by means of legal control in the rational use of the natural heritage*".

In the European Union, agriculture under the European Green Deal is implemented by means of legal control in the rational use of the natural heritage. In my opinion, as well as the opinions of farmers who manage 'family-owned' farms and reject the Deal's rules, the import of Russian and Ukrainian (or African) agricultural products (which are produced in contradiction to Green Deal principles) destroys European sustainable, circular, 'family' agriculture and the European Green Deal. Furthermore, in the conditions of the import, the Deal's rules do not facilitate social justice in circular agricultural processes and principles of economic and social solidarity. They do not facilitate local production and consumption systems, nor do they encourage the transit of resources between industries and urban systems. They do not promote adaptive capacities, skills, and abilities in the competition for food and resources, based on mutualism, commensalism, tenancy, or, in short, always symbiotic.

The author of the paper indicates that: “...*the potential for sustainability is underdeveloped, both due to external causes beyond the control of organisations (public institutions and private companies), as well as internal factors, especially those related to the lack of knowledge of sustainability tools, processes, and actions.*” According to me, the European Green Deal, particularly in agriculture, is focused on procedures by establishing binding rules that optimise the use of resources and the reintroduction of waste into the economic cycle through reuse, recycling, and repair. However, the reviewed article is missing criticism that concerns the weaknesses and threats of the narrow, procedural (formal binding rules)-oriented approach to the European Green Deal. The establishing of binding rules that optimise the use of resources and the reintroduction of waste into the economic cycle through reuse, recycling, and repair is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for sustainable prosperity and a circular economy in the care of Mother Earth.

You need to add sufficient ‘model analysis’ to address the mentioned issues by indicating (social, cultural, institutional, or economic) factors that are **complementary** to binding rules. I mean factors that would facilitate the implementation of the rules in line with social justice and solidarity, local production and consumption systems, taking into account environmental and equity parameters, such as the right of workers (as farmers who manage family-owned farms) to a fair wage.

1. The reference to Marxism literature: “*We are witnessing what Frederick Engels called the revenge of nature, warning us with the experience of ancient civilisations: ‘The men who cut down the forests in Mesopotamia, Greece, Asia Minor, and other regions in order to obtain arable land could not even imagine that, by eliminating the forests, they were laying the foundations for the present aridity of these lands’²⁰. Today we could say that nature is taking revenge...*”.

In my opinion, the reference to F. Engels is not appropriate, as the Marxism ideology (promoted by him) was a theoretical basis of voluntaristic (without any natural and human constraints !) transformation of the natural environment on an immense scale. Exploiting gas or oil resources and cutting down forests in Siberia, or changing the direction of huge rivers (such as the Amu-daria), are clear examples of voluntarism and the following natural and particularly human disasters.