Introduction to Environmental Ethics: Key Debates

Brendan Shea, PhD

Intro to Ethics

Environmental Ethics: Expanding Our Moral Horizon

- Environmental ethics examines the moral relationship between humans and the natural environment.
- Traditional ethics focused primarily on humans, but environmental ethics asks: Should our moral consideration extend beyond humans?
- Some argue only humans deserve direct moral consideration; others argue we should include animals, plants, or even ecosystems.
- This expansion debate is central to how we understand our ethical obligations to the natural world.

The Expansion Question

Should we extend moral consideration beyond humans? If so, how far?

- To animals that can feel pain?
- To all living things?
- To ecosystems and the land?
- Or should we focus solely on human interests?

Intrinsic vs. Instrumental Value: A Fundamental Debate

- **Instrumental value**: Something has value only as a means to something else (e.g., a forest valued for timber).
- **Intrinsic value**: Something has value in and of itself, regardless of usefulness to others.
- The key debate: Does nature have only instrumental value for humans, or does it have intrinsic value?
- This distinction shapes how we approach environmental protection and policy.

Example

The Old-Growth Forest Example Consider an ancient forest:

- **Instrumental view**: The forest's value lies in resources it provides: timber, recreation, ecosystem services, and aesthetic pleasure for humans.
- **Intrinsic value view**: The forest has value independent of human benefits—it deserves protection for its own sake, not just for what humans get from it.

Anthropocentrism vs. Non-Anthropocentrism

- **Anthropocentrism**: Humans are the central or most significant entities in the world; only human interests directly matter morally.
- **Non-anthropocentrism**: Moral consideration should extend to non-human entities, which have value independent of human interests.
- Anthropocentrists argue that only humans can be moral agents and proper subjects of moral concern.
- Non-anthropocentrists counter that moral consideration should depend on other criteria like sentience or being alive.

The Practical Question

Some philosophers argue this theoretical debate doesn't matter much for practice:

- Bryan Norton argues that "weak anthropocentrism" (focusing on long-term, enlightened human interests) leads to the same environmental policies as non-anthropocentrism.
- Others contend that truly recognizing nature's intrinsic value would fundamentally change our relationship with it.

Utilitarian Approaches: The Greatest Good

- **Utilitarianism** evaluates actions based on their consequences, particularly their ability to maximize welfare or happiness.
- The key question for environmental utilitarianism: Whose welfare counts in our calculations?
- Peter Singer argues that the capacity to suffer is what matters morally, so animals deserve equal consideration of interests.
- This raises challenging questions about how to weigh human interests against those of other species.

Singer's Argument for Animal Consideration

- Suffering is bad regardless of who experiences it
- Many animals can suffer (they have interests in avoiding pain)
- There is no morally relevant characteristic that all humans have and all animals lack
- Therefore, animal suffering should count equally to comparable human suffering
- This doesn't mean equal treatment, but equal consideration of interests

The Sentience Debate: Who Counts Morally?

- **Sentience** refers to the capacity to experience sensations, particularly pleasure and pain.
- Peter Singer argues sentience is the only defensible boundary for moral consideration.
- Tom Regan counters that being a "subject-of-a-life" (having beliefs, desires, memory, etc.) is required for full moral status.
- Gary Varner suggests a three-tiered approach: persons (self-aware), sentient animals, and merely living things.

Example

How do these approaches view different entities?

- A chimpanzee: Has interests, sentience, and some self-awareness—full consideration on most views
- An earthworm: Has sentience (can feel pain) but limited awareness—counts for Singer, less for Regan
- A plant: Alive but not sentient—no direct moral status for Singer, some status for biocentrists
- An ecosystem: Not a sentient individual—no direct consideration for most individualistic theories

Individual vs. Ecosystem Welfare: A Utilitarian Dilemma

- Environmental utilitarians face a dilemma: Should we prioritize individual welfare or ecosystem health?
- Aldo Leopold's **land ethic** suggests: "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community."
- This community-focused view can conflict with the welfare of individual animals.
- The **predator reintroduction debate** illustrates this conflict.

The Wolf Reintroduction Debate

- **Ecosystem focus**: Wolves restore natural processes and increase biodiversity
- **Individual animal focus**: Wolves cause suffering to prey animals
- **The dilemma**: Can a utilitarian coherently care about both ecosystem health and individual animal welfare?
- **Possible resolution**: Different levels of utilitarian analysis for different contexts

The Cost-Benefit Debate: Can We Put a Price on Nature?

- Environmental policies often employ **cost-benefit analysis** to determine the most utilitarian course of action.
- This requires assigning monetary values to environmental goods (clean air, biodiversity, wilderness).
- Proponents argue this ensures efficient resource allocation and proper consideration of environmental values.
- Critics argue some values cannot be meaningfully monetized and the process often undervalues nature.

The Monetary Valuation Problem

How do we value these environmental goods?

Method	**Limitation**
Willingness to pay	Limited by ability to pay; future generations can't bid
Replacement cost	Some natural systems irreplaceable
Contingent valuation	Hypothetical questions yield unreliable answers
Travel cost	Captures only use value, not existence value

Kantian Ethics: Beyond Rational Beings?

- Immanuel Kant argued we should treat rational beings as ends in themselves, never merely as means.
- Kant originally limited direct moral consideration to rational beings (humans), granting only indirect duties regarding animals and nature.
- Can Kantian ethics be extended to include non-human entities in our direct moral consideration?
- This question has generated significant debate among environmental philosophers.

Extending Kantian Ethics to Nature

- **Traditional Kantian view**: We have direct duties only to rational beings; we should avoid harming animals only because it might make us more likely to harm humans
- **Christine Korsgaard's argument**: Animals have a good of their own that matters to them; respecting rational nature requires respecting other beings' natural ends
- **Paul Taylor's biocentrism**: All living organisms deserve respect as "teleological centers of life" with a good of their own

The Categorical Imperative: Environmental Applications

- Kant's **Categorical Imperative**: "Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law."
- Applied to environmental ethics: Could we universalize a maxim of environmental exploitation?
- If everyone polluted or exploited natural resources without restraint, would we undermine the very conditions that make human life possible?
- This argument suggests Kantian ethics can ground environmental protection based on duties to humanity.

Example

Consider the maxim: "I will emit greenhouse gases without restriction whenever it benefits me."

- If everyone followed this maxim, it would lead to catastrophic climate change
- This would undermine the conditions for human existence and agency
- Therefore, this maxim fails the universalization test
- Kantian ethics thus prohibits unrestricted greenhouse gas emissions

Animal Rights: The Moral Status Debate

- **Rights** are strong moral protections that cannot be violated even for greater overall good.
- Tom Regan argues that animals with complex mental lives are "subjects-of-a-life" with inherent value and rights.
- Being a subject-of-a-life means having beliefs, desires, perception, memory, a sense of future, and a welfare that matters.
- These rights prohibit treating animals merely as resources for human use (in research, food, entertainment, etc.).

Regan's Rights Argument

- Many animals (especially mammals) have complex mental lives similar to humans
- They are "subjects-of-a-life" with inherent value
- Having inherent value grants them the right not to be treated merely as resources
- This right cannot be overridden even for greater overall utility
- Therefore, practices like factory farming and animal experimentation are wrong regardless of benefits

Rights of Nature: Conceptual Possibilities

- Christopher Stone famously asked: "Should Trees Have Standing?" proposing legal rights for natural entities.
- The debate centers on whether rights make sense for entities that cannot claim or waive them.
- Some argue rights require interests, which require consciousness—limiting rights to sentient beings.
- Others suggest we can meaningfully speak of rights for non-sentient entities that have a good of their own.

Rights of Nature in Practice

Several jurisdictions have begun recognizing rights of nature:

- **Ecuador's Constitution** (2008): Rights for "Pachamama" (Mother Earth) to exist and maintain vital cycles
- **New Zealand's Te Urewera Act** (2014): Former national park recognized as legal entity with rights
- **Rights of the Whanganui River** (2017): River granted legal personhood, with guardians appointed to speak for its interests
- These provide not just symbolic recognition but legal mechanisms to protect nature's interests

Virtue Ethics: Character and Nature

- **Virtue ethics** focuses on developing excellent character traits rather than following rules or calculating consequences.
- Environmental virtue ethics asks: "What kind of person would relate appropriately to nature?"
- Key environmental virtues include respect, humility, care, gratitude, and ecological wisdom.
- This approach shifts focus from "What should I do?" to "How should I live?" and "What kind of person should I be?"

Example

Environmental Virtues in Practice:

- **Simplicity**: Finding fulfillment in non-material goods rather than excessive consumption
- **Attentiveness**: Paying close attention to natural processes and relationships
- **Humility**: Recognizing human limitations and dependence on natural systems
- **Ecological wisdom**: Understanding how natural systems work and acting in harmony with them
- These virtues guide choices without requiring complex calculations or rigid rules

Indigenous Environmental Ethics: Relationship-Based Approaches

- Many Indigenous ethical traditions emphasize relationships and reciprocity rather than abstract principles.
- Natural entities are often understood as persons or relatives with whom humans have ongoing moral relationships.
- **Reciprocity** involves giving back to the land that sustains human communities.
- These traditions often reject sharp distinctions between humans and nature, seeing humans as embedded within the natural world.

Key Features of Many Indigenous Environmental Ethics

- **Relationality**: Moral obligations emerge from specific relationships, not abstract principles
- **Reciprocity**: Taking from the land creates obligations to give back
- **Respect**: Approaching other beings with respect regardless of their usefulness
- **Responsibility**: Humans have duties to maintain balance and harmony
- These approaches differ from Western philosophical traditions but offer valuable ethical insights

Animal Ethics: The Moral Status Debate

- The animal ethics debate centers on the moral status of animals and our obligations toward them.
- Peter Singer argues that sentience (ability to feel pain/pleasure) is the relevant criterion for moral consideration.
- Tom Regan contends that animals with complex mental lives have rights that cannot be violated even for greater good.
- These positions challenge traditional views that animals matter only insofar as they affect human interests.

The Factory Farming Debate

Different ethical frameworks yield different critiques of factory farming:

- **Utilitarian critique (Singer)**: The suffering of billions of animals outweighs the benefits of cheap meat
- **Rights-based critique (Regan)**: Factory farming violates animals' rights by treating them merely as resources
- **Virtue ethics critique**: Industrial animal agriculture cultivates vices of detachment and insensitivity
- **Religious/Indigenous critique**: Factory farming violates proper relationships with animal relatives

The Reform vs. Abolition Debate in Animal Ethics

- Animal advocates debate whether to pursue incremental welfare reforms or only complete abolition of animal exploitation.
- **The welfare position**: We should improve conditions for animals while working toward decreased animal use.
- **The abolitionist position**: Welfare reforms reinforce the property status of animals and delay more fundamental change.
- This debate involves both ethical principles and empirical questions about effective advocacy strategies.

Example

Consider the movement for **cage-free egg production**:

- **Welfare argument**: Cage-free systems allow hens to express natural behaviors, significantly reducing suffering
- **Abolitionist counter**: "Cage-free" eggs still involve exploitation, suffering, and killing of male chicks; reforms make consumers feel better about continuing harmful practices
- **Welfare response**: Progress occurs in stages; welfare reforms build momentum for further changes
- **The empirical question**: Do welfare reforms decrease animal product consumption or increase it by easing ethical concerns?

Climate Ethics: Unique Ethical Challenges

- Climate change presents unique ethical challenges due to its global scale, long time horizons, and complex causation.
- Unlike traditional ethical problems, climate change involves:
  - Collective rather than individual actions
  - Effects dispersed across time and space
  - Uncertain but potentially catastrophic impacts
  - Disproportionate impacts on vulnerable populations and future generations

Why Climate Change Challenges Traditional Ethics

- **The collective action problem**: Individual contributions seem negligible, yet collectively they produce catastrophic effects
- **The temporal problem**: Most severe impacts will affect future generations who cannot represent their interests today
- **The spatial problem**: Those contributing most to the problem often face the least severe consequences
- **The uncertainty problem**: We must act without complete knowledge of precise impacts

Climate Justice: Historical Responsibility Debate

- Wealthy nations have contributed disproportionately to historical emissions while developing nations face significant impacts.
- The key question: Who should bear the costs of addressing climate change?
- **The historical responsibility argument**: Those who caused the problem should pay to fix it.
- **The ability to pay argument**: Those with the most resources should contribute the most regardless of causation.

Example

Consider these competing perspectives:

- **Developed nations' responsibility**: The U.S. has contributed about 25% of cumulative CO_2 emissions despite having only 4% of world population
- **Knowledge defense**: Earlier generations didn't know their emissions would cause harm
- **Current emissions focus**: China now emits more annually than any other nation
- **Per capita perspective**: On a per-person basis, many Western nations still emit far more than developing nations

Climate Justice: Equal Emissions vs. Development Rights

- Climate justice requires determining fair allocation of the remaining "carbon budget" that avoids dangerous warming.
- **Equal per-capita emissions**: Each person should have an equal right to emit greenhouse gases.
- **Development rights**: Developing nations need carbon space to eliminate poverty.
- **Subsistence vs. luxury emissions**: Basic needs emissions deserve priority over consumption emissions.

The Development Rights Argument

- Hundreds of millions of people lack access to electricity and modern energy services
- Development to meet basic needs will require some increased emissions
- Wealthy nations achieved development using fossil fuels without restrictions
- Therefore, developing nations should have priority access to the remaining carbon budget
- Wealthy nations should both reduce emissions more rapidly and provide technology/financial support

Individual vs. Collective Responsibility for Climate Change

- Climate change raises questions about the relationship between individual actions and structural change.
- Some argue individual actions like reducing meat consumption or flying less are essential moral obligations.
- Others contend individual actions distract from necessary systemic changes in policy and infrastructure.
- This debate involves both empirical questions about efficacy and normative questions about moral responsibility.

Arguments About Individual Climate Responsibility

- **Individual insignificance argument**: My emissions are a tiny fraction of the problem; my reductions won't make a measurable difference
- **Collective responsibility counter**: Climate change is the aggregation of billions of individual choices
- **Symbolic action argument**: Individual actions help create social and political momentum for structural change
- **The integrated view**: Individual and structural changes are complementary, not competing approaches

Environmental Justice: Key Dimensions

- **Environmental justice** examines how environmental benefits and burdens are distributed across society.
- Environmental injustice occurs when marginalized communities face disproportionate exposure to environmental hazards.
- Two key dimensions of environmental justice:
  - **Distributive justice**: Fair outcomes in the distribution of environmental benefits and burdens
  - **Procedural justice**: Fair processes that allow meaningful participation by affected communities

Example

In the United States:

- Race is the strongest predictor of proximity to hazardous waste facilities
- Black Americans are 75% more likely than whites to live near industrial facilities that emit toxic pollution
- Communities with limited political power often lack resources to oppose unwanted facilities
- Environmental justice movements work to address these disparities through organizing, litigation, and policy change

Environmental Justice: Siting Toxic Facilities

- Facilities handling toxic materials are disproportionately located in low-income communities and communities of color.
- This raises profound questions about distributive justice and fairness in environmental decision-making.
- **The industry argument**: Siting decisions follow economic factors like land costs, not race or class.
- **The environmental justice response**: Even if not intentional, the outcome produces a racial and economic pattern of environmental injustice.

The Warren County Case

This foundational environmental justice case illustrates the core issues:

- North Carolina selected Warren County—a predominantly Black, low-income community—for a PCB landfill in 1982
- Residents organized protests, combining civil rights and environmental concerns
- Studies later confirmed a pattern of hazardous waste sites disproportionately located in minority communities
- The case helped launch the environmental justice movement that continues today

Indigenous Land Rights and Conservation

- Traditional conservation often involved removing Indigenous peoples from their lands to create "pristine" protected areas.
- This approach created "conservation refugees" and ignored Indigenous stewardship that maintained biodiversity for generations.
- The debate centers on whether human presence is compatible with conservation goals.
- Indigenous-led conservation represents an alternative that recognizes sovereignty and traditional ecological knowledge.

Competing Conservation Models

- **Fortress conservation**: Strictly protected areas with minimal human presence
- **Community-based conservation**: Local communities manage resources sustainably
- **Co-management**: Shared governance between state agencies and Indigenous peoples
- **Indigenous Protected Areas**: Conservation led by Indigenous communities based on traditional knowledge and practices
- Growing evidence suggests Indigenous-managed lands often maintain biodiversity as effectively as conventional protected areas

The Wilderness Debate: Preservation, Conservation, and Culture

- John Muir advocated preservation of wilderness for its spiritual and aesthetic value.
- Gifford Pinchot promoted conservation—the sustainable use of resources for "the greatest good for the greatest number."
- William Cronon challenged the wilderness concept as a cultural construct that erases Indigenous history and human-nature relationships.

Example

The establishment of **Yosemite National Park** illustrates competing perspectives:

- **The preservationist view**: Yosemite Valley as pristine wilderness, a cathedral of nature to be protected from human influence
- **The historical reality**: The valley was actively managed by Indigenous peoples for thousands of years
- **The erasure problem**: Creating the park required removing Ahwahneechee people who had shaped the landscape
- **The modern challenge**: Acknowledging human history while protecting natural values

Biodiversity Loss: Ethical Dimensions

- **Biodiversity** refers to the variety of life at genetic, species, and ecosystem levels.
- We are currently experiencing extinction rates estimated at 100-1,000 times the natural background rate.
- Different ethical frameworks provide distinct reasons for protecting biodiversity.
- The debate involves both the value of biodiversity itself and our responsibilities toward other species.

Ethical Approach	**Argument for Biodiversity Conservation**
Utilitarian	Preserves ecosystem services and potential future benefits
Rights-based	Species have intrinsic worth and right to continue existing
Virtue Ethics	Conservation cultivates virtues of care and respect
Indigenous	Maintains relationships with other beings as relatives

The Biodiversity Debate: Instrumental vs. Intrinsic Value

- The biodiversity debate centers on whether species matter only for their benefits to humans or have value in themselves.
- **The instrumental value argument**: We should protect biodiversity for ecosystem services, medical discoveries, and food security.
- **The intrinsic value argument**: Species have a right to exist regardless of their usefulness to humans.
- **The relational value argument**: We have responsibilities to other species based on our relationships with them.

The Instrumental Value Problem

- If we value species only for their usefulness, what about seemingly "useless" species?
- Many imperiled species lack obvious economic or medicinal value
- We cannot predict which species might prove valuable in the future
- The instrumental approach struggles to justify protecting all biodiversity
- This suggests either intrinsic or relational value is needed for a comprehensive ethic

Case Study: Development vs. Endangered Species

- The conflict between economic development and endangered species protection illustrates core ethical tensions.
- The **Endangered Species Act** prohibits any action that would jeopardize listed species, regardless of economic cost.
- This approach implicitly recognizes some form of rights or intrinsic value for species.
- Critics argue human needs should take priority, especially in developing regions with high poverty.

Example

The Snail Darter Controversy. This classic environmental ethics case raised fundamental questions:

- Construction of Tellico Dam threatened the endangered snail darter fish
- The Supreme Court ruled the Endangered Species Act required halting the nearly-completed dam
- Congress later exempted the project, allowing the dam's completion
- The case forced debate: Should a small fish prevent a $100 million project promising economic benefits?

Balancing Environmental Protection and Human Needs

- One of the most persistent challenges in environmental ethics is balancing conservation with human development needs.
- **The development argument**: Lifting people from poverty requires economic growth and resource use.
- **The environmental justice argument**: Everyone deserves both a healthy environment and their basic needs met.
- **The sustainability argument**: Development that undermines ecological systems ultimately harms humans too.

The Amazon Rainforest Debate

The ongoing debate about Amazon development illustrates these tensions:

- **Development perspective**: Brazil has sovereign rights to develop its resources for economic growth
- **Conservation perspective**: The Amazon provides irreplaceable biodiversity and climate regulation
- **Indigenous perspective**: Forest peoples' rights and traditional territories must be respected
- **Possible resolution**: Economic incentives for conservation, sustainable development models, recognition of Indigenous land rights

Toward an Integrated Environmental Ethic

- Despite differences, most environmental ethical frameworks agree on certain fundamental principles.
- All recognize limits to human exploitation of nature, whether based on human interests or intrinsic value.
- **Sustainability** emerges as a unifying concept compatible with different ethical approaches.
- Environmental ethics must address both theoretical questions and practical problems.

Elements of an Integrated Environmental Ethic

- Recognition that some non-human entities deserve moral consideration
- Concern for future generations and intergenerational justice
- Commitment to environmental justice within human communities
- Respect for biological and cultural diversity
- Development of virtues that support sustainable relationships with nature
- Practical implementation through policies, institutions, and individual choices

Discussion Questions

- How far should we extend moral consideration beyond humans? What criteria should determine moral status?
- Can anthropocentric ethics adequately protect nature, or do we need to recognize intrinsic value in non-human entities?
- How should we balance the rights or interests of individual animals against ecosystem health?
- What is a fair distribution of responsibility for addressing climate change between nations and generations?
- How can we reconcile environmental protection with the development needs of poor communities?
- What environmental virtues should we cultivate, and how might they guide our choices?