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Letter from the President

Watching leaves fall from the maple tree in our backyard as I tap out this short letter, I hope that ISEE members around the world are enjoying fall (or spring!), doing good work, and connecting to nature.

This summer was a busy one for ISEE. We held a successful 10th annual meeting in June, our second in Europe, this time at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England. The theme was “Thinking and Acting Ecologically.” Many thanks to Tom Greaves, Rupert Reid and Alex Carlson for their hospitality and hard work in making the meeting a success. A wrap-up on the conference can be found on page 16 of the newsletter.

ISEE sponsored two sessions in August on “International Perspectives on Environmental Ethics” at the 23rd World Congress of Philosophy held in Athens, Greece. Organized by Ricardo Rozzi, Alexandra Poole, and Gene Hargrove, the sessions were well-attended and informative, and provided a great opportunity for environmental philosophers from around the world to share ideas. The main Congress program also included many papers and sessions on environmental ethics, which was good to see. Ricardo, Alex, and Gene provide a report on ISEE’s sessions, accompanied by an introduction to a new series on international perspectives in environmental philosophy that is derived from papers presented at the Congress (p. 19). The first paper in the series is by ISEE’s Italy representative, Piergiaco Pedaro. It was stimulated, in part, by a report in the summer 2012 Newsletter on Italy by Matteo Andreado.

Also this summer, William Grove-Fanning continued making improvements to the ISEE website. Check out in particular information on environmental ethics around the world in the new ISEE International section. With this section, ISEE welcomes a host of regional representatives (p. 7) who have provided us with an overview of work being done in their regions and will be sending in updates on activities in their areas.

Thanks to William for all his hard work on the website and in putting out the newsletter. He has also set up and will be moderating ISEE’s new Climate Ethics blog (p. 6). We hope this blog will be a valuable resource for members and the general public alike, and are convinced that an established public forum devoted to ethical aspects of climate change is desperately needed.

The current issue includes a reply by Christopher Belshaw to the Dale Jamieson interview, originally published in the Fall 2012 Newsletter. Readers will also find reviews for three books: Clare Palmer’s Animal Ethics in Context, Ben Minteer’s Refounding Environmental Ethics, and Raymond Pierrotti’s Indigenous Knowledge, Ecology and Evolutionary Ecology. Our Update on X series is back as well, with a timely and thought-provoking report on climate philosophy from Martin Schönfeld (p. 38).

Finally, let me alert you to the call for papers and session proposals for ISEE’s 11th annual conference, to be held once again in Allenspark, Colorado, USA in 2014; and the call for proposals to host ISEE’s 12th annual conference in 2015 (p. 4).

—Philip Cafaro
Eleventh Annual Meeting on Environmental Philosophy

Environmental Philosophy and the Anthropocene Epoch

ISEE will hold its Eleventh Annual Meeting on Environmental Philosophy, June 17-20, 2014, at the Highlands Retreat Center in Allenspark, Colorado, USA. Come to the mountains and get their good tidings!

The theme for this year’s conference is “Environmental Philosophy and the Anthropocene Epoch.” Topics under this theme might include:

- the moral significance of the Anthropocene Epoch
- the ethics of geoengineering
- wildness as an endangered value
- the morality of species extinctions
- should environmentalists resist, accept, or embrace the Anthropocene?

However, proposals for individual papers and group sessions on any topic in environmental philosophy are welcome.

Instructions for Submissions

- Submit 250 word abstracts for 20 minute papers, as well as proposals for multi-participant sessions, to both Philip Cafaro and Ben Hale.
- Please anonymize all paper abstracts (including PDF submissions).
- Please do not submit panels without a participation commitment from all proposed participants.
- Complete papers must be available on the ISEE website by May 17, 2014, one month prior to the start of the conference.

Conference Format

The tradition of the conference is to have no overlapping sessions so that attendees can participate in all group discussions. Sessions are organized in a workshop-style format in order to maximize time for comprehensive discussion of each participant’s paper by the entire group. Papers will be distributed through the ISEE website before the conference and respondents will only summarize the papers at the conference.

Deadline for Submissions: February 15th, 2014

Staying at the Highlands Center

Highlands Presbyterian Retreat Center is located one and a half hours from Denver just south of Long’s Peak, on the border of Rocky Mountain National Park. Accommodations and meals are reasonably priced, families are welcome, and recreational opportunities in the area abound.

Highlands Presbyterian Retreat Center, PO Box 66, Allenspark, CO, USA 80510
Phone: (+1) 303-747-2888. Fax: (+1) 303-747-2889
Website: http://www.highlandscamp.org

Submissions and Academic Inquiries

Philip Cafaro, Philosophy Department, Colorado State University, Eddy Hall 226, Fort Collins, CO, USA, 80525 (+1) 970-491-2061. philip.cafaro@colostate.edu

Call for Proposals to Host ISEE’s 12th Annual Meeting in 2015

The International Society for Environmental Ethics (ISEE) seeks proposals to host its Twelfth Annual Meeting on Environmental Philosophy in summer 2015.

Conferences are held in Allenspark, Colorado, USA and in another location in alternate years. A very successful conference was held in 2013 at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England (readers can view the conference report on page 16 of this newsletter as well as ISEE’s conference web page). The 2014 conference again will be at the Allenspark conference center.

Deadline for proposals: February 1st, 2014

Submission Guidelines

Proposals should include the following information:

- Host name and proposed dates of conference
- Location and venue
- Accommodations, meals and, where relevant, transportation arrangements
- A short “case for support” for the proposal, including ideas for themes/sessions/keynote speaker, and so forth. The case for support should also provide evidence of institutional support, if possible.

Direct queries and submissions to Philip Cafaro at philip.cafaro@colostate.edu, 001-970-482-8279, Eddy Hall, Philosophy Department, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA 80523

Aleta Lederwasch, Green Trade Alliance, mixed media (pencil, ink on wooden gate), 17.7cm x 16.5 x 3.1
Climate Ethics – A New ISEE Blog

Global climate change is the leading environmental issue of our time. Too often, however, discussions about how to justly and prudently respond to climate change are obscured by a focus on power politics, or by an inability to place economic analyses within a larger ethical framework. With Earth heating up and the ongoing rollout of IPCC’s 5th Assessment Report (begun this month and set to proceed in stages over the coming year), there is a real need for a public forum devoted to the ethical and philosophical aspects of climate change.

In response, ISEE has initiated a climate ethics blog as a service to members who would like to exchange thoughts and insights with one another on the full range of ethical and philosophical issues surrounding climate change. We also hope it will serve a wider community of citizens and scholars around the world, concerned about climate change and seeking to understand their individual and collective responsibilities in a warming world. We believe this new feature will be a huge hit.

Contributions are hereby solicited from all ISEE members and other interested parties. Contributors thus far include Andrew Light, Clare Palmer, Stephen Gardiner, Katie McShane, Kyle Whyte, Trish Glazebrook, and Donald A. Brown. Posts will be temporally highlighted on the front page of the new ISEE website and broadcast through ISEE’s listserve and other media outlets.

New Regional Representatives

ISEE has been revamping its list of regional representatives in order to expand coverage of work on environmental ethics and philosophy outside the United States. Each country or region that is represented now has its own web page on the ISEE website that includes a synopsis on an area or region and a listing of local programs, schools, centers, and journals. Calls for papers, member activities, new publications, and conferences or workshops are also being announced on ISEE’s website and other media outlets.

ISEE would like to thank our outgoing representatives for their service and offer a warm welcome to our new and continuing representatives:

- Samuel Awuah-Nyamekye: Ghana
- Kwami Christophe Dikenou: Togo
- Thomas Heyd, Nathan Kowalsky: Canada
- Kyle Whyte: Indigenous America
- Ricardo Rozzi: Chile
- Mario Alencastro: Brazil
- Freya Matthews: Australasia
- Shan Gao: China
- Jonathan Parket: Japan

We encourage you to peruse our new international pages, including pages for Portugal, Britain, Italy, and India. Other countries or regions are still in need representation, so contact ISEE if you are interested in becoming a regional representative.

Contact ISEE at enrioethics@hotmail.com if you are interested in becoming a contributor.

“Weit is thought wicked and inhuman to profess indifference about whether the world will go up in flames once one is dead. And so it is undoubtedly true that we must consider on their own account the interests of those who will one day come after us.”

—Cicero, De Finibus, book 3

Website Highlights: Introductory Textbooks & Books on Specific Themes

In each edition of the newsletter we highlight a section of the ISEE website that long-standing members may have missed or not browsed lately. For this edition, we have chosen two interrelated sections: introductory textbooks and books on specific environmental themes. The purpose of these regularly updated sections is to keep members who teach courses in environmental ethics and philosophy abreast of new material.

The section on introductory textbooks (published in English) is exhaustive. Categorized by decade, it lists books ranging from the first textbooks published in the 1980s to new and forthcoming works. Two anthologies were updated to a second edition this year: Michael Boylan’s Environmental Ethics and Lori Gruen, Dale Jamieson, and Christopher Schlottmann’s Reflecting on Nature. 2014 will see the release of the second edition of Robin Attfield’s Environmental Ethics, though additional textbooks are sure to follow.

The section on specific environmental themes contains 14 topics ranging from activism to worldviews, attitudes, & values. While it too has been created with an eye to the classroom—upper-level undergraduate or graduate-level classes perhaps—it will be useful for anyone wishing to gain an overview of specific research areas. It also serves to distinguish areas that are “hot” from those outside the limelight, a useful benefit for those needing to establish their name in a research area in need of development but not dominated by experts.

1. While a few textbooks were published before the 1980s, they were published by scientists and consist almost entirely of articles on ecology and environmental policy.
Holmes Rolston, III, 3rd Annual Early Career Essay Prize

The International Society for Environmental Ethics and the Center for Environmental Philosophy invite submissions for their annual essay prize for scholars in the early stages of their career. The prize is named in honor of Professor Holmes Rolston for his pioneering work in the field of environmental philosophy.

The Prize

Rolston Prize Papers are invited on all aspects of environmental philosophy. A prize of $500 will be awarded to the winning essay. All submitted papers that qualify (see conditions below) will be reviewed by an Essay Prize Committee in consultation with the Editorial Board of Environmental Ethics. The winning essay will be published in the journal Environmental Ethics.

Submission Guidelines And Conditions

- Closing date for submissions: June 1st, 2014
- Eligibility: Submissions are invited from scholars who already hold a PhD and have earned their doctorate no more than five years prior to the submission deadline. Submissions must be accompanied by a one-page CV to provide evidence of early career status.
- Style and Content: consult the Chicago Manual of Style or any recent issue of Environmental Ethics. Essays must be prepared for blind review (cover page with contact information and email on a separate page).
- Word limit: 60,000 characters (including spaces), including notes and references. An abstract of 100-150 words should also be included.

Submissions should be emailed to Phil Cafaro at philip.cafaro@colostate.edu. Please put ‘Essay Prize’ in the subject line of the email submission.

The essay should not be under consideration for publication elsewhere, and should not be submitted to any other journal until the outcome of the competition is announced. The decision of the committee will be final. There is only one prize per year and the committee reserves the right not to award the prize if submissions are not of an appropriate standard.

Upcoming ISEE APA Sessions

2013 Eastern Division Meeting
Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel
Baltimore, Maryland, USA

Session 1: Friday, December 27th, 6:30-9:30 pm
Chair: Allen Thompson (Oregon State University)
Justin Donhauser (University of Buffalo), “General Ecosystems Theory is Not Too General and Theoretical to Inform Decision Making for Public Policy and Natural Resource Management”
David M. Frank (New York University), “Colony Collapse Disorder and Pesticide Regulation”
Nicola Morar and Brendan Bohannan (University of Oregon), “What if there are no individuals? The Impact of Microbial Biology in Environmental Ethics”
Brett Caloia (Hobart and William Smith College), “Confusion Between Moral Terms and Mere Descriptors: ‘Sustainability’ as a Case Study”

Session 2: Sunday, December 29th, 8:00-11:00 pm
Special Session on Climate Change
Chair: Benjamin Hale (University of Colorado, Boulder)
Trevor Hedberg (University of Tennessee), “Climate Change, Moral Integrity, and Obligations to Reduce Individual Emissions”
Dan Shahar (University of Arizona), “Treading Lightly on the Climate in a Problem-Ridden World”
Mark Budolfson (Stanford University), “Global Justice, Climate Change, and Cass Sunstein’s Argument that the USA Should Make Unilateral Emissions Reductions” with commentary by Andrew Light (George Mason University)

2014 Central Division Meeting
Palmer House Hilton Hotel
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Session 1: Thursday, February 27th, 7:40-10:40 pm
Lorraine Code (York University), “Culpable Ignorance?”
Alix Dietzel (University of Sheffield), “Who is Responsible for Climate Change Action?”

Session 2: Saturday, March 1st, 12:15-2:15 pm
Eric Katz (New Jersey Institute of Technology), “Geoengineering, Restoration, and the Construction of Nature”
Alex Lenferna (University of Washington), “Betting on Climate Failure: The Ethics and Economics of Fossil Fuel Divestment”
Mark Cladis (Brown University), “Religion, Democracy, and the Environmental Imagination”
**Matteo Andreozzi** (Università degli Studi of Milan) launched *Relations: Beyond Anthropocentrism*, a peer-refereed journal of trans-anthropocentric ethics and related topics. Information pertaining to the first special issue, released June 2013, can be found at the website.

**Darrell Arnold** (St. Thomas University) has been promoted to a new position as Director of the Institute for World Languages and Cultures at St. Thomas University in Miami Gardens, FL, USA.

**Brendan Bohannan** (University of Oregon), **Ted Toadvine** (University of Oregon), and **Nicolae Morar** (Rock Ethics Institute, Pennsylvania State University) were recently awarded a grant from the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Oregon. With support from the Philosophy Department, the Environmental Studies Program, and the Institute of Ecology and Evolution, this grant will fund a series of interdisciplinary workshops for students and faculty from biology, philosophy, and environmental studies in order to question the normative role of biodiversity. The group will invite a renowned biodiversity scholar to each workshop. The program is called “Biodiversity at Twenty-Five: The Problem of Ecological Proxy Values.”

**Kevin Elliot** (University of South Carolina) will begin a new position as Associate Professor in Lyman Briggs College and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife at Michigan State University. Elliott will be a member of the faculty of MSU’s graduate concentration in Environmental Philosophy and Ethics.

**Roger S. Gottlieb** (Worcester Polytechnic Institute) won a Silver Nautilus Book Award for Fiction for his collection of short stories on environmental themes, *Engaging Voices: Tales of Morality and Meaning in an Age of Global Warming*.

**Holmes Rolston** (Colorado State University) visited the Great Dismal Swamp in Virginia. In a piece published in the Fort Collins Coloradoan newspaper, Rolston weaves together reflections on his experiences with the social and ecological history of the swamp. As the title of the article suggests (“Great Dismal Swamp is not a dismal place after all”), Rolston also highlights aesthetically pleasing features of the swamp.

**Joel MacClellan** began a new position as Visiting Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Binghamton University in Binghamton, NY, USA.

**Jonathan Parker** began a new position as Assistant Professor of Philosophy & Religion at Miyazaki International College in Miyazaki, Japan.

**Kyle Whyte** (Michigan State University) has been awarded four grants:

- 2013-14 Co-PI. “Supporting Tribal Climate Change Adaptation Planning through Community Participatory Strategic Foresight Scenario Development.” Great Lakes Integrated Sciences and Assessments Center Climate Assessments Grants Competition.
Using Art to Mine Solutions
by Aleta Lederwasch

Creativity in Uncertain Environments. To be resilient in our increasingly uncertain economic environment, and in the face of natural resource depletion, it helps to unleash our creative selves. The good news – we all have capacity to be creative. The great news – being creative is a fun and rewarding process that may lead to many unforeseen benefits.

Creative Education. Ask questions that open doors to untried paths, provide stimuli that excite, encourage open and creative minds, and have yourself a rich learning environment. This has been the experience of a group of stakeholders in Australia’s minerals industry.

Art and Mining in Australia. In Brisbane 2010 a group of around 30 stakeholders in Australia’s minerals (from industry, government and academia) came together to develop a shared vision and strategy to extract long-term national benefit from the Mineral industry. This was conducted over the two-day workshop Vision 2040.

The Role of Art in Australia’s Mineral Future. Scenario Art was used at Vision 2040 to awaken the creative potentials of the participants. Scenario Art is a method that features visual representations of future scenarios alongside the process of asking stakeholders “strategic questions.” In this case the main emphasis was on opportunities for the Australian mineral industry as well as the challenges of sustainability. For a detailed outline of applying Scenario Art see the following pages 14-15.

Artworks portraying four different scenarios were used at Vision 2040. The first three represented plausible scenarios that were based on research conducted by the World Economic Forum in 2009. The fourth, however, depicted a socially and environmentally sustainable future emphasizing the capacity of humans to be agents of change – to imagine desirable futures and to respond to environmental forces to achieve those visions. To our pleasant surprise, the mineral stakeholders embraced the opportunity to unleash their creative selves. Responses to the art demonstrated foresight, empathy, and creativity; invaluable capacities for addressing sustainability challenges. The responses also demonstrated the value of creative processes in breaking down stakeholder barriers and building collaborative working environments where innovative thinking is embraced and enjoyed.

The results of Vision 2040 suggest that Scenario Art may be more effective than non-art based approaches in increasing responsiveness to systems that are unsustainable. Key insights that relate to these findings include the capacity of Scenario Art to open our minds to new perspectives, encourage empathy and long-term thinking, and the power to inspire creativity and innovation. A taste of these insights follows.

New Perspectives and Worldviews. A critical step in the use of art at Vision 2040 was providing participants with the space and time to explore and analyze the artworks on their own, in silence. Participants were asked to contemplate what value, opportunities, and challenges they saw in the scenarios. This quiet reflection process provided participants with an opportunity for self-evaluation and development. Contemplating the self is an important step in inspiring new worldviews, which are necessary in a world of increasing consumption and decreasing resources.

A preliminary analysis of the application of Scenario Art suggests that it may increase the willingness of people to share and consider alternative perspectives, which may increase empathy levels and help groups identify common values, interests, and ideas. This in turn may assist the identification of a common and complementary goal or opportunity, and aid the development of strategies offering maximum value to stakeholders for a challenge at hand, i.e., the pursuit of solutions for the greater good.

Activating Empathy and Long-Term Thinking. Drawing from neurological theory, analysis of the Vision 2040 results suggests that viewing people and environments in distress, through art, may cause participants to feel distressed themselves. They may consequently experience empathy towards those who may be impacted by the participant’s decisions. Thus, coupling art experiences with decision-making processes, whose outcomes have foreseeable long-term consequences, may increase the occurrence of decision outcomes that demonstrate greater empathy.

Inspiring Creativity and Innovation. Everyone perceives visual stimuli in different ways due to unique experiences, memories, associations, preferences, and cultures. A visual artwork may incite reactions as diverse as the myriad of people experiencing it. The malleable, indiscriminate nature of visual art, unlike literature, makes visual art a highly adaptable and valuable tool to connect with a wide audience. Perhaps of greater significance is the value of sharing individual responses to visual art. Through visual art’s capacity to generate and arouse a rich spectrum of responses it has the potential to catalyze creative and innovative responses to current challenges. Creative and innovative solutions may Bower when a group of individuals share the meanings they each experience that relates to the challenge at hand.

We are delighted to feature the work of Aleta Lederwasch in this issue of the ISEE Newsletter. Aleta is an artist and Sustainability Research Consultant at the Institute for Sustainable Futures at the University of Technology in Sydney, Australia. Aleta’s work is inspired by an appreciation of art’s unique capacity to facilitate collaborative decision-making and meaningful dialogue, and to evoke empathy, creativity, and encourage new perspectives and worldviews. Experiencing art’s ability to facilitate these capacities has drawn Aleta toward researching the potential of art to drive a shift away from high levels of consumption and individualism toward taking creative and collaborative action that responds to sustainability challenges like climate change and resource depletion, thereby enabling a transition to sustainable futures. Recently, Aleta has developed and applied a research method, called “Scenario Art,” that uses artistic interpretations of sustainability data, trends, and scenarios to enable in-depth exploration of issues involving sustainability challenges. The method has been successfully used in the development of a sustainable vision and strategy for Australia’s minerals and mining sector. It has become of particular interest to behavior change practitioners and those working across deliberative democracy and sustainable decision-making processes. Aleta hopes to begin a PhD in 2014 on the role of art for transition planning toward sustainable futures.

Aleta can be reached at Aleta.Lederwasch@uts.edu.au.
The Great Transition

Australia becomes a leader in the development of renewable energy technologies and is experiencing great economic benefit from the export of these technologies.

Some mining of primary ore still occurs but efforts to generate the land are world leading and given the highest priority.

Indigenous Australian’s teaching non-indigenous Australian’s how to protect and enhance Australia’s native flora, fauna and natural resources.

Australia is a world leader in sustainable resource processing, use and consumption. Australia becomes a technology leader in the development of mineral substitutes and metals recycling, recognising many of its trading partners are legislating against the import of goods whose production results in negative environmental and social consequences.

The introduction of a resource rent tax to establish a sovereign wealth fund was a first step towards encouraging sustainable resource production and de-materialisation in Australia. Adjustments in macro-economic policy coupled with the implementation of strong sustainability actions in the minerals sector, has increased the genuine savings rate dramatically, significantly increasing long term national benefit in environmental, social and economic terms.

Mining companies adopt new technologies that enable them to scan the earth thousands of kilometres deep so to enable assessment of viable mining sites whilst avoiding earth degrading exploration activities. Money saved from reduced labour costs associated with past exploration activities are used to fund renewable energy and recycling manufacturing plants that will create jobs for mining communities.

Global consumption patterns have moved towards the desire for truly sustainable goods; Australia’s expertise in renewable energy development and sustainable mining operations are in great demand and are being exported.

Knowledge of falling ore grades, declining mineral reserves and the growing environmental and social costs of mining was proactively addressed by the Australian government via appropriate investment to kick start the wide spread use of renewable energy; effective policy was also implemented to enable effective distributed energy.

Changing consumption patterns result in significant changes in how Australia society values mineral resources – environmental quality, ecosystem services and social sustainability are valued considerably more, and this new attribution of value further erodes the economic viability of primary ore production.

Sovereign wealth is used to address changing demographic and health issues.

A national recycling system was developed and education programs implemented to educate Australia community on the significance of recycling and how to use recycling facilities correctly.
Report on the Tenth Annual Joint Meeting on Environmental Philosophy

The Tenth Annual Meeting of the ISEE was held at the University of East Anglia in the UK from June 12-14. It was the second time that the meeting has been held outside of the United States and the first time in the UK.

The meeting was a great success, bringing together scholars from various continents and several generations. We were particularly happy that Holmes Rolston decided to join us at the last minute, contributing his vast knowledge and experience in acute and perceptive observations at many of the sessions.

The meeting featured two keynotes lectures, plenary lectures, panels, and parallel sessions. We wanted to invite contributions from scholars and thinkers whose work falls outside of mainstream topics in environmental ethics and to bring them together with those working on contemporary concerns and those revisiting classic problems. Iain Kerr, one of the conference organizers, put it this way: “This kind of session becomes more prevalent at Environmental Ethics conferences and beyond.” Among other benefits, including such sessions in the future could increase interactions among the widely scattered practitioners of environmental philosophy.

Simon James gave the second keynote lecture, arguing forcefully with a reading of Wordsworth, that the intrinsic connection between place and identity can illuminate the problem of the moral status of the nonhuman. A second plenary panel discussion continued the theme of opening the ecological conditions of valuation method and perspective. One significant theme was the analysis and critique of reductive methods of valuing nature, such as the ecosystems services paradigm.

In keeping with the precedent set at previous ISEE meetings, delegates were also given the opportunity to take their philosophical thinking and discussion beyond the classroom. The meeting featured an amazing dramatization of the UEA playwright Steve Waters’s climate change play The Contingency Plan, a picnic, and a guided wildlife walk. It also included a screening and discussion with the director of the docu-drama Green, a powerful film about the causes and consequences deforestation in Indonesia.

Abstracts for the following papers can be found in the conference program:

**The Anthropocene (Plenary)**
- Philip Cafaro, “Recognizing Limits and Preserving Wild Nature: A Superior Alternative to Embracing the Anthropocene”
- Allen Thompson, “Adaptation at the Heart of Ethics for the Anthropocene”
- Holmes Rolston, “Comments on Cafaro and Thompson”

**Aesthetics**
- Lewis Coe, “Aesthetics of the Earth”
- Nicholas Wiltsher, “Individual Aesthetics, Collective Ethics”
- María del Mar Rosa, “The Anthropocene and its Aesthetic Consequences”

**Questioning Instrumental Approaches to Ecosystems**
- Paul Knights, “Rejecting Functionalism of Ecosystems Services”
- Stijn Neuteleers, “Should Biodiversity be Useful?”
- Mike Hannis, “Virtues of Acknowledged Ecological Dependence”

**Politics and Activism**
- Jason Matske and Małgorzata Deneriowska, “On Compromise in Environmental Activism”
- Keith Peterson, “What’s Blocking Environmental Culture?”
- Lilin Keschbaumer, “Boating through the Desert?: Philosophy and Politics of Water Allocation”

**Acting For and With Nature**
- Fran Speed, “Ecology without ‘Nature’?”
- Sanne van de Hout, “Critical Reflections on the Biomimetic Turn”
- Jonathan Beever, “The Intrinsicality of Value: Soundscape”

The meeting was a great success, bringing together scholars from various continents and several generations. We were particularly happy that Holmes Rolston decided to join us at the last minute, contributing his vast knowledge and experience in acute and perceptive observations at many of the sessions.

Tom Greaves and Rupert Read started the second day with a plenary lecture on the ecological conditions of valuation and their implications in a critique of contemporary projects for valuing nature. In the evening we hosted a wonderful session of short talks and debate via weblink with three scholars in the United States: Ted Toadvine, Katie McShane, and Jeremy Bendick-Keymer. The session was designed to minimize our carbon emissions and turned out to be a great success. We very much hope that this kind of session becomes more prevalent at Environmental Ethics conferences and beyond. Among other benefits, including such sessions in the future could increase interactions among the widely scattered practitioners of environmental philosophy.
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In keeping with the precedent set at previous ISEE meetings, delegates were also given the opportunity to take their philosophical thinking and discussion beyond the classroom. The meeting featured an amazing dramatization of the UEA playwright Steve Waters’s climate change play The Contingency Plan, a picnic, and a guided wildlife walk. It also included a screening and discussion with the director of the docu-drama Green, a powerful film about the causes and consequences deforestation in Indonesia.

Abstracts for the following papers can be found in the conference program:

**The Anthropocene (Plenary)**
- Philip Cafaro, “Recognizing Limits and Preserving Wild Nature: A Superior Alternative to Embracing the Anthropocene”
- Allen Thompson, “Adaptation at the Heart of Ethics for the Anthropocene”
- Holmes Rolston, “Comments on Cafaro and Thompson”

**Aesthetics**
- Lewis Coe, “Aesthetics of the Earth”
- Nicholas Wiltsher, “Individual Aesthetics, Collective Ethics”
- María del Mar Rosa, “The Anthropocene and its Aesthetic Consequences”

**Questioning Instrumental Approaches to Ecosystems**
- Paul Knights, “Rejecting Functionalism of Ecosystems Services”
- Stijn Neuteleers, “Should Biodiversity be Useful?”
- Mike Hannis, “Virtues of Acknowledged Ecological Dependence”

**Politics and Activism**
- Jason Matske and Małgorzata Deneriowska, “On Compromise in Environmental Activism”
- Keith Peterson, “What’s Blocking Environmental Culture?”
- Lilin Keschbaumer, “Boating through the Desert?: Philosophy and Politics of Water Allocation”

**Acting For and With Nature**
- Fran Speed, “Ecology without ‘Nature’?”
- Sanne van de Hout, “Critical Reflections on the Biomimetic Turn”
- Jonathan Beever, “The Intrinsicality of Value: Soundscape”
The Future of Environmental Philosophy

Report from the World Congress
International Perspectives on Environmental Ethics at the 23rd World Congress of Philosophy, Athens, Greece, August 4th - 10th, 2013

A Two-Part Panel on International Perspectives on Environmental Ethics was held at the 23rd World Congress of Philosophy, Athens, Greece, 4th-10th of August 2013. The panel was convened by Alexandria Poole, Eugene Hargrove, and Ricardo Rozzi, as a joint initiative of the International Society of Environmental Ethics (ISEE) with the Center for Environmental Philosophy (CEP) and the Sub-Antarctic Biocultural Conservation Program (University of North Texas, University of Magallanes, Chile). It resulted from long-term collaborations with researchers from five continents (Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and North America), including Regional Representatives from ISEE. It represents a milestone activity on the road initiated twenty five years ago in the 20th World Congress of Philosophy held in Boston, when the ISEE sections for Central and South America were created. The goal of the panel was to acknowledge the importance of global scale and the critical need for interregional dialogue to address pressing socio-ecological challenges associated with global environmental change. The presentations celebrated the diversity of perspectives on environmental ethics and developed a more integrated platform for this international dialogue, including influential and foundational thinkers, institutions, and contrasting concepts and practices for environmental philosophy. Following the two-part panel, panel members and other participants held a workshop meeting on Tuesday, August 6th to discuss future plans for further developing this dialogue in this international collaborative network of environmental philosophy, and identified the need to more broadly communicate their regional approaches. As a result, this issue of the ISEE Newsletter inaugurates a series of essays on international perspectives on environmental philosophy that builds on the previous South American series, to project the Occasional Papers series to all continents, while at the same time strengthening the long-term collaboration between ISEE and CEP in this endeavor.

Panel Organizers included Dr. Ricardo Rozzi of the Sub-Antarctic Biocultural Conservation Program, and Dr. Eugene C. Hargrove and Alexandria Poole of the Center for Environmental Philosophy. Panel presenters included: Dr. Thomas Heyd, University of Victoria, representing Canada; Dr. Patricia Glazebrook, Department of Philosophy and Religion Studies, University of North Texas, representing Ghana; Dr. Wang Guopin, President of Nanjing Xiaozhuang University, China, and Guo Hui, University of Nanjing and Nanjing Forestry University, Nanjing, China; Dr. Jorge Aguirre, Universidad de Monterrey, Monterrey, Mexico; Dr. Ricardo Rozzi, University of North Texas, representing Chile; Dr. Eugene Hargrove, Center for Environmental Philosophy, University of North Texas, presenting on EE in the United States; Dr. Magda Costa Carvalho, Universidade dos Açores, Ponta Delgada, Portugal; Dr. Piergiacomo Pagano, Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Development, Bologna, Italy; Dr. Yrjö Sepänmaa, University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu, Finland; Dr. Kurt Jax, Department of Conservation Biology, Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research, Leipzig, Germany. In the session Dr. Philip Cafaro, ISEE President, Dr. Workineh Kelbessa of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Dr. Francisca Massardo, University of Magallanes, Chile, along with a number of others, also participated.
Past, Present, and Future International Perspectives on Environmental Ethics
by Ricardo Rozzi, Alexandro Poile & Eugene Hargrove

The Rio+20 Conference held in Brazil in 2012 showed that since the 1992 Earth Summit (also held in Rio de Janeiro) the rate of environmental change had increased rather than decreased, as was the goal. To reorient this trend, environmental philosophy can make a significant contribution. However, to address this challenge it is essential to catalyze interdisciplinary, interinstitutional, and international collaborations. In order to add to this goal, the Center for Environmental Philosophy (CEP) and the Sub-Antarctic Biocultural Conservation Program (University of North Texas and University of Magallanes, Chile) proposed a collaborative initiative to the International Society of Environmental Ethics (ISEE), the organization of a panel on *International Perspectives on Environmental Ethics* at the 23rd World Congress of Philosophy (WCP), Athens, Greece, 4th-10th of August 2013.

The panel resulted from long-term collaborations with researchers from five continents (Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and North America), including Regional Representatives from ISEE, who presented at the 23rd WCP a diversity of perspectives on environmental ethics and developed a more integrated platform for this international dialogue, including influential and foundational thinkers, institutions, and contrasting concepts and practices for environmental philosophy. As a follow up, panel members and other participants also held a workshop meeting on Tuesday, August 6th to discuss future plans for further developing this dialogue in this international collaborative network of environmental philosophy, and identified the need to more broadly communicate their regional approaches.

ISEE offers an ideal forum for investigating the reticulated specificity of the causes of environmental problems, as well as for favoring the expression of diverse forms of ecological knowledge, languages, and practices. This motivated us to initiate in this issue of the ISEE Newsletter a series of essays on international perspectives on environmental philosophy, building upon the previous South American series, while at the same time strengthening the long-term collaboration between ISEE and CEP in this endeavor. This series will make available essays published online with free access in English as well as in the respective languages of each of the regions. In each ISEE Newsletter’s issue we will include a regional vision written by different authors with the purpose of better capturing the multilingual richness of environmental philosophy around the planet.

We have named this section “Past, Present, and Future International Perspectives on Environmental Ethics,” alluding to the millenary roots of environmental ethics in each of the cultural traditions in Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, and North and South America, as well as the syncretic contemporary expressions in today’s cosmopolitan society, within and outside academia. The distinguished biologist at the Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy & Eco-Nomic Sustainable Development, Piergiacomo Pagano, inaugurates this series with one of the strongest interdisciplinary branches of biology and philosophy: evolutionary ethics and the schools of environmental thought in Italy. Piergiacomo is one of two ISEE representatives for Italy, and since the 1990s he has built not only a rich conceptual framework but also an online platform that fosters a dialogue on environmental philosophy. In his essay, Pagano offers an overview of Italian environmental philosophy that introduces seminal authors and approaches that give an initial impulse for this new ISEE series on international environmental philosophies.

Ricardo Rozzi, Alexandro Poile, & Eugene Hargrove
Department for Philosophy & Religion Studies University of North Texas, USA
Center for Environmental Philosophy
Sub-Antarctic Biocultural Conservation Program
University of North Texas, University of Magallanes, Institute of Ecology and Biodiversity, Chile

Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Italy
by Piergiacomo Pagano

What about environmental philosophy and ethics in Italy? In the ISEE summer 2012 newsletter my young friend Matteo Andreozzi wrote a brief review about the situation in Italy. He wrote: “Since the 1970s, many Italian scholars have recognized the importance of environmental ethics and philosophy. Various studies have been published; and websites, journals, and classes have appeared, especially within the past ten years. It is thus clear that Italian scholars, affiliated or not with academic institutions, want to contribute to the debate…” This is all true, however some difficulties have taken Italians separated from the international debate. I’ll now try to argue about some reasons.

As you can see in table n. 1 few foreigners environmental ethics books were published in Italian.

Table n. 1 - Some environmental philosophy and ethics published in Italian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s Year of last edition</th>
<th>Italian/English title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hargrove E. C. 1990</td>
<td>Fondamenti di etica ambientale.</td>
<td>Franco Muzzio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passmore J. 1991</td>
<td>La nostra responsabilità per la natura</td>
<td>Feltrinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naess A. 1994</td>
<td>Ecosofia</td>
<td>Red Edizioni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopold A. 1997</td>
<td>Man’s Responsibility for Nature</td>
<td>Red Edizioni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the contrary you can find many books published in Italian by Italian authors. If you digit “etica ambientale” (namely “environmental ethics”) and “filosofia ambientale” (“environmental philosophy”) on an Italian internet bookstore you will find about 90 books on our disciplines. Table n. 2 shows some of them. Many of these books are collective books. More than 60 authors wrote or edited an environmental philosophy and ethics book, more than a hundred wrote papers about these disciplines. Many publishers are little one. Some of them are related with Catholic Church.
If we return to look at our disciplines, picture n. 1 shows two of the more recent collective books published in Italy: Poli A. (ed.), "The Person in Philosophies of Environment", Limina Mentis, 2012; Andreozzi M. (ed.), "Environmental Ethics: Voices and perspectives", Led, 2012. Their young curators and the number of authors—old acquaintances mixed with new entries—show, again, the Italian desire to be active in our disciplines. In particular in the second book we could find the effort by the editor to include some famous English mother tongue authors in our discussion.

Nonetheless, while the Italian community shows to be dynamic, it remains, unfortunately, too isolated from the rest of the discussing world. There are some reasons for this unpleasant situation.

First of all some Italians authors, especially older ones like me, have difficulties writing in English. For some of us reading in English or translating a text from English to Italian is not a problem. Our problem is to write or either to speak in a grammatically correct English. We need a translator. It is not easy to find a good one in our disciplines, and when you have found him (or her) you have to consider costs. Costs that are too high if we have to translate a book. In these cases we need some organizations that support our efforts.

And here springs up the main problem of our disciplines in Italy. Environmental philosophy and ethics are poorly considered. That occurs not only in the scientific world but in the humanity world too.

Looking a little bit wider Italian libraries are full of books on environment, reflecting a genuine environmental concern. In Table n. 3 you could find the number of environmental related books written and published in Italian classified by keywords.

Nonetheless, while the Italian community shows to be dynamic, it remains, unfortunately, too isolated from the rest of the discussing world. There are some reasons for this unpleasant situation.

First of all some Italians authors, especially older ones like me, have difficulties writing in English. For some of us reading in English or translating a text from English to Italian is not a problem. Our problem is to write or either to speak in a grammatically correct English. We need a translator. It is not easy to find a good one in our disciplines, and when you have found him (or her) you have to consider costs. Costs that are too high if we have to translate a book. In these cases we need some organizations that support our efforts.

And here springs up the main problem of our disciplines in Italy. Environmental philosophy and ethics are poorly considered. That occurs not only in the scientific world but in the humanity world too.

Think that at the beginning of my efforts to divulge environmental philosophy in Italy, thanks to my 2001 founded environmental philosophy website some students asked me where they could follow a study plan on environmental philosophy. I addressed them to Universities but a lot of professors snubbed our disciplines. Currently this situation persists. You can find some environmental ethics courses at some Universities, but you cannot find a faculty, a department, or an academic institution specialized in it.
People speak about environmental concern in a lot of different ways, from scientific, to economic, and political point of view. But with a sort of confusion. To have an idea on studies and investigations in environmental area, about five years ago I did a brief internet research. I found that since 1970s a quantity of different areas was established.

Anyway, to remain confined to Alma Mater, the University of Bologna, my hometown, over a hundred different academic degrees containing the word “environment” in their name exist. Despite such a wide range of them, it does not exist one on environmental philosophy or ethics. Moreover few Italian Universities have environmental philosophy or ethics dedicated courses. In many cases they are spread in different faculty as philosophy, literature, biomedical sciences, and agriculture. They are generally taught mixed with other subjects, typically bioethics. In Table n. 4 you can see a raw example of the Italian situation.

Table n. 4 - In Italy Environmental Ethics courses are few and sparse. Sometime Environmental Ethics is taught inside other teachings. Here a raw example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Faculty/department</th>
<th>Name of the course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>CIRSFID</td>
<td>Bioethics, envirom bioethics</td>
<td>Carla Faralli, Silvia Zullo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Antiquity, philosophy and History</td>
<td>Moral Philosophy</td>
<td>Angelo Campodonico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Educational science</td>
<td>Bioethics</td>
<td>Luisella Battaglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macerata</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Moral philosophy, animal ethics</td>
<td>Luigi Alci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>Environmental ethics</td>
<td>Alessandro Segale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Environmental ethics</td>
<td>Matteo Andreozzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Environmental ethics</td>
<td>Maria Di Domenico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Humanities studies</td>
<td>Philosophy of science</td>
<td>Nicola Russo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Literature and philosophy</td>
<td>Moral philosophy</td>
<td>Francesca Menegoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavia</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Environmental ethics</td>
<td>Laura Gobbi, Palmeri Felice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Environmental ethics</td>
<td>Sergio Bartolomei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>Chemor and agronomic biotechnologies</td>
<td>Environmental ethics</td>
<td>Lodovico Gallenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>MA in bioethics</td>
<td>Donatelli Piergiorgio, Armandi Marco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassari</td>
<td>Biomedical sciences</td>
<td>Bioethics and legislation</td>
<td>Rossella Mascolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Foreign languages, literature, &amp; modern culture</td>
<td>Environmental ethics</td>
<td>Serenella Iovino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many teachers and scholars in Italy are not specialized on environmental philosophy and ethics. As a consequence their papers concern teaching and divulgation. Some of them divulge schools of thought like deep ecology. Some of them deal with others ideas analyzing thinkers of the past with modern environmental eye. Many of them claim animal rights. Some of them criticize anthropocentrism, re-evaluating eastern philosophies or people of the past like American Indians. And so forth.

In Italy, as far as I know, no one advanced a comprehensive analytical environmental philosophical theory. I am the only one. I defined my theory with the new term “eco-evo-centrism”. I wrote about it as chapters entitled “Evolution, environmental philosophies and proactive politics” and “Proactive Environmentalism” in the two collective books published in 2012 I showed you before, and in two of my books: “The Proactive Politics. Administration in Globalization and Multiculturalism”, Limina Mentis, 2012; “The History of Thought on Biological Evolution. With Reflections of Environmental Philosophy”, 2013, Italian Edition: ENEA Editore, English edition: see amazon.com.

Eco-evo-centrism

“Eco-evo-centrism” is my analytical theory with an ecocentric base, and a dynamic vision. Just few minutes to touch on its basic concepts.

Physics, chemistry, organic chemistry, genetics, and ecology say that life is under the same laws as any other thing, organic or not, and we—humans—have nothing special. Even ecology says that we are less important than “key species”. So we think we are superior because we are judging ourselves. If we were a bee we should consider bees as superior. The same should happen if we were a worm, a fish, or a tree.

But science tells us more than what I said, indeed. If we look nature with holistic eyes we discover a different human being. A man with an evolutionary novelty that characterize our species and enfranchises ourselves beyond the classical evolutionary laws. We are an important singularity. We overtake biological evolution and enter the cultural evolution era. Cultural and biological evolution mechanisms are similar but not equal. Cultural evolution mechanisms requires a degree of credulity and the spread of “maladaptive” ideas. That is very intriguing.

The keystone of my eco-evo-centrism is the awareness of emergent properties. When an object has a number of properties beyond the sum of its parts we talk about emergent properties. They arise thanks to relations. There are a quantity of emergent properties we could find everywhere. Cells, multicellular organisms, organs, riversides, forests are just some examples. Few of them caused, I could say, “Copernican revolutions”. Life is the greatest. After its arrival nothing was like before. A myriad of living organisms evolved in a quantity of varieties.

Now we have to realize that another “Copernican revolution” has just arrived. It is consciousness, an emergent property that arose from the complex interactions among neurons of our brain. Consciousness has produced a brand new emergent property: culture. As chemical evolution endure billions of years to produce life, biological evolution worked hundreds of millions of years to produce a nervous aggregate capable to ask questions about itself. It happened few millions of years ago and since then it began a new era. The cultural era.
Some environmental philosophy and ethics non-academic organizations in Italy

Many people, institution, and organizations speak about environmental ethics in Italy. However in nearly every cases they speak about it inside a quantity of concerns, including environmental education, and environmental management systems.

Here there are some important examples. The Italian Bioethics Institute has a section of environmental ethics they call "environmental bioethics". In their web pages they argue that bioethics embraces biomedical ethics as animalist bioethics and environmental bioethics. In its environmental dedicated section you could find many recent paper on ethics and biodiversity.

The Lanza Foundation is linked with Catholic Church with the aim of enter the delicate faith-culture debate. It has web pages in English. There is a section entitled "Ethics and Environmental Policies" where you can find some discussion about environmental ethics.

As we saw in more than one occasion, Catholic Church is ever been in the front row to discuss ethical theme. So it facilitates the birth of Environmental Ethics Centres. They cluster religious and secular institution in order to create task forces to define environmental guidelines for specific territory. Until now there are three centres in Northern Italy. The first as founded at the end of 2007 in Parma and gathers diocese, Lanza foundation, municipality, district and private environmental services societies of Parma territory to find solutions about applied ethics.

Conclusion

As you can see Italy is dynamic in discussing environmental concern and environmental philosophy and ethics themes. Otherwise, in my opinion, we need more cohesion and communication. Europe Union may be the right occasion to organizing ourselves as Italians to create a great and operational cluster of European Countries. Some actions have been made. In 2011 the European Network for Environmental Ethics (ENEE) was found. Unfortunately it is too little and it has no funds. We need to implement it. Just now a new international magazine entitled "Relation. Beyond Anthropocentrism" has been published. The first edition is freely downloadable on internet. You are kindly invited to participate.

In summary much has been done in Italy, much more will have to be done in Italy, Europe and the rest of the world. I think the better way is to collaborate each other to find a project to present for fund. Beside other opportunity Ho-

EDITOR'S NOTE

A Reply to Jamieson on the Badness of Death
by Christopher Belshaw

How bad is it to die, and so lose everything you have? Is it really bad? The worst thing possible? Or does it depend in part on how much you have, how much you want to keep it, on what the alternatives are? I will either kill you, painlessly, or torture you for a week, then let you go. You might choose death. I will either kill your cat, painlessly, or torture it for a week, and then let it go. You might choose death for your cat. (Let's assume you're not in a position to choose instead death for me).

Dale Jamieson suggests (ISEE Newsletter 23, no. 3, 2012, p. 28) that thinking about the wrongness of killing is difficult because there are conflicting intuitions in play. On the one hand, there is the thought that killing Einstein's 90 year old mother, an Alzheimer's sufferer, would be worse than killing her talented son; on the other hand, there is the thought that these are in some sense equally bad, as both people would be deprived of everything they have, both would lose a totality. The former intuition – and he says it's one we all have – is allegedly in the forefront of what he calls the Singer-Belshaw view, while the latter has predominance in the thought of Tom Regan, and others of that ilk. Jamieson doesn't want to take sides here, but suggests (in a way that isn't further unpacked) that this is the wrong way of looking at things. I imagine he'd like to reconcile the two positions, and put an end to squabbling.

Let's take a lead from Jamieson and refer to these contrasting intuitions about killing as the comparative view and the total view respectively. They roughly correspond, of course, to the quality and sanctity views about life's value, with the difference that here, there's explicit consideration of more-than-human lives. And let's also, prompted by this correspondence, shift the emphasis from the wrongness of killing to the badness of death. Killing the mother is no less of a crime than killing the son – we can hold on to that while still doubting their deaths are equally bad. And let's bracket out instrumental values: both sides might agree that Einstein is the more useful to society but agree too that this isn't the issue. The problem with the total view is that equally losing everything doesn't imply equal losses. Totalities come in different sizes. It's hard to think that the death of your tree is just as bad as the death of your plumber. And it's hard to think that your death at 30 is just as bad as your death at 90. Even though I'll allow that support for the total view is widespread, I'm not sure that many will have contrary intuitions about particular cases like these.

So those who think, as of course most do, that an animal's death can be bad for it, even if a tree's death can't, should be treated is that they feel pain. 'That's a reason not to torture them. And for what it's worth, it seems to me that torturing animals is not only bad but other things equal, is as bad as torturing people. On this score, contra Jamieson, I'm not sure the comparative view is self-serving. That animals feel pain, and dislike it, can be a reason to kill them painlessly. Similarly with people. But
there are also reasons not to kill people. One of them is that they'll often trade, and reasonably trade, some period of pain for some period of extra life. Animals can't reflect on the options, and choose in this way. That's one reason for denying that death is bad for them.

Now of course we can argue about this. Someone might insist that animals too want to live on. But if we do then we're arguing about the complexities of mental life, issues of quality, and comparing different cases. This is a way of proceeding that seems to me to be altogether appropriate. And it's not easy to see that there's an alternative.

I don't know if our discussion in Utrecht really did proceed, as Jamie's claims, with complete neglect of the total view, but if so perhaps it can be remedied here. So suppose there is something in it. Suppose that all lives, or all sentient lives, or all subject-of-a-life lives, or all lives within a given species, or some such, are of equal intrinsic or inherent value, or some such. Even so, unless the comparative or quality view is to be completely jettisoned, it is still going to turn out that Einstein's overall value outweighs that of his aged mother, and so there will still be grounds to regret his death more than hers or, if we have to kill one of them, to choose to kill her rather than toss a coin. Regan would object here that these different values are incommensurable and so can't be added together in the way I suggest. Perhaps, but then it's hard to see why the one should take precedence over the other.

Only if this total view is the only one in town, then, can we get a result where all lives, or all lives of some kind, are of equal value. But for the life of me, I can't see reasons for thinking that can be true. And reconciliation needs another way.

Christopher Belshaw
The Open University
Christopher.Belshaw@open.ac.uk

Book Reviews

Animal Ethics in Context

Clare Palmer’s Animal Ethics in Context is a great addition to Columbia University Press’s series of books on Animal Studies (and I tip my hat to Columbia UP for their decision to create the series for researchers interested in this topic).

In this book, Palmer’s central intention is to answer an important question that has been largely overlooked in the animal ethics literature: Are our moral responsibilities toward domesticated animals different from our moral responsibilities toward wild animals? In order to make this question even more compelling, Palmer invites us to think about two very different moral reactions that public opinion and some animal rights activists had to recent events. In 2007, we heard that at least ten thousand wildebeest died while crossing the Mara River. Some tourists even have photographs of the mass drowning. Two years later, the members of a British family failed to meet the most minimal welfare needs of 114 horses. Whereas the first event created little ethical turmoil, the second one “has been described at Britain’s worst ever case of animal neglect” (1). The challenge, says Palmer, is to understand and justify why “pain and suffering are regarded quite differently in these two stories” (2). Most animal ethicists would agree that the animals in the two categories have similar morally relevant capacities. And, as Aristotle once told us, equals ought to be treated equally. Hence, Palmer’s question: Why is this similarity not reflected in our moral behavior since “if something is owed to one animal, it is owed to all animals that are relevantly similar?” (3)

Palmer explains our apparent moral inconsistency by appealing to what she calls the laissez-faire intuition (LFI). Roughly, this intuition is that wild animals should be left to their fate while domesticated ones should be taken care of by providing them with food, water, shelter, etc. While most of us would easily recognize that we have a moral duty to assist domesticated animals, the LFI is supposed to explain why this duty does not extend to all sentient creatures and why the same moral duty does not apply in the case of the drowning wildebeests. Certainly, Palmer is aware that intuitions can be poor guides for determining whether an action is morally right or wrong. She recognizes that there is a significant difference between explaining and/or providing a justification for some form of behavior. Intuitions might explain the difference in behavior (assistance for domesticated animals vs. non-assistance for wildebeests), but they would not be sufficient to provide us with a robust moral justification. As Daniel Kelly has recently shown, assessing the moral status of various moral practices merely in virtue of some disgust reaction is irrelevant at best or pernicious at worst (Kelly, 2012). Herein lies the central challenge of Palmer’s inquiry—how to construct a strong argument in support of the LFI and how to build on this argument a new “ethics of assisting animals” (4).

Chapter 1 retracts the core claims of animal well-being, which, for Palmer, establishes the grounds of moral considerability of animals. Such an account is supposed to single out the capacities that underpin the moral status of animals, whether we think of being sentient or having interests, or being self-conscious, or being rational, or being part of a contract. Palmer explicitly endorses the view that “some animals can feel pain and have other kinds of aversive and positive mental states,” and consequently, they have a well-being, which is “sufficient for moral considerability” (11).

In Chapter 2, she goes into more detail specifying how capacity-oriented accounts, including utilitarianism, rights, and capabilities approaches, determine the moral status of animals. This chapter is crucial in the economy of the book since it is supposed to show that “we need more than this in order to work out our moral responsibilities toward animals in different contexts, in particular with respect to assisting them” (25). In this sense, Palmer’s introductory example is quite telling: Given that pain is pain for both domesticated and wild animals, and it should count equally, a capacity-oriented account might be committed to assisting the drowning wildebeests in...
Africa instead of firstly attending to the needs of 114 dying horses in Britain. Such a moral obligation strikes most of us as failing to capture the LFI or the importance of its domestication in generating some additional obligations. So, an account that focuses only on morally relevant capacities would have a difficult time specifying all the relevant circumstances where assisting animals is morally required, permitted, or impermissible. Hence, Palmer’s impetus to supplement the capacity-oriented accounts of moral considerability. She writes, “alongside capacities, we also need to pay attention to relational features of our contact with animals,” and to understand the ethical significance of those relations (44).

The task of chapter 3 is twofold. First, it describes ways in which existing relational approaches (affectional, causal, and contractual) determine specific moral obligations. Second, she gathers from these accounts the best elements in order to amend the capacity-oriented approach with the relational features such that it can define the relevant contexts in which we ought to assist domesticated and wild animals. Affectional and emotional relations are important for Palmer, not simply because they have been widely recognized as being the basis of our moral considerability (i.e., the ethics of care, etc.), but because they support the “idea that one’s moral obligations are stronger towards those to whom one is emotionally close in the right sorts of ways and correspondingly diminish—or even vanish—where one’s emotional responses are weaker and non-existent” (51). Such relations seem to support the LFI and “could ground a distinction between what is owed to wild and to (some) domesticated animals” (52). However, affective closeness is not sufficient by itself to give us appropriate moral guidance, even if such entanglements may trigger some special obligations. Palmer claims, “it is the human causal role in these entanglements, rather than human affective attachments” that could help us understand the moral significance of our relations with other sentient animals (54). Humans are causally responsible for the situation and well-being of domesticated animals in ways that they are not for the situation and well-being of wild animals. “Duties towards similar sentient animals vary, in part at least according to whether previous humans have had an effect on the animal’s current situation” (56). Against Rolston, Palmer defends the idea that wild animals came into being independently of us, and if we are not causally responsible for their hardship, we do not have any positive moral obligations to assist them. Unlike affectional and the causal relations, there hardly seem to be contractual relations with domesticated animals. Often contracts imply the idea that they are made “between free and equal rational agents who understand and assent to,” and even if we would somehow we would grant them freedom, rationality, understanding, Palmer still believes “they could not [..] realistically be construed as tacitly consenting to the process of domestication” (59). Hence, domestication does significantly alter our ethical responsibilities toward animals—not in virtue of some contractual relationship, but rather because of our causal interactions and affective dependence.

With chapter 4, Palmer starts fulfilling her promise for a systematic relational approach to animal ethics. She has already identified some morally relevant relations that support LFI. The next step is to get even more precise about LFI, since it allows for several radically different interpretations. The first interpretation, the strong LFI, stipulates that we should “neither harm nor assist wild animals”; hence, we should not interfere with them at all. The second interpretation, the weak LFI, also endorses the claim that we should not harm wild animals. However, it also stipulates that “there is no presumptive duty to assist them” even though sometimes it might be permissible. The third interpretation is the No-Contact LFI. Although the No-Contact LFI implies that there is no presumptive duty to assist wild animals, assistance is permissible, and “positive duties to assist [wild animals] might be generated in some circumstances” (68).

Once we know a little bit better what the LFI amounts to, the challenge for Palmer becomes providing support for the most plausible interpretation: the No-Contact LFI. The difficulty is to see “how relations might generate duties to assist in the animal context.” A new relational approach could be supported by a number of arguments. Palmer thinks, however, that the most secure one, which underpins the No-Contact LFI, is the one that supports the following claim: “we do not usually have the kind of relationship to [wild animals] that generate duties to assist” (77). This commitment to non-assistance in the case of wild animals demands from Palmer to provide an additional argument as to why “we usually have [in contrast] the kinds of relationship to domesticated animals – and some other beings by humans, does this entail that we have no moral requirements to assist people in similar situations? Palmer clearly recognizes the difficulty of this question, but believes that moral requirements are not an inherent component of LFI and that the notion of all humans are in a morally significant community.

The last chapter (ch. 8) represents Palmer’s effort to put this new account to work by considering some cases. Her goal is not merely to compare her relational account with an unmodified capacity-oriented account in order to see how the different approaches’ solutions to practical concerns might differ, but to provide at least an outline of how different problems about harm and assistance might be tackled from a relational perspective” (158).

Palmer’s book is a great contribution to the animal ethics literature. The only regret I have is that sometimes Palmer tries to do too much. As a consequence, some sections seem underdeveloped or less well integrated in the overall argument. An example would be the very interesting section on the plasticity of capacities (46-48). I wish that Palmer had spent a bit more time telling us to what extent it matters for her own account whether animal capacities are fixed/innate or plastic to a certain degree, such that environmental factors could shape them. Otherwise, this book is a model of how serious research in animal ethics should be done. Palmer is perfectly fluent in the central debates in this literature, and as a consequence the book is extremely well informed. In addition, Palmer brings nuance to a timely debate about our duties to assist animals. As the world shrinks and humans occupy more and more space on the planet, increasingly interfering with animals, Palmer’s book will be a good guide to help us solve future ethical dilemmas.
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Ben Minteer’s book offers a fulfillment of Andrew Light’s (2002) call for a new, more empirically and politically engaged, direction in environmental ethics. While Light conceives that environmental ethics may be flourishing as an academic discipline, Minteer is concerned that it has had considerably less influence on those working in the environmental management, conservation biology and the like, unlike its sibling field, bioethics. Following Light, Minteer argues that while the field should not abandon theorizing about nonanthropocentric ethics and the moral status of individuals, species, and ecosystems, such theorizing should be placed within the context of a broader model of moral inquiry, one based on the work of John Dewey, and which will make it more accessible and useful to those working in more practical fields. Briefly, the model of moral inquiry Minteer advocates is a blend of moral contextualism and deliberative democracy. After an introduction, he breaks the book into roughly two halves. Chapters 2-5 set out the main elements of his Pragmatist framework for moral deliberation, in each case indicating in a general way how the approach taken might be both fruitful in environmental decision making and linking environmental ethics with other academic and public policy fields. Chapters 6-9 provide specific case examples and empirical data, which, Minteer argues, show the relevance and superiority of the Pragmatist approach.

Given their public nature, Minteer argues in chapter 2 that the normative arguments of environmental ethics ought to be open to public, democratic discussion. Taking his cue from Dewey, the author justifies democratic political life epistemologically, arguing that its accompanying social conditions are the necessary conditions for intelligent, experimental inquiry. For Minteer, the virtues of democracy and intelligent inquiry overlap among other things, toleration, openness, free flow of information, and a nondogmatic, fallibilist attitude toward held beliefs are understood as normative constraints on both scientific inquiry and democratic deliberation. Minteer’s account of intelligent inquiry is contextualist, making the aim of moral deliberation a judgment about what would constitute the good of that situation. He follows Dewey’s account of the phases of inquiry closely, breaking it down into: (1) the specification of a problematic situation; (2) contextual investigation of the situation and the development of action-guiding hypotheses; (3) reasoning through the implications of those hypotheses; and (4) the construction of a reflection-terminating, action-generating judgment, which is (5) subject to reevaluation in light of the enactment of that judgment (29).

Of course, even intelligent inquiry needs direction, and in chapter 4 Minteer argues for the rehabilitation of the notion of the public interest as a normative standard for political and policy judgments. Minteer defines the public interest as the shared, common good of all citizens in a community, but places this in the context of Dewey’s notion of social inquiry so that the public interest is revealed through the process of democratic deliberation. More than this, though, he places his faith, as did Dewey, in that process, trusting, just as we do with scientific inquiry, that the deliberative process will self-correct over time, but also enable its participants to broaden their horizons, conceiving their interests in a way that takes others’ interests into account. Adopting this account of the public interest, he argues, would allow environmental ethics to both reconnect to a core concept in mainstream policy and administrative discourse, but also to pave the way for environmental values to be seen as important elements of the public interest within policy discussions.

In chapter 5 Minteer acknowledges that intrinsic value claims on behalf of non-human animals and/or the environment can play a role in at least two ways. First, if what spurs inquiry in a given context is the failing health of a patient, then in that context health is a final end, valuable for itself and not merely instrumentally, and with the standard justificatory status (65). Second, Minteer argues that ruling out intrinsic value claims in advance would not only isolate many people who believe in the intrinsic value of nature (though not as many as nonanthropocentrics would like), but would also deprive parties to any given inquiry a potentially useful tool. What such value claims cannot do, as Pragmatists argue about moral principles generally, is to determine once and for all what sorts of actions are permissible or impermissible, or which values should or should not prevail in any given situation. Completing his description of his environmental Pragmatism, in chapter 5 Minteer appeals to the concept of “natural piety” as it is found in Dewey’s thought as a further constraint on the extent of human manipulation and degradation of the environment. On Minteer’s construction of Dewey, natural piety is “an attitude of harmonious cooperation with nature,” incorporating “a sense of the ideal” in human experience, where ideal involves both an acknowledgement of human interdependence on the natural environment and recognition of nature as a source of or constituent of the ideal or worthwhile human life (76, 80).

Minteer defines the public interest as the shared, common good of all citizens in a community, but places this in the context of Dewey’s notion of social inquiry so that the public interest is revealed through the process of democratic deliberation. More than this, though, he places his faith, as did Dewey, in that process, trusting, just as we do with scientific inquiry, that the deliberative process will self-correct over time, but also enable its participants to broaden their horizons, conceiving their interests in a way that takes others’ interests into account. Adopting this account of the public interest, he argues, would allow environmental ethics to both reconnect to a core concept in mainstream policy and administrative discourse, but also to pave the way for environmental values to be seen as important elements of the public interest within policy discussions.

In chapter 5 Minteer acknowledges that intrinsic value claims on behalf of non-human animals and/or the environment can play a role in at least two ways. First, if what spurs inquiry in a given context is the failing health of a patient, then in that context health is a final end, valuable for itself and not merely instrumentally, and with the standard justificatory status (65). Second, Minteer argues that ruling out intrinsic value claims in advance would not only isolate many people who believe in the intrinsic value of nature (though not as many as nonanthropocentrics would like), but would also deprive parties to any given inquiry a potentially useful tool. What such value claims cannot do, as Pragmatists argue about moral principles generally, is to determine once and for all what sorts of actions are permissible or impermissible, or which values should or should not prevail in any given situation. Completing his description of his environmental Pragmatism, in chapter 5 Minteer appeals to the concept of “natural piety” as it is found in Dewey’s thought as a further constraint on the extent of human manipulation and degradation of the environment. On Minteer’s construction of Dewey, natural piety is “an attitude of harmonious cooperation with nature,” incorporating “a sense of the ideal” in human experience, where ideal involves both an acknowledgement of human interdependence on the natural environment and recognition of nature as a source of or constituent of the ideal or worthwhile human life (76, 80).

Minteer spends the remaining chapters (6-9) completing the case for Pragmatism, examining its practical advantages in specific decision-making contexts. In chapter 6, the case of invasive swans on Arrowhead Mountain Lake provides an opportunity for Minteer to show how a Pragmatist approach to environmental ethics can get past the traditional animal-environment conflict, opening up a space for intelligent problem solving that acknowledges the concerns of both animal advocates and environmentalists (93). In doing so, Minteer points out that Pragmatism shares a number of similarities with contemporary approaches to dispute resolution, which have had much success in a variety of environmental disputes (105-108).

Further support for the Pragmatist approach is given in chapter 7, where we are presented with the results of two studies of citizens’ approaches to environmental problems, designed and conducted by the author and several colleagues. The first study indicated, unsurprisingly, respondents’ views reflected a wide variety of theoretical perspectives in environmental ethics. The second, more interesting, study indicated that, rather than being dominated by their theoretical commitments, respondents’ decisions were at least partly governed by the contexts of the hypothetical decision they were asked to resolve (135). Minteer takes the results of both of these studies to portray a practical reason to adopt a Pragmatist approach to environmental decision-making: that is how people actually do approach such decisions, and the Pragmatist approach is a way to incorporate normative ethical considerations into those processes, providing the opportunity for broadening the influence of the field considerably (157).

Several additional cases are adduced in chapter 8 to highlight the advantages of the Pragmatist approach. Each case reveals a tension Minteer argues cannot be resolved via traditional environmental ethics, and provide illustrations of the ways in which the Pragmatist approach can be of benefit to the discussions. Furthermore, these cases reveal a host of more particular ethical questions raised by specific conflicts in particular contexts, all of which are amenable to the Pragmatist approach to environmental ethics. A final case, that of global climate change, is presented in chapter 9 to argue that some important traditional goals of environmental ethics are not only practically difficult to achieve, but also normatively misguided. Minteer argues for a move—consonant with his Pragmatist ethic—from a static to an adaptive approach to understanding ecosystems. Climate change, he argues, has made the earth’s ecosystems fluctuate more rapidly and beyond historical variability limits, such that we ought to focus more on “adaptive capacity” and “ecological resilience” as aims for biodiversity management, rather than on habitat restoration and species preservation. For example, using the managed relocation of certain valuable species, a traditionally mistrusted practice, may be necessary to preserve crucial ecosystem services. Minteer argues that the Pragmatist approach to ethical decision-making provides a richer and likely more effective approach, not to mention one more grounded in public deliberation about management decisions.

Minteer’s book is a continuation of the debate between Pragmatists and more mainstream environmental ethics.
cists, and as such raises some well-rehearsed questions about its adequacy, in addition to providing additional ammunition to the Pragmatist’s now long-standing cri-
tiques, points I do not have the space to discuss here. Regardless of one’s judgment of the theoretical merits of environmental Pragmatism, however, Minteer’s book is a significant contribution to the field. It is notable both for its use of examples to illustrate his theoretical points as well as for its wide scope—the range of areas to which Minteer points as being places where an environmental Pragmat-
ism could be of service is impressive, as is the insighful-
ness of his analysis of these potential synergies. Further-
more, its exposition of Deweyan Pragmatism both rings true to Dewey’s texts and constitutes a novel theoretical contribution to the literature. The book would be a useful tool for courses in environmental sciences or policy. Additionally, it would serve as a useful complement to traditional textbooks in the field of environmental ethics, which to date lack coverage of Pragmatist thought. For researchers in environmental ethics, *Refounding Environmental Ethics* stands as the most thorough explicature of environmental Pragmatism to date, and as a significant challenge to traditional theorists. It is, what I believe Minteer would want it to be, a useful book.
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In our popular cultural rubric, there has long been an asso-
ciation of Indigenous North American peoples with a sort of nascent environmentalism or environmental consciousness. The notion that the worldview and lifeways of many Amer-
Indian societies were more respectful toward the nondo-
human natural world, and that this informs a more ecolog-
ically balanced or at least less damaging relationship between humans and their environment than our current Western industrial society, is a widespread one from which many environmental theorists have claimed to have drawn inspiration. Moreover, with the growth of Native American political activism and calls for greater self-governance, many Indigenous American scholars have advocated using Traditional Ecological Knowl-
dge (T.E.K.) as basis for resource management. Perhaps then, it is hardly surprising that in recent years a veritable industry has sprung up devoted to debunking the appar-
tent “myth of the ecological Indian.” Critics such as Shepard Krech III have suggested that the ecological impact of Indig-
enous Americans may have been far less benign than previ-
ously thought and that they could have been responsible for everything from the large scale extinction of the Pleistocene mega-fauna to the decimation of the Plains Buffalo through overhunting; others such as Frances Widdowson and Albert Howard in *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry: The Deception behind Indigenous Cultural Preservation* have straigh-
twardly dismissed T.E.K. as mystic irrationalism akin to fairy tales and completely without scientific basis.

In *Indigenous Knowledge, Ecology, and Evolutionary Ecology*, ecologist Raymond Pierotti takes this debunking industry head-on, arguing not only for the ecological legacy of the first peoples of North America but also for the convergence between T.E.K. and the science of ecology. For Pierotti, T.E.K., far from being irrational, represents what the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss has famously termed the “science of the concrete,” in that it is based on direct observa-
tion of the natural world and ecological relationships, which are then encapsulated in an overarching metaphysical, meta-
phoric narrative framework or mythology that functions as a mnemonic and analytic tool allowing indigenous people to recall easily past information as well as reflect upon and integrate new empirical knowledge. This deeply practical, lived engagement with the non-human world produced a body of empirical knowledge. Pierotti claims, every bit as sophisticated as Western science, if not more so. For un-
like Western educated biologists who until recently tended to view the natural world in terms of a mechanistic frame-
work that understood ecosystems as a balanced “climax” system between collections of isolated atomistic organisms, Indigenous North Americans, he argues, understood ecosys-
tems as a dynamic, complex web of interrelationships and interdependency between different ecological communities or species; and this understanding, he posits, underscored a sense of humility and ethic of respect towards the non-
human world. Yet this ethic of humility and respect was not, as is often charged, “romantic” in the sense most Euro-Americans would understand this term. For instance, Pierotti compel-
lingly demonstrates that the romantic concept of the balance of nature is a product of the European intellectual and cultural heritage and is indeed quite foreign to indigenous North Americans’ thought, which, as reflected in many of their myths, sees the natural world as constantly, and of-
ten quite dramatically, changing. Nor does this Indigenous world-view arise from a sentimentalized or idealized view of the natural world. Pierotti quite rightly observes not only that Indigenous peoples, whose very survival depends upon their practical and accurate knowledge of the natural world, ill afford to make such idealized visions, but also the senti-
mentalized view of nature itself is a product of the Western tradition’s dichotomous view of natural world “in which na-
ture is either sentimentalized or treated as cruel and destruc-
tive” (21). Indeed, he argues, Indigenous thought does not attempt to ameliorate or deny the darker aspects of nature, but rather sees them as essential to its functioning as a whole. Nowhere is this more apparent than in their understanding of predators. For unlike the Western tradition, which often sees predators as the embodiment of evil and predation, as emblematic of the fallen state of the natural world, Indig-
enous peoples not only respect predators for their tenacity,
cunning and in the case of social predators, such as wolves, their ability to work well together as a group, but also understand the necessity of predation to the continued existence of the natural world.

Indeed, continually throughout this book, Pierotti strives to demonstrate how T.E.K. emerges not out of some childlike, sentimentalized or romantic sensibility but out of Indigenous peoples’ real, practical, hard-headed engagement with the natural world. He demonstrates, for instance, how the often maligned animistic thought of many American Indian peoples, which imbues animals with consciousness and intentiality, is not only in keeping with current ethnological research but is an incomparable aid in their subsistence activities, particularly hunting. This emphasis on the concrete, practical nature of the Native American thought is one of the great strengths of this book, as Pierotti elegantly de- flates much of the overheated rhetoric and cheap criticism of T.E.K. as fuzzyheaded mysticism.

Nevertheless, Pierotti’s criticisms are not simply reserved for Euro-American scientists, and critics of T.E.K. He also criticizes several notable Native American thinkers for misunderstanding Indigenous thought. In particular, Pierotti singles out Vine Deloria Jr. and his rejection of evolutionary theory in favour of Young Earth Creationism. This, he suggests, is not a product of Indigenous tradition but of Deloria’s education in a Lutheran seminary. Indeed, Pierotti argues that the concept of a creator in Indigenous thought is better understood as *natura naturans* rather than that of an anthropomorphized, omniscient, omnipotent creator divinity.

This touches on one of the significant weaknesses of this book, which is that in critiquing the fidelity of Deloria’s position in respect to Indigenous American thought, Pierotti appears to impart a cultural, conceptual, and religious coherence to Native American thought that seems problematic at best. In speaking of Indigenous North American thought, Pierotti lumps together numerous cultural and ethnic groups from the foraging Arctic Inuit to urban Mayans, who differ profoundly in terms of language, ecology, social structure and mode of subsistence and share perhaps little more than that they inhabit the same continent. Pierotti acknowledges this problem, but counters that he has never heard of anyone having a difficulty with the suggestion that there is a universality of ideas in the Western tradition. Yet, even if we acknowledge for the sake of argument an overall universality of ideas in the Western tradition. Yet, even if we acknowledge for the sake of argument an overall universality of ideas in the Western tradition, as well as a shared Judeo-Christian religious heritage. It would be difficult, for instance, to make sense of the cultural and intellectual heritage of most European societies from Iceland to the Russian steppes without acknowledging the centrality of one text—the Bible—to these very diverse traditions. Furthermore almost all European societies have been largely agricultural, hierarchical, urban, and literate for, in some cases, more than two thousand years. The pre-Columbian cultures of North America, however, possessed nothing like the same degree of cultural homogeneity and penetration into Europe. They had nothing like a shared intellectual or religious canon or common history, and they differed considerably in terms of political and economic structure ranging from tiny egalitarian, foraging bands to vast agrarian hierarchical empires. This leaves his argument open to criticism via a few well-chosen examples, particularly from complex agro-urban societies such as the Aztec and the Mayans, and thus able to be offhandedly dismissed.

Nevertheless, though I would query Pierotti’s own grouping of North American Indigenous peoples, this criticism is not meant to imply that I find any and all attempt at ethnographic comparison or categorization meaningless or questionable. A common approach with the sub-field of ecological anthropology, for instance, is to group or categorize cultures according to their mode of subsistence, and I would suggest that this is a product of a more robust, germane and systematic means of grouping cultures than Pierotti’s own. Of course such means of categorization is not immune from criticism; however, the suggestion that comparatively similar means of economic procurement and material production are more relevant criteria for ethnographic comparison (particularly when assessing a culture’s ecological impact) than shared geography seems rather obvious. Indeed for the most part, Pierotti seems to tacitly assume such categorization as the overwhelming majority of his examples are taken from small scale American foraging and horticultural societies whose ecological sensibilities and generally marginal environmental impact enjoys fairly strong and substantial empirical support from the discipline of ecological anthropology. However, in failing to make this explicit, Pierotti unfortunately weakens his case. This is not a fatal flaw, but one that is somewhat regrettable and perhaps little more than that it inhabits the same continent. Pierotti acknowledges this problem, but counters that he has never heard of anyone having a difficulty with the suggestion that there is a universality of ideas in the Western tradition. Yet, even if we acknowledge for the sake of argument an overall universality of ideas in the Western tradition, as well as a shared Judeo-Christian religious heritage. It would be difficult, for instance, to make sense of the cultural and intellectual heritage of most European societies from Iceland to the Russian steppes without acknowledging the centrality of one text—the Bible—to these very diverse traditions. Furthermore almost all European societies have been largely agricultural, hierarchical, urban, and literate for, in some cases, more than two thousand years. The pre-Columbian cultures of North America, however, possessed nothing like the same degree of cultural homogeneity and penetration into Europe. They had nothing like a shared intellectual or religious canon or common history, and they differed considerably in terms of political and economic structure ranging from tiny egalitarian, foraging bands to vast agrarian hierarchical empires. This leaves his argument open to criticism via a few well-chosen examples, particularly from complex agro-urban societies such as the Aztec and the Mayans, and thus able to be offhandedly dismissed.

In addition to climate research, a number of books that have been influential on philosophers or received broad exposure have been updated.


**William McDonough** and Michael Braungart have followed-up *Cradle to Cradle* (2002) with *The Upcycle: Beyond Sustainability, Designing for Abundance* (2013).

J. Baird Callicott provides a sequel to the anthology *Nature in Asian Traditions of Thought* (1989; with Roger T. Ames), titled *Environmental Philosophy in Asian Traditions of Thought* (2014, this time with James McRae).

Finally, Alan Weisman has followed up his NY Times bestseller *The World Without Us* (2007) with *Countdown: Our Last, Best Hope for a Future on Earth* (2013).

Another trend deserving attention is the sustained consolidation of heretofore distinct applied ethical issues surrounding technology and engineering. *John Bazl* and **Ronald Sandler**, among others, have been identifying similarities and points of intersection in engineering approaches to nature. As the book description from *Designer Biology: The Ethics of Intensively Engineering Biological and Ecological Systems* (p. 43) states:

\[\text{[B]iological and ecological problems are increasingly understood and approached from an engineering perspective. In environmental contexts, this is exemplified in the pursuits of geoengineering, designer ecosystems, and conservation cloning. In human health contexts, it is exemplified in the development of synthetic biology, biomaterials, and human enhancement technologies.}\]

The merging of these ethical issues under a single conceptual rubric opens new horizons of exploration that transcend the subfields of environmental ethics, bioethics, and technology ethics. In addition to *Designer Biology*, readers wishing to come up to speed on this emerging area should review *Sandler’s Ethics and Emerging Technologies* (p. 51), Ingmar Persson and Julian Savulescu’s *Unfit for the Future: The Need for Moral Enhancement* (2012), and Paul Thompson’s article on “platform technologies,” titled “Synthetic Biology Needs a Synthetic Bioethics” (Ethics, Policy & Environment 15, no. 1 (2012): 1-20).
Climate change impacts the academy across the board, and numerous disciplines integrate it in their research. But compared to the quick academic reaction to this new reality, philosophy was a bit late to the party. Pioneering ethical studies of climate change were done early on, by Dale Jamieson (1990), John Broome (1992), and Henry Shue (1993), to name just a few, but their work remained a niche interest. For years, the philosophical community was indifferent to the emerging planetary reality. Finally, Stephen Gardiner (2004) reached a wider philosophical audience with a de-liberate “primer” on climate change in the journal Ethics. This did the trick, and since then, interest in the problem among ethicists is booming.

A topic issue edited by Simon Caney and Derek Bell for The Monist (2011) illustrates recent ethical work on climate change.1 Going by the papers collected there, such inquiries explore options for compensating climate refugees; analyze the maximin principle on its policy-grounding potential; assess the share of individual responsibility for the new reality; dissect the normative aspects of the inevitable perpetration of climate change, at least temporarily; clarify whether and when ignorance is excusable; apply the fair distribution principle to mitigation; and examine the right to sustainable development.2 These inquiries are collectively called Climate Ethics, and this has put climate change on the philosophical map.

While philosophical inquiry into climate, climate change, and climatology is “climate philosophy” by lexical default, and surely also includes climate ethics, the emerging area of what we call Climate Philosophy is a very different animal. In 2006, a first conference on climate and philosophy at the University of South Florida drew colleagues from fields as diverse as Marxism, Heidegger studies, Latin American thought, and African sagacity. This raised the possibility of a line of inquiry that would be less applied and more foundational, and involve less analysis and more synthesis. In 2008, at a workshop on the human dimension of climate at Western Washington University, Marcel Cano (Barcelona) pointed to the cultural roots of the climate crisis. This gave the incipient inquiry its direction.3

The premise of climate philosophy, then, is that climate change is fundamentally a cultural problem—not a scientific problem, not an engineering problem, and not an ethical problem either. The cultural level of the problem refers to the ensemble of policies, practices, and lifestyle styles; the socioeconomic life-world. On the other levels, climate change is not a basic problem anymore because those inquiries, from climatology to electrical engineering to climate ethics, already yield answers.


2. Stephen Gardiner, “Ethics and Global Climate Change,” Ethics 114 (2004): 555-600, cf. 595: “This article has been intended as something of a primer. Its aim is to encourage and facilitate wider engagement by ethicists with the issue of global climate change.”


5. The workshop was organized by Thomas Heyd (University of Victoria) as a session on Human Dimensions of Climate Change, held at the Conference of the Society for Human Ecology (2008), Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA. In 2010, Thomas Heyd and Nick Brooks edited the papers of this workshop as Cultural Dimensions of Climate Change, special issue of Human Ecology Review 17, no. 2 (2010): 83-192.

That is to say, climate change is not a basic scientific problem anymore because its etiology is known. It remains to be determined which tipping points are being crossed when, and which causal cascades will be triggered under what conditions. However, the fact is that we know what is happening, why it is happening, and how it can be reined in. It is not a technological problem anymore, because the engineers have done their job. The tools for a postcarbon switchover are available, and the machines for scrubbing carbon out of the atmosphere have been invented. The know-how for building sustainable infrastructure is at hand. There is always room for innovation and invention, to be sure, but there is simply no technological excuse for continued reliance on the carbon economy. Climate change is not an ethical problem either, because climate ethics is boasting a real progression of knowledge and has yielded substantive and persuasive results. We understand what’s bad about the change, who the perpetrators and the victims are, and what the torts and risks amount to. We also recognize what fair and unfair distributions of mitigation burdens would look like. There is little doubt that the precautionary principle makes sense, and that contemporary civilization is doing a grave disservice to its children and our later descendants. Moral details and legal technicalities need more study, but the normative framework now stands. For all practical and theoretical purposes, our species “gets” climate change. In scientific terms, we are not confused. In engineering terms, we have all the tools we need. In ethical terms, we know what to do. So why do we not do what it takes?

This question shifts the heuristic core of the problem from analytic applied ethics to comparative, existen- tial, and future-oriented inquiries. Many climate philosophers suspect that the failure to fight the crisis is a cultural maladaptation, which reveals flaws in the collective hegemonic cognition of the societies that have the biggest historical cumulative emissions and the fattest current per capita carbon footprints; that is to say, the slice of civiliza- tion that is the Anglophone West—the UK, the US, Canada, and Australia.

The premise of climate philosophy is that climate change is fundamentally a cultural problem—not a scientific problem, not an engineering problem, and not an ethical problem either.

Since it is doubtful that the liberal tradition à la Smith, Mill, Rawls, and Rorty will help in this task, climate philosophers look elsewhere for conceptual resources and find them on all points of the compass: in the South via African sagacity and Latin American philosophy; in the North via Inuit wisdom or silatuniq; in the West via the First Nations such as the Crow; and in the East via classical Daoism. In European thought, the legacies of Wolff, Kant, Marx, and Heidegger are useful. This orientation of climate philosophy to alternative geographic models of a “love of wisdom,” according to which philosophers favor rational synthesis as their primary approach. Taking information apart is not adequate anymore. Bill McKibben and other climate ac- tivists remind us that the time has come, also for philosophers, to connect the dots. Connecting the dots generates a philosophical alternative. It is a move from the Greek model of a “love of wisdom,” according to which philoso-
not an applied inquiry. Yet its foundational nature has a concrete purpose: to grasp the phenomenological scope of the climate crisis, to elucidate its existential, cultural, and cognitive consequences, and to chart a path from the contemporary capitalistic maladaptation to an eventual civil evolution.
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Recent & Notable Publications on Climate Philosophy


In the last few decades, several international authors have been leading their research in environmental ethics and a growing attention has been paid toward this debate in Italy. There are already many publications in Italian language about environmental ethics, and both national and international voices have been documented pretty well. However, this volume is original in his scope, because it stages a dialogue between some of the most important national and international scholars in the field of environmental ethics and young Italian authors. While it illustrates some of the most representative perspectives in the field, it also encourages new protagonists to directly enter the debate, asking themselves questions about the ethical value of our actions toward the environment.


To enhance sustainable development research and practice the values of the researchers, project managers and participants must first be made explicit. *Values in Sustainable Development* introduces and compares worldviews and values from multiple countries and perspectives, providing a survey of empirical methods available to study environmental values as affected by sustainable development. The first part is methodological, looking at what values are, why they are important, and how to include values in sustainable development. The second part looks at how values differ across social contexts, religions and viewpoints demonstrating how various individuals may value nature from a variety of cultural, social, and religious points of view. The third and final part presents case studies ordered by scale from the individual and community levels through to the national, regional and international levels.


In this revised introduction to environmental ethics, Robin Attfield guides the student through the key issues and debates in this field in ways that will also be of interest to a wide range of scholars and researchers. The book introduces environmental problems and environmental ethics and surveys theories of the sources of the problems. Attfield also puts forward his own contribution to the debates, advocating biocentric consequentialism among theories of normative ethics and defending objectivism in meta-ethics. Instead, this book reconsiders the basic goals of an environmental ethic by questioning the most basic presupposition that most environmentalists accept: that nature is in need of preservation. Beginning with Bruno Latour’s idea that continuing to speak of nature in the way we popularly conceive of it is ethically and politically disastrous, this book describes a way in which the concept of nature can retain its importance in our discussion of the contemporary state of the environment. Based upon insights from the phenomenological tradition, specifically Martin Heidegger and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the concept of nature developed in the book preserves the best antihumanistic intuitions of environmentalists without relying on either a reductionistic understanding of nature and the sciences or dualistic metaphysical constructions.


Advances in our scientific understanding and technological power in recent decades have dramatically amplified our capacity to intentionally manipulate complex ecological and biological systems. An implication of this is that biological and ecological problems are increasingly understood and approached from an engineering perspective. In environmental contexts, this is exemplified in the pursuits of geoeengineering, designer ecosystems, and conservation cloning. In human health contexts, it is exemplified in the development of synthetic biology, humanotechnology, and human enhancement technologies. *Designer Biology* consists of thirteen chapters (twelve of them original to the collection) that address the ethical issues raised by technological intervention and design across a broad range of biological and ecological systems. The insights that emerge will be especially valuable to students and scholars of environmental ethics, bioethics, or technology ethics.

**Contents**

I. Engineering Humans

1. “Sex selection and the value-ladenness of the procreative liberty framework” by Inmaculada de Melo Martin
2. “The ethics of embryo selection” by Valentina Urbanek
3. “Assessing efficacy of “neuroenhancing” drugs: normative problems in empirical controversies” by David M. Frank
4. “Engineering for virtue?: toward holistic moral enhancement” by William P. Kahasanche
5. “Radical enhancement, and what’s wrong with it” by Nicholas Agar
6. “Human engineering and climate change” by S. Matthew Liao, Anders Sandberg, and Rebecca Roache

II. Engineering the Environment

8. “Why scientists should get out of nature conservation” by Donald S. Maier
9. “What it takes to justify geoeengineering the climate” by Nicole Hassoun
10. “Remediation vs. steering: an act-description approach to approving and funding geoeengineering research” by Benjamin Hale

III. Engineering Life

11. “Sensitivity enhancement: the ethics of testing cognitive enhancements on non-human research subjects” by John Basil
12. “The capacities, interests, and organisation of artificial organisms” by Sune Holm
13. “How to evolve a good of your own: the biological interests of instant organisms” by Scott Simmons

“Conclusion: lessons for the future” by John Basil and Ronald Sandler

Based on talks originally given at the annual “Purdue Lectures in Ethics, Policy, and Science.” Addressing a mixed public audience, the authors go beyond theory to explore some of the difficult moral questions that face scientists and policy-makers every day. The introduction presents a theoretical framework for the book, defining the term “bioethics” as extending well beyond human well-being to wider relations between humans, nonhuman animals, the environment, and biotechnologies. Three sections then explore the complex relationship between moral value, scientific knowledge, and policy making. The first section starts with thoughts on nonhuman animal pain and moves to a discussion of animal understanding. The second section explores climate change and the impact of “green” nanotechnology on environmental concerns. The final section begins with a discussion of ethical issues in nanotechnology, moves to an exploration of biobanks (a technology with broad potential medical and environmental impact), and ends with a survey of the impact of biotechnologies on (synthetic) life itself.

Part 1: Animals
1. “Minding Animals” (2011) by Daniel Kelly and Mark Bernstein

Part 2: Environment
5. “Ethics, environment, and nanotechnology” (2009) by Barbara Karn

Part 3: Biotechnologies
7. “Ethical issues in constructing and using biobanks” (2008) by Eric Meslin


Pascal Bruckner is a very well-known French philosopher. In this book he sets out to attack what he calls “ecological catastrophe,” the idea that, as a result of climate change, we’re facing a new kind of apocalypse. Bruckner locates the predecessors of today’s ecological catastrophism in Catholicism’s admonishment to give up joy in the present for the sake of eternal life and in Marxism’s demand that individuals forsake personal needs for the sake of a brighter future. But ecological catastrophism is harmful in that it draws attention away from other, more solvable problems and injustices in the world in order to focus on something that is portrayed as an Apocalypse. Rather than preaching catastrophe and pessimism, we need to develop a democratic and generous ecology that addresses specific problems in a practical way.


In this book, eleven prominent authorities on climate change consider the legal, policy, and philosophical issues presented by geoengineering. The book asks: When, if ever, are decisions to embark on potentially risky climate modification projects justified? If such decisions can be justified, in a world without a central governing authority, who should authorize such projects and by what moral and legal right? If states or private actors undertake geoengineering ventures absent the blessing of the international community, what recourse do the rest of us have?

Contents
Part I. Ethics and Philosophy
1. “Ethics, geoengineering and moral schizophrenia: what’s the question?” by Stephen M. Gardiner
2. “The ethical foundations of climate engineering” by Clive Hamilton
3. “The psychological costs of geoengineering: why it may be hard to accept even if it works” by Gareth Davies

Part II. Law and Governance
4. “Geoengineering and climate management: from marginality to inevitability” by Jay Michaelson
5. “Climate engineering and the anthropocene era” by Lee Lane
6. “Political legitimacy in decisions about experiments in solar radiation management” by David R. Morrow, Robert E. Kopp, and Michael Oppenheimer
7. “Geoengineering and the myth of unilateralism: pressures and prospects for international cooperation” by Joshua B. Horowitz
8. “International legal regimes and principles relevant to geoengineering” by Albert C. Lin
10. “Ocean iron fertilization: science, law, and uncertainty” by Randall S. Abate
11. “Ocean iron fertilization: time to lift the research taboo” by Kerstin Güssow, Andreas Oeschlies, Alexander Proels, Katrin Rehdanz and Wilfried Rickels
12. “Remaking the world to save it: applying US environmental laws to climate engineering projects” by Tracy Hester


Bringing together ecology, evolutionary moral psychology, and environmental ethics, J. Baird Callcott counters the narrative of blame and despair that prevails in contemporary discussions of climate ethics and offers a fresh, more optimistic approach. Whereas other environmental ethicists limit themselves to what Callcott calls Rational Individualism in discussing the problem of climate change only to conclude that, essentially, there is little hope
that anything will be done in the face of its “perfect moral storm,” Callicott instead encourages us to look to the Earth itself, and consider the crisis on grander spatial and temporal scales, as we have failed to in the past. Callicott supports this theory by exploring and enhancing Aldo Leopold’s faint sketch of an Earth ethic in “Some Fundamentals of Conservation in the Southwest,” a seldom-studied text from the early days of environmental ethics that was written in 1923 but not published until 1979 after the environmental movement gathered strength.


Environmental Philosophy in Asian Traditions of Thought provides a sequel to the foundational volume in Asian environmental ethics Nature in Asian Traditions of Thought. That volume, edited by J. Baird Callicott and Roger T. Ames and published in 1989, inaugurated comparative environmental ethics, adding Asian thought on the natural world to the developing field of environmental philosophy. This new book, edited by Callicott and James McRae, includes some of the best articles in environmental philosophy from the perspective of Asian thought written more recently, some of which appear in print for the first time. An investigation of environmental philosophy in these Asian traditions not only challenges Western assumptions, but also provides an understanding of Asian philosophy, religion, and culture that informs contemporary environmental law and policy.

Contents
1. “Environment and environmental philosophy in India” by George Alfred James
2. “Atman, identity, and emanation: arguments for a Hindu environmental ethic” by Christopher Framarin
3. “Gandhi’s contributions to environmental thought and action” by Bart Gruzalski
4. “Acting with compassion: Buddhism, feminism and the environmental crisis” by Stephanie Kaza
5. “Against holism: rethinking Buddhist environmental ethics” by Simon P. James
6. “Caution and ‘relos’: the problem of Buddhist environmental ethics” by Ian Harris
7. “The relevance of Chinese neo-Confucianism for the reverence of nature” by Mary Evelyn Tucker
8. “Beyond naturalism: a reconstruction of Daoist environmental ethics” by R.P. Peerenboom
9. “Conceptual foundations for environmental ethics: a Daoist perspective” by Karyn L. Lai
10. “Process ecology and the ‘ideal’ dao” by Alan Fox
11. “The viability (dao) and virtueosity (de) of Daoist ecology: reversion (fu) as renewal” by Sandra A. Wawrytko
12. “Envisioning the Daoist body in the economy of cosmic power” by James Miller
14. “Dogen, deep ecology, and the ecological self” by Deane Curtin
16. “From symbiosis (kyosyo) to the ontology of ‘arising both from oneself and from another’” by Hiroshi Abe
17. “The Confucian environmental ethics of Ogyu Sorai” by Tomosaburo Yamauchi
18. “Triple negation: Watsuji Tetsuro on the sustainability of ecosystems, economies, and international peace” by James McRae
19. “Afterword: recontextualizing the self in comparative environmental philosophy” by J. Baird Callicott


In today’s world the notion of infinity is at the core of the crisis humanity faces understanding nature. For the last two hundred years economies have been running at full speed, fueled by the implicit belief that natural resources are infinite; however, it is clear that they are not and that humanity needs to radically rethink the foundations of environmental and economic systems. Conche seeks to begin this rethinking, illustrating along the way insightful and sometimes unorthodox ideas about Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Montaigne, Nietzsche, Bergson, and others.


Many of us take it for granted that we ought to cooperate to tackle climate change. But where does this requirement come from, and what does it mean for us as individuals trying to do the right thing? Climate change does very great harm, to our fellow humans and to the non-human world, but no one causes it on their own and it isn’t the result of intentionally collective action. In the face of the current failure of institutions to face up to the problem, is there anything we can do as individuals that will leave us able to live with ourselves? This book makes a case for collective action on climate change by appealing to moralized collective self-interest, collective ability to aid, and an expanded understanding of collective responsibility for harm. In the absence of collective action, individuals should focus on trying to promote such action (whether through or by bypassing existing institutions), with a supplementary duty to aid victims directly.


The indexes used by local, national, and international governments to monitor progress toward sustainability do not adequately align with their ethical priorities and have a limited ability to monitor and promote sustainability. This book gives a theoretical and practical demonstration of how ethics and technical considerations can aid the development of sustainability indexes to overcome this division in the literature and aid sustainability initiatives. Specifically, guidelines for index development are combined with a pragmatic theory of ethics that enables ethical collaboration among people of diverse ethical systems. Using the resulting method of index development, the book takes a unique applied turn as it ethically evaluates multiple sustainability indexes developed and used by the European Commission, researchers, and local communities and suggests ways to improve the indexes.


Less than fifty years since the death of Albert Schweitzer, the great humanitarian and scholar has faded from public awareness. In The New Rationalism, David Goodin explores the underlying philosophy behind Schweitzer’s ethic of compassion. For the first time, the political, sociological, and philosophical contexts supporting the development of Schweitzer’s ethic are examined in order to bring his timeless message of elemental morality to new life for the modern world. Inspired by Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche, Schweitzer built his ethic to create an elemental nature philosophy compatible with empirical science, and to support a new ontological understanding of the human person—a project he termed the New Rationalism. Goodin recovers and analyses Schweitzer’s arguments and shows where his theories can provide a framework for both environmental and civic ethics today.


This book introduces the idea that ethics are an intrinsic dimension of any water policy, program, or practice, and that understanding what ethics are being acted out in water policies is fundamental to an understanding of water
resource management. Thus in controversies or conflicts over water resource allocation and use, an examination of ethics can help clarify the positions of conflicting parties as preparation for constructive negotiations. The book includes a wide range of case studies from countries including Australia, India, Philippines, South Africa and USA. These cover various contexts including water for agriculture, urban, domestic and industrial use, the rights of indigenous people and river, watershed and ecosystem management.


This volume works to connect issues in environmental ethics with the best work in contemporary normative theory. Environmental issues challenge contemporary ethical theorists to account for topics that traditional ethical theories do not address to any significant extent. This book articulates and evaluates consequentialist responses to that challenge. Contributors provide a thorough and well-rounded analysis of the benefits and limitations of the consequentialist perspective in addressing environmental issues. In particular, the contributors use consequentialist theory to address central questions in environmental ethics, such as questions about what kinds of things have value; about decision-making in light of the long-term, intergenerational nature of environmental issues; and about the role that a state’s being natural should play in ethical deliberation.

Contents

"Introduction: Consequentialism and Environmental Ethics" by Avram Hiller and Leonard Kahn

Part 1: The Structure of Environmental Value
1. "Can Biocentric Consequentialism Meet Pluralist Criticisms?" by Robin Antfield
2. "Indirect, Multidimensional Consequentialism" by Alan Carter
3. "Consequentialist and Non-Consequentialist Value Frameworks in Environmental Ethics" by Katie McShane

Part 2: Consequentialism and Environmental Decision-Making
4. "Consequences and Environmental Conflict" by Alan Holland
5. "Evaluative Uncertainty and Environmental Ethics" by Krister Bykvist
6. "Future People and Environmental Shares" by Allen Habib

Part 3: Nature and Consequentialist Theory
8. "Wildness and Inertia" by Ben Bradley
9. "Can We RemEDIATE Wrongs?" by Benjamin Hale
10. "Moral Bookkeeping and Environmental Restitution" by Julia Driver
11. "System Consequentialism" by Avram Hiller
12. "John Stuart Mill’s Green Liberalism" by Wendy Donner


Synthetic biology has potential applications that range from producing biofuels to programming human behavior. The emergence of this new form of biotechnology, however, raises a variety of ethical questions—first and foremost, whether synthetic biology is intrinsically troubling in moral terms. Is it an example of scientists “playing God”? Synthetic Biology and Morality takes on this threshold ethical question, as well as others that follow, offering a range of philosophical and political perspectives on the power of synthetic biology. The contributors consider the basic question of the ethics of making new organisms, with essays that lay out the conceptual terrain and offer opposing views of the intrinsic moral concerns; discuss the possibility that synthetic organisms are inherently valuable; and address whether and how, moral objections to synthetic biology could be relevant to policy making and political discourse.

Contents

1. "Appeals to nature and the natural in debates about synthetic biology" by Andrew Lustig
2. "Creating life: synthetic biology and ethics" by Joachim Boldt
3. "Engineered microbes in industry and science: a new human relationship to nature?" by Gregory E. Kaebnick
4. "Lessons from environmental ethics about the intrinsic value of synthetic life" by Mark A. Bedau and Ben T. Larson
5. "Three puzzles regarding the moral status of synthetic organisms" by John Basl and Ronald Sandler
6. "Synthetic bacteria, natural processes, and intrinsic value" by Christopher J. Preston
7. "Synthetic biology and public reason" by Jon Mandle
8. "Biotechnology as cultural meaning: reflection on the moral reception of synthetic biology" by Bruce Jennings
9. "‘Teaching humanness’ claims in synthetic biology and public policy bioethics” by John H. Evans


American Environmentalism examines whether competing interests can be reconciled while developing consistent, coherent, effective public policy to regulate uses and protection of the natural environment without destroying the national economy. The book delves into key normative concepts that undergird American perspectives on nature by providing an overview of philosophical concepts found in the western intellectual tradition, the presuppositions inherent in neoclassical economics, and anthropocentric (human-centered) and biocentric (earth-centered) positions on sustainability. It traces the evolution of attitudes about nature from the time of the Ancient Greeks through Europeans in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the American Founders, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and up to the present. Building on this foundation, the author examines the political landscape as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), industry leaders, and government officials struggle to balance industrial development with environmental concerns.

This book examines the threat that climate change poses to the projects of poverty eradication, sustainable development, and biodiversity preservation. It offers a discussion of the values that support these projects and a critical evaluation of the normative bases of climate change policy. It regards climate change policy as a public problem that normative philosophy can shed light on. It assumes that the development of policy should be based on values regarding what is important to respect, preserve, and protect. What sort of climate change policy do we owe the poor of the world who are particularly vulnerable to climate change? Why should our generation take on the burden of mitigating climate change that is caused, in no small part, by emissions from people now dead? What value is lost when natural species go extinct, as they may well do en masse because of climate change?


Articulates the fundamental importance of ontology to Hans Jonas’s environmental ethics. Despite his tremendous impact on the German Green Party and the influence of his work on contemporary debates about stem cell research in the United States, Hans Jonas’s (1903–1993) philosophical contributions have remained partially obscured. In particular, the ontological grounding he gives his ethics, based on a phenomenological engagement with biology to bridge the “is-ought” gap, has not been fully appreciated. She places Jonas’s philosophy in context, comparing his ideas to those of other ethical and environmental philosophers and demonstrating the relevance of his thought for our current ethical and environmental problems.


This book tracks the growth of environmental awareness and conservation in the United States through the major trends of the 20th century, and establishes a philosophical ground for protection of the environment. It records a major cultural shift in the thinking of this nation, and provides guidelines for its continuation. The book is directed to undergraduate and graduate students in environmental ethics and environmental studies classes.


For most people, animals are the most significant aspects of the nonhuman world. They symbolize nature in our imaginations, in popular media and culture, and in campaigns to preserve wilderness, yet scholars habitually treat animals and the environment as mutually exclusive objects of concern. Conducting the first examination of animals’ place in popular and scholarly thinking about nature, Anna L. Peterson builds a nature ethic that conceives of nonhuman animals as active subjects who are simultaneously parts of both nature and human society. Through her paradigm-shifting reflections, Peterson disrupts the artificial boundaries between two seemingly distinct categories, underscoring their fluid and continuous character.


Philosophy, as Aristotle said, originates in wonder. And nonhuman animals have long been a source of wonder to humans, especially in regard to the treatment they deserve. The upshot is that Western philosophy has been concerned with the way in which we ought to treat nonhuman animals since its origins with the pre-Socratic philosophers. Animal ethics is a highly challenging field, as well as one of the liveliest areas of debate in ethics in recent years. Not only has this area issued in a range of attention-grabbing controversies but it has also led to the exploration of novel and imaginative approaches to worn-out issues. This book is roughly evenly divided between the presentation and discussion of a range of influential past approaches to animal ethics and an equally significant range of contemporary approaches. We need to understand the legacy of the past and the resources that it offers us while also forging new views that are appropriate to our increasingly developed understanding of the nature of nonhuman animals.


To comprehensively address the complexities of current socio-ecological problems involved in global environmental change, it is indispensable to achieve an integration of ecological understanding and ethical values. Contem- porary science proposes an inclusive ecosystem concept that recognizes humans as components. Contemporary environmental issues include socio-social justice and the realization that as important as biodiversity is cultural diversity, inter-cultural, inter-institutional, and international collaboration requiring a novel approach known as biocultural conservation. Right action in confronting the challenges of the 21st century requires science and ethics to be seamlessly integrated. This book resulted from the 14th Cary Conference that brought together leading scholars and practitioners in ecology and environmental philosophy to discuss core terminologies, methods, questions, and practical frameworks for long-term socio-ecological research, education, and decision making.


Technology shapes every aspect of human experience and it is the primary driver of social and ecological change. Given this, it is surprising that we spend so little time studying, analyzing, and evaluating new technologies. Occasionally, an issue grabs public attention—for example, the use of human embryonic stem cells in medical research or online file sharing of music and movies. However, these are the exceptions. For the most part, we enthusiastically embrace each new technology and application with little critical reflection on how it will impact our lives and our world. What is more, when an issue raised by an emerging technology is attended to, we often lack the language, concepts, and critical perspectives to thoroughly address it. The aim of this textbook is to introduce students and other readers to the ethical issues associated with a broad array of emerging technologies—including nanotechnology, synthetic genetics, robotics, genetic engineering, geoengineering, synthetic meat, virtual reality, information technologies, sex selection, and many more—and to help them develop analytical skills and perspectives for effectively evaluating novel technologies and applications.


Concepts from justice and ethics can significantly inform energy decision-makers. Benjamin K. Sovacool introduces readers to the injustices and insecurities inherent in the global energy system before presenting an energy justice conceptual framework consisting of availability, affordability, due process, good governance, prudence, intergenerational equity, intragenerational equity, and responsibility. He showcases the application of these principles to eight real-world case studies.

Brian Treanor builds on recent work on virtue ethics in environmental philosophy, finding an important grounding in the narrative theory of philosophers like Paul Ricoeur and Richard Kearney. Character and ethical formation, Treanor argues, are intimately tied to our relationship with the narratives through which we view the human place in the natural world. By reframing environmental questions in terms of individual, social, and environmental narrations about flourishing, Emplotting Virtue offers a vision of how we might remake our character so as to live more happily, more sustainably, and more virtuously in a diverse, beautiful, wondrous, and fragile world.


Climate change is perhaps the most important issue of our time and yet the international measures necessary to mitigate it have not been implemented. Given the urgency of the problem, why has so little been done? Climate Ethics identifies the reasons behind this crucial paradox and outlines a way forward. In the first part of the book, the authors provide an accessible account of the basics of climate change. In the second part, they explore the complex ethical and moral questions that need to be addressed if long-term solutions to climate change are to be realized.

Environmental Ethics is an interdisciplinary journal dedicated to the philosophical aspects of environmental problems. It is intended as a forum for diverse interests and attitudes, and seeks to bring together the nonprofessional environmental philosophy tradition with the professional interest in the subject. The journal is published by Environmental Philosophy, Inc. and the University of North Texas; the academic sponsor is Colorado State University. This journal came into existence in 1979 and is published four times a year.
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4. “Environmental Thought in Argentina: A Panoramic View” by Daniel Eduardo Gutiérrez (399-410)
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Volume 10, no. 1 (spring 2013)
Special issue on East Asian and comparative approaches to the environment

2. “Sensing the Wind: The Timely Music of Nature’s Memory” by Melvin Chinn (25-37)
4. “Creative Climate: Expressive Media in the Aesthetics of Watsuji, Nishida, and Merleau-Ponty” by Lucy Schultz (63-81)
5. “A Prolegomenon to Transversal Geophilosophy” by Hwa Yol Jung (83-111)

Book Reviews
Environmental Values (EV) brings together contributions from philosophy, economics, politics, sociology, geography, anthropology, ecology, and other disciplines, which relate to the present and future environment of human beings and other species. In doing so it aims to clarify the relationship between practical policy issues and more fundamental underlying principles or assumptions. EV is published by the White Horse Press. This journal came into existence in 1992. It was published four times a year from 1992 to 2012; beginning in 2013, it is published six times a year.
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5. “Political Theory in a Closed World: Reflections on William Ophuls, Liberalism and Abundance” by Andrew Dobson (241-259)

Book Reviews (309-312)
8. Raymond De Young and Thomas Princen’s (eds.) The Localization Reader: Adapting to the Coming Downsizing (2012). Reviewed by Marius De Geus
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Research Articles
2. “The Impasses of Ecological Representation” by Terry H. Whiteside (339-358)
4. “Does Nature Have Value in the Pāli Canon?” by Colette Sciberras (381-399)

Book Reviews (415-436)
9. Elena Cavagno and George Curiel’s The Three Levels of Sustainability (2012). Reviewed by Colin Nolden
11. Alison Hope Alkon and Julian Agyeman’s (eds.) Cultivating Food Justice: Race, Class and Sustainability (2011). Reviewed by Agatha Herman
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Research Articles
1. “Anthropocentrism and Egopism” by John Nell (441-459)
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Book Reviews (545-560)
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1. “Governing Climate Technologies: Is there Room for Democracy?” by Hayley Stevenson (567-587)  
2. “Radically Non-Ideal Climate Politics and the Obligation to at Least Vote ‘Green’” by Aaron Maltsi (589-608)  
4. “At the Centre of What? A Critical Note on the Centrism-Terminalism in Environmental Ethics” by Lars Samuelsson (627-645)  
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8. Francois Specq, Laura Dassow Walls and Michel Granger’s (eds.) Thoreauan Modernities: Transatlantic Conversations on an American Icon (2013). Reviewed by Bob Pepperman Taylor  
12. David W. Kidner’s Flood Risk and Social Justice: From Quantitative to Qualitative Flood Risk Assessment and Mitigation (2012). Reviewed by Alan E. Stewart

Ethics & the Environment is an interdisciplinary forum for theoretical and practical articles, discussions, reviews, comments, and book reviews in the broad area encompassed by environmental ethics. The journal focuses on conceptual approaches in ethical theory and ecological philosophy, including deep ecology and ecological feminism, as they pertain to environmental issues such as environmental education and management, ecological economics, and ecosystem health. The journal is supported by the Center for Humanities and Arts, the Philosophy Department, and the Environmental Ethics Certificate Program at the University of Georgia. This journal came into existence in 1996 and is published twice a year.
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5. “Liberty and Valuing Sentient Life” by John Hadley (87-103)  

Ethics, Policy, & Environment (EPE) is a journal of philosophy and geography that offers scholarly articles, reviews, critical exchanges, and short reflections on all aspects of geographical and environmental ethics. The journal aims to publish philosophical work on the environment—human and natural, built and wild—as well as meditations on the nature of space and place. While the scope of EPE includes environmental philosophy and cultural geography, it is not limited to these fields. Past authors have been concerned with a wide range of subjects, such as applied environmental ethics, animal rights, justice in urban society, development ethics, cartography, and cultural values relevant to environmental concerns. The journal also welcomes theoretical analyses of practical applications of environmental, urban, and regional policies, as well as concrete proposals for grounding our spatial policies in more robust normative foundations. EPE is published by Routledge. The journal came into existence in 1996 as Philosophy & Geography, merged as Ethics, Place & Environment in 2005, and changed its name to Ethics, Policy, & Environment in 2010. It is published three times a year.
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Other Works in Environmental Philosophy


Subsistence norms are part of the "ecosophy" or ecological philosophy of Alaska Native Peoples in the sub-Arctic, such as the Inupiat of Seward Peninsula. This kind of animistic pragmatism is a special form of practical wisdom that spans over thousands of years and which has been instrumental in the Inupiat's struggle to survive and thrive in harsh and evolving environments. I hope to show how narrative in relationship to the "ecosophy" of Alaska Native peoples can help to promote a more ecological orientation to address food insecurity in rural communities in Alaska. Alaska Native eco-philosophy recommends central values and virtues necessary to help address concerns in Alaska's rural communities. The "ecosophy" of the Inupiat of Seward Peninsula offers examples of "focal practices", which are essential for environmental education. These focal practices instill key virtues, namely humility, gratitude, self-reliance, attentiveness, responsibility and responsiveness, that are necessary for subsistence living.


As rapid advances in nanotechnology are made, we must set guidelines to balance the interests of both human beneficiaries and the environment by combining nanoethics and environmental ethics. In this paper, I reject Leopoldian holism as a practical environmental ethic with which to gauge nanotechnologies because, as a nonanthropocentric ethic, it does not value the humans who will actually use the ethic. Weak anthropocentrism is suggested as a reasonable alternative to ethics without a substantial human interest, as it treats nonhuman interests as human interests. I also establish the precautionary principle as a useful situational guideline for decision makers. Finally, I examine existing and potential applications of nanotechnology, including water purification, agriculture, mining, energy, and pollutant removal, from the perspective of weak anthropocentrism using the precautionary principle.


As we become more aware of the potential causes and consequences of climate change we are left wondering: who is responsible? Climate change has the potential to harm large portions of the global population and, arguably, is already doing so. Further, climate change is argued to be human-caused. If this is true, then it seems to be the case that we can analyze climate change in terms of responsibility. I argue that we can approach environmental harms, such as climate change, through a theory of collective responsibility. I propose an account of reductive collective responsibility that can apply to the unstructured collective causing climate change and determine what we are each individually morally responsible for. To avoid the critiques of reductive collective responsibility for large unstructured harms, I propose we separate the determination of membership and eligibility for responsibility from the attribution of responsibility. Through this method, I can speak to the individual responsibility of each member who contributes to climate change without holding them responsible for that which is outside their control.


Climate change continues to dominate academic work within green/environmental politics. Indeed, there appears to be almost an inverse relationship between the lack of political leadership on tackling climate change and the growth in ever more sophisticated academic analyses of this complex and multifaceted problem. There is an increasing disjunction between the growth in our knowledge and understanding of the ethical, political, economic, sociological, cultural, and psychological aspects of climate change and the lack of political achievement in putting in place clear and binding targets, an agreed decarbonisation roadmap, and associated regulatory and policy instruments with enforcement. This gap might be taken as evidence that we do not need more reports on climate change. This special issue focuses on a variety of ways in which climate change is conceptualised in normative political and ethical theory, and addressed in policy and regulation.


Human rights have not played a significant role in the international law and politics of climate change to date. However, there has been increasing interest among legal scholars and moral and political philosophers in a human rights approach to climate change. This review focuses on the new literature in moral and political philosophy that has begun to explore the connections between human rights and climate change. The attractions of a human rights approach to climate change are explained. The idea of a moral conception of human rights is introduced and distinguished from human rights recognized in international and national law. The three main arguments in the literature connecting human rights and climate change are introduced and critical discussions of them are presented. The first argument (associated with Steve Vanderheiden) claims that there is a human right to a stable climate, which can be derived from a human right to an adequate environment. The second argument (associated with Simon Caney) claims that anthropogenic climate change violates basic human (negative) rights to life, health, and subsistence. The third argument claims that there is a human right to emit greenhouse gases.


The purpose of this paper is to describe the importance of a focus on ethics in sustainability education and present results from a pilot graduate-level course titled the Ethics of Sustainability. Findings: Students from diverse fields found the ethical concepts new, stimulating and crucial for their careers. Ethical concepts provide a framework for thinking about sustainable practices in their personal and professional lives. Future research could explore different teaching strategies and different institutions, and use pre/post studies. Practical implications: This study suggests that a course on ethical principles related to sustainability is a useful and potentially critical component to any curriculum intending to prepare future professionals to be effective contributors to a sustainable society. Higher education may adopt the course concepts and learning tools to enhance their curriculum and businesses and corporations will benefit from entry-level professionals with a solid ethical foundation for making more sustainability-oriented decisions.


This essay examines recent British poetry informed by Concrete and ‘open-field’ poetics which engages with landscape through experimentation with the spatiality of the poetic page. Amounting to much more than just formal playfulness, this mode of ‘landscape writing’ raises pertinent questions about the politics and ethics of en-
The struggle to sustain biodiversity is a struggle for the just and equitable treatment of others, including not only existing people but also future generations and nonhuman organisms. But in the urgency to protect biodiversity, the goals of conservation, we need a coherent and shared understanding of these competing demands of justice. We work toward such an understanding by discussing the benefits of conservation – especially to future people – the fair treatment of nonhuman organisms and the human consequences of conservation.


Anthropogenic climatic change (ACC) has been described as a tragedy of the commons (T of C) by Baylor Johnson. Johnson argues that solutions to T of C scenarios reside in collective action rather than individual action, and that our moral obligation is to advocate for collective solutions to ACC. Marion Houndeau argues that individual action can serve to promote collective action and in doing so it can also serve as an ethical obligation. I contend that individual action holds intrinsic value in lieu of its ability to counteract our susceptibility to the kind of moral corruption espoused by Stephen Gardiner.


Developments in the theoretical field of ecosophy have demonstrated the co-dependence of different human and natural factors, as well as connections between societal organization, natural sustainability and individual experience. Exploring these complex and organic relations between the social, the mental and the environmental, is an important task for contemporary research. A central question is where and how such research can be undertaken. This article traces central ecosophical lines of thinking, links them to ethical and aesthetic theory, and shows how these theories stand in a direct relation to three contemporary, on-going art projects. Ecosophy is proposed as a relational and practice-near research ideology, depending on the complexity-oriented principles of relationality, ethicity and immediacy. Finally, aesthetic research and research through art emerge as field-merging and practi-cal-theoretical approaches, which should be given more attention and resources in current science and education politics. As an alternative field of knowledge production, referring to Jacques Rancière’s distribution of the sensuous as well as phenomenological epistemology, ethic-aesthetic research not only constitutes new ways of sensing, but acknowledges larger parts of what we already know.


Part of Blackwell’s Companion to Philosophy Series. Entries of interest to environmental philosophers include:

- “Critique of the Precautionary Principle and the Possibility for an ‘Enlightened Doomsaying’” by Jean-Pierre Dupuy
- “Precautionary Principle” by Andy Stirling
- “Agriculture Ethics” by David M. Kaplan
- “Bioethics” by Paul B. Thomson
- “Biotechnology: Plants and Animals” by Bart Gremmen
- “Environmental Ethics” by Thomas Sobrén Petersen
- “Food Ethics” by David M. Kaplan
- “Future Generations” by Jesper Ryberg
- “Nanoethics” by John Wackert


vidential aesthetics. In particular, it offers opportunities for investigating and complicating Timothy Morton’s critical formulation of ‘nature writing’ as ‘ecomimesis’. My argument draws on examples from the work of three poets whose writing eschews straightforwardly mimetic relations to landscape but nevertheless claims connections between the space of the page and material geographies. These poetries ambivalently participate in an attenuated form of ‘ecomimesis’ and in doing so, provide occasions for critical reflection on the ethical imperatives and problematic of this aesthetic impulse.


The first part of this article argues that the story of Sancho Panza and his donkey in part 2 of *Don Quijote* communicates Agamben’s notion of the “bare life.” Specifically, Sancho’s relationship with his donkey in the moments after they fall into a pit reveals what Agamben means by the incomprehensibility, but necessity, of the animal-human relationship. What we propose to add to Agamben’s thesis is a description of a uniquely Cervantine humorous method in communicating this animal-human relationship. We suggest that Cervantes provides the key to understanding Agamben’s message. Cervantine humor, we argue, is the best way to explicate Agamben’s notion of the bare life to the reading public. The second part of this article argues that in *A Sand Country Almanac*, Aldo Leopold develops the animal-human relationship prefigured in *Don Quijote* by means of the same method-humor.


Ethics is the philosophical discipline concerned with how we should live, including how to treat one another. Philosophers historically have tended to limit their ethical concern to human beings, but recently some have created a new discipline, environmental ethics, to specify appropriate human relationships to the nonhuman world. In the course of their work, they have developed strong ethical arguments for preserving biodiversity and challenged conventional views of happiness and the materialistic values at the base of much modern life. While environmental ethics treat the full range of environmental issues, this article focuses on the preservation of biodiversity.


Ancient Greek philosophy begins with natural philosophy (the Milesians, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Anaxagoras), followed after about a century by a focus on moral philosophy (Socrates and the sophists). The pattern is repeated in the Modern period: first natural philosophy re-emerged after the Dark and Middle Ages (Copernicus, Galileo, Descartes, Newton) followed by a correlative revolution in moral philosophy (Hobbes, Hume, Kant). In particular, moral ontology (externally related individuals) reflected the ontology of physics (externally related atoms). Individuals are, in effect, social atoms. Curiously, 20th-century philosophy has largely turned a blind eye and deaf ear to the vast philosophical implications of the second scientific revolution in 20th-century science, among them a correlative moral ontology of internal relations and social wholes. The environmental turn in the humanities, grounded in ecology and evolutionary biology, is a harbinger of the re-orientation of philosophy to the revolutionary ideas in the sciences and foreshadows an emerging NeoPresocratic revival in 21st-century philosophy.


The struggle to sustain biodiversity is a struggle for the just and equitable treatment of others, including not only existing people but also future generations and nonhuman organisms. But in the urgency to protect biodiversity, the interests of local people have often been transgressed. To guard against these human injustices while advancing
In October 2011 a group of humanist scholars and experts from three different continents met at the Faculty of Humanities in Koper, Slovenia, to discuss problems connected with the environment and our ethical to-wards non-human animals. As the title of the conference “Living with Consequences” suggests, the question faced was not whether we have to deal with environmental problems but rather how to deal with them.
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1. “Biotic Intependence: From the Perspective of Ecofeminist Theology” by Nadija Furlan Stante
2. “Ecofeminist Christology, Incarnation and the Spirituality and Ethics of Eating” by Emily A. Holmes

Environment and Ethical Ontology
3. “Diversity as a Moral Imperative and Aesthetic Value” by Mădălina Diaconu
4. “Place, Narrative, and Virtue” by Paul Haught

Environment and Society

Living with Animals
7. “Animal Ethic and the Ethical Mirror” by Anton Mlinar


Despite differences in focus, goals, and strategies between conservation biology and animal welfare, both are in-extricably linked in many ways, and greater consideration of animal welfare, although important in its own right, also has considerable potential to contribute to conservation success. Nevertheless, animal welfare and animal ethics are not always considered explicitly within conservation practice. We systematically reviewed the recent scientific peer-reviewed and online gray literature on reintroductions of captive-bred and wild-caught animals (mammals, birds, amphibians, and reptiles) to quantify the occurrence of animal welfare issues. Practitioners can address animal-welfare issues in reintroductions by considering the potential implications for individual animals at all stages of the release process using the decision tree presented. We urge practitioners to report potential animal-welfare issues, describe mitigation actions, and evaluate their efficacy to facilitate transparent evaluation of common moral dilemmas and to advance communal strategies for dealing with them.


Across disciplines, scholars are overturning objectivist approaches to the environment in favour of theorizing the agency and liveliness of matter. The ecological promise of these ‘new materialisms’ is to invite dialogue among a wider host of agents, raising the possibility of an ethics that binds humans to the material entities upon which our livelihoods depend. However, any vision of global environmental justice is incomplete without engaging long-standing indigenous philosophies of morality. The authors devote the first portion of this essay to an analysis of why it has been difficult for the ‘new materialisms’ to incorporate indigenous intellectual traditions into discus-sions of non-human agency, focusing on contemporary arts discourse. They then turn to a discussion of recent works by Native North American artists Jimmie Durham, Rebecca Belmore, Will Wilson and Jolene Rickard, which incorporate indigenous understandings of material with an acute awareness of the contemporary, global challenges of co-habitation.


Carbon offsetting can be loosely characterized as a mechanism by which an organization or individual contributes to a scheme that is projected either to remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere or to deliver carbon dioxide emission reductions on the part of other organizations or individuals. An activity that has been offset therefore purports to make no long-term net contribution to atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations. The ethical basis for using carbon offsetting as an approach to tackling climate change is very much contested. We seek to expose some of the underlying reasons for these ethical disagreements. We show that they relate both to empirical disagreements about what the likely benefits of offsetting are and, more fundamentally, to principled disagreements about the right way to discharge duties to deliver carbon reductions.


It is clear that natural entities can be preserved—they can be preserved because they can be harmed or destroyed, or in various other ways adversely affected. I argue that in light of the rise of scientism and other forms of philis-tinism, the political, religious, mythic, personal and historical meanings that people find in those entities can also be preserved. Against those who impugn disciplines such as fine arts, philosophy and sociology, I contend that this sort of preservation requires the efforts of those whose work exemplifies the core values of the arts, the humanities and the qualitative social sciences.


A major strength of the ecosystem services (ESS) concept is that it allows a succinct description of how human well-being depends on nature, showing that the neglect of such dependencies has negative conse-quences on human well-being and the economy. As ESS refer to human needs and interests, values are to be considered when dealing with the concept in practice. As a result we argue that in using the concept there is a need to be clear about the different dimensions of value are involved, and be aware of ethical issues that might be associated with the concept. A systematic analysis of the ethical implications associated to the ESS concept is still lacking. We address this deficiency by scrutinising value dimensions as-sociated with the concept, and use this to explore the associated ethical implications. We then highlight how improved transparency in the use of the ESS concept can contribute to using its strengths without succumbing to possible drawbacks arising from ethical problems. These problems concern the dangers that some uses of the concept have in obscuring certain types of value, and in masking unevenness in the distribution of costs and benefits that can arise in the management of ESS.
Human and plant relationships are described within the rich tradition of multispecies ethnography, ethnobotany, and political ecology. In theorizing this relationship, the issues of functionalism, and interconnectivity are raised. This article aims to re-examine the position of plants in the context of contemporary urban spaces through the prism of environmental ethics. Despite conceptual plurality and socio-cultural complexity of human-plant relationships, social scientists fail to note how the perception of ‘greenery’ has objectified plants in urban environment. Without seriously considering bioethics, theories of human-plant relationship might fail to note exploitive anthropocentric relationship between humans and plants in urban spaces. The article is inspired by reflections of urban flora in Amsterdam, The Netherlands.


The increasing awareness of the public about the role of human activity in environmental problems such as “climate change,” together with the lack of a firm socio-political response to contain these problems, has created an opportunity to introduce environmental ethics as the forerunner of bioethics. Economic prosperity has a worldwide demand but an understanding of the instinctive bond of human nature with the living systems may improve other aspects of human wellbeing such as happiness; as such, happiness can be achieved not just by economic development but also through the enhancement of our innate love for life and living systems. Biophilia may be the missing key of environmental ethics for elaboration on the lifestyle changes needed in the pursuit of happiness. The experience of Bhutan with its innovative measure of “Gross National Happiness” based on human development and environmental conservation provides a good example in the Asia Pacific region. However, as long as environmental conservation is not regarded as a common moral value for all peoples and cultures around the world, the socio-political pressure for change may not be enough to protect our ecosystems and their life support systems.


When philosophers participate in the interdisciplinary ethical, environmental, economic, legal, and social analysis of nanotechnologies, what is their specific contribution? At first glance, the contribution of philosophy appears to be a clarification of the various moral and ethical arguments that are commonly presented in philosophical discussion. But if this is the only contribution of philosophy, then it can offer no more than a stalemate position, in which each moral and ethical argument nullifies all the others. To provide an alternative, we must analyze the reasons behind the prevailing individual and cultural relativism in ethics. The epistemological investigation of this stalemate position will guide us to the core problem of the relation between theory and action. The stalemate can be overcome from a pragmatic philosophical standpoint, which combines epistemology, philosophy of language—that is, the philosophy of speech acts—and practical reasoning—that is, reasoning about decision-making. From this philosophical standpoint, it will be possible to show how philosophy can accompany and support the development of nanotechnologies.


This chapter aims to reconcile the complex ethical dynamics of novel ecosystems. First, the chapter talks about the articulation of some of the ecological values present in novel ecosystems, and provides an initial taxonomy. Next, the attention turns to the field of environmental ethics, which focuses on the moral status of environments. The chapter surveys an array of approaches to valuing novel ecosystems from a number of different theories in environmental ethics. To understand the critical literature in environmental ethics on restoration ecology, one should recognize that holistic non-anthropocentrism inherits a particular kind of ontological problem that is not entailed by the other two views. The chapter concludes with a brief look at a new promising approach, namely environmental virtue ethics, which could offer an alternative framework for understanding moral relations with novel ecosystems.


This chapter begins by reviewing the foundational principles that point to the existence and importance of novel ecosystems. It provides a brief review of previous formulations of the novel ecosystem concept. The chapter then steps into synthesis and presents a new framework for the novel ecosystem concept. Using the original Hobbs components of novelty and human agency as a starting point, it develops this synthesis by first considering (1) where and how human agency leads to novelty; (2) what level of novelty constitutes a novel ecosystem; and (3) how human agency acts after a novel ecosystem has emerged. Conceptual examples of the emergence of novel ecosystems in Puerto Rico and California are illustrated.


This paper explores the potential for an environmental justice framing to shed new light on conservation controversies. We argue that, in order to make such progress, environmental justice analysis will need to provide a ‘difference-friendly’ conception of justice and that this will necessarily involve moving beyond dominant liberal and the textual to increase possibilities for action. Through engaging with Bakhtin’s ideas, this article seeks to draw attention to relations between the imagination of the world and political agency, and the need to include these relations in our own experiments with creating climate change awareness.
The paper is focused on exploring the following questions: How can policy makers develop agreement on (i) what constitutes and (ii) supports the well-being of the planet, rather than the gross domestic product of a nation state? How can we design Participatory Democracy and Systemic Governance to (i) support the appropriate distribution and consumption of resources and (ii) protect social and environmental diversity and justice? The paper discusses thinking and practice to test out ‘technologies of humility’ in the sense used by Jasonoff. It suggests the potential for a hybrid bricolage of laws and praxis to enable the transformation of our designs for living to support biospheres. Biospheres need to be understood as oceans, rivers, the air we breathe, the earth that supports the food chain and the universe of which we are a part. Caretaking needs to be rooted in many kinds of knowledge to: (i) ‘De-centre’ anthropocentrism (by drawing on the work of Rose Bird, Wynne and Machew); and (ii) ‘Address’ the convergent social, cultural and economic crisis. The challenge is to ‘promote’ an ever extending or widening circle of solidarity to ‘care for’ the next generation of life. This appreciation of narratives could inform discursive engagement to help establish ethical processes to support well-being (Braun, et al.) at a post national level.


The conventional narrative of American environmentalism is no longer very helpful for conservationists and restorationists seeking philosophical justification and guidance for their work. The tradition has often been cropped into a narrower and simplified account of the battle between the philosophies of wise use and preservation, a move bolstered by the turn to historical images of President Teddy Roosevelt and John Muir visiting California’s Yosemite National Park in the early years of the twentieth century. This cropped conservation picture needs to be restored and widened to engage the pragmatism that has always been a part of the U.S. environmental tradition, but that became eclipsed by preservationist ideology with the rise of the fields of environmental history and environmental philosophy in the late twentieth century. Restoring this lost pragmatism to the environmental tradition will prove vital to recovering the value of environmental history and philosophy for conservation and restoration practice and to reclaiming a more holistic and useful narrative of people, culture, and environment.


Ecological restoration practices are changing rapidly, and in complex ways, with higher and higher stakes both for the restoration industries themselves and for the future of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Even as ecosystem degradation has accelerated, restoration has grown into a transnational, multibillion dollar industry. These changes create an imperative for correspondingly rapid and dramatic changes in the metaphoric lenses through which we view restoration projects. In this Policy Perspectives paper, we explore a metaphor that views ecological restoration through the lens of co-dependency theories about enabling behaviors in the lives of addicts. The metaphor raises questions about the nature of the relation between restoration practices and an industrial growth economy “addicted” to cheap fuel and consumer goods. It suggests some policy changes that might prevent development of co-dependencies between restoration industries and ecologically destructive practices.


Ethical obligations to animals in conservation research and management are manifold and often conflicting. Animal welfare concerns often clash with the ethical imperative to understand and conserve a population or ecosystem through research and management intervention. The accelerating pace and impact of global environmental change, especially climate change, complicates our understanding of these obligations. One example is the blurring of the distinction between ex situ (zoo- and aquarium-based) conservation and in situ (field-based) approaches as zoos and aquariums become more active in field conservation work and as researchers and managers consider more intensive interventions in wild populations and ecosystems to meet key conservation goals. These shifts, in turn, have consequences for our traditional understanding of the ethics of wildlife research and management, including our relative weighting of animal welfare and conservation commitments across rapidly evolving ex situ and in situ contexts. Although this changing landscape in many ways supports the increased use of captive wildlife in conservation-relevant research, it raises significant ethical concerns about human intervention in populations and ecosystems, including the proper role of zoos and aquariums as centers for animal research and conservation in the coming decades. Working through these concerns requires a pragmatic approach to ethical analysis, one that is able to make trade-offs among the many goods at stake (e.g., animal welfare, species viability, and ecological integrity) as we strive to protect species from further decline and extinction in this century.


The conventional narrative of American environmentalism is no longer very helpful for conservationists and restorationists seeking philosophical justification and guidance for their work. The tradition has often been cropped into a narrower and simplified account of the battle between the philosophies of wise use and preservation, a move bolstered by the turn to historical images of President Teddy Roosevelt and John Muir visiting California’s Yosemite National Park in the early years of the twentieth century. This cropped conservation picture needs to be restored and widened to engage the pragmatism that has always been a part of the U.S. environmental tradition, but that became eclipsed by preservationist ideology with the rise of the fields of environmental history and environmental philosophy in the late twentieth century. Restoring this lost pragmatism to the environmental tradition will prove vital to recovering the value of environmental history and philosophy for conservation and restoration practice and to reclaiming a more holistic and useful narrative of people, culture, and environment.


Ecological restoration practices are changing rapidly, and in complex ways, with higher and higher stakes both for the restoration industries themselves and for the future of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Even as ecosystem degradation has accelerated, restoration has grown into a transnational, multibillion dollar industry. These changes create an imperative for correspondingly rapid and dramatic changes in the metaphoric lenses through which we view restoration projects. In this Policy Perspectives paper, we explore a metaphor that views ecological restoration through the lens of co-dependency theories about enabling behaviors in the lives of addicts. The metaphor raises questions about the nature of the relation between restoration practices and an industrial growth economy "addicted" to cheap fuel and consumer goods. It suggests some policy changes that might prevent development of co-dependencies between restoration industries and ecologically destructive practices.


The effects of oil exploration in the Niger Delta region in Nigeria have attracted serious concern on a global scale, largely thanks to the initiative of Ken Saro-Wiwa. In spite of the activities of environmental activists the region remains an epitome of environmental disaster. This has given rise to an impressive body of work by poets and visual artists enunciating the environmental challenges in this oil-rich region. The authors examine the common thread that is shared in this corpus within the larger context of education in eco-aesthetics and social responsibility, considering the relationship that currently exists between oil-producing communities and the multinational oil corporations. This position is anchored on the insights offered by current thought in eco-ethics and eco-aesthetics. Previous efforts to ameliorate these effects failed; what is now required is a strong synergy between aesthetic/environmental education and social function.


The contamination of environments with radionuclides can give rise to consequences that encompass far more than health risks from exposure to radiation. As experience from Chernobyl demonstrated, both the accident and remediation measures can have serious social and economic consequences. This paper presents a review of some of these issues, including their ethical relevance, and presents a check-list of socio-ethical aspects of remediation measures. The paper concludes with an overview of social remediation measures, encompassing actions that are directed towards benefits other than dose reduction (e.g., local food monitoring stations or medical check-up), or measures that require social rather than technical implementation (e.g. information centres, stakeholder dialogue).
Global climate change raises profound questions for normative theorists. The human impacts of climate change will be sufficiently broad, and generally adverse, to threaten the well-being of very large numbers of existing and future persons; and these impacts, if unmanaged, could also be expected to exacerbate inequalities between social groups in all states. Within this context, an increasing focus of climate change scholars has been the question of justice raised by climate change and policies for its management. In this chapter, I explore three problems that have generated substantial treatment in the growing literature devoted to this normative dimension of climate change. First, the problem of determining the share of the capacity of the atmosphere to assimilate accumulations of greenhouse gas that each state ought to be able to exploit as a matter of justice. I call this the “justice in emissions” problem. Second, the problem of specifying a just division of costs and benefits associated with our attempts to solve the justice in emissions problem and, in addition, to tackle human disadvantages arising from climate changes that are no longer preventable. I call this the “justice in burdens” problem. Third, the problem of translating justly distributed climatic entitlements and burdens into a coherent set of national, regional, and global climate policy responses that are consistent with established norms of global justice such as those concerned with international development and political legitimacy. I call this the “justice in governance” problem.


The present paper is a critical analysis on the arguments used in an attempt towards a general consensus on nature conservation, and their philosophical fundamentals and validity. Three different approaches are discussed. (1) Anthropocentric approach. The present generation accepts renunciation in order to obtain advantages for future generations (availability of resources), i.e. a mainly utilitarian strategy—the ideas of Mayer Abich and Jonas are discussed. (2) Dualistic (metaphysical) approach renounces the following a transcendent law, i.e. as a religious duty—the approach of the Judeo-Christian thinking and in Islam are discussed. (3) Holistic approach humans accept to consider themselves as a component of the ecosystem, which is based on feedback relationships, and consequently if some component of the biosphere is destroyed, something is destroyed also in humans—the approach of Buddhism, A. Schweitzer’s Reverence for Life and Naess’s Deep Ecology, as well as the opinions of Steg and of Azone are discussed.


After two decades of failure by the international community to respond adequately to the threat of global climate change, discussions of the possibility of geoengineering a cooler climate have recently proliferated. Alongside the considerable optimism that these technologies have generated, there has also been wide acknowledgement of significant ethical concerns. Ethicists, social scientists, and experts in governance have begun the work of addressing these concerns. The plethora of ethical issues raised by geoengineering creates challenges for those who wish to survey them. The issues are here separated out according to the temporal spaces in which they first arise. The significant ethical concerns. Ethicists, social scientists, and experts in governance have begun the work of addressing these concerns. The plethora of ethical issues raised by geoengineering creates challenges for those who wish to survey them. The issues are here separated out according to the temporal spaces in which they first arise. The wide range of geoengineering technologies currently being discussed makes it prudent that each technique should be evaluated individually for its ethical merit.


In this article, I consider some of the pedagogical challenges presented by a new wave of environmentalism that implores individuals to “save the earth” through simple, normalized acts like recycling. In the context of teaching environmental education in higher education settings, I provide a justification for an alternative conception of environmentalism based on self-stylisation. This conception draws on the work of French philosopher, Michel Foucault, who studied ancient Greeks to contemplate a new perspective on ethics.


There are some fundamental attitudes which man may have to nature. One of them is an anthropocentric approach, which is perhaps most common and so to say “natural”, and therefore not as questionable as the other kinds of attitudes. The other kind of a relation may be called biocentric. It has, surprisingly, quite a long tradition, too. The theory that all life is morally considerable was most fully elaborated and expressed by Albert Schweitzer, and in the second half of the twentieth century this view was popularized by Kenneth Goodpaster. The most fully elaborated and advanced theory has then been worked out by Paul Taylor. Next come those who say that one should take lessons from ecology and often develop the so-called ecocentric theories. They recognize the moral primacy of the wholes over singular entities. One of the first representatives of such thinking was Aldo Leopold. Then his theory was explained and creatively reinterpreted by J. Baird Callicott. It soon appeared, however, that biotic communities (ecosystems) can hardly be treated as objects of moral consideration. Nowadays there is a lot of discussion going on about value pluralism in reference to nature; different points of view have been presented and analyzed in connection with the above problems.


The idea of wilderness is fundamental to the North American conservation ethic. Wilderness protection and the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation arose in the same era from a common concern for the future aesthetic of the continent. These movements shared many of the same proponents within the community who leveraged significant influence on one another and the larger, non-hunting public. Their accomplishments, like the National Park System, the wildlife refuge system, the National Forest system and the National Wilderness system itself rank among the main achievements of conservation.


Humans are causing global climate change (GCC), and such climate change causes harms. Robin Attfield explained how individuals should be understood to be culpable for these harms. In this paper, I use a critical analysis of Attfield’s exploratory framework to explore further difficulties in accounting for corporate responsibility for these harms. I begin by arguing that there are some problems with his framework as it is applied to individuals that emit greenhouse gases (GHGs). I then show that it will be very difficult to extend this framework to corporations. The discussion of this concern will draw attention to another positive conclusion of this paper: the harms associated with CO2 are very unlike the harms associated with other airborne-emitted substances, which will indicate that we will need new ways of understanding how individuals and corporations are philosophically responsible for these harms. The final positive conclusion of this paper will be a discussion of what the constraints should be on new approaches to explaining our culpability.


Normality is imminently catastrophic. Climate change is a contemporary instantiation of the perpetual sense of crisis that characterises the human condition, and concepts such as sustainability and resilience serve as regulative ideals (cf. beauty, perfection, and truth) in the fight against ubiquitous unsustainability. Unsustainability
is an aspect of time, and is thus, in Kantian terms, a fundamental schema underlyng the categories of human understanding. Current growth will decay, therefore only as yet unforeseen adaptation and innovation can give humanity more time to encounter the next set of crises. On this account, the arts and humanities operate as a collective memento mori, reminding us of our fragility and fallibility. Only thus reminded can we act with the greatest possible care in the world, but this can never ensure ‘sustainable development’, which remains an inherently paradoxical policy slogan.


This chapter focuses on two types of concerns about novel ecosystems. The first concern is connected with misapprehensions that arise, mostly from lack of information or misunderstanding of the implications of managing novel ecosystems. These concerns should not be ignored or underestimated because they can easily obstruct an informed and constructive discussion about novel ecosystems and their management. The first misapprehension is that accepting or acknowledging novel ecosystems implies that managers will surrender any attempt to control invasive species. The second misapprehension addressed here is that acceptance of novel ecosystems will result in the replacement of traditional conservation and restoration practice. The second type of concern includes more persistent concerns about novel ecosystems. These are much more difficult concerns to work through because they require revisiting and possibly altering systemic patterns of social tradition and moral beliefs that pertain to nature and its conservation.


The global livestock industry has recently been inundated with criticisms about the impact of animal production systems on anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), animal welfare, environmental sustainability and human health and well-being. Although it is accepted that the estimate of GHG emissions from animal agriculture has been exaggerated by the FAO’s publication “Livestock’s Long Shadow”, the 18% estimate is a gross exaggeration. Industrialisation in the agricultural sector in some developing countries without “enlightenment” has been associated with environmental problems like among others, land degradation and water pollution. It is estimated that global livestock production will double by 2050 to satisfy demands, which suggests a faster than expected growth compared to any other agricultural sector. By contrast, there are also growing concerns about the world’s ability to provide in the considerably growing protein needs of a rapidly growing human population, especially in developing countries where it is unlikely that the demands will be met. The purpose of this paper is to focus on some of these conflicting issues and the effects of a shift to intensive production systems on the ethics of meat production, quality and animal welfare in African countries with knowingly limited natural resources.


This article outlines the contribution Rawls’ ‘well-ordered society’ makes to the ongoing discourse of intergenerational justice. Can Rawls’ ‘realistically utopian’ vision of a well-ordered society, a society comprising just institutions that embody the goods of liberty and individual self-authorship of the good life, secure justice between the generations? By considering the totality of the Rawlsian project rather than specific sections of his work such as his ‘just savings principle’, it is possible to assess the ability of ideal liberal theory to guarantee the rights of future citizens while simultaneously addressing pressing environmental crises, the most notable of which being climate change.


This article argues that one of the reasons that the unethical character of much human-dolphin contact is not more apparent to ethicists is that discussion of central issues has been colored with unintentional species bias. This article points out weaknesses in the traditional approach to discussing topics that bear on the question of whether dolphins have moral standing. It demonstrates that discussions of the cognitive abilities of dolphins by Steven Wise and Alasdair Maclntyre are unintentionally but fundamentally anthropocentric—largely because the authors are not familiar with enough of the scientific literature about dolphins to draw the conclusions that they do.


The concept of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), along with synonymous or closely related terms like indigenous knowledge and native science, has some of its origins in literatures on international development and adaptive management. There is a tendency to want to determine one definition for TEK that can satisfy every stakeholder in every situation. Yet a scan of environmental science and policy literatures reveals there to be differences in definitions that make it difficult to form a consensus. What should be explored instead is the role that the concept of TEK plays in facilitating or discouraging cross-cultural and cross-situational collaboration among actors working for indigenous and non-indigenous institutions of environmental governance, such as tribal natural resources departments, federal agencies working with tribes, and co-management boards.


This special issue of Climatic Change is dedicated to the examination of impacts of climate change on indigenous peoples and their homelands, and proposed strategies of adaptation, constitutes a compelling and timely report on what is happening in Native homelands and communities. The articles highlight why awareness of climate change is so high among indigenous peoples of the USA when compared to most citizens of the USA.
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This paper examines the presuppositions that contribute to a general disavowal of the dire warnings of runaway global warming as a future of radical difference. I note the apparent consanguinity of the catastrophic predictions of science and the genre of apocalyptic literature, noting one fundamental difference as the absence of meaning
and “justice” in the unfolding of temporality with the specter of mass glacial melting, mass starvation, and mass extinction in the coming century. Nostalgia for meaning, and inebriation with the modern vision of the future as endless growth and progress have contributed greatly to the disavowal of knowledge of impending catastrophe, but I locate the prime motivator in the ecological foundations of modern knowledge beginning with Descartes. I offer Jean-Luc Marion’s radical transformation of phenomenology, in his theory of the “saturated phenomenon,” as a counterforce to the primacy of the intentional subject, who establishes the limit horizon for the possibility of the arising of phenomena. This reversal of transcendence, from subject to phenomena, in Marion’s thought offers an opening to the future as truly “other” in a way that may preserve the possibility of consciousness itself.


Can aesthetics and ethics be integrated for the good of habitats, places, and spaces? How can the arts widen our perception of nature and deepen environmental ethics? Should the political meaning of a landscape be defined solely in terms of its economic and ecological values? Questions like these are explored from the angles of arts, environmental ethics, ecology, religious studies, theology, art history, and philosophy. The book prompts discussion about the aesthetic and spiritual dimension in the environmental humanities, and it offers transdisciplinary insights into the challenge of sustainability and ongoing changes in society and the environment.


This article is about religions and attitudes toward the natural environment as relevant to biodiversity conservation. Religious traditions have little to say specifically about biodiversity, but they provide the values, worldviews, or environmental ethics that shape the way in which different societies interact with biological diversity and nature in general. In this sense, religion can be part of the problem or part of the solution. Scholars have suggested a general theory of religion for encoding information and for involving human emotions. Religion can encode adaptive strategies for resource management and biodiversity use, and supply emotionally powerful beliefs to put these strategies into practice. Societies that have succeeded in keeping their resources productive over time have done so in part through religious or ritual representation of resource management. The key point is not religion per se, but the use of emotionally powerful cultural symbols to help maintain a sense of sacred respect.


Can Orthodox Christianity offer unique spiritual resources especially suited to the environmental concerns of today? This book makes the case that yes, it can. In addition to being the first substantial and comprehensive collection of essays, in any language, to address environmental issues from the Orthodox point of view, this volume with contributions from the most highly influential theologians and philosophers.

Conradie, Ernst M. Saving the Earth?: The Legacy of Reformed Views on “Re-Creation”. Zürich, CH: LIT Verlag, 2013.

Christians seeking to “save the Earth” have to relate creation with salvation by doing justice to both themes. This study explores the ambiguous legacy of the ways in which this challenge has been approached in the reformed tradition of Swiss, Dutch, and German origins and in the reception of this tradition in South Africa. The book focuses on the diverging interpretations of the category of “re-creation” in this regard.


Why should we get involved in urban environmental regeneration? This study presents both theological-ethical reflection and practical learning about the community-based transformation of derelict and vacant land, and how this can in turn be deeply transformative for those who participate.


Contemplative or “noetic” knowledge has traditionally been seen as the highest mode of understanding, a view that persists both in many non-Western cultures and in Eastern Christianity, where “theoria physike,” or the illumined understanding of creation that follows the purification of the heart, is seen to provide deeper insights into nature than the discursive rationality modernity has used to dominate and conquer it. Working from texts in Eastern Orthodox philosophy and theology not widely known in the West, as well as a variety of sources including mystics and nature writers, The Noetics of Nature challenges both the primacy of the natural sciences in environmental thought and the conventional view, first advanced by Lynn White, Jr., that Christian theology is somehow responsible for the environmental crisis.


This book argues that the standard arguments for and against the claim that certain Hindu texts and traditions attribute direct moral standing to animals and plants are unconvincing. It presents careful, extensive, and original interpretations of passages from the Manusmṛti (law), the Mahābhārata (literature), and the Yogasūtra (philosophy), and argues that these texts attribute direct moral standing to animals and plants for at least three reasons: they are sentient, they are alive, and they possess a range of other relevant attributes and abilities. This book is of interest to scholars of Hinduism and the environment, religion and the environment, Hindu and/or Buddhist philosophy more broadly, and environmental ethics.


Some religious believers may see synthetic biology as usurping God’s creative role. The Catholic Church has yet to issue a formal teaching on the field (though it has issued some informal statements in response to Craig Venters’ development of a ‘synthetic’ cell). In this paper I examine the likely reaction of the Catholic Magisterium to synthetic biology in its entirety. I begin by examining the Church’s teaching role, from its own viewpoint, to set the necessary background and context for the discussion that follows. I then describe the Church’s attitude to science, and particularly to biotechnology. From this I derive a likely Catholic theology of synthetic biology. The Church’s teachings on scientific and biotech research show that it is likely to have a generally positive disposition to synbio, if it and its products can be acceptably safe. Proper evaluation of, and protection against, risk will be a
significant factor in determining the morality of the research. If the risks can be minimized through regulation or other means, then the Church is likely to be supportive. The Church will also critique the social and legal environment in which the research is done, evaluating issues such as the patenting of scientific discoveries and of life.


Historically, religion has been a significant part of many visions of sustainability. Pragmatically, the inclusion of religious values in conservation and development efforts has facilitated relationships between people with different value structures. Despite this, little attention has been paid to the interdependence of sustainability and religion, and no significant comparisons of religious and secular sustainability advocacy. *Religion and Sustainability* presents an analysis of the spiritual dimensions of sustainability-oriented social movements. Exploring the similarities and differences between the conceptions of sustainability held by religious, interfaith and secular organizations, the book analyses how religious practice and discourse have impacted on political ideology and process.


Those six lectures in natural religion explore what it could mean to live at the epoch of the Anthropocene when what was until now a mere décor for human history is becoming the principal actor. They confront head on the controversial figure of Gaia, that is, the Earth understood not as system but as what has a history, what mobilizes everything in the same geometry. The lectures are organized by groups of two, the two first ones deal with the question of Natural Religion per se and show that the notion is confusing because on the one hand “nature” and “religion” share too many attributes and, on the other, the two notions fail to register the originality of scientific practice and the specificity of the religious regime of enunciation. Once the pleonasm of Natural Religion is pushed aside, it becomes possible to take up, in the next two lectures, the question first of Gaia as it has been conceived by James Lovelock and of the Anthropocene as it has been explored by geologists and climate scientists. In the last two lectures, it becomes possible to reopen the political question at the heart of what will be life at the Anthropocene. Once the key question of what has been introduced, the search for a peace along the delineations allowed by politically relevant “planetary boundaries” to which Earthbound (the new word for Humans) accept to be bound become again possible.


There is a large and growing consensus in the scientific community that resolving the environmental crisis will require massive changes in our political and economic institutions and new standards for moral and ethical behavior. In this book, Robert Nadeau makes a convincing case that these remarkable developments could occur if sufficient numbers of environmentally concerned people participate in the new dialogue between the truths of science and religion. Those who enter this dialogue will discover that the most fundamental scientific truths in contemporary physics and biology are analogous to and fully compatible. During the course of this discussion, it should become clear that there are two reasons why the new dialogue between the truths or science and religion could greatly enhance the prospects of resolving the environmental crisis. The first is that this dialogue can serve as the basis for articulating and disseminating an environmental ethos with a profound spiritual dimension. And the second is that the widespread acceptance of ethos could result in the fairly rapid emergence of well-organized and highly effective worldwide movement in religious environmentalism.


Religion’s role in development has generally been viewed with suspicion, if not indifference, in scholarly and institutional concerns with development planning and policy. The last two decades, however, mark a departure, with a burgeoning interest in religion as a category of analysis in development studies. In this paper, I address the religion-sustainable development nexus specifically, and argue that religion—for both its constructive and destructive potential—must be considered in the sustainable development agenda. Specifically, I identify three ways in which religion may play an important role in enabling sustainable development—through its values, through its potential for social and ecological activism and in the realm of self-development.


Ecological restoration integrates the science and art of repairing ecosystems damaged by human activities. Despite relatively little attention from environmental ethicists, restoration projects continue to gain significance, drawing on citizen volunteers and large amounts of public funds, providing an important model of responding to ecological crisis. Restored to Earth provides the first comprehensive examination of the religious and ethical dimensions and significance of contemporary restoration practice, an ethical framework that advances the field of environmental ethics in a more positive, action-oriented, experience-based direction. Van Wieren brings together insights and examples from restoration ecology, environmental ethics, religious studies, and conservation and Christian thought, as well as her own personal experiences in ecological restoration, to propose a new restoration ethic grounded in the concrete, hands-on experience of humans working as partners with the land.


This study explores identity in providing voluntary help for endangered animal species. Identity is a cornerstone of social psychological explanations of helping behavior but has not been understood in relation to human-animal relationships. Open-ended questionnaires were administered to 111 volunteers working in a range of international conservation projects aimed at protecting endangered animals. Participants were asked their reasons for volunteering, choice of project, experiences and expectations. Thematic textual analysis explored common features across the data set. Themes identified were identifying with animals, humans dominating nature and collective identity.
with the organization and fellow volunteers. The paper suggests social psychological knowledge about helping behavior be applied to understand human-animal interactions to offer insight into the conditions under which we will engage with conservational and environmental concerns and provide aid. Social psychology has been slow to apply its knowledge to an examination of human responses to the challenge of loss of biodiversity. To act, humans must identify with those they seek to protect.


This book presents a holistic overview of climate change uncertainty and offers a number of pathways that could be used to account for such uncertainties in the stated preference valuation research. It shows that uncertainty plays an important role in determining the values of climate change mitigation benefits. Valuing Climate Change Mitigation discusses the role of uncertainty in valuing the benefits of climate change mitigation policies using contingent valuation and choice experiments techniques. It treats climate change using three dimensions of uncertainty: scenario, policy and preference. Conceptual frameworks are advanced to account simultaneously for these various dimensions of uncertainty. The authors then explore the impact on introducing these uncertainties into benefit estimates for the Australian Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. The authors present frameworks to account for multiple uncertainty in environmental decision analysis that will prove invaluable for academics and students in the fields of environmental economics and management. Policy makers will also gain invaluable methodological insight.


The term ‘systems theory’ is used to characterize a set of disparate yet related approaches to fields as varied as information theory, cybernetics, biology, sociology, history, literature, and philosophy. The book draws attention to the traditions of systems theory in their historical development, especially as related to the humanities and social sciences, and shows how from these traditions various contemporary developments have ensued. It provides a guide for strains of thought that are key to understanding 20th century intellectual life in many areas.


America is currently transitioning from fossil fuels to renewable energy alternatives, but that transition is grudging and erratic. This lies in part with the fact that the technologies that enable renewable alternatives are still evolving. However, a larger part of the explanation lies with a pervasive failure to acknowledge the inevitability of adopting renewable sources for future energy needs. That failure of recognition is rooted in how the transition to renewable energy is framed. Prosperity and economic growth are linked to fossil fuels by past practices. That link and a complacency reinforced by influential economic actors with vested interests in the fossil fuel economy militate against a robust commitment to the advancing alternative energy future.


The Greenhouse Development Rights (GDRs) Framework is a proposal for a global climate agreement in which the obligations assigned to nations are based on a combination of responsibility (contribution to the problem) and capacity (ability to pay). A key feature of the GDRs framework is that it is modeled on the assignment of a ‘right to development’ to individuals, such that individuals with incomes below a ‘development threshold’ are nominally exempted from obligations to pay for mitigation and adaptation. Obligations for those ‘over the threshold’ are calculated in the same way for rich persons in poor countries and rich persons in rich countries. As income distribution within countries is taken into account and all countries have some wealthy people, all countries have a positive obligation to contribute to global mitigation and adaptation requirements, eliminating the sharp distinction between Annex I and non-Annex I countries. In the last few years, GDRs has become one of the most widely known of the many so-called burden-sharing frameworks that have been proposed. In this essay, one of the coauthors of the GDRs framework presents the framework’s fundamental principles, describes its place in the larger discussion of burden-sharing and climate justice, and reflects on its prospects in the next phase of the global climate negotiations. Hopefully it will be helpful both to readers new to GDRs and to our existing supporters and critics.


This volume explores the interactions between organisms and their environments and how this entanglement is a fundamental aspect of all life. It brings together the work and ideas of historians, philosophers, biologists, and social scientists, uniting a range of new perspectives, methods, and frameworks for examining and understanding the ways that organisms and environments interact. It is organized into three main sections: historical perspectives, contested models, and emerging frameworks. The first section explores the origins of the modern idea of organism-environment interaction in the mid-nineteenth century and its development by later psychologists and anthropologists. In the second section, a variety of controversial models from mathematical representations of evolution to model organisms in medical research are discussed and reframed in light of recent questions about the interplay between organisms and environment. The third section investigates several new ideas that have the potential to reshape key aspects of the biological and social sciences. Populations of organisms evolve in response to changing environments; bodies and minds depend on a wide array of circumstances for their development; cultures create complex relationships with the natural world even as they alter it irrevocably.


Why do we keep talking about so many environmental problems and rarely solve any? If these are scientific issues, then why can’t scientists solve them or at least agree on what to do? In his new book, The Moon in the Nautilus Shell, ecologist Daniel Botkin explains why. For one thing, although we live in a world of constantly changing environments and talk a lot about climate change, most of our environmental laws, policies, and scientific premises are based on the idea that the environment is constant, never changing, except when people affect it. For another, we have lost contact with nature in personal ways. Disconnected from our surroundings, we lack the deep understanding and feelings about the environment to make meaningful judgments. The environment has become just another one of those special interests that interferes with our lives.


There has been a recent increase of interest within the academic literature on the justice issues posed by climate change and the human responses to its present and forecasted effects. This literature is partially shaped by debates from environmental justice scholarship, but also has roots in various subfields of geography. In two parts (here and in a subsequent article), we review and synthesize the recent literature by asking what climate justice concerns have been identified within three related realms: (i) the characterization of climate change itself and the assignment of responsibility for that change; (ii) the differential or uneven impacts of climate change; and (iii) the actions taken
to address the problems associated with climate change, including mitigation and adaptation. Here, in Part 1, we provide a basic outline of justice concepts; we address the characterization of climate change and the associated discursive framings; and we discuss the uneven impacts of climate change with a focus on the conceptualization of vulnerability. We suggest that the field of geography has much to offer to the debate on climate justice because of its unique understanding of the human-environment relationship based on a longstanding engagement with the spatiality and scale of environmental change, the corresponding human impacts, and the conceptual inseparability of nature and society. We identify, across Part 1 and Part 2, the need for a more comprehensive theory of justice to inform climate justice considerations - one that pays more attention to linked procedural, recognition, and scalar concerns.


Since Mill’s seminal work On Liberty, philosophers and political theorists have accepted that we should respect the decisions of individual agents when those decisions affect no one other than themselves. Indeed, to respect autonomy is often understood to be the chief way to bear witness to the intrinsic value of persons. In this book, Sarah Conly rejects the idea of autonomy as inviolable. Drawing on sources from behavioural economics and social psychology, she argues that we are so often irrational in making our decisions that our autonomous choices often undercut the achievement of our own goals. Thus in many cases it would advance our goals more effectively if government were to prevent us from acting in accordance with our decisions. Her argument challenges widely held views of moral agency, democratic values and the public/private distinction, and will interest readers in ethics, political philosophy, political theory and philosophy of law.


This book is a philosophically oriented introduction to bioethics. It offers the reader an overview of key debates in bioethics relevant to various areas including; organ retrieval, stem cell research, justice in healthcare and issues in economic development, including issues surrounding food and agriculture. The book also seeks to go beyond simply describing the issues in order to provide the reader with the methodological and theoretical tools for a more comprehensive understanding of current bioethical debates. The aim of the book is to present bioethics as an interdisciplinary field, to explore its close relation to other disciplines (such as law, life sciences, theology and philosophy), and to discuss the conditions under which bioethics can serve as an academically legitimate discipline that is at the same time relevant to society.


*Flourishing* invites you into a conversation between a teacher, John R. Ehrenfeld, and his former student now professor, Andrew J. Hoffman, as they discuss how to create a sustainable world. Unlike virtually all other books about sustainability, this one goes beyond the typical stories that we tell ourselves about repairing the environmental damages of human progress. Through their dialogue and essays that open each section, the authors uncover two core facets of our culture that drive the unsustainable, unsatisfying, and unfair social and economic machines that dominate our lives. First, our collective model of the way the world works cannot cope with the inherent complexity of today’s highly connected, high-speed reality. Second, our understanding of human behavior is rooted in this outdated model. Driven by the old guard, sustainability has become little more than a fashionable idea. As a result, both business and government are following the wrong path—at best applying temporary, less rooted solutions that will fail to leave future generations in better shape. To shift the pendulum, this book tells a new story, driven by being and caring, as opposed to having and needing, rooted in the beauty of complexity and arguing for the transformative cultural shift that we can make based on our collective wisdom and lived experiences. Then, the authors sketch out the road to a flourishing future, a change in our consumption and a new approach to understanding and acting.


Techniques of genetic engineering are changing the role of living things in the production process. What do these cutting edge developments in biotechnology tell us about our relationship to nature? Going beyond the usual focus on the ethics and risks surrounding genetically modified organisms, Kenneth Fish takes the emergence of living factories as an opportunity to revisit fundamental questions concerning the relation between human beings, technology, and the natural world. He examines the coincidence of the living factory metaphor in contemporary accounts of biotechnology and in the work of Karl Marx, who described the machine as “a mechanical monster whose body fills whole factories, and whose demonic powers... burst forth in the fast and feverish whirl of its countless working organs.” Fish shows that living factories reveal the unique role of capitalism in infusing the forces of nature with conscious purpose subordinated to processes of commodification and accumulation, and that they give a new meaning, and urgency, to the liberation of the forces of production from the fetters of capital.


From diets to economic growth, everything these days has to be sustainable. Ulrich Grober reassesses the concept of sustainability using a range of fascinating historical instances of its application. He considers the vision of men such as Hans Carl von Carlowitz, credited with having first formulated the three pillars of sustainability: environmental equilibrium, economic security, and social justice. The journey takes in Francis of Assisi’s 13th-century Canticle of the Sun, as well as Greek philosophers and Enlightenment scholars. Grober reveals that sustainability, whether in the court of Louis XIV or the silver mines of Saxony, is always born of crisis and yet also marks the birth of a new awareness, a realization that the planet we live on has to be sustained and preserved for future generations. This book offers a historically nuanced introduction to a concept that could not be of more pressing importance for the 21st century.


Solving environmental problems requires a scientific understanding of public attitudes. Like rocks in a swollen river, attitudes often lie beneath the surface—hard to see, and even harder to move or change. In *Navigating Environmental Attitudes*, Thomas Heberlein helps us read the water and negotiate its hidden obstacles, explaining what attitudes are, how they change and influence behavior. Rather than necessarily trying to change public attitudes, we need to design solutions and policies with them in mind. He illustrates these points by tracing the attitudes of the well-known environmentalist Aldo Leopold, while tying social psychology to real-world behaviors throughout the book.


This article gives a concise introduction to the ‘tragedy of the anticommons.’ The anticommons thesis is simple: when too many people own pieces of one thing, nobody can use it. Usually, private ownership creates wealth. But too much ownership has the opposite effect - it leads to wasteful underuse. This is a free market paradox that shows up all across the global economy. If too many owners control a single resource, cooperation breaks down, wealth disappears, and everybody loses. Conceptually, underuse in an anticommons mirrors the familiar problem of overuse in a ‘tragedy of the commons.’ The field of anticommons studies is now well-established. Over a thousand scholars have detailed examples from across the innovation frontier, including drug patenting, telecom licensing, climate change, compulsory land purchase, oil field unitisation, music and art copyright, and post-socialist economic transition. Fixing anticommons tragedy is a key challenge for any legal system committed to innovation and economic growth.
It has been said that new discoveries and developments in the human, social, and natural sciences hang “in the air” (Bowler, 1983; 2008) prior to their consumption. While neo-Darwinist biology has been powerfully served by its mechanistic metaphysic and a reductionist methodology in which living organisms are considered machines, many of the chapters in this volume explore the paradox of interconnection. Pausing scientists and philosophers together, this volume explores what might be termed “the New Frontiers” of biology, namely contemporary areas of research that appear to call an updating, a supplementation, or a relaxation of some of the main tenets of the Modern Synthesis. Such areas of investigation include: Emergence Theory, Systems Biology, Biosemiotics, Homeostasis, Symbiogenesis, Niche Construction, the Theory of Organic Selection (also known as “the Baldwin Effect”), Self-Organization and Teleodynamics, as well as Epigenetics.


In the US and Europe, factory farm animal welfare has become a matter of significant public concern, leading to increased scientific research on animal welfare in order to guide public policy. In both locations, scientific opinion is growing that farm animal welfare is directly related to their capacities for subjective experiences and, as a result, increased research is on cognition, behavior, and emotions. The geography of science and animal geography literatures have broadly examined, respectively but with overlap, the social construction of scientific knowledge and ideas about animal subjectivity. This article argues that these literatures should be further employed to better understand the current construction and social negotiation of the concept of farm animal welfare in Europe and particularly in the US, specifically through the exploration of three significant spaces of knowledge production: the geopolitical environments of the US and Europe, the particular scientific research spaces, and animal spaces or the “locations” of their subjectivity.


Climate engineering has emerged in recent years as an extremely controversial technology. And for good reason: it carries unknown risks and it may undermine commitments to conserving energy. Some critics also view it as an immoral human breach of the natural world. The latter objection, David Keith argues in A Scientist’s Case for Climate Engineering, is groundless; we have been using technology to alter our environment for years. But he agrees that there are large issues at stake. Keith offers no naïve proposal for an easy fix to what is perhaps the most challenging question of our time; climate engineering is no silver bullet. But he argues that after decades during which very little progress has been made in reducing carbon emissions we must put this technology on the table and consider it responsibly.


Illuminating the foundations for contemporary women’s environmental writing, Fallen Forests shows how nineteenth-century predecessors marshaled powerful affective, ethical, and spiritual resources to chaste, educate, and motivate readers to engage in positive social change. It contributes to scholarship in American women’s writing, ecofeminism, ecocriticism, and feminist rhetoric, expanding the literary, historical, and theoretical grounds for some of today’s most pressing environmental debates. Karen L. Kilcup rejects prior critical emphases on sentimentalism to show how women writers have drawn on their literary emotional intelligence to raise readers’ consciousness about social and environmental issues. She also critiques ecocriticism’s idealizing tendency, which has elided women’s complicity in agendas that depart from today’s environmental orthodoxies.


With the emergence of education for sustainable development (ESD), robust literature on ethics and ESD has emerged; however, ecocentric perspective developed within environmental ethics is marginalized in current ESD debates. The questions discussed in this article are as follows: Why is the distinction between anthropocentric and ecocentric view of environment salient to ESD? How can this distinction be operationalized and measured? Until now, little has been done to address complement quantitative studies of environmental attitudes by qualitative studies, exploring the sociocultural context in which ecocentric or anthropocentric attitudes are being formed. Neither of existing scales engaged with the interface between environmental ethics and sustainable development. This article will discuss ESD in the context of environmental ethics and present the results of the case study conducted with the Dutch Bachelor-level students. Results of qualitative evaluation of the scale measuring ecocentric and anthropocentric attitudes will be presented, and the new Ecocentric and Anthropocentric Attitudes toward the Sustainable Development (EAATSD) scale will be proposed.


This article suggests that environmental ethics can have great relevance for environmental ethical content analyses in educational environment and education for sustainable development research. It is based on a critique that existing educational research does not reflect the variety of environmental ethical theories. Accordingly, we suggest an alternative and more nuanced environmental ethical conceptual framework divided into Value-oriented Environmental Ethics and Relation-oriented Environmental Ethics and present two pragmatic schedules for analyses of the value and relation contents of e.g. classroom conversations, textbooks and policy documents. This framework draws on a comparative reading of some 30 key books and 20 key articles in academic journals in the field of environmental philosophy and reflects main traits in environmental ethics from the early 1970s to the present day.


Comprised of three parts, each complemented by a short introductory paragraph, this collection presents a variety of approaches to the challenge of conserving an existing situation, evolutionary development, or the intentional substitution of one genome, species or ecosystem for another. The chapters cover the perspectives of environmental scientists with expertise in evolutionary, environmental biology, systematic zoology and botany, as well as those of researchers with expertise in philosophy, ethics, politics, law and economics. This combination facilitates a truly interdisciplinary debate by highlighting hitherto unacknowledged implications that inform current academic and political debates on biodiversity and its protection. The book should be of interest to students and researchers of environmental studies, biodiversity, environmental philosophy, ethics and management.


Many people believe that only an ecological catastrophe will change humanity’s troubled relationship with the natural world. In fact, as J.B. MacKinnon argues in this unorthodox look at the disappearing wilderness, we are living in the midst of a disaster thousands of years in the making—and we barely notice it. We have forgotten
what nature can be and adapted to a diminished world of our own making. In *The Once and Future World*, MacKinnon invites us to remember nature as it was, to reconnect to nature in a meaningful way, and to remake a wilder world everywhere. He goes looking for landscapes untouched by human hands.


*Zoo Animal Welfare* thoroughly reviews the scientific literature on the welfare of zoo and aquarium animals. The authors’ academic training in the interdisciplinary field of psychobiology provides a unique perspective for evaluating the ethics, practices, and standards of modern zoos and aquariums. The book offers a blueprint for the implementation of welfare measures and an objective rationale for their widespread use. The authors speak directly to caretakers working on the front lines of zoo management, and to the decision-makers responsible for elevating the priority of animal welfare in their respective zoos. In great detail, Maple and Perdue demonstrate how zoos and aquariums can be designed to achieve optimal standards of welfare and wellness.


Modern efforts to conserve biodiversity have their foundations in older traditions of resource management and nature protection. This article traces the history of the conservation movement, focusing on events and patterns that led to the emergence of biodiversity conservation from earlier utilitarian and preservation-oriented approaches. The evolution of the movement reflects the dynamic interplay of conservation science, philosophy, policy, and practice in achieving goals that have themselves been subject to change. Because the conservation movement continues to redefine itself, this article concludes with a consideration of key themes from recent history.


*The Upcycle* is the follow-up to *Cradle to Cradle*. Drawing on the lessons gained from 10 years of putting the Cradle to Cradle concept into practice, William McDonough and Michael Braungart envision the next step in the solution to our ecological crisis: We don’t just use or reuse resources with greater effectiveness, we actually improve the world as we live, create, and build. Instead of protecting the planet from human impact, why not redesign our activity to improve the environment? We can have a beneficial footprint. Abundance for all. The goal is within our reach.


Some argue that the new ecological paradigm (NEP) scale is incomplete and does not adequately reflect contemporary debates in environmental ethics. We focus on one specific shortcoming of the NEP, its lack of an item to reflect an ecocentric viewpoint. To test this concern, we administered the NEP to three different audiences and included one additional item to capture an ecocentric perspective. The empirical tests were designed to determine whether the addition of such an item changed results in a meaningful way. We find evidence that NEP may already capture ecocentric viewpoints, but our investigation leads us to question the validity and reliability of the NEP in capturing ecological worldview.


Forty years ago, at the birth of environmental law, both legal and philosophical luminaries assumed that the new field would be closely connected with environmental ethics. Instead, the two grew dramatically apart. This article diagnoses that divorce and proposes a rapprochement. Environmental law has always grown through changes in public values; for this and other reasons, it cannot do so without ethics. Law and ethics are most relevant to each other when there are large open questions in environmental politics: lawmakers act only when some ethical clarity arises; but law can itself assist in that ethical development. This process is true now in a set of emerging issues: the law of food systems, animal rights, and climate change. This article draws on philosophy, history, and psychology to develop an account of the ethical changes that might emerge from each of these issues, and proposes legal reforms to foster that ethical development.


Ecosystem services research has been focused on the ways that humans directly benefit from goods and services, and economic valuation techniques have been used to measure those benefits. We argue that, although it is appropriate in some cases, this focus on direct use and economic quantification is often limiting and can detract from environmental research and effective management, in part by crowding out other understandings of human—environment relationships. Instead, we make the case that the systematic consideration of multiple metaphors of such relationships in assessing social—ecological systems will foster better understanding of the many ways in which humans relate to, care for, and value ecosystems. Where it is possible, we encourage a deliberative approach to ecosystem management whereby ecosystem researchers actively engage conservationists and local resource users to make explicit, through open deliberation, the types of metaphors salient to their conservation problem.


Many experts agree that energy is the defining issue of this century. Economic recessions, foreign wars, and foreclosures are only a few of the results of America’s dependence on oil. In *Terra Nova*, ecologist Eric Sanderson elucidates the interconnections between oil and money, cars and transportation, and suburbs and land use. He then charts a path toward renewed economic growth, enhanced national security, revitalized communities, and a sustainable environment: a new form of the American Dream. Taking a cross-disciplinary, accessible approach, Sanderson delves into natural history, architecture, chemistry, and politics, to show how the American relationship to nature shaped our past and predicates our future. Illustrated throughout with maps, charts, and infographics, the book suggests how we achieve a better world through a self-reinforcing cycle of tax reform, retrofitted towns and cities, bicycles and streetcars, and investment in renewable energy.


Restoration is a young and swiftly developing field. It has been almost a decade since the inception of one of the field’s foundational documents—the Society for Ecological Restoration International Primer on Ecological Restoration (Primer). Through a series of organized discussions, we assessed the Primer for its currency and relevance in the modern field of ecological restoration. We focused our assessment on the section entitled “The Nine Attributes of a Restored Ecosystem” and grouped each of the attributes into one of four categories: species composition, ecosystem function, ecosystem stability, and landscape context. We found that in the decade since the document’s inception, the concepts, methods, goals, and thinking of ecological restoration have shifted significantly. We discuss each of the four categories in this light with the aim of offering comments and suggestions on options for updating
the Primer. We also include a fifth category that we believe is increasingly acknowledged in ecological restoration: the human element. The Primer is an important document guiding the practice of restoration. We hope that this critical assessment contributes to its ongoing development and relevance and more generally to the development of restoration ecology, particularly in our current era of rapid environmental change.


In Strange Natures, Nicole Seymour investigates the ways in which queer fictions offer insight on environmental issues through their performance of a queer understanding of nature, the nonhuman, and environmental degrada-
tion. By drawing upon queer theory and eco-criticism, Seymour examines how queer fictions extend their critique of “natural” categories of gender and sexuality to the nonhuman natural world, thus constructing a queer envi-
ronmentalism. Seymour’s analyses illustrate how homophobia, classism, racism, sexism, and xenophobia inform dominant views of the environment and help to justify its exploitation. Calling for a queer environmental ethics, she delineates the discourses that have worked to prevent such an ethics and argues for a concept of queerness that is attuned to environmentalism’s urgent futurity, and an environmentalism that is attuned to queer sensibilities.


Taking Sides volumes present current controversial issues in a debate-style format designed to stimulate student interest and develop critical thinking skills. Each issue is thoughtfully framed with Learning Outcomes, an Issue Summary, an Introduction, and an Exploring the Issue section featuring Critical Thinking and Reflection, Is There Common Ground?, and Additional Resources. Taking Sides readers also offer a Topic Guide and an annotated listing of Internet References for further consideration of the issues. An online Instructor’s Resource Guide with testing material is available for each volume. Using Taking Sides in the Classroom is also an excellent instructor resource. Visit www.mhhe.com/takingsides for more details.


In his bestselling book The World Without Us, Alan Weisman considered how the Earth could heal and even refill empty niches if relieved of humanity’s constant pressures. But with a million more of us every 4 ½ days on a planet that’s not getting any bigger, and with our exhaust overheating the atmosphere and altering the chemistry of the oceans, prospects for a sustainable human future seem ever more in doubt. For this follow-up book, Weis-
man traveled to more than 20 countries to ask what experts agreed were probably the most important questions on Earth—and also the hardest: How many humans can the planet hold without collapsing? How must we actually arrive at a stable, optimum population, and design an economy to allow genuine prosperity without endless growth?


Environmental law has failed us all. As ecosystems collapse across the globe and the climate crisis intensifies, envi-
ronmental agencies worldwide use their authority to permit the very harm that they are supposed to prevent. This book exposes what is wrong with environmental law and offers transformational change based on the public trust doctrine. An ancient and enduring principle, the trust doctrine asserts public property rights to crucial resources. Its core logic compels government, as trustee, to protect natural inheritance such as air and water for all humanity. Propelled by populist impulses and democratic imperatives, the public trust surfaces at epic times in history as a manifest human right. But until now it has lacked the precision necessary for citizens, government employees, legis-
lators, and judges to fully safeguard the natural resources we rely on for survival and prosperity.


Amidst all the wondrous luxuries of the modern world—smartphones, fast intercontinental travel, Internet mov-
ies, fully stocked refrigerators—lies an unnerving fact that may be even more disturbing than all the environmental and social costs of our lifestyles. The fragmentations of our modern lives, our disconnections from nature and from the consequences of our actions, make it difficult to follow our own values and ethics, so we can no longer be truly ethical beings. When we buy a computer or a hamburger, our impacts ripple across the globe, and, dissociated from them, we can’t quite respond. Our personal and professional choices result in damages ranging from radio-
active landscapes to disappearing rainforests, but we can’t quite see how. Environmental scholar Kenneth Worthy traces the broken pathways between consumers and clean-room worker illnesses, superfund sites in Silicon Valley, and massively contaminated landscapes in rural Asian villages. His psychologically based explanation confirms that our disconnections make us more destructive and that we must bear witness to nature and our consequences.


In this edition of Moyers & Company, biologist, mother, and activist Sandra Steingraber joins Bill Moyers to explain why she was willing to go to jail for blocking access to the construction of a storage and transportation facility involved in the controversial process of fracking. Steingraber has become internationally known for build-
ing awareness about the “toxic trespassers” she says are contaminating our air, water, and food—and threatening our children’s health. With government ensnared by the very industries it’s supposed to regulate, Steingraber has lost patience with politicians and corporations but says our kids need to know that “mom is on the job” of preventing destruction to the environment. Also on the show, Bill presents the short documentary Dance of the Honey Bee, narrated by author Bill McKibben, which looks at threats these crucial pollinators face from a rapidly changing landscape.

Rolston, Holmes III. Rediscovering, Rethinking Green Fire. Orem, Utah: Utah Valley University, 2013. Streaming Video (49 min.).

Aldo Leopold shot a wolf a hundred years ago, the most iconic wolf kill in conservation history. He recalled the “green fire” in her dying eyes, metaphor and symbol, and his “thinking like a mountain,” when launching his land ethic, on a moral frontier. Leopold is reconsidered, searching for an Earth ethics for the new millennium, think-
ing like a planet.

TEDxDeExtinction. TEDxDeExtinction: Friday, March 15, 2013. Washington DC, Grosvenor Auditorium, Na-
tional Geographic Headquarters, 2013.

A day-long conference to showcase the prospects of bringing extinct species back to life, along with a discussion of the ethical issues that will raise. TEDxDeExtinction is a TEDx event that explores a bold topic: reviving extinct species and re-introducing them to the wild. Can it be done responsibly? Should it be done at all? The full-day conference brings together a range of speakers to dive into the emerging idea of de-extinction.
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