

Lecture #4
13 January 2011
Copyright: Ronald B. Mitchell, 2011

- I. Introduction
 - A. If you have a Laptop PLEASE bring it to NEXT class for use in the simulation!
 - B. Five perspectives of the causes and solutions of environmental problems
 - C. Discuss three today and two on next class
- II. Ecophilosophical: Problem = people's and society's values are wrong. Solution = change values people hold. Education and direct action.
 - A. Problem = social values are wrong. Problem is at the societal level. People and societies don't value resources we do have appropriately. Deep ecology, GAIA principle, ecofeminism
 - B. Basic principles of deep ecology (from Devall, Bill; Sessions, George, Deep ecology, Salt Lake City, UT, Peregrine Smith Books, 1985, 70). Term coined by Arne Naess, Norwegian philosopher, in 1973 article
 1. All life forms have intrinsic value, independent of use to humans
 - C. Solution = changing the values people hold. Education and direct action.
 - D. 'Shallow ecology' view: In our interests to protect the environment
 1. Protect environment only insofar as harming the environment harms humans, e.g., mosquito eradication programs
 2. Current humans are better off if we do.
 3. Children as 'extensions' of current humans are better off if we do.
 - E. 'Medium ecology' view of Wapner (1997): environmental harm is 'bad' because it is another way by which powerful harm powerless. More palatable argument to current IR theory than deep ecology view.
 1. Liberal tradition: Maximize human freedom and only constrain it when conflicts with another human's freedom. Produces environmental insensitivity.
 2. 'Humans displace rather than solve environmental problems' (Wapner, 1997, 228).
 3. Ecojustice and environmental racism movements.
 - F. 'Deep ecology' view: ethical obligation to other species and other natural things
 1. To see 'self' as extended to include all of nature.
 2. Is it moral or amoral view? Morality as an obligation indifferent to one's interests and inclinations. Morality as 'other-regarding' or 'value-respecting' and amorality as 'self-regarding.'
 3. Should we be 'self-regarding' with an expanded notion of self (Kantian/Wapnerian - to other humans, or Fox/Naess - to ecosystem), or 'other-regarding' with a traditional notion of self? On what basis should we decide?
 4. Several main points of deep ecology
 - a) Not man in environment dichotomy but more holistic view.
 - b) Biospherical egalitarianism - only take what is necessary for human life
 - c) Diversity of all life is to be valued.
 - d) Anti-class posture
 - e) Fight against pollution and resource depletion
 - f) Complexity, not complication. Notably, 'the implementation of ecologically responsible policies requires in this century an exponential growth of technical skill and invention' (Naess, 122).
 - g) Local autonomy and decentralization - sensitivity to local conditions; damage is done to the extent that decision-makers are far away.
 5. Ecocentrism vs. anthropocentrism -
 - a) Notion that man is separate from and placed over, rather than only one part of the natural world. Dualism of mind and body, man and nature, is inaccurate.
 - b) Note that Judaeo-Christian, anthropocentric philosophy created philosophical structures and concepts that reinforced the relationship that was being created between humans and nature.
 - c) Movement away from nature worship, Goddess worship, ecocentric views of the world.
 - G. Ecofeminist view
 1. Cause and source of the environmental problem is the alienation of humans from the earth. Redemption of ourselves and remedy of environmental degradation can only come from resurrecting our connection with the earth.

2. Domination of earth parallels and stems from the same sources as domination of women. Most significant domination in society is not poor by the rich, or lower by upper classes, but is women by men. But also involves lower class and indigenous oppression.
 - a) Causal logic: fear and resentment cause male urges to dominate nature - including women - which in turn leads to hierarchy, militarism, mechanism and industrialism. Single independent variable which, when it takes a certain value (fear and resentment), causes a whole host of dependent variables to have values we don't like, such as hierarchy, militarism, pollution, etc.
 - b) Call is for a 'new philosophical underpinning of civilization' (Spretnak, 11), more radical and major change than other views. Empathetic caring for the earth, moving away from 'technocratic alienation and nihilism' (Spretnak, 13). Must break 'the alienation of women and men from each other and both from nature' (Merchant, 103).
 3. Movement towards goddess worship.
- H. Conclusions on ecophilosophy approaches
1. Are appeals to morality (e.g., Wapner and Reitan) or appeals to interests (instrumentalist and Naess view) more effective at generating action?
 2. Deep ecology posits a need to change the relationship between humans and the environment, though even stating it that way reinforces the dualism that is alleged to be the source of the problem.
 3. Causality still exists in both worlds. Can still lay out things in causal terms.
- III. Political: Problem = those with power don't have incentives to conserve environment, and those with incentives to conserve environment don't have power. Solution:
- A. Problem = those with power don't have incentives to conserve environment, and those with incentives to conserve environment don't have power.
 1. In words of Thucydides, "The strong do what they can while the weak suffer what they must."
 2. Structure of anarchic international system means that power, not law, determines outcomes
 - B. Problem is not the lack of resources but their distribution. Developed world extracts from developing.
 - C. Solution = find ways to make it in interests of powerful to protect the environment.
 1. Assumption is that, while international laws are non-existent or wrongly formulated, the nature of the anarchic international system prevents effective laws from being created and put into operation.
 - D. Sovereignty and the environment. Is it the problem? Litfin's (1997) argument. Really asking both what is effect of sovereignty on environment and what is effect of environment on sovereignty
 1. Source of harm: Countries' borders do not match environmental borders. Collective action unlikely if states act as 'individuals'; nonintervention norm protects internal environmental destruction
 2. Source of solution: only state has necessary and sufficient power resources to address problem; free trade challenges to sovereignty may harm the environment;
 3. Erosion of sovereignty thesis
 - a) Starting analysis: if sovereignty is eroding, and environment is getting worse, what does that say about sovereignty-environment relationship?
 - b) Eroding from below (taken by NGOs) and from above (given to regimes and IGOs)
 4. Environment source of change to sovereignty:
 - a) Autonomy: independence in making decisions - clearly compromised by international cooperation. Must consult with other states and other actors within state (e.g., NGOs).
 - b) Control: ability to produce effect. Should developed countries relinquish control? Should developing countries? International agreements may increase ability for control in developing world by constraining actions of developed world. Loss of control in enviro realm leads to international cooperation and less autonomy in order to regain control.
 - c) Legitimacy: recognized right to make rules. Traditionally based in power, but increasingly based in science, and to lesser extent in morality.
 5. Global civil society issues
 - E. If we could get rid of the state, should we?
 1. Is it the power of states that lead them to destroy the environment?
 2. Is it the interests of states that lead them to destroy the environment?
 3. Should power go 'down' to NGOs or go 'up' to IGOs and regimes?
 4. Once decide what should do, how would we get there?