PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACHES TO THE ENVIRONMENT
GESTALT SHIFT
DEEP ECOLOGY

- Shift: humans as locus of value $\rightarrow$ humans as part of creation on-going; total-field conception of nature
  - Reform environmental attitudes $\rightarrow$ revolutionize
- Goal of reinhabitation: learning how to dwell in and care for a place
- Central intuition: all entities are constituted by their relationships; no sharp ontological boundaries
DEEP ECOLOGY

- Value stance toward facts
  + Facts themselves permit numerous stances
- Biospherial unity + biospherial egalitarianism

Deep ecology *in principle vs. in practice*

- Problem: resolving value conflicts/ethical dilemmas
- Fox’s solution: “organisms are entitled to moral consideration commensurate with their degree of central organization (or capacity for richness of experience)” (258)

*Equal intrinsic worth of all members of biotic community*
IS IT RATIONAL TO CREATE ONE WORLD AND NOT THE OTHER?

BEAUTIFUL WORLD (THAT NO ONE WILL EVER ENJOY)?

UGLY WORLD (THAT NO ONE WILL EVER DISLIKE)?
IS IT RATIONAL TO CREATE ONE WORLD AND NOT THE OTHER?

WORLD WITH ONLY NON-CONSCIOUS LIFE?

VS.

WORLD WITH NO LIFE (EVER)?
Biocentric individualism

- Varner: (all or some) living entities have intrinsic value
  - Anthropocentrism and sentientism can count as BI, though they are more specific on which entities have intrinsic value

- Others BI theorists: all living entities have intrinsic value
  - Disagreement re: how much intrinsic value different entities have

  - Contrast: Taylor/Schweitzer vs. Attfield/Varner
  - Hierarchy of value does not entail that organisms with more intrinsic value are morally permitted to exploit/destroy/subdue those with less intrinsic value.
Moral standing if and only if it has interests
- Morally relevant: preference and biological interests
  - Do not need consciousness, desires, or mental states to have interests
- “mere existence of non-conscious life adds something to the goodness [i.e., intrinsic value] of the world” (114)

Hierarchically structured interests: in order to satisfy/fulfill $x$ (ground project), one needs to satisfy $y$ (categorical or non-categorical desire)
- $X$ is ordered above $y$, so satisfying $x$ is more important than satisfying $y
VARNER ON BIOCENTRIC INDIVIDUALISM

Equal moral consideration for layers of same kind -- regardless of the organism
Ecofeminism

- Patriarchy conceptually distinct from androcentrism (male-centered thinking)
  - But power asymmetries lead to oppression and marginalization in moral, legal, and social (public and private) spheres

- Warren’s Argument (C):
  1. Feminism is a movement to end sexism
  2. Sexism is conceptually linked with naturism.
  3. Thus, feminism is also a movement to end naturism.
QUESTIONS? COMMENTS?