

Readings and Assignments: Weeks One-Two


If you miss a class, check these *Readings and Assignments* handouts for assignments or handouts.


If you have questions about an assignment after class has adjourned, I prefer that you ask through the *Course Website* Bulletin Board so that all can benefit.

If you make a special arrangement with me about a due date, etc., write out a brief note to that effect and have me sign it. Keep the note to show to me if I forget our arrangement.

Des Jardins indicates the text, *Environmental Ethics*...

EDMF indicates *Environmental Decision-making Framework*

 indicates a handout in class.

# indicates material from *Philosophy 310 Course Pack* and # indicates its location..

[Titles with a dotted underline](#) are also available at *Course Website*.

Contents

In deference to our leaf-bearing friends, *Readings and Assignments* is handed out in instalments in case there are revisions as we go along, as there often are.

However, *Readings and Assignments* for the whole course is at the *Course Website*—just treat it as open to revision. Major due dates are listed below.

Introduction

[1. Thursday, January 8](#)

Environmental Decision-making Framework: Defining the Issue

[2. Thursday, January 15](#)

[3. Thursday, January 22](#)

Environmental Decision-making Framework: Finding Solutions

[3. Thursday, January 22](#)

[4. Thursday, January 29](#)

[5. Thursday, February 5](#)

Theories of Environmental Ethics/Negotiating Solutions

[5. Thursday, February 5](#): Seminars assigned.

Environmental Issue Project groups assigned.

[6. Thursday, February 12](#)

February 19-20: Mid-term Break

[7. Thursday, February 26](#)

[8. Thursday, March 4](#):

Seminar on Anthropocentric Ethics

Project Meeting: Anthropocentric Ethics

[9. Thursday, March 11](#)

[10. Thursday, March 18](#): Seminar on Non-anthropocentric Ethics

Project Meeting: Non-anthropocentric Ethics

[11. Thursday, March 25](#)

[12. Thursday, April 1](#): Seminar on Holistic Ethics

Project Meeting: Holistic Ethics

[13. Thursday, April 8](#)

[DUE April 22: Environmental Issue Project: Final Report](#)

1. Thursday, January 8**Introduction to the course**

[Course Description](#)

[Readings & Assignments: Weeks One-Two](#) (this handout)

[Introductory Questions](#)

Environmental Decision-making: Introduction

[Environmental Decision-making Framework](#)

[Environmental Decision-making: Introduction](#)

Co-op Work: What is the Environment?

[Methods of Inquiry](#)

Selections from Jonathan Baron, *Thinking and Deciding*

Selections from Samuel S. Komorita & Craig D. Parks, *Social Dilemmas*

Assignment

DUE NEXT SESSION if not completed in session 1: *Introductory Questions*

DO YOU HAVE QUESTIONS about the course, *Course Description, Methods of Inquiry?*

Ask at the next session, or through the course website bulletin board.

LOGON to the Course Website to make sure you can access it.

It is a good idea to check your myWebCT every couple of days to see if there are bulletin board messages, *e.g.*, clarifying an assignment.

LOOK OVER: *Methods of Inquiry;*

EDMF: Steps 1 & 2

DUE NEXT SESSION**Nature and Culture: Individual Prep Questions**

Using the method of model, contrary, and borderline examples, explain the difference between an invention and a discovery.

So, produce model, contrary, and borderline examples of inventions and of discoveries. Develop a definition of “invention” and of “discovery.”

Using these definitions, explain the difference between inventions and discoveries.

Yes, dictionaries can be useful, but do not treat them as, ahem, definitive since they are based on prominent usage of a word which can be wrong.

READ FOR NEXT SESSION:

Des Jardins chapter 1, section 2.4; [CHAPTER 8]

Selections from Donald Worster, *Nature's Economy*;

Dene Cultural Institute, “Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Environmental Assessment.”

Keep in mind your work on invention and discovery as you do this reading.

Assignment continued on next page...

You are not expected to master Worster on the history of ecology. (There are no exams in this course.) But it is important to have some notion of ecology's historical development, how that interplays with the wickedness of ecology and can allow for rivals to scientific ecology as articulated in the article from the Dene Cultural Institute.

DUE NEXT SESSION:

Why do you care?: Individual Prep Questions

For one of the environmental issues you indicated interest in on *Introductory Questions*, start to think about it in terms relevant parties and their interests.

See EDMF section 1 for guidance in formulating an issue.

In no more than about 400 words, explain why you care about it. Do you care about it because of how it affects wilderness? Nature? Animals? The environment? Ecological systems? Human interests? The interests of future generations? Other?

(It would save you some work if you pursued this issue for your *Environmental Issue Project*, but not so much work that you should worry about it much.)

READ Des Jardins chapter 2:

I do not intend to lecture on basic normative ethics, but I certainly will answer questions in class or on the course website bulletin board. If you feel the need for more background in this area, read James Rachels' *Elements of Moral Philosophy* or another introductory text.

READ FOR SESSION 3:

Kenneth E. Boulding, "The Economics of the Coming Spaceship Earth";
Des Jardins chapter 3;

Selections from Samuel S. Komorita & Craig D. Parks, *Social Dilemmas*.

It is very important to understand social dilemmas since they frame most environmental issues.

I have left out or bracketed (⌈⌋) most of the math (and math-fear inducing symbols), and most of the empirical research in psychology and sociology, which I nonetheless commend to you.

Selections from Jonathan Baron, *Thinking and Deciding*;

Do not be intimidated by the occasional bouts of math in this reading, especially in the early sections. Skip over those sections if they are not your idea of a good time. But try not to give up so that you will have a good idea of what the reading contains and can use it as a reference and cook book as the need arises.

2. Thursday, January 15

DUE: Introductory Questions

Nature and Culture: Individual Prep Questions

Why do you care?: Individual Prep Questions

QUESTIONS about the course, *Course Description, Methods of Inquiry?*

EDMF Steps 1 & 2: Modern Science and Wicked Ecology

Social Dilemmas: Introduction

Social Dilemmas: Matrix

Decision Making: Introduction

Selections from Jonathan Baron, *Thinking and Deciding*, Second Edition

Assignment

READ FOR SESSION 3:

Kenneth E. Boulding, “The Economics of the Coming Spaceship Earth”;
Des Jardins chapter 3;
Selections from Samuel S. Komorita & Craig D. Parks, *Social Dilemmas*.
Selections from Jonathan Baron, *Thinking and Deciding*;
 See explanations of reading under session 1 above.

DUE NEXT SESSION**Social Dilemmas: Individual Prep Questions**

1. For the situation assigned to you according to your last name, assign weights to the various utility factors in a pay-off matrix (*Social Dilemmas: Matrix*) so that the situation is a social dilemma, *i.e.*, it produces conflict between individual rationality (choose the dominant solution) and collective rationality (choose a Pareto optimal solution).

Then, explain whether the situation:

- involves public goods, *i.e.*, with jointness of supply, impossibility of excluding users, and discrete or continuous goods;
- is a Prisoners’ Dilemmas ($T > R > P > S$; $2R > (T + S)$);
- is a game of Chicken ($T > R > S > P$).

Situations:

Divorce: Two people are contesting a divorce to divide about \$100,000 of property. Each insists on settling for nothing less than \$65,000. Rather than divide the property equally, each threatens to a protracted legal battle that would see all the value of the contested property spent on lawyer’s fees. Even if they agree on a settlement, each can expect to spend about \$5,000 on legal fees.

(Last name: A-M)

Pricing: You have just purchased your own gas station and need to decide on your prices. Suppliers charge gas stations 30¢/litre. The gas station on the same intersection as your gas station charges its customers 50¢/litre. You figure that if you charge 50¢/litre, you will sell about 10,000 litres per month, but that if you lower your price to 45¢/litre, you will sell 15,000 litres per month if your competitor keeps the price at 50¢/litre.

(Last name: P-Samborski)

Boycott: A local cheese company has announced it will switch from using local milk to using cheaper milk from Alberta, putting at risk some local dairies that produce milk especially for making cheese. You are incensed and consider heeding the local dairy farmer’s association call for a boycott of the company’s products. But the company makes by far the best cheese available, which you sell in your delicatessen. So, as a local deli owner, you must consider the risk to local speciality dairies and the importance of supporting them, and the risk to your business of not selling the best cheese.

(Last name: Slaven-Z)

Assignment continued on next page...

For your assigned social dilemma:

2. Does it make sense to you logically, i.e., do the characteristics of social dilemmas help you understand how this situation is structured?
Does it make sense to you realistically, i.e., do the characteristics of social dilemmas help you understand what people actually do in this situation?
3. What approach would you be inclined to adopt towards it: Co-operator? Competitor? Individualist? Why?
Does it pose moral difficulties for deciding what to do in this situation?

LOOK OVER: EDMF: Steps 3-5.

DUE NEXT SESSION: EDMF Practice

This exercise simply requires you to go through the decision-making procedure at quite a basic level to ensure that you understand its fundamentals. You can worry about the finer points of the procedure later.

1. Define the problem.

1.1 Describe how things are.

Describe the situation you find yourself in such that you need to buy a car (or truck), *e.g.*, what you need the car for, how much you can afford to pay for it, etc. Include the interests of the major parties involved, *e.g.*, your family, friends, co-workers.

1.2 Ask an *Issue Question* to answer in order to resolve the issue.

It is doubtful that your *Problem Question* must at this step **require** you to buy a car. For example, it might leave open the possibility of renting a car occasionally while otherwise relying on public transport. However, for this exercise, restrict the question to deciding what car to buy.

So, your **goal** is to find a good answer to this *Issue Question*.

2. State your initial hypothesis for the best car to buy in order to achieve your goal from step 1.3.

3. Explain and justify criteria for a good resolution of the issue.

3.1 Identify and justify values that must be satisfied by a good solution.

3.2 Identify and justify other criteria that a good solution must meet.

While most of your criteria probably fall under 3.1 above, do consider feasibility criteria that you may have neglected there, *e.g.*, can you easily maintain a Ferrari in Chilliwack?

Assignment continued on next page...

3.3 Prioritise criteria by ranking them or assigning weights to them.

Distinguish non-compensatory and compensatory criteria.

Rank your criteria.

Obviously, non-compensatory criteria must be met.

Rank you compensatory criteria.

4. Identify at least three alternative cars for achieving your goal.

The selection is limited to vehicles for sale. So, there may not be a lot of room for creativity here unless you create imaginary cars. But do avoid unnecessary constraints on your choices, *e.g.*, failing to consider buying a truck, or an American car, or a used car.

5. Use criteria to decide on and justify your recommended resolution.

Use simplified rules:

Satisfice: Eliminate any alternative that does not meet your non-compensatory criteria. (Presumably, you would eliminate such possibilities even before seriously considering them as alternatives, *e.g.*, if you **need** a car that uses little gas, you would not seriously consider most SUVs.)

Rank each alternative for how well it meets each of the compensatory criteria. Add up the rankings: low score wins.

3. Thursday, January 22

EDMF Steps 1 & 2: Social Dilemmas

DUE: *Social Dilemmas: Individual Prep Questions*

Public Policy Framework Steps 3-5:

Introduction to ethical theories

Decision-making and economic rationality

DUE: EDMF Practice

Readings and Assignments: Weeks Three-Five

📄 indicates a course handout.

3. Thursday, January 22

📄 *Seminars*

📄 *Environmental Issue Project*

EDMF Steps 1 & 2

Ecological Knowledge: finish

Social Dilemmas

DUE: *Social Dilemmas: Individual Prep Questions*

Environmental Decision-making Framework Steps 3-5:

Introduction to Ethical Theories

Decision-making and economic rationality

DUE: EDMF Practice

Assignment

READ: Des Jardins chapter 4,

📄 Joel Feinberg, "The Rights of Animals and Unborn Generations"

DUE NEXT SESSION: Choose your environmental ethics issue in consultation with me.

You should decide this as soon as possible given the following assignment for session 5.

We can consult in person or by e-mail.

Your choice is constrained by how many other members of the class are interested in the same issue.

Obviously, your life will be easier if you already have some expertise in your policy area.

Issues should be neither too broad nor too narrow, *e.g.*, about what we should do about pollution from cars in BC, not about whether some particular person should drive an SUV nor about what should be done globally about pollution from cars. Even for a general issue such as what we should do about pollution from cars in BC, you should focus on some aspect of the issue that can be handled well within the limits of the *Project* length, *e.g.*, what, if anything, should we do about SUVs. Which solutions are best may depend upon the circumstances of particular jurisdictions, *e.g.*, rural or urban, North or South country.

Issues should be controversial, *i.e.*, there should be at least two **plausible** and **incompatible** positions on an issue, *i.e.*, positions where it is **not possible** to implement all aspects of all positions. For example, it is not possible **both** to allow individual consumers to decide how to equip their cars and for government to regulate pollution control devices on cars. However, it could be argued that it is compatible for consumers to decide how to equip their cars while government imposes tax differentials depending upon how cars are equipped.

Assignment continued on next page...

Issues should not rest only on empirical controversy. Many environmental issues involve empirical controversy that cannot be resolved with certainty, *e.g.*, the extent to which auto pollution contributes to global warming. Nonetheless, even if we make plausible assumptions about empirical issues, there are still important ethical issues to be argued, *e.g.*, the extent to which human interests should be sacrificed for the health of some ecosystem.

Be prepared to explain your issue to and brainstorm with others about additional information, parties and interests relevant to your and others' issues.

DUE NEXT SESSION: If you care, list your preferences for *Seminar* topics:

Extensionist ethics: extending moral consideration based on human traits to other individual things that share some of those traits;

Holistic ethics: basing moral consideration on other than human traits and thus including, *e.g.*, species, ecosystems, non-sentient environmental features, the biosphere.

Pluralist ethics: advocating use of various ethics in various contexts since there is no single, coherent, adequate environmental ethics

Pragmatic ethics: choosing a particular environmental ethics is not very important since they

tend to produce the same practical conclusions.

DUE SESSION 5: Steps 1 & 2: Explain your Environmental Ethics Issue.

In about 500 words, complete a rough draft of *Environmental Decision-making Framework* steps 1 and 2 for your environmental ethics issue.

This *Project* is **not** a research paper built on an exhaustive, comprehensive survey of the literature on empirical aspects of your issue. You are expected to be an expert empirical aspects of your issue only in comparison to other members of this class.

Do only as much research as necessary to provide yourself with the relevant background and the central arguments advanced by various plausible positions on the issue.

In particular, document any major agreements and disagreements about important empirical matters concerning this issue, and note major positions (including the reasons for them) about what should be done about this issue. Interviews with relevant experts or practitioners can be an excellent source of information.

Use footnotes to document your information.

The major part of your *Project* will be arguments about the **legitimacy** of various parties to the issue and their interests. So, at this stage, simply identify major parties and their interests without judging their legitimacy.

Take particular care in formulating your *Issue Question*.

4. Thursday, January 29

📖 **Negotiating**

EDMF Steps 3-5: finish

Introduction to Ethical Theories

Decision-making and economic rationality

Future generations

DUE: Choose your environmental ethics issue in consultation with me.

DUE: If you care, list your preferences for *Seminar* topics.

Brainstorm about your environmental issues: information, parties and interests

📖 **Rene Descartes, “Animals as Automata”**

📖 **Immanuel Kant, “Duties to Animals”**

📖 **William Baxter, “The Case for Optimal Pollution”**

Assignment

LOOK OVER 📖 *Negotiating*.

READ Des Jardins Chapter 5

📖 Rene Descartes, “Animals as Automata”

📖 Immanuel Kant, “Duties to Animals”

📖 William Baxter, “The Case for Optimal Pollution”

DUE SESSION 5: Steps 1 & 2: Explain your Environmental Ethics Issue.

See description of this assignment under session 3 *Assignment*.

DUE SESSION 6: STEP 3: Identify and briefly justify criteria for a good solution to your environmental issue.

With the results of group brainstorming about problem definition and criteria, in no more than about 500 words write a very rough draft of step3 of *EDMF*. Essentially, you are recording your initial thoughts about these criteria before we venture deeply into environmental ethics.

3.1 Briefly, justify which **parties** you believe should have what **interests** satisfied by a good resolution of your issue.

3.2 Explain the most important feasibility criteria that must be satisfied by a good resolution of your issue.

3.3 Decide which criteria in 3.1 and 3.2 are non-compensatory and which are compensatory.

You will probably revise these criteria many times as we look at different theories of environmental ethics.

Assignment continued on next page...

DUE NEXT SESSION: First Meeting Assignment for *Environmental Issue Project* group.
Make notes (to turn in) on what you want to accomplish for agenda items 1-3.

You will be assigned to a group with members working on a variety of environmental issues.

1. Decide who will serve as Chair and as Recorder for your Policy Project meetings.

After each meeting, there should be no doubt who will serve as Chair and as Recorder for the next meeting. You do not want to waste time at a meeting because no one was prepared to serve in these roles.

The easiest way to remove doubt is to select a continuing Chair and Vice-Chair (to act in the Chair's absence), First Recorder and Second Recorder (to act in the First Recorder's absence).

However, that risks having a Chair or Recorder who is not doing well but whom no one will be so impolite as to suggest replacing.

So, make your choice of having permanent or rotating Chairs and Recorders, so long as there is no doubt who will serve in these capacities at each next meeting.

The Chair convenes each meeting, reviews the agenda, chairs the meeting, ensures the agenda is set for next meeting and clarifies what preparatory work is required from each member.

The Chair does not have a license to impose its ideas on the group. If anything, the Chair should have **less** opportunity to express its views as it performs its duties.

The Recorder records and posts to the *Course Website* the minutes of each meeting, including:

- where, when, and for how long you met, and who attended;
- topics discussed, agreements reached, obstacles to agreement dealt with, obstacles to agreement that remain and steps taken to deal with them;
- significant arguments made about various issues;
- agenda for next meeting and responsibilities of members.

The fuller and better organized are these minutes, the more work will already have been done towards your *Final Report*. **So, select, care for and feed your Recorder well!**

A permanent Recorder should also have less responsibility than other members for preparing the *Group Report*.

2. Decide how your group will make decisions: Lottery? Simple majority? Stronger majority (e.g., two-thirds)? Consensus?

Negotiating parties first have to negotiate a framework agreement about how they will negotiate an agreement. You have no recourse to outside arbitration: you must decide for yourselves how you will decide. And how do you decide how to decide about how you will decide?

In part, your decision should be based on what you see as the point of negotiations:

- To ensure a fair process?
- To reach an agreement?
- To produce the best consequences?

Assignment continued on next page...

You must also be prepared to mediate disagreements within your group, essentially, to help each other follow procedures for successful negotiations.

Finally, how will you deal with a member who refuses to agree or who fails to keep agreements? Deciding on some procedures now should make it less likely that you will need to use them.

3. Develop Persona Profiles

From your earlier work, members of your group should have a fair list of parties with interests in your various environmental issues.

Your group should develop a Persona Profile for each member of your group so that these parties—or their defining characteristics—are represented in your group. A member of your group listed as, *e.g.*, old, should be on the look out for how old people might be affected differently by an environmental issue and should represent those differences to the group. See *Persona Profiles for Group Members* at the end of this handout for some characteristics that possibly should be represented in your group. (Characteristics that begin with an “S:” would require someone to, *e.g.*, act as a **steward** for sentient non-humans (not to be a sentient non-human).)

Do all the characteristics noted need to be represented? Are there missing characteristics that should be represented?

Obviously, a small group cannot represent all possible characteristics, *e.g.*, residents for every different country. But perhaps there should be a resident of a non-North country?

4. Reflect on this meeting and set the agenda for the next meeting.

How did today’s meeting go well? What could be done to help the next meeting go better?

Is the agenda and preparatory work for the next meeting clear?

5. Thursday, February 5

DUE SESSION 5: Steps 1 & 2: Explain your Environmental Ethics Issue.

EDMF Steps 3-5:

Decision-making and economic rationality

Negotiating

Future generations

Seminars assigned

Environmental Ethics: Introduction

Anthropocentrism

First *Environmental Issue Project* meeting

DUE: First Meeting Assignment for *Environmental Issue Project* group

Readings and Assignments: The Rest

5. Thursday, February 5

DUE: Steps 1 & 2: Explain your Environmental Ethics Issue.

EDMF Steps 3-5:

Decision-making and economic rationality

Negotiating

Future generations

Environmental Ethics: Introduction

Seminars assigned:

Anthropocentric and extensionist ethics: Jason R, Stuart, Jeremy

Holistic ethics: Trevor, Jason M, Sarah, Alison

First *Environmental Issue Project* meeting

DUE: First Meeting Assignment for *Environmental Issue Project* group

Assignment

DUE NEXT SESSION: STEP 3: Identify and briefly justify criteria for a good solution to your environmental issue.

With the results of group brainstorming about problem definition and criteria, in no more than about 500 words write a very rough draft of step3 of *EDMF*. Essentially, you are recording your initial thoughts about these criteria before we venture deeply into environmental ethics.

3.1 Briefly, justify which **parties** you believe should have what **interests** satisfied by a good resolution of your issue.

3.2 Explain the most important feasibility criteria that must be satisfied by a good resolution of your issue.

3.3 Decide which criteria in 3.1 and 3.2 are non-compensatory and which are compensatory.

You will probably revise these criteria many times as we look at different theories of environmental ethics.

You may find *Decision+* useful in this assignment, building a model that you can then clone and revise through subsequent assignments.

NEXT SESSION: Agenda for Second Meeting, *Environmental Issue Project* group.

Reflect on the first meeting of your Policy Project.

Did it go well, or not? What can you do to make it go better?

- 1. Approval of the agenda**
- 2. Minutes of previous meeting**
- 3. Unfinished business from previous meeting?**

4. Review of previous decisions

Is there any need to revise at this time your previous decisions regarding...?

5. Produce your group's initial concept of a sound environmental society/good theory of environmental ethics .

Parties: Whose interests must be considered?

(*E.g.*.: All living humans? Including future generations? All animals? All living things?...)

Interests: What kinds of interests must be considered?

(*E.g.*.: All the parties' interests? Only what the parties need for survival? Only those interests necessary for the parties living a good life?)

Legitimacy: How do you justify your selection of interests above? For example, what is the purpose of an environmentally ethical society?

Commitment: How should an environmental ethics be put into effect?

(*E.g.*.: Should it be imposed by the state? Should compliance be voluntary?)

This initial statement provides a working hypothesis for the *Group Report* of the *Final Report* that will almost certainly be revised many times throughout the term. Your *Minutes* should record these changes so that in your *Final Report* you can explain and justify your final definition and goals: why are they better than the alternatives?

6. Reflect on this meeting and set the agenda for the next meeting.

Did today's meeting go well? What could be done to help the next meeting go better?

Is the agenda and preparatory work for the next meeting clear?

READ FOR SESSION 8: Des Jardins chapter 6, 7

Anthropocentrism and Extensionism: Seminar leaders should be well versed in (and all are expected to read) the following classic articles:

☞ Peter Singer, "All Animals are Equal"

☞ Tom Regan, "The Case for Animal Rights"

☞ Christopher D. Stone, "Should Trees have Standing?"

☞ Mark Sagoff, "Animal Liberation and Environmental Ethics: Bad Marriage, Quick Divorce"

☞ J. Baird Callicott, "Environment ethics and animal liberation: back together again"

☞ Paul Taylor, "The Ethics of Respect for Nature"

DUE SESSION 8: Seminar on Extensionist Environmental Ethics

Environmental Issue Project, Negotiating Meeting: Extensionism

6. Thursday, February 12

DUE: STEP 3: Identify and briefly justify criteria for a good solution to your environmental issue.

Anthropocentrism and Extensionism: begin

Second EIP meeting: Begin.

Assignment

DUE SESSION 8: Seminar on Extensionist Environmental Ethics

Environmental Issue Project Meeting: Extensionism

EIP ASSIGNMENTS for meetings on Extensionism, Holism, Pragmatism-Pluralism

Before each meeting on an environmental ethics theory, explain (in probably at least 500 words) how the theory affects steps 3, 4, 5 for your EIP.

Before each meeting, plan how you will use the standards of legitimacy provided by that particular environmental ethics theory to produce criteria for evaluating .

Both **Extensionist and Holistic environmental ethics have many variations**, however. So, you should **use the variation you find most plausible**, although your view may change later as a result of working with your EIP group.

Each environmental ethics theory implies who are legitimate parties and interests to be considered when resolving environmental issues, thus generating, justifying, and ranking (or weighting) criteria. These criteria are then used to rate alternative policy solutions to your issue. So each theory may favour a different package of policies. You may find *Decision+* useful for this assignment. For example, you could clone your *Decision+* model (*i.e.*, **File Save As** with a new name, *e.g.*, from *MyCriteria.cdp* to *ExtensionistCriteria.cdp*). Then review the model with a particular environmental ethics theory in mind, altering your model as you see fit.

Step 3: Explain and justify criteria for a good resolution of the issue.

Each environmental ethics theory may justify a different set of criteria for a good solution to your environmental issue.

In light of the particular theory under consideration, review the criteria you have previously identified:

Explain why your criteria are justified or why some must be discarded.

Explain whether new criteria must be added.

Explain your rankings (or weightings) for the resulting criteria.

Keep in mind how your criteria will be viewed by other members of EIP group with their distinct interests and issues.

Step 4: Generate a package of measures to best satisfy the criteria you developed above.

Given the reasonable knowledge you have of this issue, generate a plausible package that enables you to show the implications of your criteria from Step 3. Your efforts may be scoffed at by an expert on this issue, but you may know more environmental ethics!

Step 5: Evaluate the package using those criteria.

Given the reasonable knowledge you have of this issue, evaluate the package, showing the implications of your criteria from Step 3.

In light of the particular theory environmental ethics under consideration, review any measures you have previously identified to resolve your environmental issue:

Explain why previously identified measures are justified or why some must be discarded.

Explain whether new measures must be added.

Explain your ratings for the resulting package of measures to resolve this issue.

In order to negotiate based on interests rather than position, you should go to your *EIP meeting* prepared to modify your criteria and hence your proposal as a result of discussion with the other members of your group.

However, all members are constrained by the particular theory of environmental ethics under consideration.

EIP Meetings

It is essential that the *Minutes* record the major elements of the discussion in your meetings.

Then each member and the group will have written guidance about what changes are required.

The following should be regular agenda items at these meetings:

- 1. Approval of the agenda**
- 2. Minutes of previous meeting**
- 3. Unfinished business from previous meeting?**
- 4. Review of previous decisions**

5. Negotiate a set of proposals covering each member's issue that is consistent with the environmental ethics theory under consideration.

Review each member's criteria and proposal and ask:

Are the criteria consistent with this theory of environmental ethics?

If not, how must they change?

Are the proposals justified by the criteria derived from this theory of environmental ethics?

If not, how must they change?

Impose a time limit so that you can consider each member's proposal.

Review all the proposals together and ask:

Are the proposals of all members of the group consistent with each other?

If not, how must they change?

6. Work on the *Group Report* part of your *Final Report*.

As a result of arguments for and against this environmental ethics theory, and as a result of attempting to apply it to your environmental issues, ask yourselves:

Are there elements of the theory that we think essential to an environmentally ethical society? Why, or why not?

Are there elements of the theory that we reject as part of an environmentally ethical society? Why, or why not?

How do the answers to these questions affect our initial theory of environmental ethics and of an environmental ethical society?

7. Reflections on the process.

What was accomplished during this session: what agreements were reached or obstacles to agreement dealt with?

What obstacles to agreement remain? What steps will we take to deal with them?

READ FOR SESSION 9: Des Jardins chapters 8, 9, 10, 11

Holistic ethics: Seminar leaders should be well versed in (and **all** are expected to read) the following classic articles:

In each group, the first article is the classic statement of the position, with subsequent articles either further explaining or critiquing the position, sometimes engaging in a dialectic with other positions (in which case the article is listed under both groups).

The final article, by Watson, critiques at least the non-anthropocentric foundation of land ethic, deep ecology, and ecofeminism, if not social ecology.

Few of the articles are terribly difficult, especially when read along with appropriate chapters in Des Jardins. But the deep ecology position is, for me, the most difficult to understand.

Land ethic: Aldo Leopold, "The land ethic":

J. Baird Callicott: "Holistic environmental ethics and the problem of ecofascism"

- Deep ecology:** Arne Naess: “The deep ecological movement: some philosophical aspects”
 Harold Glasser: “Demystifying the critiques of deep ecology”
 Ramachandra Guha: “Radical American environmentalism and wilderness preservation: a Third World critique”
 Murray Bookchin: “Social ecology versus deep ecology”
- Social ecology:** Murray Bookchin: “What is social ecology?”
 James O’Connor: “Socialism and ecology”
 Murray Bookchin: “Social ecology versus deep ecology”
 John Clark: “The matter of freedom: ecofeminist lessons for social ecology”
- Ecofeminism:** Karen J. Warren: “The power and the promise of ecological feminism”
 Victoria Davion: “Is ecofeminism feminist?”
 John Clark: “The matter of freedom: ecofeminist lessons for social ecology”
 Richard Watson: “A critique of anti-anthropocentric ethics”

DUE SESSION 10: Seminar on Holistic Environmental Ethics
Environmental Issue Project, Negotiating Meeting: Holistic ethics

February 19-20: Mid-term Break

7. Thursday, February 26

Anthropocentrism and Extensionism: finish
Second EIP meeting: Finish.

Assignment

DUE NEXT SESSION: Seminar on Extensionist Environmental Ethics
Environmental Issue Project, Negotiating Meeting: Extensionism

It would make for a more productive meeting to send your extensionist criteria and proposals to your group’s forum at the *Course Website* ahead of time, and for each member to review others’ proposals before your meeting.

8. Thursday, March 4

Seminar on Extensionism
EIP Meeting: Extensionism
DUE: EIP ASSIGNMENT for meeting on Extensionism

Assignment

READ FOR SESSION 9: Des Jardins chapters 8, 9, 10, 11

Holistic ethics: Seminar leaders should be well versed in (and **all** are expected to read) the following classic articles:

TBA

9. Thursday, March 11

**Holistic environmental ethics
Finish *EIP* Meeting: Extensionism**

Assignment: none

10. Thursday, March 18

Holistic environmental ethics: finish

Assignment

DUE NEXT SESSION: Seminar on Holistic Environmental Ethics

Environmental Issue Project, Negotiating Meeting: Holistic ethics

It would make for a more productive meeting to send your holistic criteria and proposals to your group's forum at the *Course Website* ahead of time, and for each member to review others' proposals before your meeting.

READ FOR SESSION 12: Des Jardins Epilogue

Pragmatism-Pluralism: TBA

11. Thursday, March 25

**Seminar on Holistic ethics
EIP Meeting: Holistic environmental ethics
DUE: *EIP* ASSIGNMENT for meeting on Holistic environmental ethics**

Assignment

READ FOR NEXT SESSION: Des Jardins Epilogue

Pragmatism-Pluralism: TBA

12. Thursday, April 1

Pragmatist-Pluralist Environmental Ethics

Assignment

DUE NEXT SESSION: *Environmental Issue Project, Negotiating Meeting:*

Pragmatist-Pluralist ethics

It would make for a more productive meeting to send your pragmatist-pluralist criteria and proposals to your group's forum at the *Course Website* ahead of time, and for each member to review others' proposals before your meeting.

13. Thursday, April 8

***EIP* Meeting: Pragmatist-Pluralist Environmental Ethics, etc.
DUE: *EIP* ASSIGNMENT for meeting on Pragmatist-Pluralist environmental ethics**

DUE April 22: *Environmental Issue Project: Final Report*