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I. Introduction

II. Five perspectives of the causes and solutions of environmental problems
   A. Economic
   B. Legal
   C. Ecophilosophical
   D. Political
   E. Scientific

III. Review Tragedy of the Commons assignment, grading, and examples
   A. Causes might include:
      1. main cause is simply open access (i.e., non-restricted access) or having it be a “commons” rather than private.
      2. self-interested actors— if ALL are altruistic, then problem doesn’t arise.
      3. total demand of all actors has to exceed carrying capacity – if you have a large resource but only a few actors who only place a small demand on the resource, then there won’t be a tragedy (big fishery with only a few small boats fishing it won’t create one).
   B. Solutions: any solution that restricts usage, including: privatize the resource, require permits or otherwise restrict access of number of users (an access charge per USER), create a charge per UNIT of usage (e.g., per fish caught). Basically, total demand on the resource has to be constrained. An alternative, is creating a strong social norm.

IV. Ecophilosophical:
   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. Solution = changing the values people hold. Education and direct action.
   C. Deep, shallow, and medium ecology
      1. 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
      2. Ethical obligation to other species and other natural things
      3. All life forms have intrinsic value, independent of use to humans
      4. To see ‘self’ as extended to include all of nature.
      5. Should we be ‘self-regarding’ with expanded notion of self (Kantian/Wapnerian - to other humans, or Fox/Naess - to ecosystem), or ‘other-regarding’ with traditional notion of self? How to decide?
      6. 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. “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.
      7. 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 Judaico-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.
      8. Shallow ecology’ view: In our interests to protect the environment
         a) Protect environment only insofar as harming the environment harms humans, e.g., mosquito eradication programs
         b) Current humans are better off if we do.
         c) Children as ‘extensions’ of current humans are better off if we do.
9. ‘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.
   a) Liberal tradition: Maximize human freedom and only constrain it when conflicts with another human's freedom. Produces environmental insensitivity.
   b) ‘Humans displace rather than solve environmental problems’ (Wapner, 1997, 228).
   c) Ecojustice and environmental racism movements.

D. 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.

E. 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.

V. Political:
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
   3. Problem is not lack of resources but their distribution. Developed world extracts from developing.

B. 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.

C. 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

D. 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?