**Course Description:**
How should human beings relate to the natural world? Do we have moral obligations toward non-human animals and other parts of nature? And what do we owe to other human beings, including future generations, with respect to the environment? This course will examine such questions in light of some of our current ethical theories: considering what those theories suggest regarding the extent and nature of our environmental obligations; and also whether reflection on such obligations can prove informative about the adequacy of our ethical theories. Later in the course we will use the tools that we have acquired to tackle various ethical questions that confront us in our dealings with the natural world. Topics discussed will include: animal rights; conservation; economic approaches to the environment; access to and control over natural resources; environmental justice and pollution; climate change; technology and the environment; and environmental activism.

**Office Hours:**
I will hold weekly office hours by appointment between 4:15 and 5:30pm on Tuesdays and Thursdays in the Law School, Crown Quadrangle Building, Room 381. If you would like to meet at another time, send me an email.

**Readings:**
All required readings will be made available on CourseWork, so there are no required texts to purchase. The required reading will come to around 50-75 pages per week. The texts demand careful attention, so please read them thoroughly and critically. You should expect to have to read some articles more than once to fully understand the arguments.

I will be putting a number of useful introductory texts and anthologies on course reserve at the library, including: *Environmental Ethics*, by Joseph Desjardins; *Animal Liberation*, by Peter Singer; *The Case for Animal Rights*, by Tom Regan; *Environmental Ethics: The Big Questions*, edited by Keller; *Environmental Ethics: An Anthology*, edited by Light and Rolston; *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, edited by Pojman; and *Environmental Ethics: What Really Matters What Really Works*, edited by Schmidtz and Willott. Dale Jamieson’s *Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction* and *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy* are available online through the library.
Papers:
There will be three paper assignments: two short papers (the first 750-1000 words and the second 1000-1500 words) and a longer final paper (2000-2500 words). The papers are due before midnight on January 22, February 15, and March 16. The questions for the papers will be distributed in class one to two weeks in advance, as noted on the syllabus.

All papers should be submitted via Coursework in .doc/docx format. Late assignments will be accepted only if you make arrangements with me prior to the deadline. Late papers will be penalized one-third of a letter grade for each day late, including weekends (for example: from A to A-, A- to B+, and so on).

Participation:
It is essential that you do the readings, come to class prepared, submit a discussion question once a week, and participate in class discussions. Your participation grade will be based on these requirements.

Discussion questions
Every week, from week two onwards, half of the class will be expected to submit a question on Tuesday’s required reading, and the other half will be expected to submit a question on Thursday’s required reading (students can sign up for the Tuesday or Thursday group during the first week of the quarter). The question must be based on one of the required readings for that class, and should be the possible subject of an interesting group discussion (yes/no questions, questions about the linguistic meaning of terms, or general questions about that week’s subject matter are not appropriate). The questions are supposed to show that you are reading the texts critically, and ideally you should be able to specify which page/section of the reading provoked your question. Each week a few students will be asked to share their question with the rest of the group, depending on how the in-class discussion goes. Questions must be uploaded to the CourseWork Drop Box by noon, the day before class.

Class discussion
As a participant in class discussions, you are expected to find an appropriate balance between sensitive listening and thoughtful speaking. The quality of your classroom participation will be a significant part of your grade.

In order to be prepared for discussion, it is essential that you come to each lecture having read the assigned material intelligently, and having given some thought as to how the readings relate to the course in general. This will allow you to benefit from the lectures and in turn prepare yourself to discuss the issues in depth in section. You should come to section with considered views about (1) what the main claims offered in the texts or cases are; (2) the arguments offered in favor of these claims; (3) whether these are good or plausible arguments; (4) whether the claim is, all things considered, strong or plausible; (5) what alternatives to the claims and arguments exist; and (6) whether some alternative is superior to the claim under discussion.

Objections are important. But keep in mind that raising puzzles and problems (even interesting puzzles and problems) for a view is easy: we can be certain in advance that every view will face some problems. Still, we are trying to decide what to think about important issues, not playing a game or showing off debater’s skills. The really hard part is to figure out what to think – what we should think – once we understand the range of theoretical options and competing arguments.
Evaluation of participation
Participation will be evaluated on the following guidelines, which stress the quality rather than the quantity of contributions.

A range: The student is fully engaged and highly motivated. They are well prepared, having studied the assigned material and thought carefully about the materials’ relation to issues raised in lecture and section. This student’s ideas and questions are substantive (either constructive or critical); they stimulate class discussions. They listen and respond respectfully to other students’ contributions.

B range: The student participates consistently in discussion. They are well prepared and contribute regularly by sharing thoughts and questions that show insight and a familiarity with the material. This student refers to the materials discussed in lecture and shows interest in other students’ contributions.

C range: The student meets the basic requirements of participation. They are usually prepared and participate once in a while but not regularly. This student’s contributions relate to the texts and the lectures and offer a few insightful ideas but do not help to build a coherent and productive discussion.

Failure to satisfactorily fulfill the criteria for participation will result in a grade of D or below.

Grading:
Short paper 1: 15%
Short paper 2: 25%
Final paper: 35%
Participation: 25%

Graduate students:
Graduate students in the course may choose to write the assigned three papers or to write a longer final paper (7000 words) on a question of your choice. If you want to write a longer final paper, you must let me know by January 16 and you must meet with me to discuss your paper topic by the end of February.

Students with Disabilities
Students who may need an academic accommodation based on the impact of a disability must initiate the request with the Office of Accessible Education (OAE). Professional staff will evaluate the request with required documentation, recommend reasonable accommodations, and prepare an Accommodation Letter for faculty dated in the current quarter in which the request is made. Students should contact the OAE as soon as possible since timely notice is needed to coordinate accommodations. The OAE is located at 563 Salvatierra Walk (phone: 723-1066, URL: http://studentaffairs.stanford.edu/oae).

The Honor Code:
Violating the Honor Code is a serious offense, even when the violation is unintentional. The Honor Code is available at: studentaffairs.stanford.edu/judicialaffairs/policy/honor-code.
You are responsible for understanding the University rules regarding academic integrity; you should familiarize yourself with the code if you have not already done so. In brief, conduct prohibited by the Honor Code includes all forms of academic dishonesty, among them copying another student’s exam, unauthorized collaboration, and representing as one’s own work the work of another. If you have any questions about these matters, please ask.
I. ANIMAL ETHICS AND ETHICAL THEORIES

Week 1  
January 6:  Introduction  
Required readings:  
Joseph Desjardins: *Environmental Ethics* (5th Edition), Sections 1.1-2.8 (30pp)  

Required if you are new to meta-ethics:  
Dale Jamieson: *Ethics and the Environment* Ch 3, ‘Meta-Ethics’  

Supplementary texts:  
David Schmidtz & Elizabeth Willott: ‘Why Environmental Ethics?’  
Richard Sylvan: ‘Is There a Need for a New, an Environmental, Ethic?’  
John O’Neill: ‘The Varieties of Intrinsic Value’

January 8:  Utilitarianism  
Required:  
Peter Singer: ‘All Animals Are Equal’ (10pp)  
Mary Midgley: ‘The Significance of Species’ (6pp)  

Supplementary:  
Singer: ‘Utilitarianism and Vegetarianism’  
Leslie Francis & Richard Norman: ‘Some Animals Are More Equal Than Others’  
Singer: *Animal Liberation*

Week 2  
January 13:  Deontology  
Required:  
Tom Regan: ‘The Case for Animal Rights’ (8 pp)  

Supplementary:  
Regan: ‘Utilitarianism, Vegetarianism, and Animal Rights’  
Tyler Cowen: ‘Policing Nature’  
Regan: *The Case for Animal Rights*

January 15:  Virtue Ethics  
Required:  
Rosalind Hursthouse: ‘Virtue Ethics and the Treatment of Animals’ (28pp)  

Supplementary:  
Daniel Engster: ‘Care Ethics and Animal Welfare’

* Questions for first short paper distributed *
II. EXPANDING THE CIRCLE OF MORAL CONCERN

**Week 3**

**January 20:** Biocentrism  
*Required:*  
Paul W. Taylor: ‘The Ethics of Respect for Nature’ (22pp)  
David Schmidtz: ‘Are All Species Equal?’ (9pp)

*Supplementary:*  
Kenneth Goodpaster: ‘On Being Morally Considerable’  
Bernard Williams: ‘Must a Concern for the Environment be Centred on Human Beings?’

**January 22:** Protecting Life  
*Required:*  
Christopher Stone: ‘Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects’ (11pp)  
Ian John Whyte: ‘The Elephant Management Dilemma’ (14pp)

*Supplementary:*  
Joel Feinberg: ‘The Rights of Animals and Unborn Generations’  
Robin Attfield: ‘The Good of Trees’  
Lilly-Marlene Russow: ‘Why Do Species Matter?’

* Thursday January 22: first short paper due by midnight *

**Week 4**

**January 27:** Ecocentrism  
*Required:*  
Aldo Leopold: ‘The Land Ethic’ and ‘Wilderness’ (21pp)  
Bill Devall, George Sessions & Arne Naess: ‘Deep Ecology’ (6pp)

*Supplementary:*  
Janna Thompson: ‘A Refutation of Environmental Ethics’  
Harley Cahen: ‘Against the Moral Considerability of Ecosystems’

**January 29:** Individualism versus Holism  
*Required:*  
Tom Regan: ‘How to Worry about Endangered Species’ (4pp)  

*Supplementary:*  
Elliot Sober: ‘Philosophical Problems for Environmentalism’  
Dale Jamieson: ‘Animal Liberation is an Environmental Ethic’  
Mark Sagoff: ‘Animal Liberation and Environmental Ethics: Bad Marriage, Quick Divorce’

* Questions for second short paper distributed *
Week 5
February 3: Conservation, Preservation and Restoration

Required:
John Muir: ‘Hetch Hetchy Valley’ (2pp)
Robert Elliot: ‘Faking Nature’ (12pp)
Ramachandra Guha: ‘Radical Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique’ (13pp)

Supplementary:
J Baird Callicott: ‘A Critique of and an Alternative to the Wilderness Idea’
Martin H Krieger: ‘What’s Wrong with Plastic Trees?’
Yeuk-Sze Lo: ‘Natural and Artifactual: Restored Nature as Subject’

III. POLITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

February 5: Dominating People, Dominating Nature

Required:
Victoria Davion: ‘Is Ecofeminism Feminist?’ (19pp)
Murray Bookchin: ‘What is Social Ecology?’ (7pp)

Supplementary:
Carolyn Merchant: ‘Feminism and the Philosophy of Nature’
Sherilyn MacGregor: ‘From Care to Citizenship: Calling Ecofeminism Back to Politics’

Week 6
February 10: Indigenous Perspectives

Required:
Fabienne Bayet: ‘Overturning the Doctrine: Indigenous People and Wilderness’ (8pp)
Winona LaDuke: ‘Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Environmental Futures’ (21pp)
Tom B K Goldtooth: ‘Stolen Resources’ (2pp)
Reading on the Alberta Oil Sands or Yasuní National Park (to be set)

Supplementary:
Linda Robyn: ‘Indigenous Knowledge and Technology’

February 12: Environmental Justice

Required:
Kristen Shrader-Frechette: *Environmental Justice*, pp. 3-18 (15pp)

Supplementary:
Christian Hunold & Iris Marion Young: ‘Justice, Democracy, and Hazardous Siting’
David Schlosberg & David Carruthers: ‘Indigenous Struggles, Environmental Justice, and Community Capabilities’

* Sunday February 15: second short paper due by midnight *
**Week 7**

February 17: Economics

*Required:*
Mark Sagoff: ‘At the Shrine of Our Lady of Fatima or Why Political Questions are not All Economic’ (16pp)
David Schmidtz: ‘A Place for Cost-Benefit Analysis’ (23pp)

*Supplementary:*
William F Baxter: ‘The Case for Optimal Pollution’

February 19: Resource Rights

*Required:*
Garrett Hardin: ‘The Tragedy of the Commons’ (6 pp)
Carol Rose: ‘Given-ness and Gift: Property and the Quest for Environmental Ethics’ (32pp)

*Supplementary:*
Elinor Ostrom et al.: ‘Revisiting the Commons’
Alejandra Mancilla: ‘The Environmental Turn in Territorial Rights’
Tim Hayward: ‘Global Justice and the Distribution of Natural Resources’

---

**IV. ETHICS AND THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Week 8**

February 24: Climate Change

*Required:*
Simon Caney: ‘Cosmopolitan Justice, Responsibility, and Global Climate Change’ (28pp)
The People’s Agreement of Cochabamba (10pp)

*Supplementary:*
Stephen Gardiner: ‘Ethics and Global Climate Change’
Henry Shue: ‘Global Environment and International Inequality’
John Nolt: ‘Nonanthropocentric Climate Ethics’
Nicole Hassoun: ‘The Anthropocentric Advantage? Environmental Ethics and Climate Change Policy’

* Questions for long paper distributed *

February 26: Future Generations

*Required:*
Brian Barry: ‘Sustainability and Intergenerational Justice’ (22pp)
Derek Parfit: ‘Energy Policy and the Further Future’ (9pp)

*Supplementary:*
Edward Page: ‘Intergenerational Justice and Climate Change’
**Week 9**
March 3: Individual Duties  
*Required:*  
Elizabeth Cripps: *Climate Change and the Moral Agent* Ch 5, ‘Mimicking Duties’ (24pp)  

*Supplementary:*  
Dale Jamieson: ‘When Utilitarians Should Be Virtue Theorists’  
Avram Hiller: ‘Climate Change and Individual Responsibility’

March 5: Environmental Activism  
*Required:*  
Naomi Klein: *This Changes Everything*, pp. 293-310 (18pp)  
Kate Rawles: ‘The Missing Shade of Green’ (11pp)  

*Supplementary:*  
J Baird Callicott: ‘Environmental Philosophy is Environmental Activism’  
Michael Martin: ‘Ecosabotage and Civil Disobedience’

**Week 10**
March 10: Engineering the Earth  
*Required:*  
Ken Caldeira & David Keith: ‘The Need for Climate Engineering Research’ (6pp)  
Christopher Preston: ‘Re-Thinking the Unthinkable: Environmental Ethics and the Presumptive Argument Against Geoengineering’ (20pp)  

*Supplementary:*  
Stephen Gardiner: ‘Are We the Scum of the Earth? Climate Change, Geoengineering, and Humanity’s Challenge’  
Dale Jamieson: ‘Some Whats, Whys and Worries of Geoengineering’

March 12: Anthropocentrism versus Nonanthropocentrism  
*Required:*  
Holmes Rolston III: ‘Feeding People versus Saving Nature?’ (19pp)  
Bryan G Norton: ‘Environmental Ethics and Weak Anthropocentrism’ (18pp)  

*Supplementary:*  
Katie McShane: ‘Anthropocentrism vs. Nonanthropocentrism: Why Should We Care?’  
Wilfred Beckerman & Joanna Pasek: ‘In Defence of Anthropocentrism’  
Mary Midgley: ‘The End of Anthropocentrism?’

* Monday March 16: long paper due by midnight *