

us thinking clearly about values so that we may engage productively with questions of value about the environment. Part three addresses our first core question. Are natural objects valuable only insofar as they are useful to people, or are they valuable in themselves? Should we be individualists or holists? Do animals (or even plants) have any moral rights? If not, what, if anything, limits how we may treat them? How, if at all, should we change our behavior in order to follow the prescriptions of moral theories regarding the environment? The fourth part addresses our second core question: how should we treat one another, in light of our need and desire to use natural objects? This part of the course is more applied, driven by cases as much as theories, and engages with moral questions about policies and practices.

By the end of the semester you should have gained and/or improved upon the following **content-related** skills and knowledge:

- Awareness and understanding of some environmental values and problems;
- Understanding of the causes and some potential solutions of certain problems;
- Recognition of the interrelation of environmental factors, and the interrelation between environmental and other moral, social, or political issues;
- Familiarity with main philosophical theories regarding the nonhuman world and regarding the interaction between humans and nonhumans;
- Awareness of some major problems of environmental justice, and philosophical analysis of them.

Interacting with content

Philosophy is in the first instance a particular way of interacting with what you read, hear, and think. The fundamental questions are “what does this mean?” “is this true?” and “if this is true, what are its implications?” In order to answer the first question we engage in *conceptual analysis*, which is a fancy word for *definition*. But philosophical definitions are not dictionary definitions; we don’t care to know how a word is generally used, but what the concept is. In order to answer the second question we engage in *argumentation*: the identification of premises and relationships among them; the drawing of distinctions as needed for disambiguation; inferences; the assessment of theses and inferences. And in order to answer the third question we set up a claim against other salient theses and determine whether they are compatible or incompatible, and why.

Philosophy requires a certain appreciation of the reality and significance of that which is unseen or taken for granted, but no less important for that. Think of radio waves. You could live your life without ever knowing they were there—as people did until the 19th century. But they are all around us, coming from all directions, bouncing off us, sometimes (but quite rarely) tickling our ear drums. They make possible a lot of modern life. And, as you know if you’ve ever operated a shortwave radio (or an FM radio in New York City), tiny distinctions between wavelengths can make the difference between two completely different broadcasts.

Doing philosophy is like attending to radio waves. If your radio waves or your interactions with them get out of whack, things could go quite wrong; your life might even be unbearable. Similarly, if the intellectual structure of your life got out of whack, your life might be unbearable. But if you didn't know about radio waves, or don't do philosophy, you would never be able to diagnose, let alone fix, the problem.

Moreover, your own confidence that you've got the radio waves in check is at best only imperfect evidence that they are in check. If you are not questioning (or monitoring your connections), you are not doing philosophy. Certitude is the enemy of philosophy. Memorization and absorption of facts are *useful* for philosophy, for the sake of informing our philosophical reflection, but do not themselves constitute philosophy. But at the same time, pure speculation and rumination, detached from any purpose, also do not constitute philosophy.

By the end of the semester you should have gained or improved upon the following **philosophical** skills:

- Capacity to recognize similarities among different things, and differences among similar things—to see “the unity in the diversity and the diversity in the unity”;
- Ability to follow written and spoken arguments, discerning their controversial elements;
- Ability clearly to summarize, without evaluating, arguments, in a way that emphasizes clarity, charity, completeness, and fidelity.
- Ability to *construct* written and spoken arguments, appreciating where your own view may be controversial;
- Capacity to assess controversial theses, including your own, in a way that is both charitable and critical, by appeal to moral, prudential, and more broadly philosophical considerations;
- Ability to disambiguate by drawing distinctions or clarifying thoughts;
- Ability fruitfully to apply your knowledge and skill-base to new moral and environmental problems that arise in the future.

Finally, philosophy is not debate. We are here to reach the truth. That is the only way to “win.” In philosophical arguments, there is absolutely no value to *being* right, the only value is in *getting it* right.

Evaluation:

1. Summaries	30%
2. Reading Engagements:	30
3. Eco-journal:	15
4. Presentation or Final exam	15
5. Participation:	<u>10</u>
Total	100%

1. *Summaries*. Whenever we read a chapter of Jamieson or Shrader-Frechette, you may write a summary of that chapter. You must do **four** altogether – no fewer than **two** by the withdrawal deadline, and no fewer than **three** by April 2. I will drop the lowest grade. Summaries should be somewhere around 3 pages.
2. *Reading Engagements*. [**RE**] Every time we have a reading from a source other than our two text books, I will give you a question sheet on the reading. I will collect all and then randomly select half of them to grade, such that each person will have 4 RE's graded over the semester. Again, I will drop your lowest grade. Reading engagements will not be accepted electronically unless you have an excused absence.
3. *Eco-journal*. [**EJ**] At the beginning of the semester you should set aside a small amount of time each day or week to keep this journal. I'll explain what this entails, and provide further information on the related assignments. With a few exceptions, we will set aside part or all of class every second Friday for discussion of Eco-Journals.
4. *Presentation or Final Exam*. If you choose to do a presentation, you should pick a day and article from the list of primary-source articles below, any chapter from KSF that is not on the syllabus, **or** another article that you clear with me in advance. Presentations will take *up to* one class period; I'll provide guidance. We will go first-come, first-served in distributing topics and presentation dates. Alternatively, you may choose to do the final exam. This will be a 30-minute **oral exam with a twist: we will each have a chance to ask the questions**. You may pick three articles or chapters on which to focus, one from each section of the course; you will be evaluated on your answers to my questions; on the quality of the questions you ask me; and on your ability to follow up based on my responses.
5. *Participation*. Participation is essential to succeeding in this class. I will expect you to contribute actively to class discussions and activities. When you participate, bear in mind that you are one of many people in the class, each of whom has an equal right and obligation to participate on equal terms. Friendly discussion of difficult issues in a context of deep disagreement is one of the central philosophical (and democratic) virtues.

A note on grading: My classes usually have an average grade between about 78 and 82 percent, which is C+/B-. I will guarantee that, unless something unpredictable happens, the course average will be no lower than a C+. And if at least 85% of the students are in class every time (starting in week 2), I will guarantee that the course average will be no lower than a B. If 95% are in class every time, I will guarantee that it will be no lower than a B+. And if everyone has perfect attendance, then everyone who has handed in every assignment will get an A.

Handing in assignments:

Presentation. Summaries should be typed in normal fonts with normal margins. If you have any questions about what this entails, ask me. I will expect all work to be spell-checked and proofread; writing will be one criterion of evaluation. Handwritten

assignments should put a premium on penmanship, since, if I can't read what you've written, that will be your problem. All assignments should be submitted using the minimum of paper and frills—double-side if possible, no folders, etc.; just a single staple in the top-left corner as needed. **Always keep a copy** of your assignments when you hand them in, and do not throw them away after I've returned them to you. If there are any discrepancies, I will assume my records are accurate unless you can provide me with documentation.

Summaries and eco-journals (if typed) may be submitted electronically in MS Word (.doc or .docx) or .rtf **only**. **If I can't open the assignment then it has not been submitted**. Your best bet is to submit such assignments through the "send email" function on Blackboard, but whatever you do **always use your U of L email account** and cc yourself on the email to ensure that the attachment was included. Then, keep that email at least until you have a grade for the relevant assignment. If there is any discrepancy, my records will be decisive unless you can show me **the original email with a date stamp and the correct document attached**.

Deadlines: With the exception of REs, which are due at the end of class, assignments are due by the beginning of class on the day listed in the schedule below. Late assignments will be penalized one grade per school day late, beginning at 1:15 p.m. If you cannot hand in an assignment on time, you must communicate with me *beforehand*. In general, unforeseeable physical impossibility and deaths in the family are the only valid excuses for late assignments.

Disabilities: The University of Louisville is committed to providing access to programs and services for qualified students with disabilities. If you are a student with a disability and require accommodation to participate in and complete requirements for this class, notify me immediately and contact the Disability Resource Center (Robbins Hall, 852-6938) for verification of eligibility and determination of specific accommodations.

Academic Integrity: Cheating and plagiarism are immoral because a) they are *dishonest* (to me and others), in that the cheater/plagiarist presents as her/his own something that is not; b) they are *unfair* (to classmates), who work hard to meet requirements that the cheater/plagiarist circumvents; c) they violate *academic obligations* (to the university) that students voluntarily accept upon enrollment; and d) they may violate *self-regarding duties* of *self-development* or *self-perfection* (if such duties exist).

They can also get one in serious trouble. According to the University of Louisville's *Code of Student Conduct*, Section 5, "Academic dishonesty is prohibited at the University of Louisville. It is a serious offense because it diminishes the quality of scholarship, makes accurate evaluation of student progress impossible, and defrauds those in society who must ultimately depend upon the knowledge and integrity of the institution and its students and faculty." It is your responsibility to know this code and comply with its requirements. If I discover violations of this policy I will pursue the required disciplinary

channels, which normally involve communicating with the dean for undergraduate affairs. If you have any questions about how to comply with this policy, ask me *in advance*.

Schedule of topics

Date	Topic	Reading	Due today	Notes
Part I: The State of Nature				
W 1/6	Introduction			
F 1/8	The Environment as an Ethical Question	DJ, chap. 1		
M 1/11	Limits, Dangers, Risks	<i>Living Planet Report</i> (BB)	RE	
W 1/13	continued	Montoya, Pimm, & Solé (BB)	RE	
F 1/15	continued	Patz et al. (BB)	RE	
M 1/18	NO	CLASS	TODAY	MLK Day
W 1/20	Individual action	Wapner & Willoughby (BB)	RE	
F 1/22	Eco-Journals 1		EJ1	
Part II: Ethical Theory				
M 1/25	Human Morality	DJ, chap. 2		
W 1/27		Continued		FYI: Thurs. 1/28 is last day to apply for a degree
F 1/29	Meta-Ethics	DJ, chap. 3		
M 2/1		Continued		
W 2/3				
F 2/5	Eco-Journals 2		EJ2	
M 2/8	Normative Ethics	DJ, chap. 4		Last chance to hand in 1st summary

W 2/10		Continued		FYI: Thurs 2/11 is national teach-in on sustainability
F 2/12		Continued		
Part III: Ethics and Nature				
M 2/15	Humans and Other Animals	DJ, chap. 5		Last chance to hand in 2nd Summary
W 2/17		continued		
F 2/19	Eco-Journals 3		EJ3	
M 2/22	Are All Animals Equal?	Singer (BB)	RE	
W 2/24		Pollan (BB)	RE	Last day to withdraw
F 2/26		continued		
M 3/1	The value of nature	DJ, chap. 6		
W 3/3		Continued		
F 3/5	Eco-Journal 4		EJ4	
M 3/8	Ecocentrism	Leopold (BB)	RE	
W 3/10	Ecofeminism	Mellor (BB)	RE	
F 3/12		continued		
M 3/15-F 3/19	Spring	Break	No	Class
M 3/22	Nature's Future	DJ, chap. 7		
W 3/24		continued		
F 3/26	Eco-Journal 5		EJ5	
Part IV: Environmental Justice				
M 3/29	Introduction to EJ	KSF, chap. 1		
W 3/31	Principles of Justice	KSF, chap. 2		Last chance to hand in 3rd summary
F 4/2		continued		
M 4/5	Procedural	KSF, chap. 3		

	Justice			
W 4/7		Continued		
F 4/9	Eco-Journal 6		EJ6	
M 4/12	Free Consent	KSF, chap. 4		
W 4/14	Paternalism	KSF, chap. 6		
F 4/16		continued		
M 4/19	Equal Protection	KSF, chap. 8		
W 4/21	Taking Action	KSF, chap. 9		
Th 4/22	Reading	Day	Nothing	Scheduled
BY T 4/27 @ 5:00	Final oral exams			You schedule; first-come, first-served

Required Articles for PHIL 328/SCHG 301-01 Environmental Ethics

1. *Living Planet Report 2008*.
http://assets.panda.org/downloads/living_planet_report_2008.pdf
2. José M. Montoya, Stuart L. Pimm, and Ricard V. Solé, "Ecological Networks and their Fragility," *Nature* 442 (20 July 2006), 259-64. On campus access: click [here](#); off-campus access: click [here](#).
3. Jonathan A. Patz et al., "Impact of Regional Climate Change on Human Health," *Nature* 438 (17 November 2005), 310-17. On-campus access: click [here](#); off-campus access: log in to the library site and search articles for author & title.
4. Paul Wapner and John Willoughby, "The Irony of Environmentalism: the Ecological Futility but Political Necessity of Lifestyle Change," *Ethics & International Affairs* 19 #3 (Dec. 2005), 77-89 (on-campus access: click [here](#); off-campus click [here](#).)
5. Peter Singer, "Speciesism and Moral Status," *Metaphilosophy* 40 #3/4 (July 2009), 567-81 (on-campus access: click [here](#); off-campus: use [this](#) journal link and then scroll down the table of contents to the article).
6. Michael Pollan, "An Animal's Place," *The New York Times Magazine*, Nov. 10, 2002, p. 58 (on-campus access: click [here](#); off-campus access: click [here](#).)
7. Aldo Leopold, "The Land Ethic"
<http://home.btconnect.com/tipiglen/landethic.html>.
8. Mary Mellor, "Feminism and Environmental Ethics: A Materialist Perspective," *Ethics and the Environment* 5 (2000): 107-23 (on-campus access: click [here](#); off-campus access: click [here](#)).