

Normal Morality

- **anthropocentric**, i.e. covers (more or less) only the welfare of humans;
- **individualistic**, i.e. deals with the relations between single individuals, and collectives, when considered, are dealt with on an individualist basis;
- **local**, i.e. deals with actions towards socially ‘near ones’, usually members of the same group or society;
- **synchronist**, i.e. takes for given that everything morally relevant is part of one common time slice, normally called ‘the present’.

Non-normal ecological development

- Irreversible damage to **species** and natural environments.
- Damages involving **collectives** on both sides of causal relations and responsibilities.
- Damages on a **global level** (climate change)
- **Long-term changes** (climate change). Risks and damages endangering **several or many generations** of humans.

Extended Morality 1 -- Biocentrism instead of Anthropocentrism?

- 1) **Argument of coherence:** it is impossible to add biocentrism to anthropocentrism.
- 2) **Argument against metaphysics:** there is no rational explanation for the per se value of nonsentient living things
- 3) **Argument for inclusion:** many of our intuitions concerning the valuableness of natural things can be dealt with via human interests.

Conclusio: stay with anthropocentrism

Extended Morality 3 -- Global?

- 1) **Argument of non-malificence:** the welfare of humans on a global scale is not to be put at risk or actively lowered.
- 2) **Argument of justice:** the welfare of humans on a global scale has to be organized justly under the condition of communal ties.

Conclusio: Normal Ethics can and should be extended onto a global scale, but in correspondence with the development of world-wide communal relations.

Extended Morality 4 -- Intergenerational?

- **Intergenerational duty problem:**

can there be **duties** towards people not yet existing? And if so, why, and to what extent?

- **Time-sensitiveness of values problem:**

is the **value** (and also the disvalue) of things now and in the future comparable and perhaps relatable, perhaps even the same? Or more general:

are **values time-referentially neutral** or not?

Importance of many Values

- **Categorical duties:** never damage someone in the future at all.
- **Ecological categorical duties:** never damage someone in the future in relation to environmental goods.
- **Conditional duties:** never leave future generations welfare packages that are overall negative.

Conclusio: there must be a balanced mix of goods the welfare package for future generations.

Problem: role of ecological goods?

Time-sensitivity of values

- **Discounting** of economic values in the future

Argument 1: interest rate relevant, discounting according to interest expectable.

Argument 2: time preference as psychological fact

- **Time-stability or increase in economic values**

Discount-rate is balanced by changed supply/demand ratio

- **Irrelevance of discounting because of non-expressability of natural goods in economic terms**

Ecological Utility Space

Exchangeable resources:

fossil fuels, renewable natural goods (forests, agriculture, mass produced animals);

Critical resources:

clean water and air, the ozone layer;

Unique resources

rare and significant species, biologically unique areas, historically important areas.

Ethical Profiles of Resources

Exchangable Resources:

Marketable goods, plus/minus regulation in order to achieve "real" prices.

Critical Resources:

Non-marketable goods of categorical importance for future generations and humanity throughout. Sustainability in these goods on the level of human rights.

Unique Resources:

Non-marketable goods of high importance to specific communities. Importance based on intra-community tradition and political process.