I J C R M
International Journal of Contemporary Research In Multidisciplinary

Research Article

Ethics and Environmental Sustainability: A Moral Perspective

Garima Sharma
Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email: garimasharma054321@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: * Garima Sharma

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20761765

Abstract

This research paper examines the relationship between ethics and environmental sustainability from a moral and philosophical perspective. It argues that environmental challenges are not merely technical or economic issues but fundamentally ethical concerns involving justice, responsibility, human well-being, and obligations toward future generations. The study reviews major ethical theories including virtue ethics, deontology, utilitarianism, and environmental ethics, and analyzes their relevance to sustainability. The paper concludes that sustainable development requires a strong ethical framework that integrates ecological protection with social responsibility.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2583-7397
- **Received:** 13-05-2026
- **Accepted:** 16-06-2026
- **Published:** 19-06-2026
- **IJCRM:**5(2); 2026: 1010-1015

- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Sharma G. Ethics and environmental sustainability: A moral perspective. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2026;5(2):1010-1015.

Access this Article Online

www.multiarticlesjournal.com

KEYWORDS: Ethics, Environmental Sustainability, Moral Responsibility, Environmental Ethics, Sustainable Development.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Environmental degradation, climate change, biodiversity loss, and resource depletion have become central concerns of the twenty-first century. While scientific and technological solutions are important, ethical reflection is equally necessary. Environmental sustainability requires societies to consider what obligations humans have toward nature, future generations, and non-human life. For decades, global policy frameworks have treated environmental disruption primarily as an externalized cost or an engineering challenge—a problem to be solved through optimized market indices or advanced physical carbon-capture systems. However, this diagnosis treats the symptoms rather than the root cause of systemic ecological collapse.

The contemporary ecological crisis is, at its core, a direct outcome of a deeply entrenched philosophical worldview that positions human beings as detached masters of a passive, mechanistic material world. This anthropocentric paradigm authorizes unrestricted resource extraction and institutionalizes a shortsighted economic calculus that values nature strictly for its utility. By analyzing environmental sustainability through a moral lens, this paper seeks to shift the discourse from pragmatic resource management to an exploration of existential duty, objective value, and planetary justice.

To confront these issues systematically, we must explore how our fundamental values inform our interactions with the biophysical environment. In doing so, we uncover a dense web of moral obligations that transcend national boundaries, economic divisions, and historical epochs. The task of environmental ethics is not merely to offer abstract critique, but to construct a robust, actionable framework capable of realigning human behavior with the natural boundaries of the Earth.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The overarching scope of this investigation is guided by a series of interrelated academic objectives designed to unpack the philosophical and practical challenges of ecological preservation. Specifically, this study aims:

- To examine the ethical foundations of environmental sustainability and establish its place within contemporary normative philosophy.
- To analyze major traditional and contemporary ethical theories—including virtue ethics, deontology, utilitarianism, and deep ecology—and evaluate their contextual relevance to current environmental issues.
- To evaluate moral responsibilities toward future generations, assessing how current resource allocation choices affect intergenerational equity.
- To propose an integrated ethical framework for sustainable development that effectively balances ecological protection with socioeconomic justice.
- To investigate the role of corporate, governmental, and individual moral agency in establishing actionable environmental stewardship practices worldwide.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholars in environmental ethics have long emphasized that ecological crises raise profound moral questions that cannot be fully resolved by scientific or economic metrics alone. Contemporary research highlights intergenerational justice, ecological citizenship, environmental stewardship, and sustainability ethics as indispensable pillars of a comprehensive societal response to environmental decline. Philosophers have historically debated whether nature possesses intrinsic value—that is, value inherent to an organism or ecosystem independent of human utility—or only instrumental value for human beings, where ecosystems are viewed merely as stores of raw resources to support human advancement.

Early foundations for this philosophical discourse were laid by pioneering figures like Aldo Leopold (1949) in his seminal work *A Sand County Almanac*. Leopold formulated the "Land Ethic," which radically expanded the boundaries of the moral community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals—collectively, "the land." He famously asserted that a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community, and wrong when it tends otherwise. This ecocentric shift challenged centuries of Western philosophical tradition that recognized moral standing exclusively in rational human actors.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, Rachel Carson's (1962) *Silent Spring* catalyzed the modern environmental movement by demonstrating the devastating, systemic consequences of chemical pesticide overuse. Carson exposed the vulnerability of interconnected biological networks, bridging the gap between empirical scientific inquiry and acute moral accountability. Following Carson, Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess (1973) introduced the critical distinction between "shallow ecology" and "deep ecology." While shallow ecology limits its focus to superficial measures against pollution and resource depletion to safeguard human health and economic affluence, deep ecology calls for a fundamental rejection of the master-nature dichotomy, demanding an egalitarian respect for all living systems.

In parallel, the socio-political structural critique developed by Murray Bookchin (1982) in *The Ecology of Freedom* suggested that all ecological crises are deeply rooted in deep-seated social hierarchies. Bookchin argued that the human drive to dominate and exploit nature stems directly from the institutionalized domination of human by human, making social liberation an essential prerequisite to ecological healing. Furthermore, the global policy framework solidified with the publication of the World Commission on Environment and Development report, *Our Common Future* (WCED, 1987), which popularized the definition of sustainable development as that which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This milestone structurally tied ecological continuity to global equity, creating a permanent foundation for contemporary debates on intergenerational justice and sustainability ethics.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To understand how moral principles apply to global environmental challenges, we must systematically evaluate the core frameworks of Western normative ethics alongside specialized ecological theories. Each philosophy offers unique insights into the nature of human duty, value, and societal organization.

4.1 Virtue Ethics and Character Development

Virtue ethics, originating in the Aristotelian tradition, focuses on the character traits and moral dispositions of individuals rather than rigid rules or immediate outcomes. When applied to the environment, virtue ethics encourages ecological responsibility through proactive character development, self-reflection, and moderation. Instead of asking "What rule must I follow?", environmental virtue ethics asks "What kind of person should I be in relation to the living world?"

By cultivating green virtues such as temperance, humility, mindfulness, and respect for nature, individuals naturally move away from destructive patterns of overconsumption and greed. Humility allows humans to recognize their physical dependence on broader ecological networks, countering the destructive pride of modern anthropocentrism. Moderation, or temperance, serves as a direct internal counterweight to the systemic drive for endless consumerism, framing simple living not as a sacrifice, but as a path to authentic human flourishing (*Eudaimonia*).

4.2 Deontological Ethics and Universal Duty

Deontological ethics, fundamentally shaped by Immanuel Kant, posits that the moral worth of an action rests entirely on its compliance with universal duties, regardless of the consequences. Traditionally, Kantian deontology restricted moral duties to rational beings capable of moral reasoning. However, contemporary environmental deontologists have expanded this framework to assert that humans have direct moral duties toward nature and future generations.

Under this expanded view, harming vital ecosystems or driving species to extinction constitutes a direct violation of universal moral duties. If we formulate a maxim that permits the reckless depletion of topsoil or the contamination of global aquifers, such a maxim fails the Kantian test of universalizability—it cannot be willed as a universal law without generating a logical contradiction and destroying the conditions required for life itself. Deontology thus demands absolute protection for environmental baselines through rigid moral prohibitions, ensuring that biological systems are never treated merely as a means to an economic end.

4.3 Utilitarianism and Net Well-Being Optimization

Utilitarianism, pioneered by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, is a consequentialist framework asserting that the moral rectitude of any action is determined by its capacity to maximize overall pleasure or well-being while minimizing pain and suffering. Applied to environmental issues, utilitarian approaches emphasize optimizing net long-term well-being and drastically reducing environmental harm. Peter Singer (2011) significantly expanded this framework by demonstrating that the capacity for suffering (*sentience*), rather than rationality, is the true threshold for moral consideration. Consequently, the pain experienced by non-human animals due to industrial agriculture, habitat fragmentation, and pollution must be factored directly into our moral calculations.

Moreover, utilitarianism requires a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis that accounts for the long-term impacts of current resource choices. For instance, the short-term economic gains generated by a coal-fired power plant are heavily outweighed by the compounding, long-term global damage caused by greenhouse gas emissions, including health crises, agricultural failure, and extreme weather events. Utilitarian optimization thus shifts away from short-sighted profit models toward the long-term stabilization of global life-support systems.

Table 1: Comparative Matrix of Core Normative and Environmental Ethical Frameworks

Ethical Framework	Primary Source of Value	Core Moral Imperative	Application to Sustainability
Virtue Ethics	Human character and inner disposition	Cultivate internal moral excellence and practice moderation	Encourages environmental humility and simple living to counter overconsumption.
Deontology	Universal moral duties and rights	Act according to maxims that can be universalized; honor obligations	Establishes strict, unyielding duties to protect natural systems and future generations.
Utilitarianism	Sentient well-being and minimization of pain	Maximize net utility and well-being for all affected entities	Demands long-term mitigation of environmental harms to safeguard global human and animal life.
Environmental Ethics (Ecocentrism)	Intrinsic value in all biotic communities and natural systems	Preserve the baseline integrity, stability, and beauty of the biosphere	Rejects anthropocentrism; demands that policies prioritize ecosystem preservation over human utility.

4.4 Environmental Ethics and Ecocentrism

Environmental ethics as an independent sub-discipline extends moral consideration far beyond human beings, challenging the core anthropocentric bias of traditional Western thought. Philosophers like Paul Taylor (1986) in *Respect for Nature* argued for a biocentric worldview, asserting that all living organisms are "teleological centres of life," possessing a good of their own and an inherent worth that demands equal moral respect. Ecocentrism goes a step further by granting intrinsic value not just to individual organisms, but to entire ecological complexes, rivers, landscapes, and evolutionary processes. By shifting the locus of value from human utility to the integrity of the biosphere, environmental ethics changes the nature of policy-making. Natural resources are no longer viewed merely as unowned properties waiting for economic exploitation, but as interconnected, self-regulating systems that possess a fundamental right to exist, persist, and regenerate. This framework provides the philosophical foundation for radical legislative transformations, including the international

"Rights of Nature" movement, which grants legal personhood to ecosystems.

5. ETHICS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Sustainable development is often described as an effort to balance three pillars: economic growth, social equity, and environmental protection. However, without a grounding in moral philosophy, these three pillars are frequently co-opted by market forces, resulting in policies that prioritize short-term economic expansion over genuine ecological survival. Ethical principles provide essential guidance for policy-making by encouraging fairness, systemic accountability, structural transparency, and long-term responsibility.

Integrating ethics into sustainable development requires a fundamental reassessment of traditional economic metrics. Gross Domestic Product (GDP), for example, measures the total monetary value of goods and services produced within a nation, yet it completely fails to account for the depletion of natural capital, the destruction of ecosystems, or the distribution of wealth. From an ethical standpoint, an economic system that registers ecological destruction as net economic growth is structurally flawed. A morally sound sustainability framework requires using comprehensive metrics, such as the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), which factor environmental degradation and social inequality directly into a nation's ledger of success.

Furthermore, sustainability ethics demands that global trade, infrastructure development, and technological implementation are evaluated through a lens of distributive justice. True sustainability cannot be achieved when affluent nations outsource their heavy pollution and resource-intensive industries to developing nations. Ethical sustainable development requires that every community enjoys equal protection from environmental hazards and equal access to clean water, fertile land, and green technology, ensuring that ecological protection is structurally linked to global social justice.

6. INTERGENERATIONAL JUSTICE

One of the most complex challenges in environmental ethics is the concept of intergenerational justice. Future generations cannot participate in present political or economic decision-making, yet they will inevitably experience the direct, long-term consequences of current environmental choices. Ethical reasoning therefore requires protecting complex ecological systems to ensure future human flourishing and to honor our obligations to those who will follow us.

This moral obligation is often evaluated through John Rawls's (1971) philosophical concept of the "veil of ignorance." If we imagine a hypothetical scenario where individuals must design the basic structure of society without knowing their place in time—whether they will be born in the 19th, 21st, or 25th century—they would rationally choose an "intergenerational just savings principle." They would opt for a social contract that strictly prohibits any generation from depleting common resources or destabilizing global climates for temporary convenience, as doing so would risk their own survival if they were born into a later, resource-starved era. To quantify these long-term impacts within environmental economics and policy analysis, a mathematical valuation tool known as the *Social Cost of Carbon* (SCC) is employed. The SCC evaluates the long-term economic and human damage caused by emitting one additional ton of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. This calculation is heavily dependent on the *social discount rate* (*r*), which dictates how much weight is given to future damages relative to present costs. The mathematical relationship is expressed as follows:

$$PV = \int \infty \, C(t) \cdot e\text{-}rt \, dt$$

Where ***PV*** represents the present value of future ecological and societal damages, ***C(t)*** is the projected cost of climate damage at time ***t***, and ***r*** is the discount rate. If policymakers use a high discount rate, they effectively declare that the well-being of future generations holds very little moral value compared to current corporate profits. Ethical consistency demands a near-zero discount rate, recognizing that a human life or a functioning ecosystem fifty years from now is as valuable as a human life or ecosystem today.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INSTITUTIONAL AGENCY

Achieving comprehensive environmental sustainability requires determining how moral responsibility is distributed among individuals, corporations, and sovereign governments. In the face of global environmental challenges, assigning responsibility is complicated by differences in political power, historic emissions, and financial capacity.

7.1 Individual and Civic Duty

Individuals bear a clear moral responsibility to cultivate ecological awareness and adopt sustainable practices in their daily lives. This includes minimizing personal waste, reducing consumption of resource-intensive goods, and supporting green initiatives. However, individual action alone is insufficient to address systemic ecological collapse. Individual moral responsibility must look beyond personal lifestyle choices toward active civic engagement—voting for climate-conscious leaders, participating in grassroots environmental advocacy, and holding powerful institutions accountable for environmental degradation.

7.2 Corporate Governance and the Limits of Greenwashing

Corporations hold a massive share of responsibility for global environmental impacts due to their extensive resource extraction, supply chain choices, and industrial pollution. True moral responsibility extends far beyond mere legal compliance or superficial corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives. Historically, many corporations have engaged in "greenwashing"—spending more resources on marketing campaigns to project a sustainable image than on implementing actual green practices. Ethical corporate governance requires complete supply-chain transparency, a rapid shift away from fossil fuels, the elimination of planned obsolescence, and a commitment to a circular economy where products are designed from the outset for complete recycling or reuse.

7.3 Governmental Regulation and Global Treaties

Sovereign governments possess the legislative and enforcement power required to structuralize environmental ethics across entire societies. Governments have a moral obligation to protect the public trust—including shared resources like air, water, and public lands—from corporate exploitation. This obligation is enacted through clear, science-based environmental regulations, carbon pricing mechanisms, and the elimination of subsidies for fossil fuels. On an international level, wealthy nations have a responsibility to uphold global climate agreements, such as the Paris Accord, and honor the principle of "Common but Differentiated Responsibilities" by providing financial and technological support to developing nations as they transition to green economies.

8. CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES

The practical application of environmental ethics faces massive structural resistance from entrenched global systems. Climate change, widespread pollution, rapid deforestation, and catastrophic biodiversity loss illustrate the urgency of ethical engagement, yet our prevailing socioeconomic models remain committed to unsustainable consumption and production patterns.

A primary challenge is the pervasive nature of global consumerism, which equates human success and happiness with the acquisition of material wealth. This ideology is driven by a global economic model that requires continuous growth to avoid collapse, putting it in direct conflict with the biophysical boundaries of a finite planet. The extraction of raw materials, the energy-intensive manufacturing of consumer goods, and the resulting mountain of waste push planetary boundaries to their absolute limits, causing severe habitat destruction and species extinctions worldwide.

This crisis is further complicated by severe environmental injustices. The impacts of climate change and industrial pollution are disproportionately borne by marginalized communities and developing nations—groups that historically contributed the least to global emissions. This imbalance highlights a profound ethical failure: the economic benefits of environmental exploitation flow to a wealthy minority, while the devastating ecological costs are externalized onto the world's most vulnerable populations. Addressing these contemporary challenges requires more than minor technological adjustments; it demands a fundamental shift in our values and social structures.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

To translate these philosophical principles into practical action and build a sustainable future, society must implement comprehensive reforms across educational, governmental, corporate, and individual levels. The following recommendations provide a pathway for integrating ethics into global sustainability efforts:

1. **Reform Environmental Education:** Academic institutions must integrate ethical reasoning, environmental philosophy, and ecological literacy into all levels of education. Curricula should encourage students to critically evaluate economic systems and explore the moral dimensions of human interactions with the natural world, fostering a generation of ecologically responsible citizens.
2. **Institutionalize Ethical Assessments in Public Policy:** Governments should mandate rigorous ethical and ecological impact assessments for all major public infrastructure projects, industrial developments, and economic policies. These assessments must look beyond short-term cost-benefit analyses to prioritize long-term ecosystem health, biodiversity preservation, and intergenerational equity.
3. **Enforce Corporate Sustainability Governance:** Regulatory bodies must establish strict, legally binding frameworks that require corporations to account for their entire environmental footprint. This includes mandating full supply-chain transparency, banning deceptive greenwashing practices, and implementing financial penalties for ecological harm, alongside tax incentives for zero-waste, circular production models.
4. **Cultivate Civic Ecological Responsibility:** Local communities and individual citizens should actively practice ecological stewardship by supporting local, sustainable agricultural systems, reducing material consumption, and participating in regional conservation initiatives. Crucially, citizens should use their political voice to advocate for systemic, structural climate action and environmental justice.
5. **Expand Global Climate Justice Funding:** International organizations must strengthen financial mechanisms to support developing nations in their transition to renewable energy systems. Wealthy nations, in accordance with their historical emissions, should provide substantial funding for global climate mitigation and adaptation strategies, ensuring an equitable transition that protects vulnerable communities worldwide.

10. CONCLUSION

Environmental sustainability is fundamentally a moral issue, rather than a purely technical, scientific, or economic puzzle. While empirical data allows us to measure climate change and technological innovations offer tools for clean energy transition, neither can tell us *why* we ought to care, or *what* constitutes a just distribution of resources. Ethical reflection strengthens efforts to address ecological crises by emphasizing responsibility, justice, and respect for nature, transforming our relationship with the biosphere from one of exploitation to one of mutual respect and preservation.

A sustainable future depends upon integrating ethical principles into personal conduct, institutional practices, and public policy. We must actively move away from an anthropocentric worldview that treats the Earth as a passive storehouse of resources, embracing instead an ecocentric paradigm that honors the intrinsic value of all living systems. By centering our social, economic, and political systems on long-term ecological health and global equity, we can build a world where both human societies and the broader biotic community can permanently flourish.

REFERENCES

1. Attfield R. *Environmental Ethics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2018.
2. Barry B. Sustainability and Intergenerational Justice. In: de-Shalit A, editor. *[Book title]*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999.
3. Bookchin M. *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*. Cheshire, CT: Cheshire Books; 1982.
4. Callicott JB. *In Defense of the Land Ethic: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1989.
5. Carson R. *Silent Spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; 1962.
6. DesJardins J. *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*. Boston: Cengage Learning; 2013.
7. Eckersley R. *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an Ecocentric Approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1992.
8. Gardiner SM. *A Perfect Moral Storm: The Ethical Tragedy of Climate Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2011.
9. Goodin RE. *Green Political Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press; 1992.
10. Jamieson D. *Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2008.
11. Jonas H. *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1984.
12. Leopold A. *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1949.
13. Light A, Rolston H, editors. *Environmental Ethics: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing; 2003.
14. Naess A. The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement: A summary. *Inquiry*. 1973;16(1):95-100.
15. Norton B. *Toward Unity Among Environmentalists*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1991.
16. O'Neill J. *Ecology, Policy and Politics: Human Well-Being and the Natural World*. London: Routledge; 1993.
17. Rawls J. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1971.
18. Singer P. *Practical Ethics*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
19. Taylor P. *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1986.
20. World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1987.

About the author

Garima Sharma is a researcher affiliated with Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India. Her academic interests include philosophy, social thought, and contemporary issues. She is committed to interdisciplinary research and contributes to scholarly discussions through critical analysis, academic writing, and innovative perspectives on society and human experience.