

## UTILITARIAN CONSEQUENTIALISM IN ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY: AN EVALUATION

**Maraizu Elechi**

Department of Philosophy  
Rivers State University  
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria  
Email: [drmaraizuelechi@yahoo.com](mailto:drmaraizuelechi@yahoo.com)  
Phone: 08038954871

### **Abstract**

Human society is witnessing enormous challenges that are largely environmental. Environmental challenges are in various dimensions including climate change that has left rivers drying up and sometimes disappearing, and the steady depletion of the ozone layer. Forests are vanishing away with wild animals almost going into extinction mainly as a result of deforestation and bush burning. Game reserves or familiar animals and aquatic lives are almost thrown into extinction. Human life is in danger with increasing cases of deaths and terminal illnesses and other challenging health conditions as a result of contaminated air and water pollutions. There are increasing cases of erosion menace worsening the situation. Worst still is the regular occurrences of earthquakes, tsunamis, and landslides occasioned by oil explorations and poor handling of natural resources. All these are consequences of human exploitation and exploration of the environment. This situation, no doubt, shows that the protection, management, and sustenance of the environment are non-negotiable for the continued existence and survival of humanity. It calls for urgent practical solutions otherwise human extinction is undoubtedly very near. Adopting analytical and critical methods of inquiry, this paper, therefore, examines some environmental ethical principles or theories on how to regard and relate with the environment to give prospects and hope to environmental preservation and sustainability. In conclusion, the paper notes that the solutions to environmental exploitation lie in ethico-moral resolve to take environmental sustainability and protection as both an individual and a collective duty to avert human generational doom.

**Keywords:** environment, environmental sustainability, pollution, climate change, ethico-moral.

### **Introduction**

World peace and unity, global development, and decent living condition have been dangerously threatened by a lot of challenges including wars, insecurity, the proliferation of weapons, human-induced killer diseases, racial, religious, and gender discriminations and segregations among other contemporary global challenges. However, among these challenges, environmental issues

and problems appear to be primal. Environmental problems are the greatest of all challenges confronting and threatening humanity *en globo*. This is why Pope John Paul II in his *Message of the World Peace* in 1990 avers that world peace is threatened not only by arms, race, regional conflict, and continued injustices among peoples and nations but most importantly, by lack of due respect for nature. According to him the plundering of natural resources has progressively declined the quality of human life. Jeffery was also right when he writes that,

... change in human attitude, approach, and morality towards all living creatures that share this planet is warranted. In the space of few short decades, basic resources such as clean air and clean water that had hitherto been considered abundant, safe and inexhaustible are now under threat (120).

The concept of environment is generally interrelated with the human being and his activities, wellbeing, and wellness. Environmental issues pervade the economic, social, political, legal, religious, cultural, and scientific planes of man and his entire living and existence. Broadly speaking, it imparts and influences man in many numerous unprecedented ways: his thinking, dressing, behavior, and his overall personality, prospect, and outlook. It is therefore impossible to think of man outside the environment. Man is not only the product of his environment but more importantly, a principal actor in it. No one can live and operate outside the environment. Human beings need the environment for continued survival as much as the environment also needs human beings for care, preservation, and sustenance. This explains the idea of environmental complementarity. It explains that man is in a symbiotic relationship with the environment in such a way that 'injury to one is an injury to all.' Elechi aptly records it thus:

...the relationship between man and the environment must be one in mutual dependency and harmony. Therefore excessive exploitation of the environment by man must be avoided and the environment seen and appreciated from its intrinsic worth. Otherwise, there will not be an end to environmental disasters since the environment has a way of fighting back (30).

According to Elechi, “We must consciously seek to maintain a mutual and complementary relationship with the environment since our survival and wellbeing depends on the conducive nature of our environment” (Elechi 40). The destruction of the environment would have unbearable consequences on humans and their existence. This, no doubt, is the reason why the environment

and its sustainability is and will continue to be central in local, national, and international or global circles. The fact is that the impact of an unhealthy environment is enormous and colossally grave on both the economic potency or productivity, the socio-cultural as well as the general health condition of man; while the benefits of a healthy environment that is well sustained cannot be hyperbolized. Environmental sustainability can be achieved in many ways including through the institution of proper and effective environmental laws and policies, and its frugal implementation to regulate human activities in the environment. Environmental challenges will have no end when there is no such conscious effort to preserve and sustain the environment. In Nigeria, such inclination appears to be blatantly disregarded thereby giving rise to all forms of environmental degradations. The point is that there are environmental impacts or influences in whatever we do as human beings. Incredible varieties of human activities have turned what is supposed to be for the good of man against him. Such human activities like oil exploration, gas flaring, mining, poor handling of waste by individuals and industrial activities, forest logging, and bush burning have also adversely affected the environment, the economic and health conditions of humans.

The occurrences of disastrous phenomena like erosions, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, etc., clearly indicate the destabilization of the cosmic relationship existing between man and the environment. These catastrophes arise mainly from human activities in the environment such as indiscriminate dumping of refuse, mismanagement of oil spill and exploration activities as well as his nonchalant attitude towards the management and sustenance of the environment (Elechi 31).

The coastal vegetation has been adversely affected; drinkable waters have been polluted; farmlands, creeks, streams, rivers, and seas have been contaminated with a general loss of sources of livelihood of the people. One of the yardsticks for determining how developed society has attained is concerning the environment, that is, the overall manipulation, conservation and preservation, and sustenance of the environment. This is the reason why philosophers are deeply interested in understanding the nature of the environment and the need in making it safe for human beings to live in. The philosopher believes that certain moral principles and values should govern human behaviours and activities in and within the environment. These morally right or wrong principles guard human actions in a relationship with the environment. The point is that philosophers are united in decisions that the environment needs to be explored, tended, or cared for and preserved for the good and healthy survival of man. The human being is therefore seen for what

he is, a mere caretaker of our common home: the environment. Peter Alawa in his article titled *Kant and Heidegger on Environmental Ethics: A Comparative Study* argues that Martin Heidegger and Immanuel Kant were unequivocal and resolute in their belief that the environment should not be destroyed otherwise generations yet unborn will suffer for it (143). The moral value that underpins this philosophical belief must be imbibed by the entire humanity. The ecosystems must be respected for their intrinsic worth, and all forms of harmful environmental activities must be brought to an end. This moral obligation, a duty to treat nature with respect and care, not with neglect, exploitation, and abuse, is the basic thesis of this paper.

### **The Concept of Environment**

The concept of environment is no doubt, general, multi-faceted, and twinned with all human disciplines and activities. It requires conscious concern by all human beings. The concept “environment” is endowed with many interpretations; it constitutes both the immediate and remote Spatio-temporal bases of human existence. In his attempt to make clear the understanding of the concept of environment, Elechi looked at it from its root word thus,

Environment means "that which environs us".  
And being "environed" simply means being encircled or surrounded. Broadly speaking, therefore, the term 'environment' is understood as the overall physical, natural, cultural, social conditions surrounding man. It pervades the economic, social, political, literary, religious, cultural and scientific planes. In fact, it covers the whole facet of human life and behaviour, rendering it, therefore, a universal or global issue (31-32).

The *Federal Environmental Protection Agency Act* of 1992 records that the environment includes water, air, land, all plants, human beings, and other lower animals living therein, and the interrelationships which exist among these or any of them. In other words, the environment includes both physical and biological entities, living and nonliving things that are found within our surroundings. An environment is a complex set of physical, geographical, biological, social, cultural, and political conditions that surrounds an individual or organism and that ultimately determine its form (Barbier, 86). Hills, mountains, rocks, houses trees, grasses, rivers, and aquatic lives are part of the environment. Furthermore, Okereke writes that,

The global environment is the surrounding, the universal earth within which human beings live worldwide and interact with one another, exploiting in the process, natural resources or

endowment, for the benefit of mankind. It comprises living houses including the courtyard in the countryside, the municipality, the lithosphere (land, soil), medium atmosphere (air zone) and water or hydrosphere (moisture, groundwater, and surface water) as well as their inherent resources (1).

The study of the environment is not an exclusive reserve of those in Environmental Sciences, but more a big concern to those in the Humanities with its place, role, and relationship with the human beings who are products of their environment. The concept of environment cuts across disciplines including economic, socio-cultural, and religious, legal, and political dimensions, etc., in the same way, that its benefits are embodied and expressly discerned within these disciplines. This lends credence to Ian Barbour's view that the environment is very important to us in many ways including biologically, economically, and aesthetically. It is useful for food, health, material wellbeing, and personal fulfillment. In furtherance to Ian's claim, Eboh in her paper titled *Ecofeminism: A Politico-Revolutionary Discourse*, argues that ecosystems provide tremendous services to humanity. According to her,

Every single species serves a useful purpose. If some of them should disappear, Edward Wilson says, new sources of scientific information will be lost. Vast potential biological wealth will be destroyed. Still, underdeveloped medicines, crops, pharmaceuticals, timber, fibre, pulp, soil-restoring vegetation, petroleum substitutes, and other products and amenities will never come to light (26).

She continues the argument in her other work *Introduction to Philosophy and Philosophizing* that bio-diversity is a necessity because every organism contributes something to the maintenance of the environment for the good of all. For instance, the bacteria (*Nitrosomonas* or *rhizobium*) which live in the root nodules of leguminous plants, fix atmospheric nitrogen into nitrogen compounds which are nutrients for plants, and animals feed on plants, and human beings feed on both. Bacteria also produce antibiotics that are useful to human health; many bacteria live in the guts of animals. If bacteria which are micro-organisms could do all these and a lot more, then the contributions of other organisms should not be underestimated. And the fact that bacteria live in plants and animals and serve useful purposes for both hosts shows interdependence (167). Elechi corroborates with Eboh's view thus:

The environment as a matter of fact must be seen and treated as one in mutual relationship or interdependency with man in such a way that each plays a crucial role in the collective existence and co-existence of all. What this means is that we need to preserve the environment because it is better to see the environment as a system and collectivity rather than as a separate entity in relation to man. This is so because there is a mutual natural dependency and interconnectedness of life and living among all realities (Elechi 34-35).

The environment is so crucial to human flourishing. It must be protected and sustained if longevity and survival mean anything to humans. The ecosystems and the species constitute the web of life in mutual rapport or constant interaction in the environment. This is to say that humanity must be environmentally enlightened to always present and actively defend the preservation and protection of the environment and its sustainability.

### **The Idea of Environmental Sustainability**

It has been mentioned in several parts of this paper that human wellbeing and continued existence depends greatly on environmental sustainability. The idea of sustainability according to Robert Gilman refers to “the ability of a society, ecosystem, or any such ongoing system to continue functioning into the infinite future without being forced into decline through exhaustion of key resources.”(Omogun, 81).The point is that environmental sustainability leads to economic growth and sustainable national development. This is why Goodland defines sustainable development as “development that is socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable.” He aptly explained that environmental sustainability is “maintenance of national capacity”. Environmental sustainability supports economic growth, productivity, and national development. It simply means the need to preserve the environment for the future. This means that there is a natural moral urge towards self-preservation since the environment is the Spatio-temporal base of human existence and coexistence. Environmental sustainability simply means community or societal sustainability. (Elechi 38).Obialo records that,

Environmental protection and conservation are necessary to preserve the interest of the populace and to conserve national wealth that would otherwise be wasted in providing necessary treatment of diseases and other ailments occasioned by the degradation of the environment. The wealth so conserved

constitutes additional capital inflow to the total value of property in that location, whereas high cost of hospital bills to the community with the degraded environment becomes a net loss of capital outflow suffered by that country (3)

Environmental sustainability has continued to attract global concern and attention basically because of the threats accessioned by human activities, which result in environmental degradations. Environmental sustainability is very critical to the holistic prosperity of a nation. It leads to economic growth and development. Responsible interaction with the environment is necessary to avoid the depletion of natural resources and the promotion of long-term environmental quality. This means that natural resources must be wisely used to protect and sustain the generality of the complex ecosystems on which the survival of humanity depends. This belief, an ethico-moral and rational belief that human beings must protect those things they share and enjoy collectively, such as air, water, land, etc., for the purpose complementarity rather than antagonism clearly explains what environmental sustainability means for us. Ruckelshaus explains that:

Sustainability is the doctrine that environment growth and development must take place, and be maintained over time, within the limits set by ecology in the broadest sense – by the interactions of human beings and their works, the biosphere, and the physical and chemical laws that govern it. Environmental protection and development are complementary rather than antagonistic processes (166).

### **Ethical Issues in Environmental Sustainability**

“The sustenance of the environment has a compelling ethical dimension,” says Elechi (38). Ethics is nothing but a collective response of the thinking majority to curtail the excesses of man in society. It justifies why good is to be done and evil avoided. One good thing about the study of ethics is that it profits the whole of humanity in the long run. In ethics, we are taught to imbibe sound moral values and principles necessary to solve concrete societal problems "so that we can live in peace and harmony, with a modicum of dignity and at least some happiness.” (Eboh 181). Morality is the health of society. Our environment is exploited and degraded and requires humanity to have a conscious moral change of attitude and actions.

As ecologists harp on the importance of the ecosystems, the danger of human-caused ecological imbalances, and environmental degradation, the scope of ethics gets more and more enlarged to

embrace a genuine concern for the planet's life-support systems. Hence there is much talk these days of environmental ethics, eco-ethics, global ethics, etc. (Eboh 182).

We must stress the fact that anything which impairs the human life-support system is according to Eboh, hurts humankind. Environmental degradation, no doubt, impairs the human life-support system and therefore hurts humanity. The major reason for environmental ethics is to awaken the moral consciousness of human beings towards the environment by inculcating in them moral values in their relationship with the environment. The inculcation of moral consciousness towards the environment will help to bring environmental exploitation and degradation under control. It is therefore important we examine some environmental ethical theories suggested by philosophers on how to relate and regard the environment. The relevance of some of the environmental ethical theories is that they seek to give hope and prospect to environmental sustainability. According to Warner,

The Earth and its creatures have “moral status”, so, are worthy of our ethical concerns; the Earth and its creatures have “intrinsic value”, so, they have moral value because they exist, and not merely because they meet human needs; drawing from the idea of an ecosystem, human beings should consider the “wholes” that include other forms of life and the environment (1-2).

Environmental ethical theories to be considered here include utilitarianism and consequentialism. However, we shall also evaluate deontological ethical theory as a way forward in this study for the preservation and sustenance of the environment.

### **Utilitarian Consequentialism: Dimensions of Environmental Ethical Theories**

Utilitarianism, an ethical principle popularized by the English philosophers Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, holds that the test of the morality of any action must be determined based on the extent to which it produced good or bad consequences, that is, pleasure or pain. It is a theory that is based on utility. Utility is for Bentham, nothing other than “...that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words, to promote or to oppose that happiness” (26). The purpose of utility is the satisfaction of human needs. As a theory based on utility, utilitarianism asserts



that moral rightness is determined by what leads to the greatest good for the greatest number of people. There are two shades of utilitarianism that stand out for discourse in our context namely: Act Utilitarianism and Rule Utilitarianism. Act Utilitarianism holds that what is morally right is determined by the consequences of such acts. This is to say that the rightness or wrongness of an act is determined by the result of such an act. If an action produces a good result for the greatest good of the greatest number of people, it is ethically right and should be desired, otherwise, it is wrong and should be rejected. Rule utilitarianism on the other hand asserts that morality is a matter of conformity to rules or principles. This is to say that moral rules must be based on the principle of utility. The right principles or rules are those that if adhered to, lead to the greatest good of the people. The right action is that which conforms to the principles or rules that have been accepted and adopted as the best for the advancement of the greatest utility. The rules serve as the basis for determining which acts will lead to the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people.

Conversely, consequentialism as an ethical theory holds that correct moral conduct is determined *solely* by a cost-benefit of an action's consequences. This implies that an action is morally right if the consequences are more favourable than unfavourable. It suggests that one can affirm that consequentialist normative principles require that we first tally both the good and bad consequences of an action, before determining whether the total good consequences outweigh the total bad consequences. Therefore, if the good consequences are greater, then the action is morally proper. If the bad consequences are greater, then the action is morally improper. Consequentialist theories are sometimes called *teleological* theories, from the Greek word *telos*, which means *an end*, since the result of the action is the sole determining factor of its morality. It is said that this branch of ethics is mostly used by philosophers who want a quick way to morally assess an action by appealing to experience, rather than by appealing to reason and the gut intuitions or long lists of questionable duties. The most attractive feature of consequentialism is that it appeals to publicly observable consequences of actions. Consequentialism is an ethical principle that resurrects Plato's assertion that "things can be good in their consequences". It can be said that the environment exists as an environment *qua tale*, not for its sake, but for the purposes for which it was created, that is the ends or purposes envisaged by the Creator. In other words, it exists for the consequences that it fosters in society. An aspect of the consequentialist theory, namely, ethical egoism, regards an action as good, which only satisfies or maximizes one's good only, in contradistinction to that of others. This theory, no doubt, threatens the very foundations of environmental sustainability.

A cursory analysis of the theories of utilitarianism and consequentialism with the environment indicates that the dominant premise as far as we are concerned, by which human beings should operate or relate with the environment must be seen to be pleasure and material benefits. By this, it claims that human beings must explore or relate with the environment in such a manner that will guarantee the greater happiness, pleasure, and material benefits of the greater number of people within the environment or community. Here, the self-interest, pleasure, and material considerations of a person is the focus, rather than the realization of the good and wellbeing of the entire ecosystem. This is unacceptable. Activities in the environment must be done in consideration of the good and wellbeing of all the eco-systems in general. In this case, we are not only concerned with human beings alone but also other beings or realities that make up the environment. Again, at this point, we must be very careful not to think that whatever one does with the environment leads to happiness because that is what many people claim. This belief is equivalent to engaging in a circular delusion. Indeed, there are times when one sets out to do things that will lead to happiness, but rather end in calamity. It is wrong to consider pleasure as the ultimate standard in relationship with the environment. Pleasure is not the ultimate consideration of a man; it is not synonymous with happiness because it does not always lead to happiness. Elechi asseverates this idea thus:

To begin with, material benefits are not ultimate issues in the mind of a philosopher. Therefore the conceptions of why a man should preserve the environment as rooted in terms of material gains or pleasure are implausible. It is fraught with the consequences of reducing man to the appetitive level of lower animals. In order words, humans need the environment to be properly human. Rather than just a means to an end, the environment also serves an end in itself. Therefore nature needs to be respected and preserved not only because it is simply the right and appropriate thing to do regardless of some sorts of benefit it be-stores on man, but also because it has values in itself (34)

Most material and pleasurable things, from experience, bring about unhappiness in the end. Therefore, not all material pleasures concerning the environment are good and desirable. The care, preservation, protection, and preservation of the environment are unconditionally right, good, and desirable. Utilitarianism and consequentialism theories of the environment seem not to defend the collective interests of all the ecosystems concerning the actions and activities of humans in the environment. The environment generates and

accommodates the general or collective happiness of all; it has greater beneficial effects over and above bad or painful ones. It is based on this that Victor Frankl rightly argues that happiness is not the product of direct choice but is attained as a concomitant of other actions. Pleasure and material considerations are therefore not a guarantee that every act sanctioned by them is validly ethical.

### **Deontological Theory of the Environment: The Search for a Way Forward**

The word *deontology* derives from the Greek words *deon* meaning *duty* and *logos* which means *science* or *study*. It can be understood roughly as ‘the study or science of duty’ In contemporary moral philosophy, deontology is one of those kinds of normative theories regarding which choices are morally required, forbidden, or permitted. Deontology or Deontological Ethics is an approach to ethics that focuses on the rightness or wrongness of actions in themselves, as opposed to the rightness or wrongness of the consequences of those actions (consequentialism) or the character and habits of the actor (virtue ethics). This branch of normative ethics determines the goodness or rightness of action from examining acts, or the rules and duties that the person performing the act strives to fulfill. The deontologists hold that some actions are wrong in themselves – or at least that they are wrong *prima-facie* – not wrong merely because of the results of the actions. This means that the rightness or wrongness of an action is not determined by the consequences of the act nor upon the motive from which the act was done, but solely upon what kind of an act it was (Popkin and Stroll 50). For the deontologists, it is the intrinsic nature of an action itself that can make such act good or right. In other words, some acts are inherently right while others are wrong. This theory can also be called ‘duty ethics’. Accordingly, duty ethics holds that humans have to act in a way that their actions can be considered to be inherently good acts. This implies that in duty ethics, an act may be considered right even if the act produces a bad consequence. The care, protection, and preservation of the environment must be done from a sense of duty irrespective of one’s inclination or tendencies. The care of the environment is not an inclination but an obligation, a duty for all. An obligation is what we are conditioned to do irrespective of personal perception. Inclination on the other hand can only thrive in the absence of obligation. The point is that we must suppress our feelings or inclinations and do only that which we are obliged or duty-bound to do towards the environment. Duty is an act in response to practical reason because it corresponds to the right course of action. It is one conferred on humans by nature that we must act rationally, morally, and legally towards to environment. This is what we ought to do because lack of environmental care and protection places an epistemic-moral questionable burden on us. Such burdens put to question our rational and moral worth or value as human

beings. Not to protect the environment debases the moral integrity of humanity. A notable scholar whose theory or argument is similar to the kind presented in this paper is Immanuel Kant when he argues that human beings have the unique capacity for rationality and moral action. No other animal possesses such a propensity for reasoned thought and moral action, and it is exactly this ability that predisposes human beings to act in accordance with nature, and for the sake of natural and moral laws or duty towards all things especially the environment.

Humans have moral duties to oneself, to others, and the environment. Kant argues that there is a more foundational principle of duty that encompasses individual responsibilities. It is a single, self-evident principle of reason that he calls the "imperative." The imperative in the case of our position in this paper is that the environment must be cared for and protected. It must not be exploited and abused. Categorical imperative, according to Kant, simply mandates an action, irrespective of one's desires, such as "You ought to do X." Treat the environment as an end, and not as a means to an end, is imperative. That is, we should always treat the environment with dignity, and never use it as mere instruments. Reflecting on Kant's postulations, Omoregbe writes:

If we simply follow our natural inclinations in our actions or if we have some material benefits from such actions, our actions have no moral value. The moral values of an action do not depend on the result of the action, but on the fact that it was performed strictly for the sake of duty (220-221).

It is our considered view that the "imperative" commands all humans to protect the environment because the environment is an end in itself, that is, it is good in itself. This imperative, in recourse to Kant's principles, obliges everyone without an exemption to protect and preserve the environment. Compliance over certain actions is achieved through compulsion, coerce, force, or threat but the protection of the environment is one that we must freely do because we are free agents. This is what it means to act morally because there is a correlation between moral action and duty or obligation of humans. By this, we mean that a moral person is one who acts from duty or obligation. For instance, when a person cares for the environment because he is afraid of being arrested by the police for refusing or failing to do so, he is not acting from duty or obligation. He would be acting from duty only if he realizes that he has a special duty or obligation to care and protect the environment. This is a moral obligation. Kant believes that the morality of all actions can be determined by appealing to this single principle of duty. This duty is according to Ross "part of the fundamental nature of the universe." Humans have a natural obligation or duty to preserve and protect the

environment not only because it is good in itself, but also because by depleting resources and polluting the environment, there will be increasing jeopardy of the welfare of the present generation and next generations to come. The oil spill, erosion menace, and other degradations will continue to affect human life for many years to come if nothing is urgently done now. (Barbour, 64).

### **Conclusion**

Humans are ends in themselves; it is wrong to treat a human being as a means to an end just as it is very wrong to see and treat the environment as a means to an end, it should be treated with some worth because it is an end in itself. Both the utilitarian and consequentialist principles that guide some people's attitudes concerning the environment will not do us any reasonable good. Man must adopt a deontologist attitude towards the environment, whereby the environment is seen under all situations as an end in itself. This means that humans in relating to the environment must act in such a way that truly shows and reflects respect and care towards the environment. Human beings must be democratic towards the environment. The rights of the environment must always be obeyed and protected including those of the lower animals and other appetitive creatures. The environment deserves some forms of justice and fairness. No one should treat it as a slave because that is not what it is. To achieve this, laws and decrees must be introduced and effectively enforced to curb environmental exploitation and degradation and regulate human activities towards the environment. This must be a crucial objective of any government in power. There must be ongoing and continuous citizens' education and enlightenment of the need to care and preserve the environment not only for the present generation but even for the next or future generations to come. There should not be any playing of politics with the environment; no semantic considerations in the making of the laws that will protect, preserve and sustain the environment, and no yielding to any form of technicality with the tendency of delaying the passage of such laws or perverse efforts towards the stringent implementations of such laws. This should become a universal principle or imperative otherwise all efforts towards the preservation and sustenance of the environment will continue to be illusory. In no situation should we feel obliged to degrade the environment because we have a natural and moral duty to protect, preserve, and sustain it. This is a categorical imperative; a self-regulating moral duty of all human beings.

### **References**

- Alawa, P. (2016). "Kant and Heidegger on Environmental Ethics: A Comparative Study" in *Port Harcourt Journal of History and Diplomatic Studies*, vol. 3(1), 2016, Pp.143-157.
- Barbier, M. (1979). *Introduction to Chemical Ecology*. London: Richard Clay

- and Chausser Publishers.
- Barbour, I. (1993). "Ethics in an Age of Technology" in *Gifford's Lectures*, vol. 2. London: Harper Collins Publishers Inc., Pp. 53-72.
- Bentham, J. (1962). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (ed.) by John Bowring, New York: Russell and Russell.
- Eboh, M.P. (1999). *Introduction to Philosophy and Philosophizing*, Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.
- Elechi, M. (2020). "Critical Analysis of Basic Challenges in Environmental Ethics and Sustainability in Nigeria" in *EVAIA: International Journal of Ethics and Values*, vol. 1(1). Pp.30-41.
- Goodland R. (1995). "The Concept of Environmental Sustainability" in *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, vol.1(4), Pp.1-4.
- Jeffery, M.I. "Environmental Ethics and Sustainable Development: Ethical and Human Rights Issues" in *Implementing Indigenous Rights*. MQJICE, vol.2, Pp. 105-120.
- Kant, I. (1993). *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, Trans by Ellington, J.W., Indianapolis, Hackett Publishing Co. Inc.
- Lawrence Atsegbua et al., (2010). *Environmental Law in Nigeria: Theory and Practice*, Benin City: Ambik Press.
- Obialo, E. D. (1992). "Environmental Pollution and Property Value", Presidential Address at the Opening Ceremony of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual Conference on the Nigerian Institution of Estate Surveyors and Valuers, Port Harcourt, 25-29<sup>th</sup> March.
- Okereke, C.D. (2006). *Environmental Pollution Control*, Benin: Barloz Publishers Inc.,
- Omogbe, J. (2000). *Ethics*. Lagos: Joja Educational and Research Publications.
- Omoogun, Ajai C. (2009). *Ethics and Environment: Issues and Perspective*, Calabar: Baye Communications.
- Ruckelshaus, William D. (2016), "Toward a Sustainable World" in *Scientific America*, vol. 261, Pp. 152-168.
- Popkin, R. H. and Stroll V. (1983). *Philosophy Made Simple*. London: Heinemann.
- Warner, K.D. and Decosse, D. Thinking Ethically about the Environment. [https://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/focusarcas/environment\\_ethics/s hort\\_course.html.1-2.2009](https://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/focusarcas/environment_ethics/s hort_course.html.1-2.2009).
- Zimmerman, Michael E. (2001). *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*, London: Prentice-Hall.