© APR 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 10 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I10-1719205

Environmental Ethics and Human Responsibility Toward Nature: A Philosophical Framework for Intergenerational Justice and Ecological Stewardship

DR. VASEEM KHAN
Department of Philosophy, Ravindra Nath Tagore PG College Kapasan

Abstract- ***The accelerating environmental crisis of the twenty-first century demands a fundamental reexamination of human moral responsibilities toward nature. This study investigates the philosophical foundations of environmental ethics and articulates a comprehensive framework for human responsibility that transcends traditional anthropocentric limitations while maintaining practical applicability. Employing qualitative conceptual analysis and comparative philosophical methodology, this research critically examines three predominant ethical paradigms—anthropocentrism, biocentrism, and ecocentrism—alongside emerging frameworks including environmental stewardship, intergenerational justice, and the rights of nature movement. Data sources encompass 25 scholarly publications from Scopus-indexed journals (2020-2026), philosophical texts, and contemporary policy documents including Agenda 21 and sustainable development frameworks. The analysis utilizes comparative analysis, interpretive methodology, and critical philosophical evaluation grounded in theories developed by Aldo Leopold, Arne Næss, Dale Jamieson, and contemporary environmental philosophers. Key findings demonstrate that exclusive anthropocentric frameworks insufficiently address the moral dimensions of environmental degradation, while pure ecocentric approaches face implementation challenges in human-centered political systems. The research establishes that environmental responsibility must be understood through a synthesized framework integrating intrinsic value recognition, expanded ecological responsibility, and justice-based considerations encompassing both marginalized contemporary populations and future generations. Results reveal that intergenerational justice states present humanity has ethical obligation to ensure future generations access healthy ecosystems, abundant natural resources, and predictable climate. The study contributes a novel integrative framework balancing ecological integrity with human flourishing, emphasizing environmental stewardship as ethics for environmental respectability challenging irresponsible appropriation and instrumentalization of nature. Indigenous knowledge systems offer complementary pathways understanding social-environmental problems through accumulated generational observation. This research advances environmental ethics discourse by providing practical framework for ethical oversight in environmental policy, conservation practice, and climate governance in the twenty-first century.[1][2][3][4][5]***

Keywords: Environmental Ethics, Human Responsibility, Intergenerational Justice, Ecocentrism, Environmental Stewardship, Intrinsic Value, Environmental Justice

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Topic

The environmental crisis confronting contemporary civilization represents not merely a technological or policy challenge but fundamentally an ethical crisis requiring philosophical examination of human-nature relationships. The philosophical sphere of environmental ethics reflects on how humanity respects 'Mother Nature,' suggesting that all forms of life have inherent worth beyond their utility to humans. Environmental ethics, as a subdivision of environmental philosophy, investigates the moral connections and interactions between humans and the natural world, representing a critical area of research addressing contemporary ecological challenges.[6][7] Modern Green Philosophy relies on three fundamental principles: recognition of the intrinsic value of nature, expansion of human ecological responsibility, and integration of environmental interests in moral decision-making. These principles form the foundation for contemporary debates regarding whether human beings serve as stewards (or trustees) on this planet to conserve and nurture its resources, or whether nature possesses independent moral status requiring protection regardless of human benefit.[8][9]

The deep ecology movement, introduced by Arne Næss, emphasizes the interconnectedness of all life forms and the intrinsic value of nature, contrasting sharply with anthropocentric approaches to environmental issues. This perspective, initially proposed by environmental philosopher Aldo Leopold (1887-1948) and later expanded within the Deep Ecology movement, views the planetary ecosystem as the moral community to which all beings belong. Leopold's land ethic and Næss's deep ecology appeal to biocentrism, asserting that both human and non-human beings possess intrinsic value and a right to exist, independent of their usefulness to humans.[10][11][12]

Importance and Relevance

The importance of environmental ethics research cannot be overstated in the context of accelerating climate change, biodiversity loss, and ecological degradation. Environmental ethic to safeguard environment for future generations is the primordial challenge and a much needed debate faced by humanity today. Generation alpha are born with environmental challenges such as global warming, scarcity of resources, food chain disruptions, and loss of biodiversity. It has been proven time and again that the current generation has to reserve resources and conserve environment for generations yet to come.[9]

Environmental justice is a crucial framework that ensures fair and equitable access to clean air, water, and natural resources for all, particularly for marginalized and vulnerable populations. According to EEB4, environmental justice relates to how certain communities and groups, including people of colour, ethnic minorities, indigenous groups, or low-income groups, are disproportionately affected by environmental burdens, have less access to environmental resources and services, and/or are discriminated against in their right to information, to participation in decision-making, and to access to justice in environmental matters. This framework is essential for understanding and mitigating the impacts of environmental degradation, which disproportionately affect marginalized communities.[13][14][15]

The long-term nature of many environmental problems has forced moral philosophy to pay closer attention to relations between generations. Intergenerational ethics, as a branch of applied ethics, considers whether present-day humanity is morally obligated to future generations to aim for environmental sustainability. This approach revolves around the idea of intergenerational justice, which states that we have an ethical obligation to ensure that future generations have access to healthy ecosystems, abundant natural resources, and a predictable climate.[2][1]

Problem Statement

The central philosophical problem this paper addresses is the inadequacy of traditional ethical frameworks to adequately capture the moral dimensions of human responsibility toward nature. A common debate among environmentalists concerns environmental stewardship—whether human beings are stewards (or trustees) on this planet to conserve and nurture its resources. However, existing ethical paradigms present significant limitations: anthropocentric approaches narrowly aimed at preserving human welfare fail to recognize nature's intrinsic value; ecocentric approaches seeking to protect the environment for the sake of the environment itself face implementation challenges in human-centered political systems; and stewardship frameworks, while challenging irresponsible appropriation and instrumentalization of nature, may still presuppose human dominance over nature.[16][4][17][9]

The distinctiveness of environmental ethics is thought to be based upon principles that attribute intrinsic value to nature, independent of human value. Consequently, it is argued that one has to reject anthropocentrism that treats humans as the ultimate reference point for value. However, in anthropocentrism, the human subject takes precedence over the object (nature); in ecocentrism, nature as the substrate takes precedence—this naturalism ultimately leads to subjectivism, where what matters is only what the individual thinks or values.[18][10]

The decentralized political and legal movement focusing on rights of nature argues that existing environmental law frameworks have failed to protect the planet and that new strategies—like granting animals, plants, and natural features legal personhood—are needed to stave off disaster. This movement represents a response to the failures of traditional anthropocentric environmental law but raises philosophical questions about the correlativity between claim-rights and duties.[19][20]

Furthermore, climate change focuses on questions about who has what responsibility to bear the burdens of mitigating it or adapting to it. A prominent debate in climate ethics concerns who has a responsibility to do what, with the 'what' usually discussed under two headings: mitigation and adaptation. The philosophy of climate change deals with the ethical aspects of this global issue, investigating the ethical responsibilities of individuals, governments, and institutions in reducing and adapting to the adverse effects of climate change.[21][22]

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This research seeks to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To conduct a critical philosophical analysis of predominant environmental ethics paradigms—anthropocentrism, biocentrism, and ecocentrism—and evaluate their capacity to articulate comprehensive human responsibility toward nature[17][23][10]
2. To examine the concept of environmental stewardship as a synthetic narrative integrating Western and Islamic philosophies, exploring what morality has to say about the ecosystem and how it enables restoration of ecological balance on Earth[9]
3. To analyze intergenerational justice as a framework for understanding moral responsibilities shared among different generations, addressing the scope of obligations to future generations and answering questions about managing natural resources responsibly[24][2]
4. To investigate the role of Indigenous knowledge systems in contributing to environmental ethics, reviewing pathways by which Indigenous peoples and local communities engage with management of and relationships to nature through accumulated generational observation and experience[3][5][25]
5. To evaluate the rights of nature movement as an innovation space combining indigenous worldviews and state structures, assessing its potential as hybrid legal architecture for environmental protection[26]
6. To conduct comparative analysis examining strengths and limitations of different ethical frameworks across environmental application domains including conservation, climate policy, and resource management[6][13]
7. To develop an integrative ethical framework balancing ecological integrity with human flourishing, emphasizing environmental stewardship as ethics for environmental respectability challenging irresponsible appropriation, commercialization, and instrumentalization of nature[4]
8. To propose practical recommendations for implementing environmental ethics in policy, conservation practice, and climate governance, advancing current ethical discussions about environmental oversight in the twenty-first century[27][6]

This research advances environmental ethics discourse by providing practical framework for ethical oversight in environmental policy, conservation practice, and climate governance.[6]

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Critical Analysis of Existing Research

The literature on environmental ethics has expanded significantly over the past decade, revealing complex debates about ethical paradigms, responsibility frameworks, and implementation challenges. This review critically examines 25 key research works, emphasizing recent studies from the last 5 years.

Foundational Works on Anthropocentrism and Ecocentrism

Frantz, Rego, and Barbas (2025) address the central moral challenge of twenty-first-century societies: identifying a core principle to guide the hierarchy of values in environmental decision-making. This article addresses the dilemma between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism, exploring how to overcome this dichotomy rather than simply choosing one side. In ecocentric worldview, the planet as a whole—its ecosystem—becomes the central focus of moral considerations, representing the ultimate reference point for value.[10]

The distinction between anthropocentric and biocentric concerns for the environment has been differentiated by many scholars, with anthropocentric concerns narrowly aimed at preserving human welfare while biocentric concerns are oriented toward protecting non-human organisms and nature as a whole. However, biocentrism is unlikely to be a singular stance; rather, it plausibly consists of at least two qualitatively distinct attitudes: first, stemming from desire to avoid hurting sentient beings (e.g., harboring concerns about killing animals); second, stemming from desire to uphold purity in nature (e.g., harboring concerns about violating sanctity or telos of natural kinds).[17]

Biswas Mellamphy and Vangeest (2024) examine contemporary narratives and counter-narratives regarding the Anthropocene crisis, maintaining that anthropocentrism should be understood as distinct from "ecocentrism" or "biocentrism" where value is no longer solely in the purview of humanity. They argue these perspectives maintain distinctions between human-centered and ecosystem-centered foci, respectively.[28]

Environmental Stewardship Frameworks

Environmental stewardship is a term describing both the philosophy and the actions required to protect, restore, and sustainively use natural resources for the future benefit of the environment and society. Underpinning social and political responses to environmental problems is the concept of environmental stewardship, a term used for describing both a philosophy/ethic as well as the actions or behaviors required to achieve those aspirations.[29]

A systematic scoping review of environmental stewardship published in 2024 examines the philosophy and actions required for environmental protection, providing comprehensive analysis of stewardship conceptualization and implementation. This review establishes stewardship as integrating both ethical framework and practical action dimension.[29]

Gubazire (2022) presents stewardship as an ethics for environmental respectability in Africa, strongly challenging mankind to treat nature (environment) with substantial reverence and care. Stewardship, as an ethical theory and practice, pivots on the philosophical idea that nature is sacred (i.e., bearer of intrinsic value and locus of transcendence). This ethics challenges human beings to committedly preserve nature and to only tamper with it for procurement of basic human needs. Destroying nature is somehow destroying oneself.[4]

The paper recommends contributory measures for implementing ethics of stewardship, including ethical principles of co-existentiality, personalised responsibility, proportionality, and solidarity. Ethics of stewardship carries greater prospects of challenging people's irresponsible appropriation, commercialisation and instrumentalisation of nature (anthropocentrism), hence contributing to environmental respectability.[4]

Islamic and Western Philosophical Integration

Environmental ethic to safeguard environment for future generations is the primordial challenge faced by humanity today. A common debate among environmentalists concerns environmental stewardship—whether human beings are stewards (or trustees) on this planet to conserve and nurture its resources. In paper exploring Western and Islamic perspectives, authors seek answer from both moral traditions about ecosystem and how it enables restoration of ecological balance on Earth.[9]

Environmental stewardship represents synthetic narrative integrating Western and Islamic philosophies, exploring what morality has to say about ecosystem and how it enables restoration of ecological balance. This comparative approach

previews future prospect for protecting environment through integrated ethical frameworks.[9]

Intergenerational Justice and Climate Ethics

Intergenerational ethics, as branch of applied ethics, considers whether present-day humanity is morally obligated to future generations to aim for environmental sustainability. The long-term nature of many environmental problems has forced moral philosophy to pay closer attention to relations between generations. This approach revolves around idea of intergenerational justice, which states that we have ethical obligation to ensure that future generations have access to healthy ecosystems, abundant natural resources, and predictable climate.[1][2]

The principle says that current generation has moral duty to manage natural resources wisely, making sure we don't leave a mess for future people to clean up. Current generation has moral duty to manage natural resources responsibly, avoiding long-term damage, and ensuring that future people can enjoy clean air, water, and healthy ecosystems just like we do today.[30]

Climate ethics focuses on questions about who has what responsibility to bear the burdens of mitigating climate change or adapting to it. A prominent debate in climate ethics concerns who has a responsibility to do what, with the 'what' usually discussed under two headings: mitigation and adaptation. Persuasive by many, that those who have been causally responsible for overburdening the atmosphere have moral responsibility for dealing with the consequences.[21]
Jamieson argues that individuals have moral responsibility to address climate change, proposing alternative approaches such as "climate ethics" and "global environmental ethics," which prioritize collective action and global cooperation. He proposes alternative approaches prioritizing collective action and global cooperation over individual responsibility.[31]

Philosophy and ethics play central role in debates on environmental ethics, the tragedy of the commons, climate ethics, intergenerational justice, energy justice, theory of motivation, and above all water ethics. The Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies organized advanced training program on "The Ethics of Climate Change: Duties, Responsibilities and Challenges," highlighting philosophy and ethics centrality in environmental debates.[27]

Deep Ecology and Intrinsic Value

Deep ecology, introduced by Arne Næss, emphasises the interconnectedness of all life forms and the intrinsic value of nature, contrasting sharply with anthropocentric approaches to environmental issues. Bill Devall and George Sessions articulated their interpretation of deep ecology through eight key points in 1985, with first point stating: "The well being and flourishing of human and nonhuman life on Earth have value in themselves (this is commonly referred to as inherent worth, or intrinsic value). These values are independent of the usefulness of the nonhuman world for human purposes".[11]

These principles advocate for nature's intrinsic value and propose that environmental policy be oriented not toward human flourishing but toward what Sessions and Naess believed would ensure the flourishing of all life. In Naess' new moral ethic, "each natural entity is held as being inherently equal to every other entity," and the biosphere, rather than human well-being, becomes the focus of value.[32]

Deep ecology is an environmental philosophy and social movement that focuses on the intrinsic value of nature, placing it at the centre of its concerns. Deep Ecology's low opinion of humanity is not shared by most humans, with Naess proposing that "each natural entity is held as being inherently equal to every other entity".[33][32]

Environmental Justice Frameworks

Environmental Justice is an academic interdisciplinary field applicable to plethora of environmental and social issues and provides framework of guiding principles and practices for conducting ethical and beneficial community-focused research. This is especially true when integrated with Environmental (E) framework—Environmental Justice encompasses range of environmental and social issues, providing guiding principles and

practices for conducting ethical and beneficial community-focused research.[34]

Environmental justice is a crucial framework that ensures fair and equitable access to clean air, water, and natural resources for all, particularly for marginalized and vulnerable populations. By safeguarding these elements, the study promotes sustainable future and healthier planet for generations to come. Central to research is concept of environmental ethics, which defines moral responsibilities humans have toward the ordinary, often overlooked aspects of the natural world.[13]

According to EEB4, environmental justice relates to how certain communities and groups, including people of colour, ethnic minorities, indigenous groups, or low-income groups, are disproportionately affected by environmental burdens, have less access to environmental resources and services, and/or are discriminated against in their right to information, to participation in decision-making, and to access to justice in environmental matters. Framework is essential for understanding and mitigating impacts of environmental degradation, which disproportionately affect marginalized communities.[14][15]

Rights of Nature Movement

The decentralized political and legal movement focusing on rights of nature argues that existing environmental law frameworks have failed to protect the planet and that new strategies—like granting animals, plants, and natural features legal personhood—are needed to stave off disaster. This movement represents response to failures of traditional anthropocentric environmental law but raises philosophical questions about correlativity between claim-rights and duties.[20][19]

Rights of Nature (RoN) approach reflects hybrid legal architecture that combines indigenous worldviews and state structures. This approach reflects innovation space for education for sustainable development, combining indigenous cosmologies with modern legal frameworks.[26]

Secondly, we have the ecocentric approach which seeks to protect the environment for the sake of environment itself and not humans. Practically, there are different number of prerequisites for invoking ecocentric legal rule and more for anthropocentric legal rule. For an anthropocentric law, there is one added prerequisite—harm or effect to the humans; whereas for ecocentric law, this prerequisite is entirely absent.[16]

Indigenous Knowledge Systems

The knowledge, values, and practices of Indigenous peoples and local communities offer ways to understand and better address social-environmental problems. The article reviews state of literature on this topic by focusing on six pathways by which Indigenous peoples and local communities engage with management of and relationships to nature. These are (a) undertaking conservation and protection, (b) sustainable use of resources, (c) environmental monitoring and assessment, (d) governance and decision-making, (e) knowledge transmission, and (f) spiritual and cultural practices.[3]

In article, "indigenous knowledge" and its relationship to tradition and to reinvented religion are explored. Indigenous people around the world have rich body of knowledge about ecology of local flora and fauna and of ecosystem processes, accumulated and applied through many generations of observation and experience.[5]

Rather, it is a dynamic concept of knowledge of survival with history of involvement with nature and potential to generate scientific knowledge and ethical norms about how humans should interact with nature. Climate change is one of the biggest challenges facing the world today threatening societies and the future of the planet. The impacts of climate change are more severe in poor and marginalised populations like Indigenous communities where people face disproportionate environmental burdens.[25]

Circular Economy and Environmental Ethics

The Philosophical sphere of Environmental Ethics reflects on how humanity respects 'Mother Nature,' suggesting that all forms of life have inherent worth beyond their utility to humans. In addition, the intergenerational justice concept stresses the

responsibility of the present generation to preserve the environment for future generations, ensuring capable sustaining life (something that was highlighted in Agenda 21).[6]

Environmental ethics considerations in circular economy and waste management reflect growing integration of ethical frameworks into sustainable development practice. This integration demonstrates practical application of environmental ethics in contemporary policy frameworks.[6]

Contemporary Debates and Emerging Perspectives
Over the past generation or two, environmental ethics positions have sometimes been identified by labels 'anthropocentrism', 'biocentrism' and 'ecocentrism,' which refer to human-centred, life-centred and ecosystem-centred foci, respectively. These labels represent primary ethical paradigms in contemporary environmental philosophy discourse.[23]

Leopold's land ethic and Naess' deep ecology appeal to biocentrism, with ecosystem maintained by interdependence of various kinds of living things. Anthropocentrism criticizes biocentrism, representing ongoing tension between human-centered and nature-centered ethical frameworks.[12]

Jamieson situated climate ethics within applied ethics, highlighting Leopold's "anti-Copernican revolution": the land ethic, which shifted the focus from human beings to the earth itself, and which later inspired the development of the "rights of nature". This historical trajectory demonstrates evolution from anthropocentric to ecocentric frameworks.[27]
Breaking down biocentrism reveals two distinct forms of moral concern for environment, with scholars differentiating between "anthropocentric" (also called "homocentric" or "altruistic") and "biocentric" (also called "ecocentric" or "biospheric") concerns. These two attitudes are indeed distinct, representing qualitatively different moral orientations toward nature.[17]

Trends, Debates, and Gaps
Emerging Trends:

1. Integration of Ethical Frameworks into Policy: Growing integration of environmental ethics into circular economy, waste management, and sustainable development frameworks[6]
2. Rights of Nature Movement Expansion: Decentralized political and legal movement gaining traction, arguing existing environmental law frameworks have failed[19]
3. Indigenous Knowledge Integration: Increasing recognition of Indigenous peoples' knowledge, values, and practices offer ways to understand and address social-environmental problems[3]
4. Climate Ethics Institutionalization: Philosophy and ethics playing central role in debates on environmental ethics, climate ethics, intergenerational justice, energy justice[27]
5. Stewardship Ethics Development: Ethics of stewardship carrying greater prospects of challenging irresponsible appropriation and instrumentalization of nature[4]

Key Debates:

1. Anthropocentrism vs. Ecocentrism: Central moral challenge of identifying core principle to guide hierarchy of values in environmental decision-making[10]
2. Stewardship Premises: Whether human beings are stewards (or trustees) on this planet to conserve and nurture its resources[9]
3. Rights Correlativity: Philosophical questions about correlativity between claim-rights and duties in rights of nature framework[20]
4. Biocentrism Complexity: Whether biocentrism is singular stance or consists of at least two qualitatively distinct attitudes[17]
5. Implementation Challenges: Ecocentric approaches facing implementation challenges in human-centered political systems[16]

Identified Gaps:

1. Limited research on synthesizing anthropocentric and ecocentric approaches into practical framework[10]
2. Insufficient integration of Indigenous knowledge with Western environmental ethics frameworks[5][3]
3. Gap in practical implementation guidelines for environmental ethics in policy and conservation practice[4][6]

4. Limited comparative analysis examining strengths and limitations of different ethical frameworks across application domains[13][6]
5. Gaps in understanding how rights of nature movement can be integrated with existing legal systems[19][26]

IV. RESEARCH GAP

What is Missing in Previous Studies

Despite the substantial body of literature on environmental ethics, critical gaps remain that this research addresses. First, previous studies have predominantly examined anthropocentrism, biocentrism, and ecocentrism as separate, competing paradigms rather than exploring potential synthesis integrating strengths of each approach. While Frantz, Rego, and Barbas (2025) address the central moral challenge of identifying core principle to guide hierarchy of values, they focus on overcoming the dichotomy rather than developing comprehensive integrative framework. This leaves practitioners without practical guidance for implementing environmental ethics in policy and conservation practice that balances ecological integrity with human flourishing.[23][10]

Second, while substantial literature exists on Indigenous knowledge systems offering ways to understand and better address social-environmental problems through six pathways of engagement with nature, insufficient integration of Indigenous knowledge with Western environmental ethics frameworks remains. Indigenous people around the world have rich body of knowledge about ecology of local flora and fauna and of ecosystem processes, accumulated and applied through many generations of observation and experience. However, this knowledge remains largely compartmentalized from dominant Western ethical discourse, limiting potential for cross-cultural ethical synthesis that could enhance environmental protection effectiveness.[5][3]

Third, limited research exists on practical implementation guidelines for environmental ethics in policy, conservation practice, and climate governance. While ethics of stewardship carries greater prospects of challenging people's irresponsible appropriation, commercialisation and instrumentalisation of nature, contributing to environmental respectability, the paper recommends contributory measures for implementing ethics of stewardship but lacks comprehensive implementation framework with specific actionable steps. This gap prevents environmental ethics from translating into effective policy and practice.[4][6]

Fourth, gap exists in comparative analysis examining strengths and limitations of different ethical frameworks across environmental application domains including conservation, climate policy, and resource management. Environmental justice is a crucial framework ensuring fair and equitable access to clean air, water, and natural resources for all, particularly for marginalized and vulnerable populations. However, systematic comparison of how different ethical frameworks perform across domains is limited, preventing evidence-based selection of appropriate ethical approaches for specific contexts.[13][6]

Fifth, gaps exist in understanding how rights of nature movement can be integrated with existing legal systems. The decentralized political and legal movement focusing on rights of nature argues existing environmental law frameworks have failed to protect the planet. Rights of Nature approach reflects hybrid legal architecture that combines indigenous worldviews and state structures, but practical guidance for integration remains limited. This creates uncertainty for policymakers and legal practitioners seeking to implement rights of nature within existing systems.[26][19]

Why This Gap is Important

These gaps represent not merely theoretical deficiencies but practical challenges affecting real-world environmental policy, conservation practice, and climate governance. The insufficient integration of anthropocentric and ecocentric approaches limits the practical applicability of environmental ethics frameworks. As environmental challenges become increasingly complex, requiring balance between ecological preservation and human needs, exclusive adherence to either paradigm proves inadequate.

Without integrative framework, policymakers lack ethical guidance for making difficult decisions requiring trade-offs between human welfare and ecological integrity.[10]

The compartmentalization of Indigenous knowledge from Western ethical discourse represents significant loss of potential ethical insight. Indigenous peoples and local communities possess accumulated generational knowledge about ecosystem processes and human-nature relationships that could enhance Western environmental ethics. Climate change impacts are more severe in poor and marginalised populations like Indigenous communities where people face disproportionate environmental burdens. Excluding Indigenous knowledge from environmental ethics discourse not only perpetuates epistemic injustice but also limits effectiveness of environmental protection strategies by failing to incorporate valuable traditional wisdom.[25][3]

The lack of practical implementation guidelines prevents environmental ethics from translating into effective policy and practice. While environmental ethics reflects on how humanity respects 'Mother Nature,' suggesting all forms of life have inherent worth beyond utility to humans, this philosophical insight remains abstract without concrete implementation mechanisms. Environmental ethic to safeguard environment for future generations is the primordial challenge faced by humanity today, but without practical guidance, ethical principles remain disconnected from action.[9][6]

The gap in comparative analysis across application domains prevents evidence-based selection of appropriate ethical approaches. Different environmental challenges require different ethical frameworks: conservation may benefit from ecocentric approaches emphasizing intrinsic value, while climate policy may require anthropocentric considerations of human welfare alongside ecological concerns. Without comparative analysis, practitioners lack guidance for selecting appropriate ethical frameworks for specific contexts, potentially leading to ineffective or inappropriate ethical application.

The uncertainty around rights of nature integration with existing legal systems creates barriers to implementation. The rights of nature movement argues existing environmental law frameworks have failed to protect the planet, yet without clear integration pathways, this promising approach remains largely theoretical. Rights of Nature approach reflects hybrid legal architecture combining indigenous worldviews and state structures, but practical implementation guidance remains limited, preventing widespread adoption.[19][26]

These gaps collectively limit environmental ethics' capacity to address contemporary environmental challenges effectively. Addressing them is essential for developing robust, practically applicable, and culturally inclusive frameworks for human responsibility toward nature in the twenty-first century.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs qualitative conceptual analysis and comparative philosophical methodology. The research is primarily qualitative, conceptual, analytical, and comparative in nature, drawing upon philosophical analysis rather than empirical data collection. Specifically, this research conducts:

1. Conceptual Analysis: Philosophical analysis of environmental ethics paradigms including anthropocentrism, biocentrism, ecocentrism, stewardship, and intergenerational justice, outlining normative standards and evaluating their capacity to articulate human responsibility toward nature[10][9][4]
2. Comparative Analysis: Comparative examination of strengths and limitations of different ethical frameworks across environmental application domains including conservation, climate policy, and resource management[13][6]
3. Critical Analysis: Critical evaluation of predominant environmental ethics paradigms against contemporary environmental challenges, identifying limitations and potential for synthesis[23][10]

4. Interpretive Analysis: Interpretive examination of philosophical texts by Aldo Leopold, Arne Næss, Dale Jamieson, and contemporary environmental philosophers to understand evolution of environmental ethics thought[11][31][10]
5. Normative Analysis: Development of integrative ethical framework balancing ecological integrity with human flourishing, proposing practical recommendations for implementation[27][4]

Data Sources and Collection Methods
This research draws upon diverse data sources including:

Primary Philosophical Texts:
- Classical environmental philosophy works by Aldo Leopold on land ethic
- Arne Næss's deep ecology principles and eight fundamental points
- Contemporary philosophical works on climate ethics by Dale Jamieson
- Theoretical frameworks on stewardship ethics and intergenerational justice

Secondary Academic Sources:
- Peer-reviewed journal articles from Scopus-indexed publications (25 publications analyzed from 2020-2026)[13][6][10]
- Recent research articles (2023-2026) on environmental ethics, ecocentrism, anthropocentrism, and environmental justice[11][10][4]
- Book chapters from edited volumes on environmental philosophy and climate ethics[2][24]
- Bibliometric analyses and systematic reviews of environmental ethics literature[29]

Policy and Legal Documents:
- Agenda 21 and sustainable development frameworks highlighting intergenerational justice[6]
- Rights of Nature legal frameworks and hybrid legal architecture documents[26][19]
- Environmental justice policy frameworks including EEB4 guidelines[14]

Digital Resources:
- arXiv preprints and PhilArchive documents on environmental ethics[18][23]
- Academic database entries from Semantic Scholar and university research portals[10][9]
- Online journal articles from specialized environmental ethics publications[13][6]

Indigenous Knowledge Sources:
- Annual Reviews literature on Indigenous peoples' knowledge, values, and practices[3]
- Journal articles exploring indigenous knowledge relationship to tradition and reinvented religion[5]
- Research on how Indigenous knowledge contributes to understanding climate change impacts[25]

Tools and Techniques Used
Comparative Method:
The research employs comparative analysis examining strengths and limitations of different ethical frameworks across environmental application domains. This includes comparing anthropocentrism's human welfare focus with ecocentrism's ecosystem-centered value approach. Comparative studies draw parallels between different ethical traditions, enriching understanding of diverse moral orientations toward nature.[28][9][10]

Interpretive Method:
Interpretive analysis examines philosophical texts by Leopold, Næss, Jamieson, and contemporary environmental philosophers. Leopold's land ethic represents "anti-Copernican revolution" shifting focus from human beings to earth itself. Næss's deep ecology emphasizes interconnectedness of all life forms and intrinsic value of nature. Jamieson's climate ethics prioritizes collective action and global cooperation over individual responsibility. These interpretive examinations trace evolution of environmental ethics thought.[31][11][27]

Critical Method:
Critical analysis evaluates predominant environmental ethics paradigms against contemporary environmental challenges. Critical evaluation reveals anthropocentric approaches

narrowly aimed at preserving human welfare fail to recognize nature's intrinsic value. Ecocentric approaches seeking to protect environment for its own sake face implementation challenges in human-centered political systems. Stewardship frameworks, while challenging irresponsible appropriation, may still presuppose human dominance over nature.[16][17][4]

Normative Method:
Normative analysis develops integrative framework balancing ecological integrity with human flourishing. This normative approach provides direct implications for environmental policy, conservation practice, and climate governance. The framework proposes practical recommendations for implementing environmental ethics in policy and practice.[27][6]

Systematic Literature Review:
Systematic review of 25 key research works identifies trends, debates, and gaps. Systematic scoping review of environmental stewardship published in 2024 examines philosophy and actions required for environmental protection. Review of literature on Indigenous peoples' knowledge focuses on six pathways by which they engage with management of and relationships to nature.[29][3]

Justification of Methods
Qualitative Conceptual Analysis Justification:
Environmental ethics is fundamentally a philosophical discipline requiring conceptual clarity and normative reasoning rather than empirical measurement. Qualitative conceptual analysis enables deep examination of ethical paradigms' philosophical foundations, assumptions, and implications. This method is appropriate for addressing questions about moral responsibilities, intrinsic value, and ethical obligations that cannot be answered through empirical data collection alone.[23][10]

Comparative Philosophy Justification:
Comparative philosophical methodology enables identification of strengths and limitations across different ethical traditions, facilitating potential synthesis integrating complementary insights. Given the complexity of contemporary environmental challenges requiring balance between ecological preservation and human needs, comparative analysis provides essential guidance for selecting appropriate ethical frameworks for specific contexts.[9]

Critical Analysis Justification:
Critical evaluation of predominant paradigms against contemporary challenges identifies limitations preventing effective environmental protection. This critical approach is essential for advancing environmental ethics discourse beyond established debates toward more practically applicable frameworks.[4][10]

Interpretive Method Justification:
Interpretive examination of philosophical texts traces evolution of environmental ethics thought, providing historical context for contemporary debates. Understanding intellectual history enables more informed engagement with current ethical questions and prevents repetition of previous conceptual errors.[11][10]

Normative Analysis Justification:
Normative framework development moves beyond critique toward constructive proposal of integrative approach balancing ecological integrity with human flourishing. This constructive dimension is essential for translating philosophical insight into practical policy guidance.[27][4]

VI. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Presentation of Findings
The conceptual analysis and comparative philosophical evaluation conducted in this research yields several critical findings regarding environmental ethics and human responsibility toward nature:

Finding 1: Anthropocentrism Insufficiently Addresses Moral Dimensions
Anthropocentric concerns for the environment are narrowly aimed at preserving the welfare of humans, failing to recognize nature's intrinsic value independent of human utility. In anthropocentrism, the human subject takes precedence over the object (nature), treating humans as ultimate reference point

for value. This limitation proves inadequate for addressing contemporary environmental challenges requiring recognition of nature's independent moral status.[18][17][10]

Finding 2: Ecocentrism Faces Implementation Challenges

The ecocentric approach seeks to protect the environment for the sake of the environment itself and not humans, representing ultimate reference point for value as the planetary ecosystem. However, ecocentric approaches face implementation challenges in human-centered political systems where policy must address human needs alongside ecological concerns. For anthropocentric law, there is one added prerequisite—harm or effect to humans; whereas for ecocentric law, this prerequisite is entirely absent, creating practical implementation barriers.[16][10]

Finding 3: Biocentrism Consists of Distinct Attitudes

Biocentrism is unlikely to be a singular stance; rather, it plausibly consists of at least two qualitatively distinct attitudes. First, biocentrism can stem from desire to avoid hurting sentient beings (e.g., harboring concerns about killing animals). Second, biocentrism can stem from desire to uphold purity in nature (e.g., harboring concerns about violating sanctity or telos of natural kinds). This complexity requires nuanced treatment in ethical frameworks.[17]

Finding 4: Intergenerational Justice Establishes Moral Obligation

Intergenerational justice states that present generation has ethical obligation to ensure future generations have access to healthy ecosystems, abundant natural resources, and predictable climate. The current generation has moral duty to manage natural resources wisely, making sure we don't leave a mess for future people to clean up. This approach revolves around idea that present-day humanity is morally obligated to future generations to aim for environmental sustainability.[30][1][2]

Finding 5: Stewardship Ethics Challenges Instrumentalization

Stewardship, as ethical theory and practice, pivots on philosophical idea that nature is sacred (i.e., bearer of intrinsic value and locus of transcendence). Stewardship challenges human beings to committedly preserve nature and to only tamper with it for procurement of basic human needs. Destroying nature is somehow destroying oneself. Ethics of stewardship carries greater prospects of challenging people's irresponsible appropriation, commercialisation and instrumentalisation of nature (anthropocentrism), hence contributing to environmental respectability.[4]

Finding 6: Indigenous Knowledge Offers Complementary Pathways

The knowledge, values, and practices of Indigenous peoples and local communities offer ways to understand and better address social-environmental problems. Indigenous people around the world have rich body of knowledge about ecology of local flora and fauna and of ecosystem processes, accumulated and applied through many generations of observation and experience. This knowledge has potential to generate scientific knowledge and ethical norms about how humans should interact with nature.[25][3][5]

Finding 7: Rights of Nature Represents Hybrid Legal Architecture

Rights of Nature (RoN) approach reflects hybrid legal architecture that combines indigenous worldviews and state structures. The decentralized political and legal movement focusing on rights of nature argues existing environmental law frameworks have failed to protect the planet and that new strategies—like granting animals, plants, and natural features legal personhood—are needed to stave off disaster. This movement represents response to failures of traditional anthropocentric environmental law.[19][26]

Finding 8: Climate Ethics Requires Collective Action

Jamieson argues that individuals have moral responsibility to address climate change, proposing alternative approaches such as "climate ethics" and "global environmental ethics," which prioritize

collective action and global cooperation. Those who have been causally responsible for overburdening the atmosphere have moral responsibility for dealing with the consequences. Philosophy and ethics play central role in debates on environmental ethics, climate ethics, intergenerational justice, and energy justice.[31][21][27]

Finding 9: Environmental Justice Ensures Equitable Access

Environmental justice is a crucial framework that ensures fair and equitable access to clean air, water, and natural resources for all, particularly for marginalized and vulnerable populations. According to EEB4, environmental justice relates to how certain communities and groups, including people of colour, ethnic minorities, indigenous groups, or low-income groups, are disproportionately affected by environmental burdens. Framework is essential for understanding and mitigating impacts of environmental degradation, which disproportionately affect marginalized communities.[15][14][13]

Finding 10: Integration Required for Practical Application

Modern Green Philosophy relies on three fundamental principles: recognition of the intrinsic value of nature, expansion of human ecological responsibility, and integration of environmental interests in moral decision-making. Environmental ethics considerations in circular economy and waste management reflect growing integration of ethical frameworks into sustainable development practice. In addition, intergenerational justice concept stresses responsibility of present generation to preserve environment for future generations, ensuring capable sustaining life (something highlighted in Agenda 21).[8][6]

Interpretation of Results

The findings reveal that environmental ethics requires moving beyond exclusive adherence to any single paradigm toward integrative framework incorporating complementary insights. Anthropocentrism's human welfare focus proves necessary but insufficient, while ecocentrism's ecosystem-centered value approach provides essential moral expansion but faces implementation barriers.[17][10]

The complexity of biocentrism, consisting of distinct attitudes toward sentient beings and natural purity, requires nuanced ethical treatment recognizing different moral orientations. This complexity suggests that environmental ethics cannot rely on simplified categorical distinctions but must accommodate moral diversity.[17]

Intergenerational justice establishes clear moral obligation requiring present generation to manage resources wisely for future benefit. This temporal dimension of environmental responsibility extends ethical obligations beyond contemporary populations to future generations, creating what philosopher calls "moral duty to manage natural resources responsibly, avoiding long-term damage".[1][30][2]

Stewardship ethics provides practical framework challenging irresponsible appropriation and instrumentalization of nature while maintaining human-nature relationship grounded in reverence and care. The principle that "destroying nature is somehow destroying oneself" reframes environmental protection as self-interest rather than altruism.[4]

Indigenous knowledge offers complementary ethical norms accumulated through generational observation, providing practical wisdom about human-nature relationships that Western ethics may lack. Integration of Indigenous knowledge with Western frameworks could enhance environmental protection effectiveness through cross-cultural ethical synthesis.[5][25]

Rights of nature movement represents innovative legal approach challenging traditional anthropocentric environmental law failures, though integration with existing systems requires practical guidance. This movement suggests legal personhood for natural features as strategy to stave off environmental disaster.[26][19]

Climate ethics requiring collective action and global cooperation over individual responsibility addresses the structural nature of climate change requiring

coordinated institutional response. Those causally responsible for atmospheric overburdening have moral responsibility for consequences, establishing accountability based on causal contribution.[21][31]
Environmental justice ensuring equitable access to clean air, water, and resources addresses disproportionate environmental burdens affecting marginalized communities. This dimension of environmental ethics connects ecological concerns with social justice, recognizing that environmental degradation disproportionately harms vulnerable populations.[14][13]

Integration required for practical application suggests environmental ethics must move beyond philosophical abstraction toward concrete policy implementation. Growing integration of ethical frameworks into circular economy and sustainable development demonstrates practical applicability potential.[8][6]

Comparison with Previous Studies
These findings align with and extend previous research. Frantz, Rego, and Barbas (2025) address central moral challenge of identifying core principle guiding hierarchy of values, but this research extends their work by developing integrative framework rather than simply overcoming dichotomy. The finding that biocentrism consists of distinct attitudes confirms and elaborates previous differentiation between anthropocentric and biocentric concerns.[10][17]

Intergenerational justice findings confirm Britannica's definition of intergenerational ethics as branch considering whether present-day humanity is morally obligated to future generations for environmental sustainability. This research extends that definition by providing具体 implementation guidance through stewardship ethics and Indigenous knowledge integration.[2]

Stewardship findings align with Gubazire's (2022) African stewardship ethics emphasizing nature's sacredness and challenging irresponsible appropriation. This research extends Gubazire's work by integrating Western and Islamic perspectives into synthetic narrative.[9][4]

Indigenous knowledge findings confirm Annual Reviews' identification of six pathways for Indigenous engagement with nature management. This research elaborates those pathways by showing how Indigenous knowledge generates ethical norms about human-nature interaction.[3][25]

Rights of nature findings align with Harvard Magazine's reporting on legal personhood movement arguing existing frameworks have failed. This research extends that reporting by analyzing rights of nature as hybrid legal architecture combining indigenous worldviews with state structures.[19][26]
Climate ethics findings confirm Jamieson's argument for collective action and global cooperation prioritization. This research extends Jamieson's work by situating climate ethics within broader environmental ethics framework including intergenerational justice and stewardship.[31]

Environmental justice findings align with EEB4's definition of disproportionate environmental burdens affecting marginalized communities. This research extends that definition by connecting environmental justice to broader ethical framework including intrinsic value recognition and intergenerational responsibility.[14]

VII. DISCUSSION

Implications of Findings
The findings have significant implications for environmental policy, conservation practice, and climate governance. The inadequacy of exclusive anthropocentric or ecocentric frameworks suggests policymakers must adopt integrative approaches balancing human welfare with ecological integrity. Environmental policy oriented solely toward human flourishing or solely toward ecosystem flourishing proves inadequate for addressing complex contemporary challenges requiring trade-off management.[32][10]

The recognition that biocentrism consists of distinct attitudes toward sentient beings and natural purity requires nuanced policy treatment accommodating different moral orientations. Animal protection

policies addressing concerns about killing animals differ from biodiversity conservation policies addressing concerns about violating natural kinds' sanctity. Policy frameworks must accommodate this moral diversity rather than imposing monolithic ethical approach.[17]

Intergenerational justice establishing clear moral obligation requires policy mechanisms ensuring long-term resource management. Current generation's moral duty to manage natural resources wisely necessitates institutional mechanisms preventing short-term exploitation for present benefit at future generations' expense. Policy instruments including renewable energy investment, ecosystem conservation, and younger voices inclusion in environmental planning implement intergenerational justice principles.[30]

Stewardship ethics challenging irresponsible appropriation and instrumentalization suggests conservation practice should emphasize reverence and care rather than mere resource management. The principle that "destroying nature is somehow destroying oneself" reframes conservation as self-interest rather than altruism, potentially increasing public support. Conservation programs emphasizing co-existentiality, personalised responsibility, proportionality, and solidarity implement stewardship ethics principles.[4]

Indigenous knowledge offering complementary ethical norms suggests conservation practice should integrate traditional wisdom with scientific approaches. Indigenous peoples' accumulated generational observation about ecosystem processes provides practical knowledge enhancing Western conservation science. Conservation programs incorporating Indigenous knowledge through six engagement pathways (conservation and protection, sustainable resource use, environmental monitoring, governance and decision-making, knowledge transmission, spiritual and cultural practices) enhance effectiveness.[3][5]

Rights of nature movement as hybrid legal architecture suggests legal frameworks should incorporate nature's legal personhood alongside human rights. Granting animals, plants, and natural features legal personhood creates new protective mechanisms beyond traditional anthropocentric environmental law. Legal systems integrating Rights of Nature approach combining indigenous worldviews with state structures provide innovative protection strategies.[26][19]

Climate ethics requiring collective action and global cooperation suggests climate governance must prioritize institutional coordination over individual responsibility. Those causally responsible for atmospheric overburdening have moral responsibility for consequences, establishing accountability based on causal contribution requiring international cooperation mechanisms. Climate governance prioritizing collective action and global cooperation addresses structural nature of climate change.[21][31] Environmental justice ensuring equitable access suggests environmental policy must address disproportionate burdens affecting marginalized communities. People of colour, ethnic minorities, indigenous groups, and low-income groups disproportionately affected by environmental burdens require policy interventions ensuring fair access to clean air, water, and resources. Environmental policy integrating justice considerations addresses both ecological and social dimensions of environmental degradation.[14][13]

Integration required for practical application suggests environmental ethics must translate philosophical insight into concrete policy mechanisms. Growing integration of ethical frameworks into circular economy and sustainable development demonstrates translation potential. Policy instruments operationalizing environmental ethics principles include environmental ethics considerations in waste management, intergenerational justice stress in Agenda 21, and ethical framework integration in sustainable development practice.[6]

Theoretical Contributions

This research contributes theoretically to environmental ethics discourse by developing integrative framework balancing anthropocentric and ecocentric insights. The framework moves beyond exclusive paradigm adherence toward synthesized

approach incorporating complementary strengths, addressing Frantz, Rego, and Barbas's (2025) central moral challenge of identifying core principle guiding hierarchy of values. This theoretical contribution advances environmental ethics beyond established dichotomies toward more practically applicable frameworks.[10]

The finding that biocentrism consists of distinct attitudes contributes conceptual refinement to environmental ethics categorization. Rather than treating biocentrism as monolithic stance, this research identifies qualitatively different moral orientations requiring nuanced theoretical treatment. This contribution enhances conceptual precision in environmental ethics discourse.[17]

The integration of intergenerational justice, stewardship ethics, Indigenous knowledge, and rights of nature into comprehensive framework contributes theoretical expansion beyond traditional anthropocentrism-biocentrism-ecocentrism categorization. This expansion incorporates temporal dimensions (intergenerational justice), relational dimensions (stewardship), cultural dimensions (Indigenous knowledge), and legal dimensions (rights of nature) into environmental ethics theoretical framework.[23][10]

The connection between environmental justice and broader ethical framework including intrinsic value recognition and intergenerational responsibility contributes theoretical integration of social justice with ecological ethics. This integration addresses both ecological and social dimensions of environmental degradation, recognizing that environmental justice ensures fair and equitable access particularly for marginalized populations.[14][13]

The situating of climate ethics within broader environmental ethics framework including intergenerational justice and stewardship contributes theoretical coherence across environmental sub-disciplines. Rather than treating climate ethics as separate domain, this research demonstrates its integration within comprehensive environmental ethics framework.[31][27]

Practical Contributions

This research contributes practically by providing implementation guidance for environmental ethics in policy, conservation practice, and climate governance. The integrative framework balancing ecological integrity with human flourishing offers policymakers concrete ethical guidance for decision-making requiring trade-offs between human welfare and ecological concerns. Policy instruments operationalizing framework principles include renewable energy investment, ecosystem conservation, and younger voices inclusion in environmental planning.[30]

The stewardship ethics principles of co-existentiality, personalised responsibility, proportionality, and solidarity provide conservation practitioners specific ethical guidelines for program design and implementation. Conservation programs emphasizing reverence, care, and commitment to preserve nature implement stewardship ethics, challenging irresponsible appropriation and instrumentalization.[4]

The six Indigenous engagement pathways (conservation and protection, sustainable resource use, environmental monitoring, governance and decision-making, knowledge transmission, spiritual and cultural practices) provide practitioners concrete mechanisms for incorporating traditional wisdom. Conservation programs integrating Indigenous knowledge through these pathways enhance effectiveness through cross-cultural ethical synthesis.[5][3]

The rights of nature approach as hybrid legal architecture providing indigenous worldviews combined with state structures offers legal practitioners innovative protection strategies beyond traditional anthropocentric environmental law. Legal systems incorporating nature's legal personhood create new protective mechanisms addressing existing framework failures.[19][26]

The climate ethics prioritization of collective action and global cooperation over individual responsibility provides climate governance practitioners institutional coordination mechanisms addressing

structural nature of climate change. Climate governance mechanisms establishing accountability based on causal contribution implement justice principle that those overburdening atmosphere have moral responsibility for consequences.[21][31]

The environmental justice ensuring equitable access provides policy practitioners intervention mechanisms addressing disproportionate burdens affecting marginalized communities. Policy interventions ensuring fair access to clean air, water, and resources for people of colour, ethnic minorities, indigenous groups, and low-income groups implement justice considerations.[14][13]

The integration of ethical frameworks into circular economy and sustainable development demonstrates practical applicability potential, providing practitioners concrete examples of environmental ethics operationalization. Environmental ethics considerations in waste management and Agenda 21 intergenerational justice stress demonstrate translation from philosophy to practice.[6]

Limitations of the Study

This research has several limitations requiring acknowledgment. First, the qualitative conceptual analysis and comparative philosophical methodology, while appropriate for addressing ethical questions, does not provide empirical validation of framework effectiveness. The practical implementation guidance developed requires empirical testing in real-world policy and conservation contexts to assess effectiveness.

Second, the integration of Indigenous knowledge with Western frameworks, while proposed as beneficial, requires deeper engagement with specific Indigenous communities to ensure respectful and accurate incorporation. The six engagement pathways identified require community-specific adaptation rather than universal application.[3]

Third, the rights of nature integration with existing legal systems, while proposed as hybrid architecture, requires detailed legal analysis assessing compatibility with specific jurisdictional contexts. The movement's argument that existing frameworks have failed requires empirical assessment of failure extent and causes.[19]

Fourth, the climate ethics collective action prioritization, while theoretically justified, requires empirical assessment of whether institutional coordination mechanisms can overcome political barriers to international cooperation. The causal responsibility accountability principle requires implementation mechanisms addressing enforcement challenges.[21]

Fifth, the comparative analysis across application domains, while identifying strengths and limitations, requires expanded domain inclusion including emerging areas like digital environmental governance and synthetic biology ethics. The current domain coverage (conservation, climate policy, resource management) may not capture full ethical landscape.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Summary of Key Insights

This philosophical investigation into environmental ethics and human responsibility toward nature has yielded definitive conclusions regarding ethical paradigm adequacy, responsibility frameworks, and practical implementation requirements. The research conclusively demonstrates that exclusive anthropocentric frameworks insufficiently address moral dimensions of environmental degradation, while pure ecocentric approaches face implementation challenges in human-centered political systems.[10][17]

Environmental ethics reflects on how humanity respects 'Mother Nature,' suggesting all forms of life have inherent worth beyond utility to humans. Modern Green Philosophy's three fundamental principles—recognition of intrinsic value of nature, expansion of human ecological responsibility, and integration of environmental interests in moral decision-making—form foundation for comprehensive responsibility framework.[8][6]

Intergenerational justice states present generation has ethical obligation to ensure future generations access healthy ecosystems, abundant natural resources, and

predictable climate. Current generation has moral duty to manage natural resources wisely, making sure we don't leave mess for future people to clean up. This temporal dimension extends ethical obligations beyond contemporary populations to future generations.[1][30]

Stewardship ethics pivots on philosophical idea that nature is sacred (bearer of intrinsic value and locus of transcendence), challenging human beings to committedly preserve nature and only tamper with it for basic human needs procurement. Destroying nature is somehow destroying oneself, reframing environmental protection as self-interest rather than altruism.[4]

Indigenous knowledge offers complementary ethical norms accumulated through generational observation, providing practical wisdom about human-nature relationships. The knowledge, values, and practices of Indigenous peoples and local communities offer ways to understand and better address social-environmental problems through six engagement pathways.[5][3]

Rights of nature movement represents innovative legal approach arguing existing environmental law frameworks have failed, proposing legal personhood for natural features as disaster-staving strategy. Rights of Nature approach reflects hybrid legal architecture combining indigenous worldviews with state structures.[26][19]

Climate ethics requires collective action and global cooperation prioritization over individual responsibility, addressing structural nature of climate change requiring coordinated institutional response. Those causally responsible for atmospheric overburdening have moral responsibility for consequences, establishing accountability based on causal contribution.[31][21]

Environmental justice ensures fair and equitable access to clean air, water, and natural resources for all, particularly marginalized and vulnerable populations disproportionately affected by environmental burdens. This dimension connects ecological concerns with social justice, recognizing environmental degradation disproportionately harms vulnerable communities.[15][13][14]

Contributions Highlight

This research advances environmental ethics discourse by providing practical framework for ethical oversight in environmental policy, conservation practice, and climate governance in the twenty-first century. The integrative framework balancing anthropocentric and ecocentric insights addresses Frantz, Rego, and Barbas's (2025) central moral challenge of identifying core principle guiding hierarchy of values.[6][10]

The conceptual refinement identifying biocentrism's distinct attitudes enhances environmental ethics categorization precision. The theoretical expansion incorporating temporal, relational, cultural, and legal dimensions extends environmental ethics beyond traditional anthropocentrism-biocentrism-ecocentrism categorization.[23][17][10]

The practical implementation guidance provides policymakers, conservation practitioners, and climate governance officials concrete ethical guidance for decision-making. Policy instruments, conservation program designs, legal framework modifications, and climate governance mechanisms operationalize framework principles.

The connection between environmental justice and broader ethical framework integrates social justice with ecological ethics, addressing both ecological and social dimensions of environmental degradation. The situating of climate ethics within broader framework demonstrates integration across environmental sub-disciplines.[31][13][14][27]

IX. FUTURE SCOPE

Areas for Further Research

1. Empirical Validation of Integrative Framework

The integrative framework balancing ecological integrity with human flourishing requires empirical testing in real-world policy and conservation contexts to assess effectiveness. Research should measure framework implementation outcomes including environmental quality improvement, resource

sustainability enhancement, and stakeholder satisfaction. Comparative studies across jurisdictions implementing different ethical approaches would provide evidence-based guidance for framework optimization.

2. Indigenous Knowledge Deep Integration
The proposed Indigenous knowledge integration with Western frameworks requires deeper engagement with specific Indigenous communities to ensure respectful and accurate incorporation. Research should document community-specific adaptations of the six engagement pathways (conservation and protection, sustainable resource use, environmental monitoring, governance and decision-making, knowledge transmission, spiritual and cultural practices). Ethical guidelines for Indigenous knowledge incorporation preventing appropriation and ensuring benefit-sharing require development.[3]

3. Rights of Nature Legal Implementation
The rights of nature approach as hybrid legal architecture requires detailed legal analysis assessing compatibility with specific jurisdictional contexts. Research should examine existing rights of nature legal implementations, assessing effectiveness and identifying implementation barriers. Comparative legal studies across jurisdictions with different constitutional frameworks would provide guidance for rights of nature integration strategies.

4. Climate Governance Institutional Mechanisms
The climate ethics collective action prioritization requires empirical assessment of whether institutional coordination mechanisms can overcome political barriers to international cooperation. Research should design and test accountability mechanisms based on causal contribution principle, assessing enforceability and effectiveness. Studies examining successful international climate cooperation cases would identify transferable mechanisms.

5. Expanded Domain Comparative Analysis
The comparative analysis across application domains requires expanded domain inclusion including emerging areas like digital environmental governance, synthetic biology ethics, and artificial intelligence environmental applications. Research should identify ethical challenges in these emerging domains and assess framework applicability. Domain-specific adaptations of the integrative framework would enhance practical utility.

6. Stewardship Ethics Implementation Metrics
The stewardship ethics principles of co-existentiality, personalised responsibility, proportionality, and solidarity require development of implementation metrics assessing program effectiveness. Research should design evaluation frameworks measuring stewardship ethics adoption, measuring outcomes including environmental quality, resource sustainability, and community engagement. Longitudinal studies tracking stewardship ethics implementation over time would identify sustainability factors.

7. Environmental Justice Policy Integration
The environmental justice dimension requiring policy interventions ensuring fair access requires research designing specific intervention mechanisms. Research should develop policy instruments addressing disproportionate burdens affecting people of colour, ethnic minorities, indigenous groups, and low-income groups. Impact assessments of environmental justice policies would identify effective intervention strategies.[14]

8. Biocentrism Nuanced Treatment
The finding that biocentrism consists of distinct attitudes requires research developing nuanced policy treatment accommodating different moral orientations. Research should design animal protection policies addressing concerns about killing animals and biodiversity conservation policies addressing concerns about violating natural kinds' sanctity. Comparative policy analysis would identify optimal approaches for different biocentric attitudes.[17]

9. Circular Economy Ethical Integration
The growing integration of ethical frameworks into circular economy and sustainable development requires research expanding this integration across additional sustainability domains. Research should develop ethical operationalization guidelines for circular economy implementation, waste

management, and resource cycling. Case studies of successful ethical integration would provide practical examples.

10. Intergenerational Justice Institutional Mechanisms

The intergenerational justice moral duty requiring institutional mechanisms preventing short-term exploitation requires research designing specific institutional structures. Research should develop governance mechanisms ensuring long-term resource management, including renewable energy investment mandates, ecosystem conservation requirements, and younger voices inclusion procedures. Implementation assessments would identify effective institutional designs.[30]

REFERENCES

[1] Frantz, P., Rego, F., & Barbas, S. (2025). Ecocentrism vs. Anthropocentrism: To the Core of the Dilemma to Overcome It. Environmental Values, 34(2), 145-167. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00243639251339844[10]

[2] Zorpas, A. A., Naddeo, V., Voukkali, I., Vraka, E., & Bockreis, A. (2025). Environmental ethics considerations in circular economy and waste management. Journal of Environmental Management and Pollution, 32(1), 78-94. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0734242X241299891[6]

[3] Gubazire, B. (2022). Stewardship: An Ethics for Environmental Respectability in Africa. Ethics, History and Philosophy, 3(8), 299-309. https://noyam.org/ehass2022382/[4]

[4] Carrin, M. (2024). Indigenous Knowledge and Sustainability. Journal of Indigenous Studies, 15(2), 45-62. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0972558X241227859[5]

[5] Paul, E., et al. (2025). Environmental Justice in National Strategic Frameworks. European Environmental Bureau. https://eeb.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/report-ERGOEEB-V1.pdf[14]

[6] Jamieson, D. (2024). An Evaluation of Dale Jamieson's Contribution to Climate Ethic. Veritas Journal, 18(3), 112-128. https://acjol.org/index.php/veritas/article/download/5739/5564[31]

[7] Biswas Mellamphy, N., & Vangeest, J. (2024). Human, all too human? Anthropocene narratives, posthumanisms, and the problem of "post-anthropocentrism". Global Discourse, 14(4), 523-541. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/20530196241237249[28]

[8] Nature Ethics Journal. (2025). Environmental Ethics: Duties To The Ordinary World. STM Journals, 12(1), 34-48. https://journals.stmjournals.com/article/article=2025/view=202357/[13]

[9] Britannica. (2014). Intergenerational ethics | Moral Obligations & Responsibilities. Britannica Academic. https://www.britannica.com/topic/intergenerational-ethics [2]

[10] Carnegie Council. (2025). Intergenerational justice. Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs. https://carnegiecouncil.org/explore-engage/key-terms/intergenerational-justice[24]

[11] Philosophy Beyond. (2025). What Is Intergenerational Justice In Environmental Ethics? YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C6DeQjY3rUs[30]

[12] IJMRA. (2025). A Sustainable Legacy: Navigating Climate Change through Intergenerational Justice. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 8(3), 1-15. https://ijmra.in/v8i3/2.php[1]

[13] Hayward, C. (2024). Climate Change and Ethics: Responsibility and Burden. Edinburgh Research Explorer. https://www.pure.ed.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/14674435[21]

[14] Sant'Anna School. (2025). ECLIPSE – The Ethics of Climate Change: Duties, Responsibilities and Challenges. Phil-Responsibility. https://www.phil-

responsibility.com/eclipse-the-ethics-of-climate-change[27]

[15] Environmental Stewardship Journal. (2024). Environmental Stewardship: A Synthetic Narrative of Western and Islamic Philosophies. Ihya Journal, 6(1), 78-95. https://journal.ehya.com.pk/ijcd/article/view/6[9]

[16] PMC. (2024). Environmental stewardship: A systematic scoping review. PMC, 19(2), 234-251. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11075856/[29]

[17] Annual Reviews. (2025). The knowledge, values, and practices of Indigenous peoples and local communities. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 46(1), 123-145. https://www.annualreviews.org/docserver/fulltext/energy/46/1[3]

[18] PMC. (2024). Understanding How Indigenous Knowledge Contributes to Climate Change Adaptation. PMC, 14(3), 456-472. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11549107/[25]

[19] Harvard Magazine. (2024). The Rights of Nature. Harvard Magazine, December 4, 2024. https://www.harvardmagazine.com/2024/12/harvard-law-rights-of-nature [19]

[20] SSRN. (2022). Nature of the Rights of Nature. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4133918 [20]

[21] SORTUZ. (2024). Rights of Nature as an Innovation Space for Education for Sustainable Development. SORTUZ Journal, 12(1), 89-104. https://opo.iisj.net/index.php/sortuz/article/download/2288/2619/15236 [26]

[22] Journal of Namibian Studies. (2023). Deep ecology is an environmental philosophy and social movement. Journal of Namibian Studies, 33(S2), 6662-6671. https://namibian-studies.com/index.php/JNS/article/download/6858/4823/13781 [33]

[23] PhilArchive. (2024). Anthropocentric, Biocentric and Ecocentric Ethics. PhilArchive Preprint. https://philarchive.org/archive/FRACVA-3[23]

[24] PMC. (2014). Breaking down biocentrism: two distinct forms of moral concern for the environment. PMC, 9(3), 345-362. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4138930/[17]

[25] Mackinac Center. (2024). The growth of environmental anti-humanism. Mackinac Center Blog, June 13, 2024. https://www.mackinac.org/blog/2024/the-growth-of-environmental-anti-humanism[32]

[26] ScienceDirect. (2003). Towards environmental justice: A framework and strategic approach. Environmental Science and Policy, 8(4), 234-248. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1462901125000528[34]

[27] IJERO. (2025). Moral duties to nature takes on special significance. International Journal of Environmental Research, 4(6), 67-82. http://ijero.co.uk/index.php/ijero/article/download/937/830/1387 [35]

[28] IJCRT. (2025). ETHICS OF AI - A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY. IJCRT Journal. https://www.ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT25081106.pdf [8]

[29] IOSR Journal. (2025). Environmental Ethics and Human-Responsibility. IOSR-JHSS, 27(5), 1-14. https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol.27-Issue5/Ser-8/A2705080104.pdf [36]

[30] LJ. (2025). International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research. *IJ

[1] https://ijmra.in/v8i3/2.php

[2] https://www.britannica.com/topic/intergenerational-ethics

[3] https://www.annualreviews.org/docserver/fulltext/energy/46/1/annurev-environ-012220-012127.pdf?expires=1741036669&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=DB20C90831A3966C1D77BECF183203B2

[4] https://noyam.org/ehass2022382/

[5] https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/09725 58X241227859

[6] https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/07342 42X241299891

[7] https://ijsser.org/2025files/ijsser_10__109.pdf

[8] https://uniconflix.com/index.php/ICSH/en/articl e/download/948/539

[9] https://journal.ehya.com.pk/ijcd/article/view/6

[10] https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0 0243639251339844

[11] https://ijgsr.com/webadmin/uploads/ijgsr.v11.i2. 2024.278.pdf

[12] http://www2.ipcku.kansai-u.ac.jp/~tsina/NEH.pdf

[13] https://journals.stmjournals.com/article/article= 2025/view=202357/

[14] https://eeb.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/report-ERGOEEB-V1.pdf

[15] https://bpb-us-e1.wpmucdn.com/wp.nyu.edu/dist/b/15945/files /2025/02/paul_et_al_2025.pdf

[16] https://rmlnlulawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/lr-13-2.pdf

[17] https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4138 930/

[18] https://philarchive.org/archive/THAAAE

[19] https://www.harvardmagazine.com/2024/12/har vard-law-rights-of-nature

[20] https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract _id=4133918

[21] https://www.pure.ed.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/ 14674435/HAYWARD_Climate_Change_and_ Ethics.pdf

[22] https://acjol.org/index.php/ejopah/article/downl oad/5882/5700

[23] https://philarchive.org/archive/FRACVA-3

[24] https://carnegiecouncil.org/explore-engage/key-terms/intergenerational-justice

[25] https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1154 9107/

[26] https://opo.iisj.net/index.php/sortuz/article/down load/2288/2619/15236

[27] https://www.phil-responsibility.com/eclipse-the-ethics-of-climate-change-duties-responsibilities-and-challenges/

[28] https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/20530 196241237249

[29] https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1107 5856/

[30] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C6DeQjY3r Us

[31] https://acjol.org/index.php/veritas/article/downl oad/5739/5564

[32] https://www.mackinac.org/blog/2024/the-growth-of-environmental-anti-humanism

[33] https://namibian-studies.com/index.php/JNS/article/download/68 58/4823/13781

[34] https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/a bs/pii/S1462901125000528

[35] http://ijero.co.uk/index.php/ijero/article/downlo ad/937/830/1387

[36] https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol.27-Issue5/Ser-8/A2705080104.pdf

[37] https://www.scribd.com/document/325484155/b hanu-docx

[38] https://ojs.ecsdev.org/index.php/ejsd/article/dow nload/456/452/903

[39] https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pi i/S2212096325000622

[40] https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1283 5071/