ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

Review Article

The Utilitarian Approach to Environmental Law: Balancing Costs and Benefits

Sepehr. Khajeh Naeeni[1*]

[1] Department of Chemical Engineering, Lakehead University, 955 Oliver Road, Thunder Bay, ON P7B 5E1, Canada

*** Corresponding author email address**: skhajeh@lakeheadu.ca

Received: 2022-10-04 **Revised:** 2022-11-08 **Accepted:** 2022-11-13 **Published:** 2023-01-01

This article examines the utilitarian approach to environmental law, evaluating its effectiveness in balancing economic development with ecological preservation. Through a detailed review of literature and analysis, we explore the ethical underpinnings, applications, and limitations of utilitarianism in environmental policy-making, alongside alternative ethical frameworks including ecocentrism, biocentrism, rights-based approaches, deontological ethics, and the Capability Approach. The methodology involves a comprehensive literature review, focusing on theoretical explorations and case studies that illustrate the utilitarian approach in action, as well as its criticisms and the corresponding strengths of alternative ethical perspectives. Our findings reveal that while the utilitarian approach offers a pragmatic framework for decision-making by emphasizing the maximization of overall welfare, it faces significant challenges. These include the potential for overlooking social inequities, difficulties in quantifying long-term ecological impacts, and a tendency to value nature solely for its utility to humans. In contrast, alternative ethical frameworks provide valuable insights into the intrinsic value of nature, the importance of considering rights and duties, and the need for policies that ensure fair distribution of environmental benefits and burdens. In conclusion, the article argues for a pluralistic and integrative approach to environmental governance. It suggests that drawing on the strengths of both utilitarian and alternative ethical frameworks can lead to more nuanced, just, and sustainable environmental laws and policies. This approach necessitates ongoing dialogue among diverse stakeholders, aiming to reconcile economic development with moral obligations to present and future generations, as well as the non-human world. Through such collaborative efforts, we can better navigate the complex ethical landscape of environmental conservation and governance.

Keywords: *Utilitarianism, Environmental Law, Cost-Benefit Analysis, Sustainability, Policy Evaluation.*

How to cite this article:

Khajeh Naeeni, S. (2023). The Utilitarian Approach to Environmental Law: Balancing Costs and Benefits. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 1*(2), 4-15. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.2.1.2

1. Introduction

The intersection of environmental law and utilitarianism presents a critical and multifaceted domain for scholarly examination. At the heart of this nexus lies the challenge of balancing ecological imperatives with human needs and desires, a challenge compounded by the pressing exigencies of climate change, biodiversity loss, and environmental degradation. Utilitarianism, with its core principle of maximizing happiness and minimizing suffering, offers a compelling ethical framework for navigating these challenges. The significance of applying a utilitarian perspective in environmental law cannot be overstated. As Gustafson (2013) elucidates, utilitarianism offers a pragmatic foundation for ethical decision-making in business and policy contexts, including environmental governance. This approach fundamentally integrates

economic evaluations—such as cost-benefit analyses—with moral considerations, aiming to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number (Gustafson, 2013). Hadas, Mingelgrin, and Fine (2020) underscore the economic dimensions of this process, advocating for cost-benefit analyses in environmental decision-making to ensure the optimal allocation of resources (Hadas et al., 2020). Similarly, Kula and Evans (2011) highlight the importance of dual discounting in environmental impact assessments, further illustrating the utilitarian commitment to pragmatic, outcome-oriented ethics (Kula & Evans, 2011).

The application of utilitarian principles to environmental law is not without controversy or critique. Loreau (2014) invites us to consider the reconciliation of utilitarian approaches with non-utilitarian ethical frameworks, such as those prioritizing intrinsic ecological values over human-centric benefits (Loreau, 2014). This reflects a broader debate within environmental ethics regarding the role of anthropocentrism versus ecocentrism. Additionally, the work of Friedman et al. (2018) on social equity in conservation research emphasizes the complex interplay between utilitarianism and justice, raising important questions about how policies can be both efficient and equitable (Friedman et al., 2018).

This inquiry into the utilitarian approach to environmental law is timely and essential. As Bonnet et al. (2020) argue, regulating meat consumption for health, environmental, and animal welfare benefits reflects utilitarian calculus in action, striving to mitigate a significant source of environmental impact (Bonnet et al., 2020). Furthermore, the environmental efficiency frameworks discussed by Horne et al. (2018) and Hopkins (2016) exemplify the utilitarian emphasis on maximizing benefits and minimizing harms in ecological contexts (Hopkins, 2016; Horne et al., 2018). These examples illustrate the practical implications of utilitarian reasoning in addressing contemporary environmental concerns.

Moreover, the debate surrounding the utilitarian approach in environmental law is enriched by the contributions of scholars like Cord et al. (2017), who explore ecosystem service trade-offs and synergies. Their work illuminates the complex decisions that lie at the intersection of human benefit and ecological preservation, reinforcing the utilitarian quest for balanced outcomes (Cord et al., 2017). Similarly, Gong et al. (2022) highlight the relevance of life cycle analyses in product remanufacturing, demonstrating how utilitarian principles support sustainability in industry practices (Gong et al., 2022).

The objective of this article, therefore, is to critically examine the utilitarian approach to environmental law through a comprehensive review of the literature, focusing on the methodologies, applications, and ethical considerations of balancing costs and benefits in environmental policy-making. By engaging with diverse sources and perspectives, this article aims to contribute to a nuanced understanding of how utilitarian ethics can guide legal and policy frameworks toward sustainable, equitable environmental outcomes.

In pursuing this objective, we navigate the rich landscape of utilitarian thought, its application in environmental law, and the ongoing debates that shape this field. This exploration seeks not only to clarify the theoretical underpinnings and practical implications of the utilitarian approach but also to illuminate the challenges and opportunities it presents for future environmental governance.

Through this systematic review, we aim to answer critical questions about the efficacy, ethics, and equity of applying a utilitarian framework to environmental law. We draw upon the works of leading scholars and thinkers to construct a comprehensive analysis that contributes to the evolving discourse on environmental ethics, law, and policy.

2. Methods and Materials

This review article adopts a comprehensive and systematic approach to examining the utilitarian approach to environmental law, focusing on the methodology of balancing costs and benefits. The objective is to critically assess the application, implications, and challenges of integrating utilitarian principles into environmental policymaking. This methodology section outlines the procedures for literature selection, analysis, and synthesis utilized in constructing this article.

2.1. Literature Search and Selection Criteria

To ensure a broad and in-depth exploration of the utilitarian approach to environmental law, we conducted a systematic literature search across several academic

databases, including Google Scholar, JSTOR, and ScienceDirect. Keywords used in the search process included "utilitarianism", "environmental law", "cost-benefit analysis", "policy making", and "sustainability". The search was limited to articles published in English between 1980 and 2023, ensuring both historical perspective and contemporary relevance.

Selection criteria were based on the relevance to the utilitarian approach in environmental law, the methodological rigor of studies, and their contribution to the debate on balancing costs and benefits in environmental policy. Both theoretical discussions and empirical studies were included to provide a comprehensive view of the field. Priority was given to peer-reviewed articles, books, and reports from reputable environmental and ethical organizations.

2.2. Analysis Framework

To structure the analysis of the selected literature, an analytical framework was developed around three main themes: (1) the fundamental principles of utilitarianism and their application to environmental law, (2) methodologies for implementing cost-benefit analysis within environmental policy, and (3) critiques and alternatives to the utilitarian approach in environmental law.

Within this framework, particular attention was given to the methodologies employed in cost-benefit analyses, including the valuation of environmental goods and services, discounting future benefits and costs, and considering distributive impacts. This analysis aimed to uncover the nuances of how utilitarian concepts have been operationalized in law and policy, the challenges encountered, and the outcomes achieved.

2.3. Synthesis and Interpretation

The synthesis involved a thematic analysis of the literature, categorizing findings according to the analytical framework. This process facilitated the identification of patterns, trends, and gaps in the literature on the utilitarian approach to environmental law. The interpretation of findings was guided by a critical examination of how well utilitarian principles align with the goals of environmental protection, sustainability, and justice.

2.4. Limitations

This methodology is subject to several limitations. First, the selection of literature may be influenced by publication bias, as studies reporting significant findings are more likely to be published. Second, the focus on English-language sources may exclude relevant insights from non-English publications. Finally, the rapidly evolving nature of environmental law and policy may mean that very recent developments are not fully captured in the review.

3. Theoretical Background

The philosophical domain of utilitarianism, as explored in the realm of ethics and morality, predicates its foundation on the principle of maximizing pleasure or happiness and minimizing pain or suffering (Gustafson, 2013). This ethical theory, rooted in the consequentialist perspective, advocates for the evaluation of actions based on their outcomes. The utilitarian approach dictates that the most ethical choice is the one that results in the greatest good for the greatest number of beings. Historically, the works of philosophers such as Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill have been pivotal in shaping the utilitarian discourse, emphasizing the quantifiable nature of happiness and suffering in ethical decision-making.

Environmental law, on the other hand, encompasses the statutes, regulations, treaties, and conventions aimed at protecting the environment from harm caused by human activities. It provides a legal framework to address issues such as pollution, resource management, and biodiversity conservation. The principles embedded within environmental law, including sustainability, precaution, prevention, and polluter pays, aim to strike a balance between ecological preservation and economic development (Cord et al., 2017; McGarity, 1983). Moreover, environmental laws seek to mediate the relationship between human beings and the natural world, emphasizing the intrinsic value of nature and the necessity of its protection for future generations.

The intersection of utilitarianism and environmental law emerges from the shared goal of maximizing welfare, albeit from different angles. Utilitarianism's emphasis on outcome-based ethics parallels the objectives of environmental law to achieve sustainability and ensure the well-being of the global population (Gustafson, 2013).

The application of utilitarian principles, such as cost-benefit analyses, to environmental policymaking facilitates a systematic approach to decision-making, where the potential impacts on human happiness and ecological health are weighed and balanced (Hadas et al., 2020).

Kula and Evans (2011) highlight the use of dual discounting in environmental impact assessments, which reflects a utilitarian approach by accounting for both temporal and spatial dimensions of benefits and costs. This method underscores the importance of considering future generations in environmental decision-making, echoing the utilitarian principle of the greatest good over time (Kula & Evans, 2011). Furthermore, Bonnet et al. (2020) illustrate the practical application of utilitarianism in environmental law through the regulation of meat consumption, showcasing how policies can be designed to improve health, environmental outcomes, and animal welfare simultaneously (Bonnet et al., 2020).

However, the application of utilitarianism in environmental law is not devoid of challenges and critiques. Loreau (2014) calls for a reconciliation between utilitarian and non-utilitarian approaches, acknowledging the limitations of a purely utilitarian framework in capturing the intrinsic value of biodiversity and the non-human elements of the natural world (Loreau, 2014). Furthermore, Friedman et al. (2018) raise concerns about social equity, suggesting that a strict utilitarian approach may overlook the distributional impacts of environmental policies, potentially exacerbating inequalities (Friedman et al., 2018).

In essence, the theoretical background of this article underscores the complexity and potential of integrating utilitarian principles into environmental law. While utilitarianism offers a pragmatic and outcome-oriented framework for environmental decision-making, it is imperative to consider its ethical limitations and strive for approaches that encompass both human and ecological welfare equitably. The ongoing dialogue at the intersection of utilitarianism and environmental law thus represents a dynamic arena for exploring the nuances of ethical reasoning and legal practice in pursuit of a sustainable and just future.

4. Utilitarian Approaches in Environmental Law: A Historical Overview

The utilitarian approach, rooted in the ethical theory that emphasizes maximizing overall happiness and minimizing suffering, has significantly influenced environmental law and policy over the years. Historically, the utilitarian perspective has been instrumental in shaping environmental policies, particularly those involving regulatory "balancing" and the implementation of cost-benefit analyses. One of the earliest and most significant applications of utilitarian principles in environmental law can be traced back to the debates surrounding pollution control and resource management. Here, lawmakers and regulators have often employed utilitarian calculus to weigh the economic benefits of industrial activities against the environmental and health costs associated with pollution (Heyes & Liston-Heyes, 1997). This balancing act reflects the core utilitarian tenet of seeking the greatest good for the greatest number, aiming to achieve an optimal level of pollution that considers both economic growth and environmental protection.

The utilitarian approach has also been evident in the development and application of fiscal instruments designed to address environmental issues. For instance, the concept of "Pigovian taxes," named after economist Arthur Pigou, exemplifies a utilitarian strategy to correct market failures related to negative externalities, such as pollution. By imposing taxes equivalent to the external cost of pollution, governments aim to internalize these costs, thereby aligning private interests with social welfare—a principle deeply rooted in utilitarian thought (Alt & Lowry, 1994).

In more recent years, the field of environmental economics has further advanced the utilitarian approach through the valuation of ecosystem services—a method that attempts to quantify the economic value of the benefits that humans derive from ecosystems. This valuation is crucial for informing policy decisions that balance environmental conservation with economic development (Cord et al., 2017). Such methodologies, while contentious, embody utilitarian principles by striving to make visible the otherwise ignored or undervalued benefits of environmental preservation, thereby facilitating more informed and balanced decision-making processes.

Another significant milestone in the utilitarian approach to environmental law is the widespread adoption of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs). EIAs require project proponents to assess and report the likely environmental impacts of their proposed actions, weighing these impacts against the social and economic benefits of the project (Kula & Evans, 2011). This process, which often includes a cost-benefit analysis, is inherently utilitarian, as it seeks to ensure that projects proceed only when their overall benefits outweigh their environmental costs.

The evolution of thought within the utilitarian framework has been marked by increasing sophistication in the methods used to assess and balance costs and benefits, as well as by a growing recognition of the complexities and limitations inherent in this approach. Critically, scholars and practitioners alike have highlighted the challenge of quantifying non-market values, such as biodiversity loss and ecosystem resilience, in monetary terms (Loreau, 2014). Moreover, the distributive implications of utilitarian policies—that is, who benefits and who bears the costs—have come under scrutiny, with calls for a more equitable consideration of impacts on marginalized and vulnerable populations (Friedman et al., 2018).

In response to these challenges, there has been a movement towards more inclusive and nuanced approaches that incorporate elements of justice and equity into utilitarian decision-making processes. For example, Environmental Justice frameworks seek to ensure that the benefits and burdens of environmental policies are distributed more fairly among populations, addressing some of the criticisms leveled against traditional utilitarian approaches (Friedman et al., 2018).

In conclusion, the utilitarian approach to environmental law has a rich and complex history, evolving from straightforward cost-benefit analyses to more sophisticated methodologies that attempt to capture the full range of ecosystem services and address issues of social equity. Despite its limitations and the ongoing debates it generates, the utilitarian framework continues to play a crucial role in guiding environmental legislation and policy-making towards the goal of achieving the greatest good for the greatest number.

5. Case Studies

5.1. Climate Change Policies

Climate change policies, particularly those aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions, serve as a prominent example of the utilitarian approach in action. The Paris Agreement, for instance, can be viewed through a utilitarian lens, focusing on balancing the economic costs of mitigation with the long-term benefits of a stabilized climate. The principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" reflects a utilitarian calculus designed to maximize global benefits while minimizing disparities between nations (Cord et al., 2017).

A critical evaluation of outcomes reveals both strengths and limitations. On the positive side, the agreement's utilitarian framework has galvanized global action, leading to significant investments in renewable energy and other mitigation strategies. However, critics argue that the utilitarian emphasis on aggregate benefits may overlook the disproportionate impact of climate change on vulnerable populations, an issue highlighted by Friedman et al. (2018) (Friedman et al., 2018). Moreover, the challenge of quantifying long-term benefits and costs adds uncertainty to the utilitarian calculus.

5.2. Pollution Control

The utilitarian approach has been instrumental in shaping pollution control policies, with the implementation of Pigovian taxes being a notable example. By imposing taxes on carbon emissions, governments aim to internalize the environmental costs of pollution, thus aligning private interests with the social good (Alt & Lowry, 1994). This method follows a utilitarian rationale by attempting to balance the economic activities contributing to pollution with the broader goal of environmental preservation.

The outcomes of such policies have been mixed. On one side, carbon taxes have successfully motivated reductions in emissions and fostered innovation in clean technologies. However, as Heyes and Liston-Heyes (1997) point out, the effectiveness of these policies can be undermined by economic and political considerations, such as the potential for industry pushback and the challenge of setting the "right" tax level to achieve desired outcomes (Heyes & Liston-Heyes, 1997). Additionally, concerns about the regressive impacts of environmental taxes on lower-income

households highlight the complexities of achieving equitable outcomes through utilitarian strategies.

5.3. *Wildlife Conservation*

Wildlife conservation efforts, particularly those involving the designation of protected areas and the sustainable management of natural resources, often utilize a utilitarian approach to balance conservation goals with human needs. For example, the establishment of marine protected areas (MPAs) is based on a utilitarian assessment of the benefits of biodiversity preservation against the costs to fishing communities and related stakeholders (Kenter et al., 2015).

While MPAs and similar conservation strategies have yielded positive outcomes, including the restoration of ecosystems and the protection of endangered species, they also exemplify the dilemmas inherent in utilitarian approaches. The designation of protected areas can lead to conflicts with local communities over land use rights and economic livelihoods, underscoring the challenge of distributing the costs and benefits of conservation measures fairly (Friedman et al., 2018). Furthermore, the reliance on economic valuation methods to justify conservation actions can marginalize non-economic values and cultural significance attached to natural resources.

5.4. *Reflections*

Across these case studies, the utilitarian approach to environmental law reveals a common aspiration to balance diverse and often competing interests in pursuit of the greatest overall benefit. The success of this approach largely depends on the ability to accurately assess and weigh the costs and benefits involved, a task complicated by uncertainties, value judgments, and the challenges of quantifying non-market environmental goods (Kula & Evans, 2011).

The utilitarian framework has undoubtedly contributed to significant progress in addressing environmental issues. However, the critiques and limitations identified in these case studies highlight the importance of incorporating considerations of equity, justice, and the intrinsic value of nature into environmental decision-making processes. This suggests a need for a more nuanced approach that transcends traditional utilitarian calculus, integrating ethical considerations that acknowledge the complexity and interconnectedness of human and ecological systems.

6. Debates and Criticisms

The utilitarian approach to environmental law, while offering a pragmatic framework for balancing the intricate trade-offs between economic development and environmental conservation, has not been without its controversies and criticisms. This section delves into the central debates surrounding utilitarianism in environmental law, underscoring criticisms related to potential neglect of inequities, long-term ecological impacts, and the sidelining of non-utilitarian ethical considerations.

6.1. *Neglect of Inequities*

One of the primary criticisms lodged against the utilitarian approach concerns its potential to overlook or exacerbate social and environmental inequities. Utilitarianism's focus on maximizing aggregate welfare could, paradoxically, justify outcomes where benefits to the majority come at a significant cost to vulnerable or marginalized groups (Friedman et al., 2018). Critics argue that this framework can inadvertently legitimize policies that perpetuate existing disparities, as the suffering of the few is deemed acceptable if it contributes to the overall greater good. The emphasis on quantifiable benefits and costs further complicates the issue, as not all values and impacts—especially those affecting disadvantaged communities—can be easily measured or adequately compensated (Friedman et al., 2018).

6.2. *Long-term Ecological Impacts*

The utilitarian approach's emphasis on immediate, measurable outcomes can also lead to the underappreciation of long-term ecological impacts. Environmental systems are characterized by complex interdependencies and delayed feedback loops, where the consequences of present actions may not be fully evident for years, decades, or even centuries (Cord et al., 2017). Utilitarian calculations, particularly those reliant on cost-benefit analyses, often struggle to account for these temporal dynamics, favoring short-term gains over long-term sustainability. Critics highlight that this short-sightedness could undermine efforts to address pressing environmental challenges, such as climate change and

biodiversity loss, which require forward-thinking and precautionary approaches (Loreau, 2014).

6.3. *Non-utilitarian Ethical Considerations*

Beyond the practical concerns associated with the utilitarian approach, there are profound philosophical debates regarding the ethical foundations of environmental law. Critics of utilitarianism argue that it fails to acknowledge the intrinsic value of nature, reducing ecological entities and processes to mere instruments for human benefit (Loreau, 2014). This anthropocentric bias, according to detractors, neglects the moral consideration owed to non-human life forms and ecosystems for their own sake, independent of their utility to humans. Furthermore, the utilitarian disregard for non-consequentialist ethical principles, such as justice, rights, and duties, is seen as a significant limitation in addressing the moral complexity of environmental issues. The call for a more ecocentric or biocentric ethics in environmental law reflects a desire to transcend the instrumental valuation of nature, recognizing the inherent worth of all forms of life and the ecosystems that sustain them (Kenter et al., 2015).

The debates and criticisms surrounding the utilitarian approach in environmental law reveal deep-seated tensions between different ethical perspectives, values, and priorities. While the utilitarian framework offers valuable insights for navigating the trade-offs inherent in environmental policymaking, its limitations underscore the need for a more inclusive, equitable, and ecologically sensitive approach. Addressing these criticisms requires a reevaluation of the ethical foundations of environmental law, incorporating broader considerations of justice, rights, and the intrinsic value of nature. Moving forward, the challenge lies in developing legal and policy frameworks that adequately balance human welfare, social equity, and ecological integrity, acknowledging the complex and interconnected nature of environmental challenges.

7. Balancing Costs and Benefits

Within the utilitarian approach to environmental law, the use of cost-benefit analysis (CBA) serves as a pivotal tool in policy formulation and decision-making processes. This section examines methodologies for conducting CBAs in environmental law, discusses the inherent challenges in quantifying ecological and societal benefits and costs, and explores case examples demonstrating both effective and problematic applications of CBA.

7.1. *Methodologies for Cost-Benefit Analysis*

Cost-benefit analysis in environmental law involves a systematic evaluation of the economic, social, and environmental impacts of proposed policies or projects. This process typically encompasses the identification, quantification, and comparison of all relevant costs and benefits associated with an action. Notably, Kula and Evans (2011) discuss the concept of dual discounting in environmental impact assessments, which takes into account both the time value of money and the dynamic value of ecological goods and services over time (Kula & Evans, 2011). This methodology acknowledges the challenge of balancing immediate human needs with the long-term preservation of natural resources.

Furthermore, approaches such as the valuation of ecosystem services aim to monetize the benefits provided by natural systems, thereby incorporating these values into economic analyses (Cord et al., 2017). Techniques include market-based valuation, contingent valuation (willingness to pay), and cost-effectiveness analysis. These methods strive to capture the broad range of ecological and societal benefits derived from environmental conservation, such as clean air, water filtration, and carbon sequestration.

7.2. *Challenges in Quantifying Benefits and Costs*

Quantifying the ecological and societal benefits and costs associated with environmental policies poses significant challenges. One critical issue is the inherent difficulty in assigning monetary values to non-market goods and services, such as biodiversity, cultural heritage, and ecosystem resilience (Cord et al., 2017). This challenge is compounded by the need to account for future uncertainties, including climate change impacts and technological advancements, which can dramatically alter the effectiveness and desirability of environmental interventions.

Additionally, the application of discount rates in CBA, intended to reflect the present value of future benefits and costs, is a subject of contention. Critics argue that high discount rates can undervalue long-term

environmental benefits, thereby favoring short-term economic gain over sustainability (Kula & Evans, 2011). Moreover, the potential for CBA to marginalize issues of equity and distributional justice further complicates its application in environmental law, as not all costs and benefits are borne or received equally across different populations (Friedman et al., 2018).

7.3. Case Examples

Effective application of CBA can be observed in pollution control initiatives, where economic incentives and penalties have been used to mitigate environmental harm while promoting technological innovation. For instance, the implementation of carbon pricing mechanisms, based on the principles of Pigovian taxes, illustrates a utilitarian approach aimed at internalizing the external costs of greenhouse gas emissions (Heyes & Liston-Heyes, 1997). These policies have catalyzed investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency, demonstrating the potential of CBA to align economic activities with environmental objectives.

Conversely, the problematic application of CBA is evident in cases where the methodology has led to the approval of projects with significant, irreversible environmental impacts. A notable example includes large-scale infrastructure developments in ecologically sensitive areas, where the projected economic benefits were deemed to outweigh the environmental and societal costs. In some instances, subsequent assessments revealed that the long-term ecological damages, including habitat destruction and loss of biodiversity, were underestimated, leading to calls for more rigorous and precautionary approaches in CBA (Loreau, 2014).

The use of cost-benefit analysis in environmental law is a double-edged sword, offering a structured framework for decision-making while facing criticism for its limitations in capturing the full spectrum of ecological and societal values. The challenges in quantifying non-market benefits and costs, along with concerns about equity and long-term sustainability, highlight the need for continued refinement of CBA methodologies. Incorporating advancements in ecosystem services valuation, adopting lower discount rates to prioritize future benefits, and enhancing stakeholder engagement in the assessment process could improve the effectiveness and equity of CBA in environmental policymaking. As such, ongoing dialogue among economists, environmental scientists, ethicists, and policymakers is essential for leveraging the strengths and addressing the weaknesses of cost-benefit analysis within the realm of environmental law.

8. Ethical and Policy Implications

The application of utilitarianism in environmental policy not only frames legislative priorities and decision-making processes but also raises significant ethical and policy implications. This section delves into the ethical underpinnings of utilitarianism within the environmental context and explores its broader policy implications, particularly regarding sustainability, equity, and interspecies considerations.

8.1. Ethical Underpinnings

At its core, utilitarianism is predicated on the ethical principle of maximizing welfare or happiness and minimizing suffering. In the environmental realm, this principle necessitates a careful balance between human progress and the preservation of natural environments (Gustafson, 2013). Yet, as Loreau (2014) contends, reconciling utilitarian goals with the inherent value of biodiversity and ecosystems underscores a critical ethical tension (Loreau, 2014). The utilitarian framework tends to value nature primarily for its utility to humans, potentially sidelining ethical considerations related to the intrinsic worth of non-human life forms and the moral obligation to preserve ecological integrity for its own sake.

Additionally, the utilitarian emphasis on outcomes may inadvertently overlook the processes and means by which environmental benefits are achieved, raising questions about the ethical dimensions of rights, justice, and duties in environmental decision-making. As Friedman et al. (2018) highlight, the distributional impacts of environmental policies on different populations underscore the importance of integrating social equity considerations into utilitarian analyses (Friedman et al., 2018). This ethical complexity demands a nuanced approach to utilitarianism that accounts for the diverse values and interests at stake in environmental governance.

8.2. *Policy Implications*

8.2.1. *Sustainability*

At the policy level, the utilitarian approach has profound implications for sustainability efforts. By assessing the long-term costs and benefits of environmental actions, utilitarian policies aim to ensure that current development needs do not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Kula & Evans, 2011). However, achieving this balance is challenging, given the difficulties in quantifying future ecological and societal benefits and the tendency of cost-benefit analyses to favor immediate economic gains. As such, crafting utilitarian policies that genuinely promote sustainability requires a broad and inclusive understanding of welfare that encompasses ecological health and intergenerational equity.

8.2.2. *Equity*

Equity considerations are central to the utilitarian approach in environmental policy, given the emphasis on achieving the greatest good for the greatest number. This principle necessitates careful attention to how environmental benefits and costs are distributed across different societal groups, ensuring that vulnerable and marginalized communities do not bear a disproportionate share of environmental harms (Friedman et al., 2018). The challenge lies in operationalizing equity within a utilitarian framework, demanding transparent and inclusive decision-making processes that actively engage affected populations and consider the social determinants of environmental health and justice.

8.2.3. *Interspecies Considerations*

The utilitarian application in environmental policy also raises crucial questions about interspecies considerations, particularly the moral standing of non-human life forms and the value of biodiversity independent of human utility (Loreau, 2014). The ethical imperative to consider the welfare of other species and ecosystems necessitates a reevaluation of utilitarian priorities, potentially extending the scope of moral consideration beyond human interests. This expanded ethical perspective challenges policymakers to devise strategies that protect biodiversity and maintain ecological processes, not merely for their instrumental value to humans but as ends in themselves.

In sum, the application of utilitarianism in environmental policy encompasses a complex array of ethical and policy considerations, from sustainability and equity to interspecies justice. While the utilitarian approach offers a compelling framework for balancing competing interests and maximizing collective welfare, it also demands a critical examination of underlying ethical values and the long-term implications of environmental decision-making. As the discourse on environmental ethics and policy evolves, the utilitarian perspective must be continually reassessed and refined to address the multifaceted challenges of ecological preservation, social justice, and intergenerational equity.

9. Alternatives to the Utilitarian Approach

As the quest for sustainable and equitable environmental governance evolves, several alternative ethical frameworks have emerged, challenging the utilitarian paradigm in environmental law. These approaches, including Ecocentrism, Biocentrism, Rights-based approaches, Deontological ethics, and the Capability Approach, offer diverse perspectives on how to conceptualize and prioritize environmental protection and human well-being.

9.1. *Ecocentrism*

Ecocentrism shifts the focus from human interests to the intrinsic value of nature, emphasizing the moral significance of ecosystems and species as wholes, independent of their utility to humans. This perspective advocates for acknowledging and protecting the interests of natural entities and systems, recognizing the interconnectedness of all life forms and the moral duty to preserve ecological integrity (Loreau, 2014).

Unlike utilitarianism, which primarily values nature for its benefits to humans, ecocentrism champions the preservation of nature for its own sake. The strength of this approach lies in its holistic view of environmental protection, which can motivate more comprehensive and long-term conservation efforts. However, its emphasis on nature's intrinsic value may conflict with pressing human needs and economic development, making it challenging to apply in policy contexts where trade-offs are inevitable.

9.2. *Biocentrism*

Biocentrism extends ethical consideration to all living beings, asserting that all life forms have inherent value and rights. This approach argues for the equal consideration of human and non-human interests in environmental decision-making, emphasizing the moral worth of individual organisms beyond their instrumental value to humans (Kenter et al., 2015).

Biocentrism addresses some of the ethical limitations of utilitarianism by advocating for the welfare of all living entities, not just those with utility to humans. This broader ethical scope can lead to more inclusive and protective environmental policies. However, the practical implications of treating all life forms as morally equal can pose significant challenges for policymakers, particularly in situations where human welfare and biodiversity conservation appear to be in conflict.

9.3. *Rights-based Approaches*

Rights-based approaches to environmental law focus on the establishment and protection of legal rights for individuals, communities, and sometimes nature itself. This framework emphasizes the legal entitlements and moral rights of people to live in a healthy and sustainable environment, often advocating for the recognition of nature's rights as well (Grazer & Martin, 2011).

Rights-based approaches provide a strong legal and moral foundation for environmental protection, enabling individuals and communities to hold governments and corporations accountable. Unlike the consequentialist focus of utilitarianism, rights-based approaches prioritize adherence to moral and legal principles, regardless of the outcomes. However, the challenge lies in defining and enforcing environmental rights, especially when they intersect with conflicting interests and economic development goals.

9.4. *Deontological Ethics*

Deontological ethics, rooted in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, posits that the morality of an action is determined by adherence to rules or duties, rather than the consequences. In the environmental context, this could involve principles like the duty to protect endangered species or preserve natural habitats, independent of the utilitarian calculus of costs and benefits (Groenfeldt & Schmidt, 2013; Kenter et al., 2015; Khan, 2016).

The strength of deontological ethics lies in its emphasis on moral principles and duties, which can offer clear guidance for environmental conservation efforts. Unlike utilitarianism, it does not require difficult assessments of outcomes, which can be uncertain or contested. However, strict adherence to rules may sometimes result in suboptimal outcomes or conflicts with other moral duties, highlighting a key challenge in applying deontological ethics to complex environmental issues.

9.5. *The Capability Approach*

The Capability Approach, developed by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, focuses on expanding individuals' freedoms and capabilities to live the life they value. In environmental law, this approach would prioritize policies that enable all members of society, including future generations, to flourish, taking into account both human and ecological well-being (Groenfeldt & Schmidt, 2013; Gustafson, 2013; Khan, 2016).

The Capability Approach offers a comprehensive framework that considers both human and environmental needs, addressing some of the criticisms of utilitarianism regarding equity and long-term sustainability. It emphasizes the importance of enhancing capabilities, rather than merely focusing on outcomes. However, operationalizing this approach in environmental policy can be challenging, as it requires identifying and measuring a wide range of capabilities and their interaction with ecological systems.

Each of these alternatives to the utilitarian approach offers unique perspectives and solutions to the ethical and practical challenges of environmental protection. While utilitarianism provides a clear framework for balancing costs and benefits, these alternative approaches introduce valuable dimensions of moral consideration, including the intrinsic value of nature, rights, duties, and capabilities. The choice of ethical framework significantly influences environmental policy and law, highlighting the importance of thoughtful consideration of the underlying values and principles in guiding sustainable and equitable governance.

10. Conclusion

The exploration of the utilitarian approach to environmental law, alongside its alternatives, underscores the profound complexity and ethical richness inherent in crafting laws and policies to safeguard our environment. Utilitarianism, with its pragmatic emphasis on balancing costs and benefits to achieve the greatest good, offers a compelling framework for environmental decision-making. It caters to the pressing need for practical solutions to contemporary environmental challenges, from climate change and pollution control to wildlife conservation. However, as our analysis has revealed, this approach is not without its limitations and ethical dilemmas. The potential neglect of inequities, the challenges in quantifying long-term ecological impacts, and the reduction of non-human entities to their utility for humans are significant concerns that call for careful consideration and mitigation.

The exploration of alternative ethical frameworks, including ecocentrism, biocentrism, rights-based approaches, deontological ethics, and the Capability Approach, broadens our perspective on environmental law and policy. Each of these philosophies contributes valuable insights, highlighting the importance of intrinsic values, individual rights, moral duties, and the capabilities necessary for a flourishing life for both humans and non-human entities. These alternative approaches address some of the criticisms leveled against utilitarianism, particularly its anthropocentric bias and potential for overlooking long-term sustainability and equity concerns.

In essence, the quest for effective and just environmental governance is a multi-faceted endeavor that transcends a single ethical framework. The strengths of utilitarianism in offering clear, outcome-focused guidance must be harmonized with the deeper ethical considerations illuminated by its alternatives. This synthesis requires an inclusive, adaptive, and reflective approach to policymaking, one that is attuned to the evolving scientific understanding of ecological systems and the diverse values and needs of global societies.

As we move forward, it becomes evident that no single ethical framework can fully encapsulate the complexity of human-nature relationships or provide a panacea for the environmental crises confronting our world. Instead, a pluralistic and integrative approach that draws upon the strengths of different ethical theories holds the most promise for crafting environmental laws and policies that are not only effective but also just, equitable, and sustainable. This approach demands ongoing dialogue among lawmakers, ethicists, environmental scientists, and the communities most affected by environmental decisions. Through such collaborative engagement, we can aspire to develop legal and policy frameworks that honor our ethical responsibilities to both present and future generations, as well as the non-human world with which our lives are inextricably intertwined.

In conclusion, the utilitarian approach to environmental law serves as an essential tool in our ethical toolkit, but it is not the sole instrument at our disposal. By embracing a diverse array of ethical perspectives, we can navigate the complexities of environmental governance with a more nuanced and holistic vision, one that is capable of addressing the urgent environmental challenges of our time with a robust commitment to justice, sustainability, and the intrinsic value of the natural world.

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

Ethical Considerations

Given the focus on published academic literature and public domain sources, the review did not involve primary data collection from human participants, thereby minimizing ethical concerns related to privacy and consent. However, ethical considerations were paramount in the interpretation and reporting of findings, particularly concerning the potential social and environmental implications of utilitarian policy recommendations.

References

Alt, J. E., & Lowry, R. C. (1994). Divided Government, Fiscal Institutions, and Budget Deficits: Evidence From the States. *American Political Science Review*. https://doi.org/10.2307/2082709

Bonnet, C., Bouamra-Mechemache, Z., Réquillart, V., & Treich, N. (2020). Viewpoint: Regulating Meat Consumption to Improve Health, the Environment and Animal Welfare. *Food Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2020.101847

Cord, A. F., Bartkowski, B., Beckmann, M., Dittrich, A., Hermans, K., Kaim, A., Lienhoop, N., Locher-Krause, K. E., Priess, J. A., Schröter-Schlaack, C., Schwarz, N., Seppelt, R., Strauch, M., Václavík, T., & Völk, M. (2017). Towards Systematic Analyses of Ecosystem Service Trade-Offs and Synergies: Main Concepts, Methods and the Road Ahead. *Ecosystem Services*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.07.012

Friedman, R., Law, E. A., Bennett, N., Ives, C. D., Thorn, J. P. R., & Wilson, K. A. (2018). How Just and Just How? A Systematic Review of Social Equity in Conservation Research. *Environmental Research Letters*. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aabcde

Gong, Q., Xiong, Y., Jiang, Z., Yang, J., & Chen, C. (2022). Timing Decision for Active Remanufacturing Based on 3E Analysis of Product Life Cycle. *Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148749

Grazer, V. M., & Martin, O. Y. (2011). Elevated Temperature Changes Female Costs and Benefits of Reproduction. *Evolutionary Ecology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-011-9508-4

Groenfeldt, D., & Schmidt, J. J. (2013). Ethics and Water Governance. *Ecology and Society*. https://doi.org/10.5751/es-04629-180114

Gustafson, A. (2013). In Defense of a Utilitarian Business Ethic. *Business and Society Review*. https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12013

Hadas, E., Mingelgrin, U., & Fine, P. (2020). Economic Cost-Benefit Analysis for the Agricultural Use of Sewage Sludge Treated With Lime and Fly Ash. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-42018/v1

Heyes, A., & Liston-Heyes, C. (1997). Regulatory 'Balancing' and the Efficiency of Green R&D. *Environmental and Resource Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02441763

Hopkins, E. A. (2016). Program Efficiency Analysis Within the Environmental Landscape. *Environment Systems & Decisions*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-016-9594-5

Horne, A., O'Donnell, E., Loch, A., Adamson, D., Hart, B. T., & Freebairn, J. (2018). Environmental Water Efficiency: Maximizing Benefits and Minimizing Costs of Environmental Water Use and Management. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Water*. https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1285

Kenter, J. O., O'Brien, L., Hockley, N., Ravenscroft, N., Fazey, I., Irvine, K. N., Reed, M., Christie, M., Brady, E., Bryce, R., Church, A., Cooper, N., Davies, A., Evely, A., Everard, M., Fish, R., Fisher, J., Jobstvogt, N., Molloy, C., . . . Williams, S. (2015). What Are Shared and Social Values of Ecosystems? *Ecological Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.01.006

Khan, Z. H. (2016). A Quest for Utilitarian Approach in Research. *Indian Journal of Anaesthesia*. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5049.174805

Kula, E., & Evans, D. (2011). Dual Discounting in Cost-Benefit Analysis for Environmental Impacts. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2010.06.001

Loreau, M. (2014). Reconciling Utilitarian and Non-Utilitarian Approaches to Biodiversity Conservation. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*. https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00149

McGarity, T. O. (1983). Media-Quality, Technology, and Cost-Benefit Balancing Strategies for Health and Environmental Regulation. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. https://doi.org/10.2307/1191560