

Starting in the 1970s, philosophers concerned about the environment began arguing that existing ethical theories were too anthropocentric to appreciate the intrinsic value of nonhuman nature: animals and plants, rocks and rivers, wetlands and deserts, the climate and the planet itself. The contention that we've moved into the Anthropocene, in which these natural entities and processes have themselves become at least to some degree human artifacts, would seem to confirm the suspicion that anthropocentrism – the myopic overvaluing of the human over the natural – lies at the root of all environmental evils. In this paper, I explore the opposite possibility: that more, not less, humanity might provide the foundation for a promising environmental ethic.