

Discussion Topic Guidelines

1. Assignment: In teams of five, your assignment is to become informed on one of seven moral issues, which we will informally discuss over the course of the semester. Your team will be evaluated based on two components—a written and an oral component, as follows:

- (a) The written component: Your team will write a roughly two page informal report on your assigned topics (500-700 words), to be turned in by the beginning of class on the day of our discussion. Late papers will not be accepted. Roughly, your instructions are as follows: You will briefly introduce the issue, and then provide some moral reasons both for and against.* More specific instructions for your particular prompt can be found on the pages below.

* Note: For the purposes of our course, when brainstorming reasons for and against each position, the focus of your efforts should be on the *moral* reasons for and against; though you *may* also appeal to practical and/or legal reasons—especially in instances where you are able to make a case that these other sorts of reasons might be morally relevant.)

- (b) The discussion component: On the assigned date, your team will lead a class discussion on that topic. I will come prepared with a set of questions and comments, which I may interject with periodically. (This will become more likely if I see that the discussion is flagging.)

2. How to Begin: Begin by reading your particular prompt (on the pages below). I then encourage you to do some preliminary brainstorming and research on your own. As you begin to familiarize yourself with the issue and read articles about it, ask yourself: What is *my* moral stance on this issue? *Why* do I believe this? Why do others disagree? What reasons could *they* have for *their* stance?

You should then arrange to meet up with your teammates to discuss and share your thoughts from your preliminary research with one another. From there, you can then do some further brainstorming as a group, and decide how to divide up the work, and so on.

3. Grading Rubric: I will be looking for several things when I assign grades:

Written

- (1) Following Instructions: Did you complete the assignment according to the instructions stated here?
- (2) Clarity: Do you explain yourself in a way that is *clear, concise, and well-organized*? You should think of this as a somewhat informal assignment. However, your writing should still be clear enough and careful enough that someone who has never taken philosophy could read it and understand it (and perhaps even learn from, and be persuaded by it!).
- (3) Careful, Contemplative Reasoning: It should be evident that you have actually thought carefully about the assigned issues, and that you have put some time and consideration into your written response. In short, this is not meant to be the sort of assignment that can be completed successfully 10 minutes before class.

Oral

- (1) Preparedness: It should be apparent that each of your team members has come to class prepared to discuss the issue—in both your prepared presentation as well as your responses to any questions and comments.
- (2) Class Engagement & Facilitation of Discussion: Ask yourself, What sort of classroom experience do *you personally* value the most? Do you prefer for class to be fun? to raise interesting and thought-provoking questions? to provide helpful and insightful potential answers to those questions? to be engaging? and encouraging of discussion? ‘Yes’ to all of the above? Then strive for that. Do not plan to deliver an uninterrupted lecture; rather, plan to introduce the issue to your classmates, provide some context and direction for what you want to discuss, and then helpfully guide a fun and productive discussion about it.
- (3) Civility: It should go without saying that our discussion will remain civil and respectful. This means no insulting of classmates, or shouting at or over them, and it also means giving others the opportunity to share their own views. We will also strive whenever possible to keep our comments constructive and productive, with the goal of moral progress and learning as we work through these difficult issues together, in a group effort.

Some Tips for Discussion Day

- **Don’t Force It.** The most common issue that I have seen is that students will over-prepare several hours’ worth of material. Then, in their effort to insist on covering absolutely all of it, they will regularly shut down conversation in order to have time to rush through every last bit of their material. Don’t do this. (You’ll probably see me do this too now and then over the course of this semester, but hey I’m not proud of those moments.)
- **Don’t Save the Best for Last.** That said, you should probably open with your best and most interesting claims / observations / conversation pieces. This will serve to (a) hook your audience and get them excited, and (b) ensure that your favorite stuff gets discussed, in case you run out of time (because you probably will).
- **Prepare to Be Adaptive.** Audiences are frequently unpredictable. Something that you *thought* would be super interesting may fall totally flat. You can try re-framing it. (Maybe you didn’t pitch it clearly enough.) But, it might just be that they don’t find this point as interesting as you do. Don’t be afraid to abandon what you had planned to say about it and move on to your next item. Or, maybe you’re on issue #2 when your audience brings up what you’d planned as issue #5. Don’t be afraid to re-arrange the order of your presentation on the fly. Your audience is excited to discuss issue #5 *now*! Consider letting them do so.
- **Take Part in the Conversation.** Avoid simply nodding silently for 50 minutes as your classmates discuss. Don’t forget that *you* are the experts in the room. (Not to mention, this is *your* assignment.) Be sure to regularly insert your expertise into the conversation. For example, highlight aspects of your classmates’ comments that are interesting or important; or explain how their opponent might push back on what they have just said; or expose relationships between ideas by explaining how their point ties into something else from your research. And so on. In short, don’t forget that you are playing the role of the *instructor* on this day.

4. Specific Topics: Specific prompts for the seven discussion topics are found on the pages below.

Day One (Mon, 9/30): Killing as Conservation

The Issue: In the Pacific Northwest, [Northern spotted owl](#) populations plummeted through the 1990's, resulting in the species being designated as 'threatened'. This was initially due to logging in the area, but was then accelerated due to encroachment of the (non-threatened) barred owl into the spotted owl's territory. In the 2010's, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service began shooting barred owls in order to save the spotted owl from extinction. Story [here](#), with update [here](#). Video [here](#).

Two Related Issues: There is tension between killing and conservation elsewhere too. You may wish to include the following in your discussion too. (At least be prepared to do so.)

Invasive Species. These are non-native species introduced into an area, which then thrive—often far too well—wreaking havoc on the local ecosystem. The typical method of dealing with invasive species is eradication—i.e., killing them. Consider for instance the viral 2022 campaign to kill the spotted lanternfly on sight (video [here](#)).

The list goes on. We kill Asian carp in the Illinois River (video [here](#)), lionfish off the coast of Florida (video [here](#)), cane toads in Australia (video [here](#), at 11:10 – 12:09), and kudzu vines in the South (video [here](#)). See [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#) for some additional interesting videos.

Kate McKinnon humorously sums up the angst of the dilemma [here \(0:31-2:10\)](#).

Trophy Hunting. The killing of [Cecil the lion](#) in 2015 in Zimbabwe by an American hunter sparked controversy. How could someone kill a member of a threatened species for sport? Big game hunters defend the practice by claiming that it actually *promotes* conservation by putting money into wildlife programs and providing incentives for communities to maintain game preserves where endangered animals are protected.¹ Podcast [here](#). Video [here](#).

Question: Is it morally permissible to kill individual organisms in the name of conservation? Specifically, is it morally permissible to, say, kill barred owls in order to save spotted owls?

For the Writing Assignment: Briefly introduce the controversy surrounding the spotted owl, and then discuss at least **two reasons in favor** of killing barred owls, and **two reasons against**. Then, decide which side of this issue your team ultimately agrees with, and explain why.

Finally, while the above should be your focus of your essay, be sure to briefly explore the other two issues as well. Are there any potentially morally relevant differences between killing barred owls to save spotted owls and, say, killing Asian carp? Or going on conservation-funding black rhino hunts? Do those differences lead your team to take a different position regarding the moral status of killing animals in these other cases? Why or why not?

¹ Donald Trump, Jr. put it this way: "Anyone who thinks hunters are just 'bloodthirsty morons' hasn't looked into hunting. If you wait through long, cold hours in the November woods with a bow in your hands hoping a buck will show or if you spend days walking in the African bush trailing Cape buffalo while listening to lions roar, you're sure to learn hunting isn't about killing. Nature actually humbles you. Hunting forces a person to endure, to master themselves, even to truly get to know the wild environment. Actually, along the way, hunting and fishing makes you fall in love with the natural world. This is why hunters so often give back by contributing to conservation." (interview with *Forbes*, 2012)

Day Two (Mon, 10/7): Terraforming Mars

Environmentalists are commonly described as being fundamentally concerned with *preserving nature*. That is, they believe that we have moral reasons to preserve the environment in its natural state. But, does this moral imperative extend to other environments beyond our Earth?

The Issue: The colonization of Mars is nearly upon us. Elon Musk’s [SpaceX](#) plans to put the first humans on Mars as early as [2029](#), with the goal being a large city in the decades to follow. NASA’s [Artemis](#) mission plans to put humans back on the Moon by 2027, in preparation for putting humans on Mars in the 2030’s. Initially, Martians will live in enclosed, air-tight structures. But, scientists are already looking ahead to a future time when Mars could become a second Earth. Simply put, they are beginning to propose ways in which we could “geoengineer” Mars’s atmosphere—i.e., alter its climate on a planetary-wide scale in order to make it suitable for human habitation through a process called ‘terraforming’. Videos [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#). (Perhaps we could even [terraform Venus!](#))

There are many moral questions that arise here. For example, are there any moral reasons against destroying or fundamentally altering the untouched landscape of another planet? Also, if colonizing Mars increases the likelihood of the continued existence of human beings and other species,² does this render it a moral imperative? Why or why not? And many more.

Question: Would it be morally permissible (or even obligatory) to terraform Mars?

For the Writing Assignment: Briefly introduce the issue, and then discuss at least **two reasons in favor** of terraforming Mars, and **two reasons against**. Then, decide which side of this issue your team ultimately agrees with, and explain why.

During the course of your discussion, be sure to also explore the issue of whether colonization *in general* is morally permissible (e.g., humans inhabiting Mars in biosphere bases). You should also briefly explore the moral ramifications of creating a “back-up Earth”. Are there any moral reasons for or against such a project?

Suggested readings: (available on Blackboard)

- James Schwartz, “On the Moral Permissibility of Terraforming” (2013)
- Ian Stoner, “Humans Should Not Colonize Mars” (2017)
- *Optional:* Joseph Gottlieb, “Space Colonization and Existential Risk” (reply to Stoner, 2019)

² For example, Elon Musk’s professed goal for SpaceX is to help both humans and other species avoid extinction—essentially by creating a modern day Noah’s ark, and using Mars as a “back-up” planet. (See [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).)

Day Three (Fri, 10/18): De-Extinction (and Facilitated Adaptation)

The Issue: Scientists are [presently working](#) to resurrect the long-extinct woolly mammoth [by 2029](#) (!!), using DNA found frozen in Arctic tundra, combined with advances in cloning and gene editing technology (video [here](#)). There are efforts to resurrect a host of other extinct species as well, including [passenger pigeons](#) and dodo birds (video [here](#)).

Related Issue: We could also use gene editing technology to help species avoid extinction in the first place. You may wish to discuss the following too. (At least be prepared to do so.)

Consider the American chestnut. In 1900, there were 3.5 *billion* chestnut trees growing in the eastern United States. But, after thriving there for 40 million years, the accidental introduction of a blight-causing fungus in 1904 led chestnut numbers to dwindle to almost nothing today. Yet, advances in gene-editing technology have allowed scientists to isolate and splice into the chestnut's DNA a blight-resistant gene, resulting in the creation of a blight-resistant chestnut. One proposal is to release this genetically modified chestnut into the wild to save the species from extinction. (Story [here](#). Video [here](#).)

And that's just the tip of the iceberg. For instance, perhaps we could also genetically modify species in order to help them adapt to a rapidly warming climate. (This process, sometimes called 'facilitated adaptation' or '[assisted evolution](#)', is already being tested on coral reefs – story [here](#); video [here](#)). Or perhaps we could go further and actually modify species to *help reverse* climate change – e.g., we could genetically modify cows to produce less methane ([here](#)), or modify plants to more efficiently sequester carbon from the atmosphere ([here](#)).

Question: It is morally permissible to resurrect the woolly mammoth?

For the Writing Assignment: Briefly introduce the issue, and then discuss at least **two reasons in favor** of resurrecting the woolly mammoth, and **two reasons against**. Then, decide which side of this issue your team ultimately agrees with, and explain why.

During the course of your discussion, be sure to also briefly explore the question of whether there is a moral difference between creating a single individual (to be kept in confinement) and creating *many* individuals to be re-introduced into the wild. Also, does your verdict for resurrecting mammoths extend in the same way to the resurrection of *any* extinct species? (For instance, is there a moral difference between resurrecting a woolly mammoth and, say, a passenger pigeon? Why or why not?)

Suggested readings: (available on Blackboard)

- Doug Campbell & Patrick Whittle, "Ethical Arguments For and Against De-Extinction" (2017)
- *Optional:* Heather Browning, "Won't Somebody Please Think of the Mammoths? De-Extinction and Animal Welfare" (2019)
- *Optional:* Clare Palmer, "Saving Species but Losing Wildness: Should We Genetically Adapt Wild Animal Species to Help Them Respond to Climate Change?" (2016)
- *Optional:* Clare Palmer, "Assisting Wild Animals Vulnerable to Climate Change" (2019)

(Note that there was also an entire series of TED talks on de-extinction in 2013, if you're interested – found [here](#). The Hank Greely talk, "Hubris or Hope?" is particularly good.)

Day Four (Mon, 11/4): Climate Change Denial

The Issue: At least a quarter (or even a third) of Americans embrace some form of climate denialism.³ Former president Donald Trump famously [denied the reality of climate change](#). (Podcast [here](#).) Presently, 23% of our Congresspeople are climate change deniers – 23 senators and 100 representatives ([source](#)). All told, the U.S. has the greatest percentage of climate change deniers out of any developed nation.

Question: What are our moral responsibilities with respect to climate change deniers? i.e., how should we respond to them?

For instance, should we de-platform climate skeptics?* Should we *ban* climate denial propaganda, and/or the promotion of climate denial? Or, should climate scientists simply step up their efforts to inform the public? Or what? Consider facebook, for instance, which has been accused of driving many of its users to climate denial (see [here](#) and [here](#)); or Twitter (X) where climate misinformation ran rampant in the wake of Elon Musk's takeover ([here](#)). Should these platforms be doing more to stop this; for instance, by deleting ads and posts (or users who share posts) containing misinformation about climate change?

* **'No-Platforming'** is the practice of refusing to give a person, or group of people, or a set of beliefs, etc., any public platform from which to speak, or share, or spread their views. No-platforming might include, for example, deleting a tweet or suspending a social media account, denying a permit to a rally organizer, refusing to allow someone to rent out a public venue where they want to give a talk, or refusing to publish pieces which endorse, promote, or normalize some particular belief (e.g., see [here](#)).

On the other hand, perhaps we should be *more* inclusive of climate skeptics rather than less? Simply allow all voices to be heard, and let all evidence be presented, and let the people decide for themselves? May the best view win in the free market of ideas! (This is what "[free-speech absolutists](#)" such as Elon Musk suggest, for example.) Is it better, perhaps, to respond to disagreement by encouraging open, public discourse about it? Why or why not?

For the Writing Assignment: Briefly introduce the issue of climate denial, and then discuss at least **two reasons in favor** of no-platforming climate change deniers, and **two reasons against**. Then, decide which side of this issue your team ultimately agrees with, and explain why.

During the course of your discussion, be sure to explain how far you think we should go in the direction that your team takes. For instance, if you are against suppressing climate denial, are you merely in favor of refraining from silencing climate deniers, or would you like to see them actively be given a platform from which to spread their view? If you are in favor of suppression, how far should this go? Are you merely in favor of no-platforming? Or should we go farther? (e.g., a legal ban or even active harassment?) Explain why (or why not). Be sure to also consider what social media's role in all of this should be – or at least be prepared to discuss this in class.

Suggested readings: (available on Blackboard)

- Catriona McKinnon, "Should We Tolerate Climate Change Denial?" (2016)
- *Optional:* Uwe Peters & Nikolaj Nottelmann, "Epistemic Dilemma of No-Platforming" (2021)

³ In a [2023 Ipsos poll](#) (see pg. 15), over 70 million Americans (over 1 in 5) accepted that the climate is changing, but denied that human activity is the cause, while another 17 million (~1 in 20) denied that it is even changing at all; Meanwhile, in a [2024 Monmouth University poll](#), a shocking 23% (!) of Americans denied that the climate is changing at all, with 34% reporting that climate change was not a serious problem.

Day Five (Mon, 11/11): Climate Activism & Un-Civil Disobedience

The Issue: In recent years, people like [Greta Thunberg](#) have brought a spotlight to environmental activism. (In 2018, she began skipping school to protest for political action on climate change – sparking climate protests and rallies across the globe that continue to this day. Story [here](#). In 2024, her civil disobedience continues, even resulting [in arrest](#).)

Surely activism such as school strikes, rallies, marches, etc. are morally *permissible*. (right?) But, are we ever morally *obligated* to engage in such activism? Thunberg's answer is clear: "It is my **moral duty** as a human being, as a citizen, to do everything I can." ([here](#)) Or consider the oft-repeated words of legendary activist John Lewis: "When you see something that is not right, not just, not fair, you have a **moral obligation** to *say* something, to *do* something. ... We have a mission and a mandate to be on the right side of history." (e.g., [here](#))

First Question: Is that true? Are acts of climate activism ever morally *obligatory*? (What about acts of civil disobedience that break laws and run some risk of arrest?)⁴

But, let's go further, and consider acts of climate protest that are *un-civil* (that is, involving incivility, destruction of property, or even violence); for example, sabotaging logging equipment, or throwing acid onto whaling boats. Uncivil disobedience even includes acts as simple as standing in a restaurant, shouting at a dining, climate-denying politicians.

In 2022, "[Just Stop Oil](#)" activists began vandalizing famous artwork in museums to draw attention to climate change. (Story [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#). By 2024, this expanded to [celebrity mansions](#), [airports](#), [the U.S. Constitution](#), and [Stonehenge](#).) Let's focus in on one particular example as a case study: Consider those activists who [threw soup on Van Gogh's Sunflowers](#), and then asked, "[What is worth more? Art or life?](#)" Was that permissible?

Second Question: Are such acts of *un-civil* disobedience (such as "[eco-vandalism](#)") ever morally *permissible*? Or, rather, should our activism always remain civil?

Start by checking out the work of philosopher Candice Delmas – e.g., [this lecture](#) (start at 4:41), [this interview](#), [this podcast](#) (interview with Delmas starts at 27:10), or [this lecture](#).

For the Writing Assignment: Briefly introduce the issue of climate activism, and then discuss at least **two reasons in favor** of the moral permissibility of *un-civil* disobedience, and **two reasons against**. Then, decide which side of this issue your team ultimately agrees with, and explain why.

During the course of your discussion, be sure to also address the question of whether *civil* acts of climate activism (e.g., peaceful protest, marches, etc.) are ever morally obligatory. Why or why not?

Suggested readings: (available on Blackboard)

- Candice Delmas, "In Defense of Uncivil Disobedience" (ch. 2 of *A Duty to Resist*, 2018)
- *Optional:* Thomas Young, "The Morality of Ecosabotage" (2001)
- *Optional:* Candice Delmas, "Civil Disobedience" (2016)

⁴ Some say 'yes' to this too. Consider activist Mary Frances Berry, who is asked, "What would you say is the most pressing issue that you think people need to protest for?" Her answer: "Climate change," adding, "Every generation has to make its own dent in the wall of injustice" and "Protest is an essential ingredient of politics." And later: "You have to *do* something yourself," she says. "You have to *be* there. You have to put your body on the line. You have to be willing to go to jail. You have to be willing to say, 'Here I stand and you will go no further, because I have moral authority in what I'm doing.'" ([here](#))

Day Six (Mon, 11/18): E-Waste, Exportation, and Exploitation

The Issue: How new is your phone? How many phones have you owned, total? What do you think happened to the ones you got rid of? Would it surprise you to hear that Americans throw away over 400 thousand phones **each day** (~150 million per year)? ([source](#)) Globally, human beings purchase about 1.5 **billion** phones every single year. ([source](#)) ...And then there are all of the other devices that we throw out, like ipads, laptops, TV's, and on, and on.

That's not great news, because our electronic waste (E-waste) contains many toxic elements and chemicals – e.g., lead, mercury, and arsenic – which can poison the soil, water, and air once we dispose of it. ([source](#)) For this reason, the World Health Organization has identified E-waste as a major health threat. ([source](#)) But, it gets worse... According to the WHO,

“Appropriate collection and recycling of e-waste is key to protect the environment and reduce climate emissions.” And yet, “Only 17.4% of e-waste produced in 2019 reached formal management or recycling facilities ... the rest was illegally dumped, overwhelmingly in low- or middle-income countries, where it is recycled by informal workers.”

Disposing of E-waste properly is expensive. (See how it's done, [here](#).) The cheapest way to get rid of it is to export it to developing nations where it is “recycled” – i.e., picked over by scavengers living in horrendous conditions, who salvage the precious metals and burn the rest – and suffer major health ailments as a result. (See for instance, what's happening in the city of Accra, Ghana: Story [here](#), videos [here](#) & [here](#).) Some call this practice exploitative (i.e., taking advantage of the need, desperation, or dire circumstances of another for personal gain or profit). Some have even called it ‘[waste colonialism](#)’.⁵ So, is it immoral?⁶

Decent video survey [here](#), another [here](#). Some stats [here](#). (Note: There's a similar problem for the millions of tons of plastic waste that we produce each year: Story [here](#), video [here](#).)

Questions: Is it immoral to export our E-waste to less developed nations, such as Ghana? (Assume that they *want* our waste.) Can exploitative behavior *ever* be morally justified? On a personal level, is it permissible for me to buy a new phone (or tablet, etc.), knowing that my old one will likely end up in this system of E-waste once I dispose of it?

For the Writing Assignment: Briefly introduce the issues of E-waste, exportation, and exploitation, and then discuss at least one reason in favor of the moral permissibility of waste exportation, and one reason against. Then, consider the issue on an individual level, and provide at least one reason in favor of the moral permissibility of buying a new phone / disposing of the old one, and one reason against. Then, decide which side of these issues your team ultimately agrees with, and explain why.

Suggested readings: (available on Blackboard)

- Samuel Abalansa, et. al., “Electronic Waste, an Environmental Problem Exported to Developing Countries: The GOOD, the BAD and the UGLY” (2021)
- Christopher Pearson, “Exploitation: A Missing Element to Our Understanding of Environmental Justice” (2022)

⁵ Not to mention, it is also the case that a lot of [conflict minerals](#) find their way into our devices.

⁶ You might be thinking, How could exploitative behavior ever be permissible? There's not a lot of literature on exploitation and waste exportation, but the literature on the ethics of purchasing sweatshop labor products has many parallels: See [here](#) and [here](#). (Hint: The answer has to do with the fact that the “victim” in many instances of exploitation both *benefits from* and *consents to* – or at least gives the *appearance* of consent to – the supposedly exploitative transaction.)

Day Seven (Fri, 11/22): Climate Refugees

The Issue: Due to rising sea levels, island nations like [Tuvalu](#) and [Kiribati](#) are sinking. The homes of coastal populations in nations like [Bangladesh](#) are threatened too. Here at home, cities like [Miami](#) and [New Orleans](#) are in danger of being submerged. Over the next few decades, we should expect to see large populations of people displaced from their homes due to climate change—so-called “climate refugees”. Videos [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).

The people of Miami are fortunate to live in a rich nation that can afford [a \\$6 billion sea wall](#). Or they might move inland. But what of people in nations that lack these resources? Or those whose *entire nation* is expected to cease to exist (as in Kiribati)? What should they do?

Question: What are our moral obligations with respect to global climate refugees?

Do we have any obligations to the people of, say, Kiribati? Some argue that developed nations owe them a homeland, as they are the ones who caused climate change. The U.S. in particular—being *by far* the worst emitter, historically*—bears some special responsibility.

* Presently, China’s *total* annual emissions exceed that of the U.S., but only because their population is more than four times that of the U.S. The average American emits almost twice as much as the average citizen of China, per capita; and historically, over the past two centuries, the U.S. has emitted about twice as much as China in total.

It is worth noting that displaced citizens of Kiribati already applied for asylum in New Zealand, only to be denied. (See, e.g., Ioane Teitiota’s story [here](#).) The UN considered Teitiota’s case, and while it ultimately did not recognize the legitimacy of his *personal* claim to refugee status, it *did* open the door for “climate refugee” to be internationally recognized as a legitimate category of refugee in the future. (Story [here](#), and [here](#).) Yet, as of 2024, it is not yet recognized ([source](#)). By contrast, Australia recently agreed to grant asylum to the entire population of Tuvalu over the next 40 years. Whoa! (great video [here](#) ; criticism [here](#))

So... What should we *do* about climate refugees? What is the best solution?

For the Writing Assignment: Briefly introduce the issue of climate refugees, and then provide at least **two reasons in favor** of a moral duty to offer aid or asylum to these refugees, and **two reasons against**. Then, decide which side of this issue your team ultimately agrees with, and explain why.

During the course of your discussion, be sure to consider some specifics. For example: For nations like Kiribati (which are disappearing), are we obligated to grant their people asylum? (or more? Offer them *land*?) How about the climate-displaced people in nations that will *not* disappear? Do we also owe *them* asylum? (or do we at least owe them *aid* to fund relocation within their home country?)

One more thing: If the people of, say, Kiribati are dispersed, this may jeopardize the preservation of their culture; and they would cease to be a sovereign, self-governing state. Is this of moral concern?

Suggested readings: (available on Blackboard)

- Rebecca Buxton, “Reparative Justice for Climate Refugees” (2019)
- Olúfèmi Táíwò and Beba Cibralic, “[The Case for Climate Reparations](#)” (2020)
- *Optional:* Cara Nine, “Ecological Refugees, States Borders, & the Lockean Proviso” (2010)