

ARIL 17, 2:30-4:30

Rozanski 101

Questions on the final will be a subset of those found below. Approximately 6 questions will be selected from the A group (worth 2 points each); Three or four questions from the B group (worth 3-4 points each); and one question from the C group (worth 5-6 points).

A. **Concepts:** Define/explain. 1-2 sentences each.

1. The land ethic
2. Typological vs population thinking.
3. Phenomenological communities.
4. Biotically Integrated vs. Abiotically Determined communities.
5. Balance of nature
6. The N + M problem
7. Welfare economics
8. Willingness to pay
9. Kantian approach to environmental ethics
10. Ecosystem services
11. Economic value
12. 'Natural' according to a place-based ethic.

****Note that the date of the exam is April 17, not April 20 as it says on syllabus*******

B. **Short answer:** Approximately one paragraph.

1. According to Leopold, what role should political and legal institutions play in formulating and regulating environmental policy? Why did he hold this view?
2. As discussed in class, what are the three levels of controversy in the climate change debate? Where do Monbiot's criticisms of the "denial industry" belong in this framework?
3. What problems do "producers" and "consumers" of science face when it comes to complex scientific issues like climate change, and how are these problems supposedly resolved under the popular conception of science?
4. What is Sagoff's diagnosis of the problem with economics and environmentalism respectively?
5. Why does Sagoff reject cost benefit analysis as a sufficient means for identifying the value of the environment?
6. Why does Sagoff think that it is impossible to put a price on ecosystem services?
7. How does Sagoff recommend that we should engage in environmental decision making?

C. **Short essay question:** up to three paragraphs.

1. Leopold hoped to extend our moral circle to include wilderness areas. Likewise, Sagoff claims that environmentalists should inform society of the intrinsic value in nature. Do you think that the intrinsic value of nature, if it exists, can be demonstrated with a logically compelling argument? Why or why not? How does this impact the environmental movement?
2. What do you think are the obligations of scientists when communicating their conclusions to the media, and what are our obligations as non scientists when consuming scientific information that it is presented in the media?