ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS AND JUSTICE AS FOUNDATIONS FOR ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE IN AFRICAE

Emmanuel Onucheojo Egwu
Department of Philosophy, Veritas University, Abuja
emmanuelegwu977@gmail.com

Michael Sunday Sasa, PhD
Department of Philosophy, Veritas University, Abuja
dvc@veritas.edu.ng

Ikechukwu Anthony Kanu, PhD
Department of Philosophy, Veritas University, Abuja
ikee_mario@yahoo.com

Abstract
There is an urgent need for accountability in managing the natural environment if we are to safeguard the health of our ecosystem and secure the well-being of future generations. Africa, once renowned as a cradle of rich biodiversity, is now increasingly threatened by environmental degradation. If such ecological decline can occur in a region historically celebrated for its biodiversity, the implications for the rest of the world are deeply concerning. While many scholars identify physical and economic factors as the primary drivers of environmental crises, this study argues that the absence of environmental ethics and justice constitutes the fundamental cause of ecological degradation. Consequently, if humanity is to thrive sustainably, serious attention must be given to these ethical and justice-oriented dimensions. To address this concern, the study adopts an analytical and conceptual approach. Central concepts such as "environmental ethics," "justice," and "climate change" are critically examined and clarified to establish their relevance to the discourse. Within this framework, Peter Singer approaches environmental concerns from a utilitarian perspective, emphasizing human welfare and the reduction of suffering. In contrast, Thomas Pogge argues that we must confront the structural and foundational causes of environmental crises, particularly how the actions of wealthy nations adversely affect poorer nations and hinder their development. Similarly, Arne Naess, through his theory of "deep ecology," advocates for a responsible and respectful relationship with the natural environment while rejecting radical anthropocentrism. This article contributes to the ongoing discourse on climate change by emphasizing the ethical and justice-related foundations of environmental degradation. It argues that continued ecological destruction poses a serious threat not only to human survival but also to other sentient beings, organisms, and plant life that depend on a balanced ecosystem.

Keywords: Environmental justice, Ethics, Africa, climate change, Ecosystem, Accountability

Introduction
Climate change is one of the most serious environmental and developmental issues facing Africa. The continent contributes relatively little to global greenhouse gas emissions, yet it faces severe consequences. They include droughts, floods, biodiversity loss, desertification, food insecurity and declining agricultural productivity (IPCC, 2022, 2023). These impacts are not distributed equally. Poor households, rural communities, women, children and other vulnerable groups often have fewer resources to adapt. Hence, climate change is not only an ecological problem. It is also a question of responsibility, justice and human welfare.

Existing responses have largely asserted scientific knowledge, technological innovation, finance and public policy. These remain necessary, but they do not by themselves answer important moral questions. Who should bear responsibility for climate-related harm? What duties do affluent countries have towards vulnerable societies? How should environmental burdens and adaptation resources be distributed? What obligations do present generations have to future generations? These questions require ethical analysis. Environmental ethics tackles the moral relationship between human beings and the natural world. Environmental justice examines the fair distribution of environmental benefits and burdens, participation in decision-making and the recognition of vulnerable communities (Schlosberg, 2007; Agyeman, 2014).

This paper brings these concerns together through a dialogue among Arne Naess, Peter Singer, Thomas Pogge and Ubuntu philosophy. Naess (1973, 1989) interrogates anthropocentrism by asserting the intrinsic value of the natural world and the need for a less exploitative relationship with nature. Singer (1972, 2011) draws attention to the moral obligation to prevent avoidable suffering, particularly where those with greater resources can provide assistance. Pogge (2002, 2008) shifts attention from individual duties to the global structures that produce and sustain inequality. Ubuntu adds an African relational perspective centred on interconnectedness, solidarity, reciprocity and communal responsibility (Ramose, 2015). Generally, these perspectives provide a broader framework for understanding both the ecological and distributive dimensions of climate change. The paper asserts that environmental ethics and environmental justice should not be treated as separate responses to the African climate crisis. Ecological responsibility must be accompanied by justice and justice must recognise humanity's dependence on the natural world. Thus, the paper proposes an integrated framework in which ecological responsibility, the prevention of suffering, structural justice and Ubuntu-based communal responsibility foster one another. This framework is applied to African climate realities, including resource extraction and environmental degradation, to evince why effective climate governance requires not only technological and institutional reform but also ethical transformation.

Statement of the Problem

Climate change presents a serious threat to Africa's ecological stability and socio-economic development. The continent contributes relatively little to global greenhouse gas emissions but bears a disproportionate share of climate-related harms. Droughts, floods, desertification, declining agricultural productivity, biodiversity loss and water scarcity increasingly threaten livelihoods and human well-being (IPCC, 2022, 2023). These pressures are particularly severe for poor and rural communities whose adaptive capacity is limited. Thus, climate change exposes a persistent problem of unequal vulnerability: those who contribute least to the crisis often have the fewest resources to respond to it. Current responses have produced important scientific, technological and policy interventions, but they remain insufficient when considered only in technical terms. Climate governance also involves questions of moral responsibility, fairness, participation and accountability. Resource extraction, pollution, land degradation and unequal access to adaptation resources evince that environmental harm is often connected to wider economic and political structures. Hence, the problem is both ecological and distributive. Communities may bear environmental costs without receiving a fair share of the benefits or having meaningful influence over decisions that affect their lives (Schlosberg, 2007; Pogge, 2008). Moreover, there is limited integration of African philosophical perspectives into contemporary climate governance. Ubuntu and indigenous ecological knowledge assert relationality, communal responsibility, reciprocity and respect for the natural environment (Ramose, 2015; Ojakorotu & Bamidele, 2019). Yet these perspectives often remain peripheral to formal environmental policy.

Consequently, this study tackles this gap by examining environmental ethics and environmental justice as complementary foundations for climate governance. It brings Naess's ecological responsibility, Singer's concern for human suffering, Pogge's structural account of global injustice and Ubuntu's relational ethic into a single analytical framework. The study opines that climate action in Africa will be more effective when ecological protection, social justice, communal responsibility and institutional accountability are treated as interconnected rather than separate concerns.

Review of Relevant Literature

Environmental Ethics and Environmental Justice

Environmental ethics and environmental justice tackle different but connected dimensions of the environmental crisis. Environmental ethics asks how human beings ought to relate to nature. Environmental justice asks who suffers environmental harm, who benefits from environmental resources and who participates in environmental decisions (Schlosberg, 2007). The distinction is important, but the two perspectives cannot be separated in practice. Environmental protection without justice may ignore vulnerable communities. Justice without ecological responsibility may fail to protect the natural systems on which human life depends. Environmental ethics interrogates the assumption that nature exists mainly for human use. Leopold (2002) views human beings as members of a wider biotic community. Naess (1973, 1989) develops this concern through deep ecology. He rejects excessive anthropocentrism and roots for respect for the intrinsic value of nature. His position is relevant to Africa because extractive activities often place short-term economic interests above ecological integrity. However, environmental protection must also recognise the development needs of poor communities. Hence, a viable African approach must protect ecosystems without ignoring poverty, employment, energy access and other basic needs. Environmental justice adds the question of fairness. Bullard (1990, 1994) evinces how environmental hazards can be concentrated in already disadvantaged communities. Sze and London (2008) further expose that environmental justice involves social movements, policy and public participation. These concerns are relevant to Africa, where communities affected by mining, petroleum extraction, deforestation and other activities may receive limited economic benefits while carrying substantial environmental costs.

Naess, Singer and Pogge: Three Dimensions of Climate Responsibility

Naess, Singer and Pogge advanced different but complementary ways of understanding climate responsibility. Naess focused on the relationship between human beings and nature. Singer focused on the duty to prevent avoidable suffering. Pogge focused on the structures that produce and sustain inequality. Generally, they move the discussion from ecological value to human welfare and then to institutional responsibility. Singer's (1972, 2011) position is particularly relevant to climate justice. His polemics that preventable suffering creates moral obligations calls affluent societies to assist those facing severe climate-related hardship. Applied to Africa, this supports greater assistance for adaptation, food security, health protection and disaster response. Yet Singer's approach mainly asserts the duty to assist. It does not fully explain why some societies repeatedly bear greater environmental burdens. Pogge's (2002, 2008) structural approach handles this limitation. He draws attention to international arrangements that reproduce unequal opportunities and deprivation. In the climate context, his position directs attention to historical emissions, unequal economic power and unequal access to finance and technology. Consequently, these three perspectives complement one another. Naess explains why ecological systems deserve protection. Singer explains why those able to prevent suffering have duties to act. Pogge explains why climate responsibility must also handle unjust structures. None is sufficient alone. They collectively provide a stronger ethical basis for analysing Africa's climate vulnerability.

Ubuntu and Indigenous Ecological Knowledge

Ubuntu brings an important African contribution to this framework. Its stresses on relationality, solidarity, reciprocity and communal responsibility issues highly individualistic approaches to environmental responsibility (Ramose, 2015). Environmental protection, from this perspective, is not merely a private choice. It is a communal obligation. Moreover, Ojakorotu and Bamidele (2019) connect failures in resource management with the erosion of values such as caring, sharing and communal responsibility. Ubuntu also provides a useful link between environmental ethics and environmental justice. Respect for nature is connected to respect for people. Decisions concerning land, water, forests and other resources should consider the interests of the wider community. This supports participatory approaches to climate governance and strengthens the recognition dimension of environmental justice.

Indigenous ecological knowledge adds a practical dimension. African communities have developed knowledge of local soils, rainfall, forests, water systems, crops and other ecological conditions over generations. Such knowledge can support conservation and climate adaptation. It should not, however, be romanticised. Some traditional practices may no longer be adequate under changing demographic, economic and climatic conditions. Thus, indigenous knowledge should be critically appraised and combined with scientific knowledge.

African Climate Experience and the Literature Gap

The Title

Recent African climate research demonstrates the practical importance of these ethical concerns. Mugambiwa (2021) shows that Africa's limited contribution to global emissions contrasts sharply with its exposure to climate impacts. Vulnerable populations, particularly poor communities and women, bear significant burdens. Research on adaptation finance also indicates that policies designed by governments and external institutions may fail when affected communities are not adequately consulted. These findings foster the importance of both distributive and procedural justice. Specifically, the Niger Delta provides a concrete example of the connection between ecological harm and social injustice. Decades of petroleum extraction have generated substantial economic value while many host communities have experienced pollution, environmental degradation and threats to their livelihoods (Olawuyi, 2020). The case demonstrates why climate governance cannot focus only on national economic gains. It must also consider ecological integrity, community rights, participation and fair distribution of benefits.

Consequently, the literature brings important insights but remains fragmented. Environmental ethics often concentrates on humanity's relationship with nature. Environmental justice focuses on unequal burdens and participation. The works of Naess, Singer and Pogge tackles ecological value, human suffering and structural inequality respectively. Ubuntu champions an African account of relational responsibility. What remains insufficiently developed is a framework that brings these perspectives together in analysing Africa's climate crisis. Hence, this study tackles that gap. It treats environmental ethics and environmental justice as complementary rather than competing approaches. Naess contributes ecological responsibility. Singer contributes the duty to reduce avoidable suffering. Pogge contributes structural justice. Ubuntu contributes communal responsibility and an African relational perspective. Their integration provides the philosophical basis for a more context-sensitive approach to climate governance in Africa.

Methodology

This study adopts analytical, critical and comparative philosophical methods. The analytical method clarifies key concepts such as environmental ethics, environmental justice, anthropocentrism, sustainability, ecological responsibility and climate change. The critical method examines the arguments of Naess, Singer, Pogge and relevant environmental justice scholars in relation to Africa's climate realities. It appraises their strengths and limitations. The comparative method places these perspectives in dialogue with Ubuntu and indigenous African ecological thought. It identifies areas of convergence and difference and evinces how they can complement one another. The study also uses selected African environmental experiences, particularly the Niger Delta, to show the practical relevance of the philosophical arguments. The analysis is based on relevant scholarly literature and policy materials. It does not claim to provide empirical measurement of climate impacts. Rather, it develops a normative framework for understanding and responding to climate change in Africa.

Findings

The study found that Africa's climate vulnerability is closely linked to global and domestic inequalities. Although the continent contributes relatively little to global greenhouse gas emissions, it faces severe impacts on agriculture, water, food security, health and livelihoods (IPCC, 2022, 2023; UNEP, 2021). Poor and rural communities are particularly exposed because they often have limited infrastructure, finance, and adaptive capacity. Thus, climate vulnerability is not simply a geographical problem. It is also a problem of justice.

The study further found that environmental ethics and environmental justice are mutually supportive. Naess's (1973, 1989) ecological perspective evinces the need to move beyond excessive anthropocentrism and protect the integrity of nature. Singer's (1972, 2011) thesis strengthens the human dimension by imposing a moral duty to reduce preventable suffering. Pogge (2002, 2008) extended the analysis to global structures that reproduce unequal vulnerability and responsibility. Environmental justice then provides practical criteria for assessing these concerns through fair distribution, participation, recognition and accountability (Schlosberg, 2007). Hence, the findings support an integrated rather than fragmented approach to climate governance.

The study also found that Ubuntu and indigenous ecological knowledge can strengthen this framework. Ubuntu asserts relationality, reciprocity, solidarity and communal responsibility (Ramose, 2015). Indigenous ecological knowledge similarly provides locally developed practices for managing land, water, forests, agriculture and biodiversity (Berkes, 2018). These perspectives can improve community participation and make adaptation policies more culturally appropriate. However, they should be critically appraised and combined with scientific knowledge rather than treated as complete substitutes for it.

The review further found that environmental injustice is visible in concrete African contexts. The Niger Delta evinces how resource extraction can produce economic benefits while imposing substantial environmental costs on host communities. Pollution, ecological degradation and loss of livelihoods raise questions about distribution, participation, accountability and compensation (Olawuyi, 2020). Like issues arise in other African contexts affected by deforestation, mining, land degradation and climate-induced livelihood losses. These cases show that climate governance must tackle both environmental protection and the social consequences of environmental decisions.

Finally, the study found that weak institutions, inadequate climate finance, limited community participation and poor enforcement continue to constrain effective climate action. Hence, scientific

and technological interventions are necessary but insufficient. Sustainable climate governance requires ethical leadership, accountable institutions, fair access to resources, meaningful participation and stronger cooperation between scientific and indigenous knowledge systems. The central finding is that Africa needs a climate framework that connects ecological responsibility with human welfare, structural justice and communal responsibility.

Discussion

The findings evince that Africa's climate crisis cannot be understood only in terms of environmental exposure. It is also a question of justice and responsibility. The continent contributes relatively little to global emissions but experiences severe climate impacts. Pogge's (2002, 2008) account of structural injustice helps postulate this disparity. Climate vulnerability is shaped not only by environmental conditions but also by unequal economic and political structures. Wealthier countries have greater financial and technological capacity, while many African countries face limited resources for adaptation. Hence, climate justice must include greater responsibility from those with greater capacity and historical contribution to the problem.

Singer's (1972, 2011) position fosters this argument from a different direction. If suffering can reasonably be prevented, those capable of preventing it have a moral obligation to act. Applied to climate change, this creates a strong ethical case for greater international support for vulnerable African societies. Climate finance, technology transfer, disaster assistance and adaptation support are not merely acts of charity. They can also be understood as responses to a moral responsibility to reduce avoidable suffering. However, Singer's method does not fully explain the structural genesis of unequal vulnerability. Pogge's analysis complements it by showing why responsibility must extend beyond individual acts of assistance to the institutions and global arrangements that sustain inequality.

Naess (1973, 1989) adds the ecological dimension that both approaches require. His deep ecology questions the assumption that nature has value only because it serves human interests. This is important in Africa where oil extraction, mining, deforestation and other forms of resource exploitation have often produced serious ecological costs. Yet Naess's postulate must be applied with sensitivity to African socio-economic realities. Communities facing poverty, unemployment, inadequate energy access and weak infrastructure cannot simply be asked to place ecological protection above all other needs. Therefore, environmental ethics must combine ecological limits with legitimate human development needs. The Niger Delta illustrates this given. Petroleum extraction has generated substantial economic value, yet oil pollution and ecological degradation have imposed serious costs on many host communities (Olawuyi, 2020). The problem is not simply that nature has been damaged. It is also that the people living with the consequences may have limited influence over resource decisions and may not receive benefits proportionate to the burdens they bear. Thus. the Niger Delta brings Naess's concern for ecological integrity into direct conversation with Pogge's structural account of injustice and Singer's concern for preventable suffering. It also evinces why environmental ethics and environmental justice should be considered interconnected.

Ubuntu deepens this synthesis by providing an African ethical language for environmental responsibility. Its stress on relationality, reciprocity, solidarity and communal well-being interrogates the idea that environmental responsibility is primarily an individual or state obligation (Ramose, 2015). Environmental harm affects relationships within communities and between communities and their natural surroundings. Hence, Ubuntu supports participatory governance in which affected communities are not passive recipients of climate policies but active participants in

environmental decision-making. Indigenous ecological knowledge strengthens this position by providing locally grounded knowledge of land, water, agriculture, forests and biodiversity.

The combined framework consequently offers four connected dimensions of climate responsibility. Naess provides ecological responsibility; Singer provides the duty to reduce preventable suffering; Pogge provides structural and historical responsibility and Ubuntu provides communal and relational responsibility. Environmental justice connects these dimensions through fair distribution, meaningful participation, recognition and accountability. This synthesis is more useful for Africa than any single theory because the continent's climate problems involve ecological degradation, human vulnerability, unequal global structures and local governance at the same time.

The significance is that African climate governance should move beyond narrowly technical responses. Scientific knowledge and technological innovation remain essential, but they should operate within institutions guided by justice and ethical responsibility. Climate policies should protect ecosystems, reduce human suffering, tackle structural inequalities and recognise local communities as partners in environmental governance. Such an approach would make climate action not only more ethically defensible but also more responsive to the social and ecological realities of African societies.

Conclusion

Climate change in Africa is not merely an environmental problem. It is also a problem of justice, responsibility and governance. This study has shown that Africa's vulnerability cannot be separated from unequal global structures, ecological exploitation and weak domestic institutions. Naess, Singer, Pogge and Ubuntu offer complementary resources for tackling these problems. Naess postulate responsibility towards nature. Singer asserts the duty to reduce preventable suffering. Pogge projects structural inequality and historical responsibility. Ubuntu adds the principles of solidarity, reciprocity and communal responsibility. Generally, these perspectives evince that effective climate governance must protect ecosystems while also protecting vulnerable people. Thus, Africa needs climate policies that combine ecological responsibility with distributive and procedural justice, scientific knowledge with indigenous ecological knowledge and economic development with environmental sustainability. Such an approach offers a stronger ethical basis for climate resilience and more inclusive sustainable development.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussion, the study makes five recommendations:

1. **Integrate environmental ethics and justice into climate policy.** African governments should embed ecological responsibility, fairness, accountability and intergenerational responsibility in climate legislation and development planning. Ubuntu-based principles of solidarity and communal responsibility should also inform relevant policies.
2. **Strengthen community participation and indigenous knowledge.** Local communities, women, youth and other vulnerable groups should participate meaningfully in climate planning and implementation. Indigenous ecological knowledge should be integrated with scientific research where it can improve locally appropriate adaptation and conservation.
3. **Promote a multidimensional approach to climate justice.** Climate adaptation should consider distributive, procedural, recognitional and intergenerational justice. Climate finance should reach communities that face the greatest risks and have the least capacity to respond.
4. **Strengthen environmental institutions and accountability.** Governments should

improve regulatory enforcement, transparency, environmental monitoring and accountability in sectors such as petroleum, mining, forestry, and infrastructure. The Niger Delta and similar cases demonstrate the need to ensure that economic development does not transfer environmental costs to vulnerable communities.

5. **Strengthen international climate responsibility and future-oriented action.** Developed countries and other high-capacity actors should expand accessible climate finance, technology transfer and adaptation support for vulnerable African countries.

References

Agyeman, J. (2014). *Introducing just sustainabilities: Policy, planning, and practice*. Zed Books.

Berkes, F. (2018). *Sacred ecology* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Bullard, R. D. (1990). *Dumping in Dixie: Race, class, and environmental quality*. Westview Press.

Bullard, R. D. (1994). *Unequal protection: Environmental justice and communities of color*. Sierra Club Books.

Gardiner, S. M., & Weisbach, D. A. (2016). *Debating climate ethics*. Oxford University Press.

Gwaravanda, E. T. (2018). Ubuntu environmental ethics: Conceptions and misconceptions. *Philosophia, 46*, 1-15.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *Climate change 2023: Synthesis report*. IPCC.

Ibeh, J. I., & Kanu, I. A. (2022). "The church and ecological concerns: A dogmatic systematic approach." *AKU: An African Journal of Contemporary Research,* 3(2), 176-193.

Ibeh, J. I., & Kanu, I. A. (2022). "Human dimension of the ecological crisis in Nigeria: The imperatives of *Caritas in Veritate. Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development,* 3(2), 254-270.

Kanu, I. A. (2022). "Nigeria and the Question of Climate Change." *Ekpoma Review: Philosophy and Theology Journal,* 9, 1-12.

Kanu, I. A. (2022). "African Eco-Spirituality: An Igwebuike Indigenous Response to Modern Ecological Crisis." *TOLLE LEGE: An Augustinian Journal of Philosophy and Theology,* 4(1), 1-51.

Kanu, I. A. (2022). *African Indigenous Ecological Knowledge Systems: Religion, Philosophy and the Environment. UK: AuthorHouse*

Kanu, I. A. (2022). *African Eco-Philosophy: Cosmology, Consciousness and the Environment. UK: AuthorHouse*

Kanu, I. A. (2022). *African Eco-Theology: Meaning, Forms and Expressions. UK: AuthorHouse*

Kanu, I. A. (2022). *African Ecological Spirituality: Perspectives on Anthroposophy and Environmentalism. A Hybrid of Approaches. UK: AuthorHouse*

Kanu, I. A. (2017). Igwebuike philosophy and environmental ethics. *Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development, 12*(3), 45-60.

Leopold, A. (2002). *A sand county almanac: With essays on conservation* (Centennial ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1949)

Naess, A. (1973). The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement: A summary. *Inquiry, 16*(1–4), 95–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747308601682

Naess, A. (1989). *Ecology, community and lifestyle: Outline of an ecosophy* (D. Rothenberg, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Nhamo, G., Chikodzi, D., Kunene, M. R., & Mashula, S. (Eds.). (2021). *Sustainable development*

goals and institutions of higher education. Springer.
Ojakorotu, V., & Bamidele, O. (2019). Ubuntu and nature: Towards reversing resource curse in Africa. *Ubuntu: Journal of Conflict and Social Transformation*, Special Issue, 25-46.
Olawuyi, D. S. (2020). *Environmental law in Arab states*. Oxford University Press.
Okereke, C., & Coventry, P. (2016). Climate justice and the international regime: Before, during, and after Paris. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 7*(6), 834-851.
Pogge, T. W. (2008). *World poverty and human rights: Cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
Ramose, M. B. (2015). Ecology through Ubuntu. In M. K. Shoko & E. Chitando (Eds.), *African theology and identity*. University of Zimbabwe Publications.
Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.
Schlosberg, D. (2007). *Defining environmental justice: Theories, movements, and nature*. Oxford University Press.
Schlosberg, D. (2021). Environmental justice and climate change. In *The Oxford handbook of climate change and society*. Oxford University Press.
Singer, P. (1972). Famine, affluence, and morality. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 1*(3), 229-243.
Singer, P. (2011). *Practical ethics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
Sze, J., & London, J. K. (2008). Environmental justice at the crossroads. *Sociology Compass, 2*(4), 1331-1354. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00131.x
United Nations Environment Programme. (2021). *Making peace with nature: A scientific blueprint to tackle the climate, biodiversity and pollution emergencies*. United Nations.
World Bank. (2023). *Africa climate change and development report*. World Bank.