

lunli De Shengtai Xiangdu

伦理的生态向度

—— 罗尔斯顿环境伦理思想研究




杨英姿 著

中国社会科学出版社

lunli De Shengtai Xiangdu

伦理的生态向度

罗尔斯顿环境伦理思想研究

 杨英姿 著

中国社会科学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

伦理的生态向度 / 杨英姿著. —北京: 中国社会科学出版社,
2010. 5

ISBN 978 - 7 - 5004 - 8712 - 8

I. ①伦… II. ①杨… III. ①环境伦理学 IV. ①B82 - 058

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 075520 号

出版策划 任 明
特邀编辑 乔继堂
责任校对 林福国
封面设计 弓禾碧
技术编辑 李 建

出版发行 **中国社会科学出版社**

社 址 北京鼓楼西大街甲 158 号 邮 编 100720

电 话 010 - 84029450 (邮购)

网 址 <http://www.csspw.cn>

经 销 新华书店

印 刷 北京奥隆印刷厂 装 订 广增装订厂

版 次 2010 年 5 月第 1 版 印 次 2010 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

开 本 880 × 1230 1/32

印 张 7.5 插 页 2

字 数 192 千字

定 价 26.00 元

凡购买中国社会科学出版社图书, 如有质量问题请与本社发行部联系调换
版权所有 侵权必究

中文摘要

在人类思想文化史中，人与自然的关系问题是个恒久而弥新的话题，其中也不乏以道德的眼光来观照这一关系的，只是作为一种哲学伦理学思潮，明确地主张自然具有道德地位以及人与自然之间存在道德关系，却是发端于20世纪70年代，这就是西方环境伦理思潮的兴起，它直接导源于现实中的环境与生态危机。西方环境伦理思潮各流派在不同的层面上探究自然存在物的道德地位以及人与自然的道德关系问题，其中美国环境伦理学家霍尔姆斯·罗尔斯顿作为环境伦理学的奠基者，主张自然具有内在价值，尊重自然的内在价值是人的道德应该。其哲学努力在于沟通自然界与人类世界，构建自然价值与人类德性、自然与文化辩证互补的环境伦理学，开辟伦理道德的生态向度。

罗尔斯顿的环境伦理学立足于西方伦理思想的整体发展，通过伦理拓展主张人类的道德视阈应扩展至自然生态系统，通过伦理转向坚持人类价值理论和道德价值观的生态/环境转向，通过伦理整合论证了自然与文化、自然价值与人类德性的辩证关系，通过伦理反思批判了西方“现代性”道德价值观和不公正的现代资本主义社会结构。

罗尔斯顿以现代生态科学的发展为理论支撑，以道德是人的本质规定和存在方式为根据，论证了环境伦理学伦理拓展的合理性与必然性。在物质、生命、精神三个层次上作为人类根源的大自然成为道德关注的对象，是道德他者范围迄今为止最广泛、最彻底的扩展，这使得环境伦理学成为最具利他主义精神的、更具

包容性、无歧视性和生命力的伦理学，它在关注非人存在物和整个自然生态系统的存在目的和整体利益的同时包容了自我利益和个体利益，因而是最具生态性的利他主义伦理学。针对现代西方道德意识结构的倒错，罗尔斯顿的环境伦理学主张“恰当的生存单元就是道德关心的恰当层面”，强调自然观、世界观相对于人的价值观、道德观的前提优先性，力图为人的道德价值观提供存在论基础、注入生态性内涵。

罗尔斯顿认为，“环境伦理学使西方伦理学走到了一个转折点”，这一伦理转向的标志性概念就是“内在价值”和“整体主义”。通过论证大自然及其非人存在物的内在尺度和内在价值，罗尔斯顿的环境伦理学实现了价值范式由主观工具价值论向客观内在价值论的非人类中心转换；通过论证生态系统的系统价值统摄个体生命的内在价值和工具价值，以及人类整体环境利益高于个体利益，罗尔斯顿的环境伦理学实现了环境整体主义转向。客观内在价值论并不否认人的主观价值的存在，环境整体主义也不排斥而是包容了人类利益和个体利益，所以，罗尔斯顿的环境伦理转向通过强调道德的关系性和整体性而赋予了伦理道德以涵容更广的生态性。

伦理整合是罗尔斯顿环境伦理学在前述分析论证基础上的具体构建。罗尔斯顿首先论证了自然与文化各具独立性而自然又环绕文化的辩证互补的生态关系，进而提出在环境伦理语境下人的德性从属于自然的内在价值，环境伦理学应当是价值伦理与德性伦理相结合、目的论与道义论相统一的伦理学，表现在环境伦理实践中即是自然主义环境伦理准则与人本主义环境伦理准则的结合。伦理整合的目的是为人的道德规定性和存在方式确立一个宇宙自然的大背景，促使人类道德在存在论的意义上更趋成熟和完整，这也是伦理道德的生态性所内涵的。

伦理反思是反观西方“现代性”道德是否有助于环境伦理学

的理论建构。罗尔斯顿认为欧洲启蒙运动以来形成的西方“现代性”道德存在着个人主义的狭隘、人类中心主义的偏执和物质性的低下等问题，同时在人与自然的关系上存在着价值盲点。“现代性”道德在物化、异化了自然的同时，也把自身以及人与自然的关系物化、异化了。可以说，西方“现代性”道德价值观与环境伦理理念存在着严重的不相融性，而建基于个人主义价值观之上的现代资本主义社会结构则从制度上强化了人对自然的道德无视。所以，罗尔斯顿认为环境伦理学无法建基于主客二分的主体性形而上学哲学体系和个人主义道德价值观体系之上，期望到强调人与自然两相互补、和谐共生的东方思想中寻求伦理道德的存在论根据和生态性向度。同时，建基于个人主义道德价值观之上的资本主义制度和工业文明发展模式，是全球性生态危机产生的根源，在资本主义和工业文明语境下无法真正解决生态危机问题，社会主义生态文明不能不成为历史的选择。

罗尔斯顿所开创的“伦理的生态向度”决不仅仅是指道德关注自然生态系统，它至少还有如下三个重要含义：一是人的安身之处、人的居所的生态性，人不仅生活于文化环境中，也同时栖息于自然环境中，人固然是独立的文化存在，但不能把自己看作是“逃离”（*exodus*）了自然的存在。这种居所的生态性决定了“伦理的生态向度”的第二个含义，就是作为人的本质规定和存在方式的道德的生态性，即同时置身于自然与文化这一生态性背景下的人须践行道德的自我他在性、关系性和整体性，约束个体自我和人类自我的自利性，坚持共同体利益的逻辑优先性，把自我利益和个体利益融于整体利益，我存在是因为共同体存在，而不是相反。“伦理的生态向度”的第三个含义是，道德须统摄人类生活的两大领域（自然与文化），以环境伦理与人际伦理共同构成完整的伦理学。罗尔斯顿环境伦理学的理论贡献和现实意义在于，在宇宙自然的视角下，将人同时置身于自然与文化的共同背景之

中，在自我的他在性、关系性和整体性中为人类的道德生存开辟了新的生态向度，期望人与自然和谐共存。伦理的生态向度的开辟，不只是人类对人与自然关系的道德觉悟，更是整个人类伦理文化的进步，它具有普遍而深刻的哲学意义和社会意义。

关键词：环境伦理学；道德；生态向度；内在价值；系统价值；整体主义；生态文明

Abstract

The relationship between humans and nature is a permanent and vital topic in the human history of thoughts and culture, no lack of moral thinking about it. But it is the western trends of thoughts in environmental ethics, which appeared in 1970's directly resulting from the actual environmental and ecological crisis, that definitely maintains the moral standing of nature and the moral relationship between humans and nature. Different schools of the western environmental ethics discuss the moral standing of nature and the moral relationship between humans and nature from different points of view, and the American environmental ethicist Holmes Rolston III, as the founder of environmental ethics, claims that nature possesses intrinsic value and it is our moral duty to respect the intrinsic value of nature. In order to initiate the ecological orientation for ethics, Rolston philosophically attempts to establish a kind of dialectical environmental ethics of complementarity which ought to bridge nature and culture, natural value and human virtue, and the natural world and the human world.

In the context of the western ethical thoughts' complete development, Rolston's environmental ethics has a moral extension toward ecosystem, makes the value theory and the moral view have a ecological/environmental turning, has an ethical integration of nature and culture and of natural value and human virtue, and criticizes the western 'modernity' morality and the unjust modern capitalist social structure by

ethical self-reflection.

On the basis of ecological theory and in the light of human moral essentials and existences, Rolston demonstrates the legitimacy and necessity of the environmental ethical extension. That nature, being we humans' material, life and spiritual sources, becomes moral patient indicates that the extension of moral others is so extensive that environmental ethics is the most altruistic, comprehensive, inclusive and vital ecological ethics, which includes individual interests when cares for the non-human beings' and ecosystem's existing goal and holistic interests. In view of the reverse structure of the modern western moral consciousness, Rolston's environmental ethics insists that the appropriate unit for moral concern is the fundamental unit of survival and emphasizes that our outlook on nature and the world ought to be prior to our moral view. Rolston attempts to lay the ontological foundation for and infuse the ecological intension into human moral view.

Rolston believes that environmental ethics is a sign of the turning of the western ethics, whose typical concepts are intrinsic value and holism. By recognizing the intrinsic measure and the intrinsic value of nature, Rolston's environmental ethics accomplishes the non-anthropocentric conversion of value-paradigm from subjective instrumental value theory to objective intrinsic value theory; and by recognizing that the ecosystem's systemic value is superior to the individual intrinsic value and instrumental value and that the human collective environmental interests dominates the individual interests, Rolston's environmental ethics completes the environmental holistic turning. The objective intrinsic value theory does not deny the human subjective value, and the environmental holism does not either exclude but include the human interests and individual interests. So, Rolston's environmental ethical turning lets

human ethics be endowed with more ecological intension by emphasizing the relativity and holism of morality.

After the above discussion, Rolston performs the concrete theoretical establishment through ethical integration. First of all, he demonstrates the dialectical and complementary ecological relationship between nature and culture, that is, their respective independent status and nature including culture. And then he proposes that the human environmental virtue results from respecting the intrinsic value of nature in environmental ethics. So, environmental ethics ought to be the combination of value ethic and virtue ethic and of teleology and deontology, that is, of naturalistic principles and humanistic ones in the environmental ethical practice. The goal of ethical integration is to establish a cosmic-natural context for humans' moral essentials and existences and to promote human morality becoming more mature and full in the ontological sense, which is also the ecological intension of human ethic.

Ethical self-reflection is to see if the western 'modernity' morality will be helpful to the theoretical formation of environmental ethics. Rolston thinks that there exists individualistic illiberality, anthropocentric bigotry, materialistic vulgarity and value-blind-spot on the relationship between humans and nature in the western 'modernity' morality having been formed since the European Enlightenment. The western 'modernity' morality materializes and dissimilates we humans ourselves and the relationship between humans and nature as well as nature. We could say that the western 'modernity' moral view is seriously inconsistent with the idea of environmental ethic and that the modern capitalist social structure, on the basis of individualism, institutionally strengthens our moral ignorance of nature. So, Rolston believes that environmental ethics can not be established on the foundation of the dualist subjective met-

aphysics and the individualistic moral view, and hopes to seek ontological reason and ecological orientation for ethic from the eastern culture that emphasizes a complementary, harmonious and symbiotic relationship between humans and nature. Meanwhile, the capitalism and industrial civilization, on the basis of individualism, have primarily invited the global ecological crisis, which cannot be ultimately resolved under capitalism and industrial civilization. And so, the socialist ecological civilization cannot but be the historical choice.

Besides the moral concern for ecosystem, there are at least three important implications about the ecological orientation for ethics. The first one is the ecological orientation for our habitats. We humans not only live in cultural context but also natural context. Though we humans are independent cultural beings, we can not regard ourselves as being 'exodus' from nature. The second one is the ecological orientation for morality that is our essentials and existences. Living in the natural and cultural contexts, we humans must hold to altruism, relativity and holism of ethic, hold in the selfishness of individual ego and human ego, and insists on the logical priority of the interests of community, which include individual interests into holistic interests. The existing of community is prior to that of oneself, not vice versa. The third one is that morality must work on humans' two living fields (natural and cultural), and environmental ethic in company with traditional human ethic finishes the integral ethics. Rolston initiates the ecological orientation for ethics by emphasizing altruism, relativity and holism of oneself who lives in the natural and cultural contexts from the cosmic-natural point of view, and hopes we humans could get along with nature harmoniously, which is the theoretical contribution and actual significance of Rolston's environmental ethics. The ecological orientation for ethics demonstrates not

only the moral consciousness of the relationship between humans and nature but also the advancement of human ethical culture, which has universal and profound philosophical and social significance.

Keywords: Environmental Ethics; Morality; Ecological Orientation; Intrinsic Value; Systemic Value; Holism; Ecological Civilization

序 言*

我毕生都在与我所继承的世界观进行着广泛的论争。苏格拉底说：“未经省察的生活是没有意义的。”我认为：“生活在未经省察的世界里也是没有意义的。”我喜爱自然科学，但是教过我的大多数科学家均认为自然没有价值，只是供人类利用的一种资源。我喜爱科学哲学，但哲学家们宣称自然哲学太过天真幼稚和不切实际。于是，为了热爱自然，我不得不同时与科学和哲学进行斗争。换个角度讲，也许存在着考虑这一问题的更好思路，即必须辩证地对待科学和哲学，辩证地对待启蒙世界观——它同时继承了主张人类能够也应当统治自然的希腊哲学传统和基督教传统。或许还有一个更好的思路，就是我需要在人类恰当地统治自然和关心自然之间建立一种辩证关系。

整个西方传统似乎认定人类是地球上的价值的中心。而当我更为彻底地研究西方科学和西方传统时却发现，人类的确是地球上的优势物种，但这意味着他们应该承担关心地球家园（一个美好的造物）的责任。科学家们应该能够认同这一点，因为他们发现了丰富的生物多样性，那是我们从漫长的自然进化历史中继承下来的共有财产。我在周围世界中发现了工具价值、内在价值和系统价值。

* 将罗尔斯顿先生为本书所作序言译成中文后，有幸得到中国社会科学院哲学研究所研究员、中国伦理学会环境伦理学研究会执行会长、联合国教科文卫组织环境伦理专家组成员、英文杂志《环境伦理学》（*Environmental Ethics*）编委杨通进博士的精心审校，甚为感谢。——本书作者注

我是幸运的，在有生之年，我的理解自然的个人工作最终变成了确定人类在地球上的位置的世界性工作。我所过的地域性的生活引导我进行全球性的思考。我的自传在地球的传记中得以“显现”。这使得我能够受邀在七大洲进行演讲。

令我惊喜的一点是，我对我们这个星球的论证和关心受到了人们的关注。比如，我四次到中国访学；三本专著和二十多篇论文被译成中文。特别值得一提的是，杨英姿在她这本《伦理的生态向度》中评价了我的如下观点：自然界中的价值是如何在多个层面上被发现的——个体层面、物种层面、生态系统层面，以及当人类遭遇自然价值时，尤其是当人类把自然价值置于危险境地时，所产生的道德责任。

数十亿年创生万物的劳作积累起来的财富，数百万个充满生命的物种，被移交给了人类这个后来物种的关心，在这里思想之花开放，道德层创进化而生。难道这惟一的道德物种不能少做一些自私自利的事情，不要仅仅把生态系统的所有进化成果当作供他们开发利用的资源吗？这样的态度几乎是不符合生物学常识的，更不用说道德上的恰当了。这样一种逻辑对于道德人性而言太过偏狭。如果符合“智人”这一特殊称谓，这具有智慧的物种难道不应该看重因其自身的权利而值得关心的众多物种？

人类在新千年面临四个最重要的挑战：战争与和平、人口、发展、环境。四者之间是相互联系的。没有科学和技术，我们无法解决其中任何一个问题，但是光靠科学却不能让我们认识到对这四个问题我们最需要了解什么。依靠以科学为基础的技术的力量，人类正在改变着地球的自然史，但是，这一过程同样也威胁着生命的未来、动植物群落和人类的生存。尽管科学在现代取得了显著的进步，但价值问题依然严重而棘手。

应对挑战需要伦理学（一种关于自然和人性的本体论）；

需要对我们居住、交往、生存于其中的世界进行哲学解释；需要以更好的世界观为基础的政治决策。在下个世纪，科学比以往更需要良心；这越来越意味着，生态良心将打上生态科学的烙印。除非存在社会正义，否则人们不可能与其自然景观和谐相处，也不可能与其自然资源建立可持续的关系。在西方，我们日益意识到，社会正义不仅仅关乎一个社会对奴隶、妇女、黑人、少数民族、残疾人、儿童或未来世代人做了什么，同时关乎对展现了该社会之特征的动物、植物、物种、生态系统和自然景观做了什么。

对地球的责任也许被视为与我们的责任相关性最小的责任；与我们对孩子、邻居或者国家的具体责任相比，它看起来是如此地不切实际和含糊不清。但事实并非如此，相反，对地球的责任同地方的和国家的责任相连，是我们最根本的责任。责任是随着处于危险中的事物的层次和价值成比例增长的。我们人类力量能够影响到的最高层次的存在物是我们这个美好的星球；它是所有现象中最重要现象。

自启蒙运动以来，我们美国人——至少是推动发展的欧裔美国人——只是在新大陆生活了大约四百年。中国人已经在古老世界的景观中生活了好几万年。更加深入的研究让我在我的传统中找到了智慧。我相信中国人也同样如此。但是，我也在逐步增长的（经济）数字、日益增强的（消费）欲望和对无限发展的冲动中，发现了新的威胁。中国正遇到类似的问题。对我们双方来说，可持续生活的关键在于深化对生态系统完整性和自然内在价值的关心与尊重。

我们到底在做什么？我们究竟能做什么？我们究竟应该做什么？也许当我们把起源和未来连接在一起的时候，我们也会在发展中国力图中维持这美妙星球上的生命。人们的命运与地球的命运已经紧密地结合在一起；这在过去是真理，现在是真理，并仍然会

是新千年的关键所在。杨英姿在这里试图把东西方关于人类与自然关系的新看法结合起来。我把她的著作推荐给那些热爱美丽地球上的美好生活的人。

霍尔姆斯·罗尔斯顿三世

科罗拉多州立大学终身荣誉教授及哲学教授

美国科罗拉多州科林斯城

Foreword

I have spent my life in an extended quarrel with the worldview I inherited. Socrates said: “The unexamined life is not worth living.” I found out: “Life in an unexamined world is not worth living either.” I loved natural science, but most of the scientists who taught me thought that nature was value-free, only a resource for human use. I loved philosophy of science, but the philosophers said that philosophy of nature was too romantic and naive. So I had to fight both science and philosophy to love nature. Or perhaps a better way to think of it is that I had to engage in dialectic with science and with philosophy, with the Enlightenment worldview, inherited from both Greek philosophy and Christian religion, that humans can and ought to have dominion over nature. Perhaps a still better way to think of this is that I wanted a dialectic about the appropriate human dominion over and caring for nature.

My whole Western heritage seemed to agree that humans were the center of value on Earth. But when I looked at both modern science and my Western heritage more closely, I found that, indeed humans were the dominant species on Earth, but that they had responsibilities of caring for a garden Earth, a good creation. Scientists could agree because they had discovered a wealth of biodiversity, our inheritance from a long evolutionary natural history. I found instrumental, intrinsic, and systemic value in the world around me.

I've been lucky that my own personal agenda, figuring nature out,