Guest Editorial Preface

Special Issue on Crosspollination in the Humanities, Arts, Sciences, Technologies, and Professions:
Past and Present

A. Pablo Iannone, Department of Philosophy, Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, USA

This and the next volume of the *International Journal of Technology Ethics (IJT)* seek to address some salient problems and issues arising in philosophy and society from the geometrically accelerating transformations human societies are undergoing since the twentieth century. The present volume, IJT9(2), addresses problems arising in philosophy, the sciences and technologies and, as an area of particular interest, environmental policies. While IJT 10(1) focuses on philosophy, its history, and the arts, sciences and technologies in our changing times.

Most of the contributions to the present volume have been associated with the *Philosophy and Society Circle*, housed in the *Department of Philosophy* at the *Carol A. Ammon College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences* of *Central Connecticut State University*. In particular, all but one of the authors in this volume have participated in events the *Philosophy and Society Circle* organized, on Thursday, April 20, 2016, *Animal Species Management*; on Thursday, October 6 and Friday, October 7, 2016 *The Arts, Sciences, and Humanities in the Digital World*; and on Thursday, October 5, 2017, *The Arts, Sciences, and Humanities: Past and Present*.

The lead article, "De-marginalizing Technophilosophy and Ethical Inquiry For An Evolving Technological Society," by Rocci Luppicini, focuses on the recalcitrant marginalization of the philosophy of technology in philosophical associations and publications and takes the lead from Sven Hanson's remark to the effect that though there is no lack of technology-related subject matter in philosophy, there is a remarkable lack of sustained attention to it, a fact that needs rectification in order for philosophy to reflect the human condition in an accurate manner.

After canvassing the history of the philosophy of technology since its inception around the mid-twentieth century, Luppicini focuses on three aspects of its development today: the growing emphasis on technology as a social context, the resulting shift towards pragmatic approaches to the study of the relation between technology and humans, and the fact that this new emphasis on technology in real life contexts and its concurrent greater inclusiveness toward interdisciplinary scholarship, and appreciation of alternative forms of inquiry helps overcome the recurrent challenge of relevance that threatens philosophy. Building on these three aspects of current philosophy of technology, Luppicini proceeds to outline promising future prospects for philosophy of technology which philosophers could bring about, perhaps together with researchers from other humanities, sciences, technologies, arts, and practitioners of various professions.

This raises the question: How can researchers reach practitioners of the professions given the significant differences there are between the languages and conceptual systems of the former and those of the latter? Cameron Brewer addresses it in his "Obtaining Support for Eradication Programs Using a Common Ethical Language." He points out that invasive alien species are considered a danger to the environment and the economy and that, often, prevention is no longer an option. Eradication, however, is not always easy because of public concerns and obstacles arising from governmental institutions. He argues that using a common ethical language when discussing particularly divisive programs with the public, can help garner support for eradication programs. Further, that given the substantial prevalence of utilitarian language and concepts of utilitarian theory among policy makers and much of the public, this language and concepts, at least when compatible with biocentric theories, can play a valuable role in obtaining public support for eradication programs involving appealing animals.

It is worth mentioning here that some forms of modern utilitarianism are very close to forms, or at least tools of contemporary economic theory—cost-benefit-analysis is a tool that comes to mind. After all, the founders of modern utilitarianism, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, had much to say about economic theory. By contrast, Adam Smith, the author of *The Wealth of Nations* who was a pioneer of modern economic theory, modern sociology, and the defense of moral common sense, thought his *The Theory of Moral Sentiment*s—a largely Humean book that formulates a kind of virtue ethics than the rule-based moral systems often identified with utilitarian (and also Kantian) ethical theories—was the superior to the two books[1]. His often-cited assertion that policy makers should rely on the "invisible hand of the market" rather than on the hand of government was based on his belief that governments are often for sale, co-opted, or simply absent, while markets are not and, in the long run, satisfy public demand. Yet, as the British economist John Maynard Keynes famously commented, in the long run we're all dead.

The conflicting concerns just described provide a background for John Davenport's "Environmental Public Goods not Securable by Markets or Networks: A Partial Response to Scruton and Iannone" where he objects to those who, following Adam Smith's advice, argue that market-based approaches can solve many environmental problems. For analogous reasons, Davenport also objects to those who hold that voluntary civic organizations can solve many environmental problems. He argues that both market-based approaches and voluntary civic organizations tend to bring about excessive concentrations of power, unhealthy dependencies, and lack of choice about which groups act as guardians of our interests. His conclusion is that there will be many public goods that are more optimally delivered by government than by voluntary civil society groups.

Davenport article converges with John Martin Gillroy's "Toward An Environmental Law Of Essential Goods: A Philosophical And Legal Justification For 'Ecological Contract'," where he argues that it is time to move away from our reliance on changing grass-roots conventional moral values as a prerequisite to policy in a bottom up approach to change. Instead, Gillroy proposes that we consider a revolutionary change in the terms of the explicit legal contract between humanity and nature granting new essential status and fundamental legal standing to the natural world, thus redefining the core values and assumptions applied to policy from the top down. He calls this explicit contract between humanity and nature that results from the reflective effort of humanity to gauge problems and create authoritative solutions to them through active interchange, persuasion, and political consensus, the Ecological Contract. This republic-driven political process that determines policy independent of majorities is more "constitutional" than "legislative" and more "global" than "local" and, Gillroy argues, only through legitimizing the status of nature in law in this manner, can we assure the long-term sustainability of the natural world.

Marina Malamud's "Environmental Ethics in The Military: Between Warfare and Ecosystem Protection" addresses a growing concern in contemporary global politics: the fact that climatic-related events that pose a threat to security and the environmental footprint can undermine peace. Malamud discusses the concerns that this raises in many militaries of democratic nations. She first discusses the mainstream environmental security literature through the geopolitical, human security

and biocentric perspectives, as well as through main social trends to analyze ethical issues in the relationship between ecology and the armed forces. As an outcome of this discussion, Malamud identifies two major ethical challenges for the military: the securitization of the development agenda that can lead to a militarized conservation in conflict areas; and the search for a corporate sense of responsibility in terms of efficient and still ecologically sustainable operational systems that comply with international environmental agreements.

The concerns in the latter article are echoed in "Eventuality of an Apartheid State of Things; An Ethical Perspective on the Internet of Things," by Sahil Sholla, Roohie Naaz Mir, and Mohammad Ahsan Chishti. They argue that absence of a solid framework of ethics may lead to situations where smart devices are used in ways uncongenial to moral fabric of a society. Hence, they seek to provide an outline of a conceptual framework that would help incorporate ethics in the Internet of Things (IoT) and propose dedicating a separate ethics layer reflecting this outline in the protocol stack of smart devices. This layer would include such items as ethical rules, moral behaviors, religious instructions, legal requirements, cultural values, safety instructions, code of conduct, management policies and many other associated rules. The authors acknowledge that their attempt is only a starting point for research about these items (e.g., which item takes priority when? How should matters be resolved when items conflict?) and other ethical questions surrounding the IoT paradigm. The authors' hope is that this research effort helps bring about a more humane and compassionate world.

A. Pablo Iannone
Guest Editor
IJT

ENDNOTES

[1] See Jack Russell Weinstein. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: A Peer Reviewed Academic Resource*. Retrieved from https://www.iep.utm.edu/smith/