

ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS AND SUSTAINABLE TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT. AN ANALYSIS FROM THE SPECIESISM CATEGORY¹

LUCIANO FÉLIX FLORIT²
DIEGO DA SILVA GRAVA³

*“Y si la solidaridad entre los hombres es negada y desplazada,
para la solidaridad con la Naturaleza tampoco hay lugar”⁴*
Eduardo Gudynas (2004, p. 143)

1 Introduction

For some time we have known that many of the disputes around sustainable development, besides expressing conflicts of interest, also express disputes over view on the *must be* of the development processes. They are disputes around value assumptions that define the substantive development purposes, but also include questions about the type of relationship acceptable among humans, landscapes and non-human living beings.

It is also known, nowadays, that such aspect does not become any different if we add a “territorial” perspective to the sustainable development. Human territoriality manifests itself in power operations that define what can or cannot be done in the territory or what is acceptable or unacceptable in each side of a frontier (SACK, 2011). Finally, we are also aware that it happens from value judgments inseparable from the involved actors’ power positions (THEIS, 2008).

The value dimension inherent to the environmental issues and the relationship with nature has caused specific problematizations and the production of academic

1. This work was carried out with CNPq support, Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (National Council for Scientific and Technological Development), Brazil, (no process 408969 / 2013-0). The authors acknowledge Maria Roseli Rossi Ávila for the reading and reviewing of this paper.

2. Doctor in Sociology from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Master in Political Sociology from the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC) and graduated in Sociology from the University of Buenos Aires (UBA). Professor of the Graduate Program in Regional Development of Blumenau Regional University Foundation (FURB). E-mail: <lucianoflorit@gmail.com>.

3. Doctoral student in Sociology from the Institute of Social and Political Studies of the State University of Rio de Janeiro (IESP-UERJ), Master degree in Regional Development and graduate in Social Sciences at Blumenau Regional University Foundation (FURB). Internship student of CAPES – Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior (Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel). E-mail: <diego.grava@gmail.com>.

4. “And if solidarity among men is denied and displaced, there is no place for solidarity with nature.” (GUDYNAS, 2004) – English version by the authors.

subfields, such as Environmental Ethics and Animal Ethics. These results have put back in the discussion agenda objections to anthropocentrism. These objections have been environmentalism key agenda, but have lost space in recent years due to more pragmatic discussions aimed at solving problems more evident to the eyes of theoretical paradigms established in the field of political ecology and environmental sociology.

In this sense, the connection between the analysis produced in the field of Environmental Ethics and the reflection on the ongoing development processes, is rarely seen explicitly and systematically. One reason is that the issues relating to moral consideration of non-human living beings raised by Environmental Ethics are usually dealt with in the philosophical and normative level, without delving systematically into the plot of social and political relations in which these issues are concretely inscribed. This way, one loses the ability to see how non-human beings' moral disregard relates to social inequities (FLORIT, 2016).

This paper synthetically presents a reading of the discussions in the field of Environmental Ethics. Then, it places this kind of question in an analysis of social and political relations that support, naturalize and reproduce circumstances on which the Environmental Ethics formulates challenging objections, notably those relating to Speciesism and the objectification of animals.

It is intended, at first, to propose a critical approach to certain ongoing development standards, from categories of Environmental Ethics. Secondly, it aims to demonstrate the relevance of systematic reflection on the value systems that permeate the discussion on Sustainable Territorial Development from the analysis of social relations that sustain and legitimize such values.

2 Environmental Ethics Trends and the category of Speciesism¹

Environmental Ethics is the field of reflection on the ethical foundations of our actions in relation to nature and to not human beings. It is the specialty of ethics that addresses questions such as: is it justified an activity that will create jobs, but will cause the extinction of species? It is better to protect a natural park than to produce energy that will improve certain people's lives? Should we care whether a human enterprise causes the death of animals? (FLORIT, 2016).

Such issues include dimensions that go beyond the technical aspects and therefore cannot be based only on factual information such as the amount of energy that will produce a dam or potential medical usefulness of a plant species. Although such information is relevant and can help decide, the issues involved inescapably require value judgments. Even in cases in which the considered options result only from instrumental criteria excluding other moral aspects, what often exists is the routine reproduction of the dominant option, which in the context of globalized capitalism tends to value the non-human living beings as mere things or objects.

Critical reflection on the ethical validity of such value judgments is the field of Environmental Ethics. For this, in this field, questions are formulated such as: do we have moral obligations in relation to nature, species, living beings individually and natural

landscapes? Is an individual of a wild species more important than that of a domesticated species? Does a living being have a value in itself, or only value if it is useful to meet people's needs?

It is important to note how philosophical issues are intertwined in concrete decisions. Indeed, while the second group of questions refers to an abstract analysis of a branch of philosophy, the first refers to situations that often arise in concrete development processes. On the other hand, when it comes to decisions with political implications in a democratic context (which, by definition, implies the coexistence of different value systems) it is indispensable to open reflection on the moral assumptions and interests underlying those decisions.

There are many currents in Environmental Ethics and also several ways to classify them. Robert Elliot (2004) classifies the Environmental Ethics in four approaches: a) centered on the human being; b) focusing on animals; c) focusing on life and d) ethics of all or ecological holism. This classification was designed based on the degree of expansion of the moral consideration circle – a fundamental problem of Environmental Ethics. To what extent and for what reasons would we have moral responsibility towards not human beings? Does this responsibility include animals, other living things like plants, or landscape units?

There are several possible answers to these questions. They make use, in different ways, of classical philosophical sources from Western tradition to find consistent basis, often through a critical reflection on them.

They imply questioning the usual prospects for sustainable development, which are almost exclusively focused on trying to secure human needs. Thus, although there is rich and stimulating controversy in Environmental Ethics, one can say that it is mostly consensual that the problem root is the exacerbated anthropocentrism that permeates the impulses dealing with nature in Western civilization. This impulse is part of the main political, economic and developmental concepts, built under the terms of classical religious and moral traditions that justified the transformation of nature due to the human domain (STERBA, 2010; FELIPE, 2009; SINGER, 2002, cap. 10).

The reflective potential of this area for discussions on Sustainable Territorial Development is even more evident if we establish another distinction between holistic and individualistic currents of Environmental Ethics.

The first group claims that, since the primary concern of environmentalism refers to entities that constitute totalities, as ecosystems and species, Environmental Ethics should aim at supporting the moral status or intrinsic value of these entities. Therefore, it must be attached to some form of holism for which the classical paradigms are badly prepared. These total entities, which form the core of holistic concern, are composed of both biotic (animals, plants, etc.) and abiotic (rivers, rocks, etc.) elements. This form of justification explores the need to systematize the ethical implications of Darwinian legacy, which, in turn, informs the worldview of conservationist thought and life sciences in general (CALLICOTT, 2001).

On the other hand, the individualist line thinkers seek ethical foundations to defend the moral value of non-human living individuals, understanding that this reaso-

ning could give more consistent basis and would avoid new problems which arise when defending total entitiesⁱⁱ. In this sense, Paul Taylor (2011), defends a biocentric perspective in which we would have moral responsibilities towards all non-human subjects, to the extent that “each [individual organism] is seen to be a teleological (goal-oriented) center of life, pursuing its own good in its own unique way” (TAYLOR, 2011, pp 44-45). From another perspective, the beings we have moral responsibility for are those able to feel pain and have other suffering sensations, which are qualified as “sentient beings”. In this line, through a consequentialist argumentation (which assesses the actions according to their consequences) formulated in the utilitarian tradition, Peter Singer (2002, 2004) argues that the quality of sentience is enough to say that these beings have interests, which should be taken into consideration, regardless of the species they belong to.

Through a Kantian argument, Tom Regan (2006) argues that these subjects should be considered “subject-of-a-life”, which would make them worthy of rights. To be bearers of rights, these beings could not, under any circumstances, have their dignity and interest violated, regardless of the overall benefit calculation that eventually can be done on a case of their instrumental usage.

The arguments based on sentience surely include all the animals of more complex nervous system, leaving doubts in relation to other categories of animals. These whose inclusion in moral consideration is questionable or inconclusive, by means of sentience could, in turn, have their interests preserved based on the category of subjects-of-a-life, making the latter a more inclusive category.

It should be noted that although the lines of reasoning centered on sentience are often called “animalistic”, they also have implications for the defense of broader landscape units that include vegetables, abiotic elements, etc. This is true to the extent that, under natural conditions, wild sentient individuals would not be able to guarantee their interests but with the preservation of ecosystems which they are part of. Thus, these perspectives provide foundations for reflection on the treatment ethics human give both to domestic and wild animals. The same does not occur with the holistic perspectives that focus their concern on landscape, “natural” or wild units, excluding from it the animals raised by humans.

It is important to note that the proposals that raise objections to the anthropocentrism and / or seek to ground the moral evaluation of nature are not only discussed by professional philosophers in their strictly academic circles. Rather, these issues have been raised in recent years by other types of subjects, such as traditional people and governments. Therefore, the objections to anthropocentrism that nowadays question the development patterns are not limited to seeking foundations in the Western philosophical tradition.

Effectively, reflections based on other philosophical perspectives have gained spaces in recent years, becoming, in some cases, programs to formulate alternative development paradigms to the prevalent models in the context of global capitalism. This is the case of propositions about the prospects of Good Living (*Sumak Kawsay* in Quechua language, or *Suma Gamaña* in Aymara language) in Latin America (ACOSTA, 2016) and the Gross National Happiness strategy (*Felicidade Interna Bruta* – FIB) in Bhutan (THINLEY, 1999).

The Good Living and FIB approaches include the recognition of intrinsic moral value of nature, and in this sense, contain “Environmental Ethics”. At the same time, both express attempts to reposition their people in relation to the globalized capitalism, based on the recognition of their cultural specificities, and the valuation of such specificities by their ethical implications regarding nature.

Thus, the interface between Environmental Ethics and reflection on development is complex, not only by the different lines of argument, but also by different types of individuals who use them, both in the academic field and outside it.

As it was said beforehand, the individualist perspectives focused on sentience allow analysis that cross the boundary between wild and domesticated environments, since the foundation of their moral consideration is the sentient beings, regardless of the degree of human intervention in their environments.

For Brazil, this feature proves particularly relevant, since the ethical challenges posed by the relationship with non-human beings are enormous, not only in relation to the transformation of wild landscapes, but also with respect to animals raised in artificially produced contexts. The latter are part of the process of radical transformation and manipulation of nature for the establishment of territorial development standards that now occupy a significant part of the Brazilian territory, with huge economic, environmental and ethical implications.

Related to the notion of sentience, moral disregard of sentient beings, depending on their species, is highly regarded by many authors as Speciesism, expression adopted by Singer in order to, by analogy with racism and sexism, qualify the practices that consider pain and suffering of sentient beings little relevant, based on their species. In the next section this category is exploited, aiming to demonstrate their critical and analytical capabilities for reflection on Sustainable Territorial Development in Brazil.

3 Speciesism and Sustainable Territorial Development

3.1 The category of Speciesism

As stated, one of the most pressing interfaces between Environmental Ethics and regulatory parameters of the Sustainable Territorial Development in Brazil is provided by the use of the category of Speciesism. This category has fueled questions in various fields of social life, and the Australian philosopher Peter Singer is undoubtedly one of the most influential authors in this phenomenon. Singer is a contemporary author belonging to the utilitarian current which, as it is known, establishes a consequentialist ethic that prescribes maximizing the welfare of those affected by an action as a criterion to establish whether this action is ethically justifiable or not. Singer (2002, 2004) develops the argument by which the circle of moral consideration, namely the extension of categories of beings with which humans have moral obligation, should be extended to the limit that includes all creatures which, according to our knowledge, are considered to be sentient, i.e., being capable of suffering. The fact that these beings have the capacity to feel pain implies that they also have appreciation for their lives and a spontaneous tendency to

seek satisfaction through what brings them welfare, and this implies, in turn, a sense of psychic or mental identity.

This is, therefore, the criterion advocated by Singer to establish the boundary of moral consideration: sentient beings, including human and non-human. For him, “the capacity to suffer and feel pleasure, however, is not only necessary, but enough so that we can ensure that a being has interests - at least the interest not to suffer “ (Singer, 2004, p. 09).

According to the author,

If a being suffers, there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration. No matter what the nature of the being, the principle of equality requires that the suffering be counted equally with the like suffering – in so far as rough comparisons can be made – of any other being. If a being is not capable of suffering, or of experiencing enjoyment or happiness, there is nothing to be taken into account. This is why the limit of sentience (using the term as a convenient, if not strictly accurate, shorthand for the capacity to suffer or experience enjoyment or happiness) is the only defensible boundary of concern for the interests of others. (Singer, 1993, p. 57-58).

To avoid controversy with lawyers about the conditions that allow a certain quality to lead to the recognition of a right (for example, the argument that the legal community is the product of a pact of reciprocity which animals cannot participate), Singer chooses not to defend that sentient beings are bearers of rights, but of interests. Once the basic normative criterion of any ethical action would be a tendency to maximize the welfare and prevent the generation of suffering, ethics cannot exclude beings who are sentient only because they do not belong to our species. Restricting moral consideration to our species would be Speciesism. From its inception, the Speciesism can be understood as a prejudice or a biased attitude in favor of the interests of members of the agent’s own species and against the interests of members of other species.

Two important considerations: first, although Singer sometimes is accused of radicalizing in his arguments, in fact he sets himself a conservative, self-contained criterion to define the boundary of moral consideration. Singer does not propose a biocentric ethic that has any form of life as a criterion of moral consideration, a position for which he is criticized, not for the boldness of his position, but on the contrary, for the limits restricted to it. Singer’s attitude is deliberate, choosing arguments that are easily and intuitively understood, and to which one can give scientific support. It is frankly difficult to argue that causing suffering in a being which provenly feels pain is innocuous from an ethical point of view. Singer also chooses criteria which, in his view, would have undeniable practical feasibility if specific attitudes and policies were adopted, which would not be so obvious to other prospects that defend the intrinsic value of every life and every being. For the author, there is a clear opportunity to consider alternatives to at least reduce the suffering inflicted on animals in the food industry, testings, etc. in today’s society. In

other words, what sometimes is pointed out as limitation, in Singer's arguments it is also its own strengthⁱⁱⁱ.

Second, by rejecting the Speciesism, Singer does not intend to propose a simplistic concept that denies the obvious differences between humans and animals as well, and he does not mean that the animals have the same rights as human beings. Once the principle of equality between human "is not a description of an alleged actual equality among humans" but "it is a prescription of how we should treat human beings" (SINGER, 2004, p. 06), the principle of equality should be extended to other species because it does not imply denying the obvious differences between them, but to admit a prescriptive criteria on how we treat them. These two elements help explain the magnitude of the impact caused by Singer's arguments giving support to animal rights movements.

It should be noted that Singer has also developed the application of his ideas to analyze more general environmental problems, involving wilderness areas and landscape units and therefore are not focused only on domestic animals. This aspect of his work, however, has not been absorbed by the social movements with the same intensity, for reasons related to the concept of nature that prevails among the institutionalized actors of the environmental movement, bringing them closer to holistic arguments. Singer's main line, in this sense, is to make the account of sentience taken by the environmental protection field a justification for such concept. This is argued by him from the recognition of the interests of wild animals that inhabit these areas, which provides an indirect argument for the protection of other forms of not sentient life^{iv}.

3.2 Territorial Development and Intensive Speciesism Regions

The radical disregard of the interests of nonhuman animals which provides a purely utilitarian treatment of them is a symbolic operation and policy that, in the last decades, has enabled standards of development and of territory production with increasing intensification. So, despite the speeches extolling Brazil's role in global food security and employment opportunities generated by the sector, it is noteworthy to detach the Speciesism category as a heuristic tool for the critical examination of these spatial development patterns.

Brazil currently holds worldwide prominence in terms of export meat production, and livestock is the activity that occupies the largest land area in the country, of approximately 20% (SCHLESINGER, 2010)^v. Brazil's position climbing in the global meat market takes place in central countries (especially Europe) at the same time, public reflection on the ethical implications of meat production gains power and negative environmental externalities of activity becomes more obvious. In 2005, as part of monitoring and meeting the demands for animal welfare policies, the European Commission for Health and Consumer Protection ordered a special edition of the Eurobarometer in order to be aware of European consumers' views in relation to livestock treatment in Europe (*European Commission*, 2005). The survey interviewed 24,708 people over 15 years in the 25 member states. Respondents were asked about their opinion regarding the welfare of farmed animals, how the welfare of animals was considered in deciding the purchase of animal products, and what was the respondents' opinion on the policy developed by the

European Community in relation to this issue. Considering the global data, ie, not considering regional disparities, 43% of European consumers have shown to take into account, somehow, the welfare of animals originating the products purchased by the respondents. Also, 55% of consumers said that, in their respective countries, importance to the protection policy to animals is not sufficiently given, and that it would need more support.

But public reflection on livestock production in some major consuming centers results in paradoxical consequences for the producing regions, since the reflectivity on the consumption patterns of these centers favors the spatial segregation between consumer market and producer territory. Indeed, while in some large consumer centers certain activities become subject of questions and controversies, peripheral regions are willing to absorb this demand by building specialized territories. These territories, whose spatial segregation protects them against the extra economic questions, encourage the free development of the methods of instrumental rationalization and increased productivity with fewer environmental restrictions and unhindered moral order.

In this context, what we call here Intensive Speciesism Regions (ISR) arise, in which the process of building the territory is associated with intensive livestock industry, mediated by specific relationships among human beings. In these regions, the historically constructed concepts of nature (FLORIT, 2004; GUDYNAS, 1999) are naturalized and reified as “regional vocations” (FLORIT et al, 2014; FLORIT, 2011; GRAVA, 2013). These alleged vocations make these regions establish inter-regional specific relationships, both nationally and internationally, providing animal products to other areas and absorbing environmental liabilities and ethical burden. In them, the pattern of development is based on the premise, a false one, but ideologically reproduced in matching sentient beings to mere things, to the extent that the productive specialization requires those beings to be considered as raw materials of an industrial process.

These are regions with their own dynamics, where aspects of the modernization of production and Speciesism, which generally permeates social relations, appear in a particularly intense way, and whose naturalization results in a socio-political and economic process that takes place both in individuals’ subjectivity and in the objective dimension of social life. On the subjective side, it operates a symbolic reduction process in animality to a merely instrumental statute, based on mechanistic theological and philosophical as well as ethical anthropocentric justification, in contrast to the selective moralization of nature and life that characterizes the practices and cultural reflection of contemporaneity (EDER, 1996).

On the objective side, there is the political legitimation of economic models that enable, in an assistant mode, economic support for low-skilled industrial workers and farmers who find economic viability in the integration with agribusinesses. This combination becomes a solid system as it relies on the “regional vocations” supposedly natural and self-evident, and tend to ignore other possibilities for production. These supposed vocations find their mainstay in social and political relations, linked to specific actors, beneficiaries of the conception of nature that the alleged vocation expresses. Among these actors are both economic groups (such as large refrigerators), and political sectors (such as those competing in the state and local administrations and those that effectuate the political discourse with federal spheres).

The formation of these regions shows the enormous role of refrigerators and agroindustrial chains of meat production in the territory. In them, the Intensive Speciesism is associated with unhealthy and depressing working conditions for a large proportion of people in circumstances that are not usually seen in the official indicators. The routine in slaughterhouses and abattoirs includes repetitive work on “animal disassembly lines”^{vi}, in which there are frequent accidents, depression and trauma.

In the ISR, the naturalization of dealing with animals, proper of traditional farming, is absorbed and reproduced without interruption, in an entirely different situation – the industrial productivism in scale economies. This operation, which is both symbolic and economic at the same time, hides the fact that the traditional farmer’s practice and that of the farming and slaughter industry worker (often the same person at different stages of life) observed fundamental differences both qualitatively and quantitatively, being them crucial differences when considering the moral justification of the activity. In ISR, this activity, which is, unfortunately, the way for economic viability of many rural families, produces an oligopsonic labor market with few strong buyers and countless workers. This fact turns this activity almost the only alternative source of income for a significant portion of the population, for whom there are few options rather than the routine of dealing with killing and causing suffering to sentient beings in questionable conditions. This is seen not only from the point of view of animal treatment, but also from that of human health and dignity.

It is worth remembering that the ethical and political implications of development patterns that rely on livestock are not limited to those relating to the interests of the involved animals and workers, focus of this article. They also stem from several actual environmental impacts. It is known that livestock plays an important role in climate change, biodiversity loss, water pollution and high “water footprint”. There is also an ethical and political reflection focused on food standards relating high intake of meat with the mentioned environmental problems and also consumers’ health problems^{vii}.

3.3 Intensive Speciesism Regions in Santa Catarina

Brazil has currently significant weight in the world meat market, occupying prominent positions as the largest producer and exporter of beef and the third in relation to pork. With regard to chicken meat (2010 data), Brazil ranks second as a producer and the first place as exporter (USDA, 2012a and 2012b). With regard to the production of poultry and pork meat, this setting is associated with the consolidation of ISR, which are especially concentrated in the southern states of the country.

Considering all the federal units, Santa Catarina is the state that most slaughter pigs, followed by the other two states that make up the South Region, Rio Grande do Sul and Paraná. Santa Catarina, according to 2010 data, ranks second as exporter state, between Rio Grande do Sul and Paraná, respectively (ABIPECS, 2011). According to the same data, the production of chicken in Santa Catarina is the second largest in Brazil, between Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul (1st and 3rd largest respectively) ranking first as exporting state, followed by Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul (UBABEF, 2012). In Santa

Catarina's export agenda, the meat and meat products constitute 30.21% of total exports, the most prominent production chain in this aspect (MDIC, 2010).

To the extent that the focus in this work is the reflection on Intensive Speciesism, it is necessary to pay attention to activities that affect larger amount of non-human sentient beings. In this sense, the data on the quantities of per capita slaughters establish evidence of this phenomenon in its relationship with the territory. The slaughter rate per capita points to sentient animals density slaughtered in a specific territory with respect to the size of the human population of the same territory, regardless of their species. This index is different from the calculations that express the total weight of carcasses or their monetary value, which does not reveal the amount of slaughtered beings. Thus, the per capita slaughter index of a region can be considered as a Speciesism level indicator of the prevailing development pattern in the territory.

Tables 1 and 2 show that the numbers, in terms of the number of involved sentient beings, account for billions, with a per capita distribution concentrated in the southern states, especially Paraná and Santa Catarina.

Table 1 – Total slaughter by species, Brazil and states in the Brazilian South (2010)

UF / state	Bovines	Swines	Poultry*	Total**
Brazil	29,278,095	32,510,569	4,988,320,741	5,050,109,405
Paraná	1,459,406	5,410,958	1,316,488,442	1,323,358,806
Santa Catarina	509,350	8,745,890	898,888,357	908,143,597
Rio Grande do Sul	1,938,588	7,110,973	753,338,456	762,388,017

Source: Grava (2013).

Based on data from IBGE/SIDRA (2010).

* Only chickens (young bird, male or female, usually up to 60 days of age). It includes "frangões" breeding results and discarded adult animals (discarded layers, chickens and roosters).

** The southern states are followed by the states of São Paulo, with 686 million, Minas Gerais, with 377 million, and Goiás, with 305 million.

Table 2 - Total and *per capita* slaughter (bovines, swines and poultry), Brazil and Brazilian South (2010)

	Total slaughtered animals	%	Human Population	%	<i>Per capita</i> slaughter
Brazil	5,050,109,405	100.00	190,755,799	100.00	26.47
Santa Catarina	908,143,597	17.98	6,248,436	3.27	145.33
Paraná	1,323,358,806	26.20	10,444,526	5.47	126.70
Rio Grande do Sul	762,388,017	15.09	10,693,929	5.60	71.29
Total Brazilian South	2,993,890,420	59.27	27,386,891	14.34	109.31

Source: Grava (2013).

Based on data from IBGE/SIDRA (2010).

Internally in Santa Catarina, per capita concentration is more pronounced in some micro-regions. While in Brazil we have an average of 26.47 per capita slaughters in Concórdia micro-region this number reaches more than 1,150.00 (Tables 3 and 4). If put into perspective with the ethical discussion that formulates objections to Speciesism, the result shows an extremely disproportionate concentration of ethically questionable activities, depending on the style of development considered, ideologically, as a “regional vocation”.

Table 3 – Per capita swine slaughter, in Santa Catarina and selected micro-regions (2010)

Micro-region	Population	Total slaughter	per capita slaughter
Santa Catarina	6,248,436	7,933,016	1.26
Concórdia	141,990	1,909,323	13.44
Joaçaba	326,459	1,690,450	5.17
São Miguel do Oeste	174,732	854,561	4.89
Chapecó	405,066	1,572,128	3.88
Xanxerê	152,465	586,379	3.84
Rio do Sul	204,894	550,695	2.68
Curitibanos	122,626	273,077	2.22

Source: Grava (2013).

Based on data from IBGE (2010, *apud* Health Ministry, no date) and from MAPA (2010).

Table 4 – per capita poultry slaughter, in Santa Catarina and selected micro-regions (2010)

Micro-region	Population	Total slaughter *	per capita slaughter
Santa Catarina	6,248,436	877,982,611	140.51
Concórdia	141,990	163,158,718	1,149.08
Joaçaba	326,459	208,552,559	638.74
Xanxerê	152,465	66,180,388	434.06
Chapecó	405,066	172,271,238	425.29
São Miguel do Oeste	174,732	62,704,966	358.86
Araranguá	180,808	35,462,251	196.13
Tabuleiro	23,928	3,454,658	144.37

Source: Grava (2013).

Based on data from IBGE (2010, *apud* Health Ministry, no date) and from MAPA (2010).

* It includes chicken, hen, turkey, goose, duck, mallard, among others, mostly chicken.

The Intensive Speciesism is associated with social relationships expressing, also among human beings, obvious inequity patterns, if considering the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

Considering the labor market in Brazil, it is observed that the overall contribution of the sector in terms of formal employment is 1.96% of the country's bonds. In Santa Catarina, this share reaches 3.45%^{viii}. However, data disaggregated per micro-region reveal the sector concentration and dependence, with micro-regions reaching almost 25% of connections which depend on the meat chain (Table 5).

Table 5 - Percentage of connections in the creation and slaughter (cattle, pigs and poultry) and manufacture of meat products in Santa Catarina and selected micro-regions (2010)

Micro-region	Total of jobs	%	Total in meat production	%
Santa Catarina state	1,969,654	100	68,148	3.45
Concórdia	42,357	100	10,533	24.86
São Miguel do Oeste	34,436	100	5,661	16.43
Xanxerê	35,412	100	4,979	14.46
Chapecó	115,990	100	16,467	14.19
Joaçaba	101,546	100	10,008	9.85
Araranguá	36,009	100	2,017	5.60
Criciúma	111,480	100	3,981	3.57
Curitibanos	25,126	100	869	3.45

Source: Grava (2013).

Based on data from MTE (2010a).

Considering the working conditions of this population and the reflections on the normative development assumptions, these percentages are revealed extremely worrying and show a reality hidden behind seemingly 'good' Human Development Index (HDI).

The average salary in the sector is among the worst ones. According to data from the Ministry of Labor and Employment 2010, the average pay of the Agricultural subsector (929.97 reais) was the lowest in a rating of 25 sub-sectors of the economy. Also, the subsector Food Products Industry, was the 6th worst (1,249.28 reais)^{ix}.

The work in industrial abattoirs, which implies the killing routine of beings to which one should reasonably show some kind of moral consideration, compromises what, in anthropocentric terms, is regarded as the dignity of human personx. The reflections on the health status of these workers begin to be evidenced by research. These show not only the occupational consequences in terms of injuries and physical injuries, but also manifested in the form of psychological distress.

A Survey by the Social Welfare reveals that meatpacking workers are three times more likely to suffer head or abdomen injuries than workers in other sectors; the chicken

deboning line, is 743% more likely to develop tendinitis. The rate of depression of these workers is also three times higher than the average of the economically active population in Brazil (CAVECHINI; BARROS, 2011, 28 min.).

In Santa Catarina, a survey conducted by researchers from the Federal University of Santa Catarina and University of Vale do Itajaí shows that the pig, birds and other small animals slaughter activity have the largest number of occupational accidents and absenteeism due to health issues related to working conditions, paying benefits to 39% of workers in the sector between 2005 and 2011. The average age of workers removed in the period was only 37 years old, with a significant number diagnosed with depressive episodes, back pain and shoulder injuries with evidence of underreporting of occupational diseases in the industry (UMAMC, 2013). The epidemiological panel NTEP (Nexus Technical Epidemiological Social Security) establishes a prevalence of depressive episodes 341% higher in meatpacking workers in relation to employees of other economic activities (UMAMC, 2013).

4 - Final Considerations

This paper presented a reading of the discussions in the Environmental Ethics field to show the importance of placing this kind of discussion in the context of social and political relations that support, naturalize and reproduce the circumstances on which the Environmental Ethics formulates its thoughts.

Thus, while it sought to demonstrate the relevance of systematic reflection on value systems that permeate the discussion on Sustainable Territorial Development, from the analysis of social relations that legitimize such values, it was intended to make allowances for critical approach to certain patterns of territorial development in progress.

From the perspectives of Environmental Ethics presented, the analysis focused on the category of Speciesism given the heuristic relevance (critical and analytical) that it has, to analyze the spatial development patterns that rely on livestock farming in Brazil.

From an empirical point of view, the focus on the reality of Santa Catarina allowed delineating the notion of Intensive Speciesism Regions (ISR) in which the process of building the territory is associated with intensive industrial exploitation of farm animals, mediated by specific relationships among human beings. In them, there is a specific social dynamics built on the premise of lack of moral problems surrounding the radical instrumentalization of life and the bodies of non-human sentient beings. This assumption seems untenable in the light of ethical reflection that questions how one should treat non-human sentient beings.

These are regions with their own dynamics, in which aspects of production modernization and Speciesism permeating social relations in general appear in a particularly intense way, and whose naturalization results in a socio-political, economic and symbolic process, which also causes inequity patterns among humans, considering the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

Notes

- i A more extensive presentation of the Environmental Ethics field from the perspective of social relations, but that does not emphasize the category of Speciesism, can be found at Florit (2016).
- ii To delve into the debate between individualist and holistic, see Varner (2001), and Callicot's response (2001). An excellent analysis that confronts the prospect of Taylor, Callicot and Singer is in Kuhnen (2016).
- iii For a detailed study of the scope and limits Peter Singer's work in defense of animals, see Felipe (2003).
- iv See especially Chapter X in Singer (2002).
- v It is unclear whether this figure also considers the areas dedicated indirectly to serve livestock in Brazil and abroad, for the production of animal food. Consider, for example, that the Chinese pork industry is one of the main destinations of the soy produced in Brazil.
- vii Unlike the auto assembly line where the initial process is made up of separate pieces that are being arranged to, in the end, get a complete product, in line disassembling the live animal enters, whole, reaching the end of the process "pieces" separate, put up for processing.
- viii Analysis of the implications of livestock can be found in Deutsch et al. (2010); FAO (2006); Goodland, R. and Anhang, J. (2009); Henning (2011); Fundación Heinrich Böll Stiftung (2014); Westhoek, H. et al. (2014); Raphaely and Marinova (2016).
- ix There is also a significant amount of jobs for business owner and producers, having no dependency in terms of employing, which is not included in these numbers, consisting of producers 'integrated' to large firms in the sector.
- viii These sub-sectors include workers in the meat chain, but there is no information that discriminates the data of the chain separately.
- x For Kant (1724-1804) dignity is a unique attribute of human beings. However, indirectly, the dignity would compel to prevent cruelty against animals, since this implies coarsening of people.

References

- ACOSTA, A. **O Bem Viver**: uma oportunidade para imaginar outros mundos. Tradução Tadeu Breda. São Paulo. Editoras Autonomia Literária e Elefante, 2016, 256 p. ISBN 978-85-69536-02-4.
- ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DA INDÚSTRIA PRODUTORA E EXPORTADORA DE CARNE SUÍNA [ABIPECS]. **Produção Mundial de Carne Suína**. Sem data. Disponível em: <<http://www.abipecs.org.br/pt/estatisticas/mundial/exportacao.html>>. Acesso em: 13 de junho de 2012.
- CALLICOTT, J. B. The Land Ethic. In: JAMIESON, D. **A companion to environmental philosophy**. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2001, p. 204-217.
- CAVECHINI, C.; BARROS, C. J. (diretores). Carne, Osso. **Repórter Brasil**, 2011, 65 min.
- DEUTSCH, L. *et al.* Watermediated Ecological Consequences of Intensification and Expansion of Livestock Production. In: STEINFELD, H. *et al.* (Ed.). **Livestock in a Changing Landscape**, London: Island Press, 2010.
- EDER, K. **The Social Construction of Nature**: a Sociology of Ecological Enlightenment. London: Sage, 1996.
- ELLIOT, R. La ética ambiental. In: Singer, Peter (Ed.) **Compendio de ética**. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2004, pp. 391-404.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION, Attitudes of consumers towards the welfare of farmed animals. Special Eurobarometer 229/Wave 63.2 – TNS Opinion & Social, 2005.

FELIPE, S. T. Antropocentrismo, sencientismo e biocentrismo: Perspectivas éticas abolicionistas, bem-estaristas e conservadoras e o estatuto de animais não-humanos. **Revista Páginas de Filosofia**, v. 1, n. 1, jan-jul/2009.

_____. **Por uma questão de princípios: alcance e limites da ética de Peter Singer em defesa dos animais.** Florianópolis: Boiteux, 2003.

_____. **Ética e experimentação animal: fundamentos abolicionistas.** Florianópolis: Ed. da UFSC, 2007.

FLORIT, L. F. **A reinvenção social do natural.** Natureza e agricultura no mundo contemporâneo. 1. ed. v. 1. Blumenau: Edifurb, 2004.

_____. Natureza, especismo e vocações ambientais. Dilemas éticos e políticos para o desenvolvimento territorial sustentável. In: XIV Encontro Nacional da ANPUR, Rio de Janeiro. **Anais do XIV ENCONTRO NACIONAL DA ANPUR**, 23 a 27 de maio de 2011. Disponível em: <<http://unuhostedagem.com.br/revista/rbeur/index.php/anais/article/viewFile/3698/3623>> Acesso em: 13 de agosto de 2016.

_____.; SBARDELATI, C.; GRAVA, D. S.; REFOSCO, J. C.; COELHO, A. P. Implicações Éticas e Sociais da “Vocação Regional” pela Suinocultura e Avicultura na Microrregião de Concórdia/SC. In: SEDRES II - Seminário de Desenvolvimento Regional, Estado e Sociedade, 2014, Campina Grande. **Anais do 2º SEDRES. SEMINÁRIO DE DESENVOLVIMENTO REGIONAL, ESTADO E SOCIEDADE.** A Diversidade Regional Brasileira em Perspectiva. Campina Grande: EDUEPB/UEPB, 2014. p. 85-108.

_____. Conflitos ambientais, desenvolvimento no território e conflitos de valoração: considerações para uma ética ambiental com equidade social. **Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente** (UFPR), v. 36, p. 255-271. 2016.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS [FAO]. **Livestock’s Long Shadow: environmental issues and options.** FAO, 2006. Disponível em: <<http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/a0701e/a0701e00.HTM>>. Acesso em: 22 de maio de 2013.

FUNDACIÓN Heinrich Böll Stiftung. **Atlas de la Carne. Hechos y cifras sobre los animales que comemos.** Fundación Heinrich Böll Stiftung. Santiago de Chile, México e Brasil. 2014.

GRAVA, D. da S. **A construção social da pecuária como “vocação regional” em Santa Catarina:** notas críticas sobre suas implicações socioeconômicas, ambientais e éticas. Dissertação (Mestrado em Desenvolvimento Regional) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Regional, Universidade Regional de Blumenau, Blumenau, 2013.

GUDYNAS, E. **Ecología, Economía y Ética del Desarrollo Sostenible.** Coscoroba Ediciones. 5ª. edición revisada, 2004.

_____. Concepciones de la naturaleza y desarrollo en América Latina. Santiago de Chile: **Persona y Sociedad**, abril de 1999, 13 (1), pp. 101-125.

_____. Buen vivir: Germinando alternativas al desarrollo. América Latina em Movimento - **ALAI**, nº 462: pp. 1-20; fevereiro 2011, Quito.

GOODLAND, R.; ANHANG, J. **Livestock and Climate Change**. World Watch Institute, nov./dec. 2009. Disponível em: <<http://www.worldwatch.org/files/pdf/Livestock%20and%20Climate%20Change.pdf>>. Acesso em: 21 de maio de 2013.

HENNING, B. Standing in livestock's 'Long Shadow': the ethics of eating meat on a small planet. **Ethics and the Environment**, v. 16, n. 2, 2011, pp. 63-94.

INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATISTICA [IBGE]. **Sistema IBGE de Recuperação Automática – SIDRA**: pesquisa trimestral do abate de animais. Sem data. Disponível em: <<http://www.sidra.ibge.gov.br/>>. Acesso em: 11 de agosto de 2016.

KUHNEN, T. A. E possível ir além dos animais sencientes na definição da comunidade moral? Argumentos ecocêntricos e a resposta biocêntrica na bioética ambiental. In: ROUANET, L. P.; CARVALHO, M. C. M. de. (Org.). **Ética e direitos dos animais**. 1ª ed. Florianópolis: Ed. da UFSC, v. 1, 2016, p. 181-218.

LIVESTOCK ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE. **Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options**. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2006.

MINISTÉRIO DA AGRICULTURA, PECUÁRIA E ABASTECIMENTO [MAPA]. **Quantitativo de Animais Abatidos por Categoria e UF**. 2010. Disponível em: <http://sigsif.agricultura.gov.br/sigsif_cons!/sigsif.ap_quant_abate_cat_rep_cons>. Acesso em: 03 de dezembro de 2012.

MINISTÉRIO DO DESENVOLVIMENTO, INDÚSTRIA E COMÉRCIO EXTERIOR [MDIC]. **Balança comercial brasileira da cadeia produtiva da indústria de carnes, por tipo**. 2010. Disponível em: <<http://www.desenvolvimento.gov.br/sitio/interna/interna.php?area=5&menu=1078&ref=1076>>. Acesso em: 28 de agosto de 2012.

MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE [MS]. **População Residente – Santa Catarina**. População residente segundo microrregião IBGE/Município. Portal da Saúde [online], sem data. Disponível em: <<http://tabnet.datasus.gov.br/cgi/tabcgi.exe?ibge/cnv/popsc.def>>. Acesso em: 31 de janeiro de 2013.

MINISTÉRIO DO TRABALHO E EMPREGO [MTE]. **Bases Estatísticas RAIS e CAGED**. 2010a. Disponível em: <<http://bi.mte.gov.br/bgcaged/login.php>>. Acesso em: 12 de dezembro de 2012.

_____. **Brasil: Evolução do Emprego Formal, do Período de 2003 a 2010, Segundo a RAIS**. 2010b. Disponível em: <<http://bi.mte.gov.br/bgcaged/login.php>>. Acesso em: 16 de setembro de 2012.

RAPHAELY, T.; MARINOVA, D. (Org.) **Impact of Meat Consumption on Health and Environmental Sustainability**. IGI Global, 2016. ISBN 13: 9781466695535

- REGAN, T. **Jaulas vazias: encarando o desafio dos direitos animais**. Porto Alegre: Lugano, 2006.
- SACK, R. D. O significado de territorialidade. In: DIAS, L. C.; FERRARI, M. **Territorialidades humanas e redes sociais**. Florianópolis: Insular, 2011.
- SCHLESINGER, S. **Onde Pastar? O Gado Bovino no Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: Fase, 2010. Disponível em: <<http://fase.org.br/pt/acervo/biblioteca/onde-pastar-o-gado-bovino-no-brasil/>>. Acesso em: 13 de fevereiro de 2013.
- SINGER, P. **Ética Prática**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002 [1994].
- _____. **Libertação animal**. Ed. rev. Porto Alegre: Lugano, 2004.
- _____. **Practical Ethics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 1993 [1979].
- STERBA, J. Kantians and Utilitarians and the Moral Status of Nonhuman Life. In: Keller, David R. (Ed) **Environmental Ethics**. The Big Questions. Malden, Oxford, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2010, pp. 182-192.
- TAYLOR, P. W. **Respect to Nature**. A Theory of Environmental Ethics. Princeton University Press, 2011 [1986].
- THEIS, I. M. **Desenvolvimento e território: questões teóricas, evidências empíricas**. Ivo M. Theis (org.). Santa Cruz: EDUNISC, 2008.
- THINLEY, L. J. Y. Values and Development: “Gross National Happiness” in Gross National Happiness: A Set of Discussion Papers, chapter 2. **Journal of Bhutan Studies**. 1999. Disponível em: <<http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/gross-national-happiness-a-set-of-discussion-papers/>>. Acesso em: 30 de dezembro de 2010.
- THOMAS, K. **O homem e o mundo natural: mudanças de atitude em relação as plantas e aos animais (1500-1800)**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1996 [1988].
- UNIÃO MUNICIPAL DAS ASSOCIAÇÕES DE MORADORES DE CONCÓRDIA [UMAMC]. **Santa Catarina apresenta 48% de adoecimentos acima da média nacional**. UMAMC, 20 de dezembro de 2013. Disponível em: <<http://www.umamc.com.br/noticias/738-santa-catarina-apresenta-48-de-adoecimentos-acima-da-media-nacional>>. Acesso em: 03 de abril de 2014.
- UNIÃO BRASILEIRA DE AVICULTURA [UBABEF]. **Relatório Anual Ubabef 2010/2011**. UBABEF, 2011. Disponível em: <<http://www.youblisher.com/p/140147-Relatorio-Anual-da-Uniao-Brasileira-de-Avicultura-UBABEF/>>. Acesso em: 13 de junho de 2012.
- _____. **Relatório Anual Ubabef 2012**. UBABEF, 2012. Disponível em: <http://www.asgav.com.br/editorial_detalhe.php?id=42&id_categoria=4>. Acesso em: 06 de dezembro de 2012.
- UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE [USDA]. **Beef and Veal Summary Selected Countries**. USDA, 07 de abril de 2012a. Disponível em: <<http://>

www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?navid=DATA_STATISTICS>. Acesso em: 10 de maio de 2012.

_____. **Livestock and poultry world markets and trade**. USDA, outubro de 2012b. Disponível em: <https://www.fas.usda.gov/psdonline/circulars/livestock_poultry.pdf>. Acesso em: 06 de dezembro de 2012.

VARNER, G. Sentientism. In: JAMIESON, D. *A companion to environmental philosophy*. Malden: **Blackwell Publishers**, 2001, pp. 192-203.

WESTHOEK, H., *et al.*, Food choices, health and environment: Effects of cutting Europe's meat and dairy intake. **Global Environ. Change**, 2014. Disponível em: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.02.004>>. Acesso em: 11 de agosto de 2016.

Submitted on: 23/05/2014

Accepted on: 09/07/2016

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422ASOC135333V1942016>

ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS AND SUSTAINABLE TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT. AN ANALYSIS FROM THE SPECIESISM CATEGORY

LUCIANO FÉLIX FLORIT
DIEGO DA SILVA GRAVA

Abstract: The article proposes ways to relate discussions held at the field of Environmental Ethics with analysis about the Sustainable Territorial Development. For this, a summary discussion of this field is presented, emphasizing the category of Speciesism and the problem of moral consideration of animals. This approach aims to show the heuristic potential that this category have to analyse patterns of territorial development supported by livestock. From an empirical point of view, the article analyses data from the meat industry in Santa Catarina, from which the notion of Intensive Speciesism Regions (ISR) is outlined. They constitute territories that show Speciesism disproportionately intense in their development patterns, result of a socio-political, economic and symbolic process that combines radical moral disregard of animals with unrighteousness among humans.

Key words: Environmental Ethics, Speciesism, Sustainable Territorial Development.

Resumo: O artigo propõe caminhos para relacionar as discussões realizadas no campo da Ética Ambiental com as análises em torno do Desenvolvimento Territorial Sustentável. Para isto, é realizada uma apresentação das discussões neste campo, dando destaque à categoria de Especismo e à problemática da consideração moral dos animais. Esta abordagem obedece à potencialidade heurística que essa categoria apresenta para a análise de padrões de desenvolvimento territorial que se apoiam na pecuária. Do ponto de vista empírico, o artigo analisa dados da indústria da carne em Santa Catarina, a partir dos quais esboça-se a noção de Regiões de Especismo Intensivo (REIs). As mesmas constituem territórios que evidenciam Especismo desproporcionalmente intenso nos seus padrões de desenvolvimento, resultado de um processo sócio-político, econômico e simbólico que associa a radical descondição moral de animais à iniquidade entre seres humanos.

Palavras-chave: Ética Ambiental, Especismo, Desenvolvimento Territorial Sustentável.

Resumen: El artículo propone caminos para relacionar discusiones realizadas en el campo de la Ética Ambiental con análisis sobre Desarrollo Territorial Sustentable. Para esto, es realizada una presentación sintética de las discusiones en este campo, dando énfasis a la categoría de Especismo y a la problemática de la consideración moral de los animales. Este enfoque, resulta de la potencialidad heurística que esta categoría presenta para el análisis de los padrones de desarrollo territorial apoyados en la pecuaria. Del punto de vista empírico, son analizados datos de la industria de la carne en Santa Catarina, a partir de los cuales es esbozada la noción de Regiones de Especismo Intensivo (REIs). Las mismas constituyen territorios en los cuales el Especismo de sus padrones de desarrollo es desproporcionalmente intenso, resultado de un proceso sociopolítico, económico y simbólico que conjuga la radical desconsideración moral de los animales a inequidades entre seres humanos.

Palabras clave: Ética Ambiental, Especismo, Desarrollo Territorial Sustentable
