

2024

Ethical Analysis of the 2022 South Africa Floods



Juliano Alves de Souza

PH-363 Environmental Ethics

6/23/2024

Introduction

In April 2022, South Africa experienced a catastrophic environmental disaster: devastating floods primarily affecting the KwaZulu-Natal and Eastern Cape provinces. Over two days of intense rainfall led to severe flooding and landslides, resulting in over 400 fatalities, the destruction of more than 12,000 homes, and the displacement of approximately 40,000 people. The floods also caused significant damage to infrastructure, including impacts on 630 schools, and the estimated cost of the disaster was about \$1.57 billion (Tandon, 2022). This event not only wreaked havoc on human life but also had profound effects on the environment, including soil erosion, water contamination, and disruption of local ecosystems.

The floods highlighted several critical issues, such as the exacerbation of natural disasters by climate change, inadequate urban planning, and structural inequalities. Climate change, driven by human activities such as industrialization, deforestation, and urbanization, played a significant role in increasing the intensity and likelihood of the extreme rainfall that caused the floods. Poor urban planning and insufficient drainage systems further worsened the impact, leading to severe flooding in populated areas. Structural inequalities and forced relocations heightened the vulnerability of affected communities, demonstrating the urgent need for equitable access to resources and resilient infrastructure (Tandon, 2022).

Application of Approaches in Environmental Ethics

Theory I: Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism, an ethical theory proposed by philosophers like Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, assesses the morality of actions based on their outcomes, specifically aiming to maximize

overall happiness and minimize suffering. According to utilitarianism, the ethical evaluation of the 2022 South Africa floods would focus on the total amount of suffering caused and the benefits of preventing future such events through climate action.

In applying utilitarianism to the South Africa floods, one must consider the significant suffering caused by the disaster, including the loss of lives, displacement of thousands of people, and long-term health risks due to waterborne diseases. The immediate and severe impact on human well-being underscores the need for proactive measures to prevent similar future events. Utilitarianism would advocate for robust early warning systems, improved urban planning, and enhanced emergency response strategies to minimize suffering and maximize the overall well-being of affected communities (Tandon, 2022).

A representative article by Juliano Alves de Souza (2024) discusses the utilitarian approach to environmental ethics, emphasizing the need to consider the impact on all sentient beings affected by environmental disasters. The article argues that utilitarianism requires a careful evaluation of the overall pain and suffering caused by habitat destruction, such as the loss of life, disruption of ecosystems, and prolonged suffering due to inadequate shelter and increased vulnerability to diseases. This ethical framework underscores the importance of minimizing suffering and maximizing well-being through effective disaster preparedness and climate resilience strategies.

Theory II: Deontological Ethics

Deontological ethics, as proposed by Immanuel Kant, focuses on the morality of actions themselves rather than their consequences, emphasizing duties and rights. Deontological ethics would assess the 2022 South Africa floods by examining whether the actions that led to the disaster

violated any moral duties or rights, such as the duty to protect citizens and the right to a safe environment.

Applying deontological ethics to this disaster involves evaluating the responsibilities of governments, corporations, and the international community. Governments have a duty to implement adequate urban planning and drainage systems to protect their citizens from natural disasters. The failure to do so in this case constitutes a violation of their moral duty to safeguard the well-being of their population. Corporations that contribute to climate change through industrial activities and environmental degradation also bear moral responsibility for their actions. Additionally, the international community has a duty to support climate mitigation and adaptation efforts in vulnerable regions, recognizing their historical contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions (Udo, 2022).

A representative article by Udo (2022) discusses the deontological approach to environmental ethics, highlighting the importance of adhering to moral duties and rights in environmental decision-making. The article emphasizes that actions should be morally justifiable regardless of their outcomes, focusing on the ethical obligations to protect the environment and ensure the well-being of affected communities. This framework underscores the need for governments, corporations, and the international community to fulfill their moral duties in addressing the root causes of environmental disasters and enhancing resilience.

Critical Evaluation

Utilitarianism's strength lies in its practical application for policymaking, as it focuses on overall well-being and encourages actions that benefit the greatest number of people. However, it may

overlook individual rights and justice, and calculating the overall happiness or suffering is complex and subjective. In the case of the South Africa floods, utilitarianism provides a comprehensive framework for evaluating the overall impact and guiding policy decisions to minimize suffering and maximize well-being.

Deontological ethics emphasizes moral duties and rights, providing clear guidelines for ethical behavior. It ensures that actions are morally justifiable regardless of their outcomes. However, this approach can be rigid and inflexible, sometimes leading to impractical decisions. In the context of the South Africa floods, deontological ethics highlights the moral responsibilities of various stakeholders but may conflict with practical considerations of outcomes (Udo, 2022).

By integrating the strengths of both theories, we can develop ethical guidelines that are both practical and just, addressing the broader impacts while upholding individual rights and moral responsibilities. A combined approach provides the best analysis of the disaster, ensuring that policies are not only effective but also ethically sound.

Ethical Evaluation

➤ Moral Harm

The appropriate assessment of moral harm in the case of the South Africa floods involves recognizing the significant impact on human lives, displaced people, and the environment. Over 400 lives were lost, causing profound and long-lasting psychological and emotional impact on survivors and the community. Approximately 40,000 people were displaced, losing their homes, personal belongings, and livelihoods. The disruption to daily life and the strain of living in temporary shelters under inadequate conditions posed significant moral harm.

Additionally, the spread of waterborne diseases such as cholera and dysentery due to stagnant water and inadequate sanitation facilities increased overall suffering and mortality (Tandon, 2022).

The floods also caused extensive soil erosion, loss of fertile land, and water contamination, affecting agriculture and freshwater supplies. The disruption of local ecosystems and the displacement of wildlife constituted significant moral harm to the environment. The destruction of infrastructure, including homes, schools, and roads, had long-term economic implications, exacerbating poverty and hindering recovery efforts. This economic instability affected the well-being of the community and future generations (Udo, 2022).

➤ **Moral Wrongdoing**

The appropriate assessment of moral wrongdoing in this case involves identifying the specific wrongs committed by various stakeholders. Governments were negligent in urban planning, failing to implement adequate drainage systems and disaster preparedness measures in vulnerable areas. This negligence contributed significantly to the severity of the flooding, constituting a critical moral failing. Inadequate early warning systems and emergency response strategies also left many residents unprepared and unable to evacuate in time, further exacerbating the disaster's impact (Udo, 2022).

Corporations involved in industrial activities, deforestation, and other practices that contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions bear moral responsibility for their role in exacerbating climate change. Their actions have increased the frequency and severity of extreme weather events like the South Africa floods. The international community also shares

moral responsibility, as developed nations that have historically contributed more to global greenhouse gas emissions have a duty to support climate mitigation and adaptation efforts in more vulnerable regions. Failure to provide adequate support and resources to countries like South Africa reflects a broader moral wrongdoing on an international scale (Tandon, 2022).

Conclusions Regarding Ethical Theories

In conclusion, the utilitarian approach offers a comprehensive framework for evaluating the overall impact and guiding policy decisions to minimize suffering and maximize well-being. Utilitarianism's emphasis on outcomes makes it particularly effective in formulating policies that aim to prevent future environmental disasters. For instance, policies designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote sustainable practices directly align with the utilitarian goal of minimizing overall suffering and maximizing collective happiness. By focusing on the broad impacts of climate change and the benefits of mitigation strategies, utilitarianism provides a robust justification for proactive and preventive measures. It supports extensive investment in early warning systems, improved urban planning, and robust emergency response strategies. This framework ensures that the potential suffering from future disasters is minimized, and community resilience is enhanced.

However, utilitarianism may sometimes overlook the rights and justice of individuals, focusing solely on the aggregate outcomes. This can lead to ethical dilemmas where the benefits to the majority might come at the cost of significant harm to a minority. For example, while large-scale infrastructure projects may prevent future floods, they might also displace communities or disrupt local ecosystems, raising concerns about justice and rights.

Deontological ethics, on the other hand, provides clear guidelines for ethical behavior by emphasizing moral duties and rights. This approach is crucial in ensuring that actions are morally justifiable, regardless of their outcomes. Deontological principles can underpin policies that respect individual rights and uphold ethical standards in environmental management. For instance, governments and corporations are ethically bound to protect citizens' rights to a safe environment and to refrain from actions that would harm future generations. Policies grounded in deontological ethics would prioritize equitable access to resources, fair treatment of all communities, and strict adherence to environmental protections.

Deontological ethics can be particularly effective in ensuring accountability and ethical governance. It mandates that entities responsible for environmental management must act in ways that uphold moral duties and rights, regardless of the outcomes. This can lead to more transparent and ethically consistent policies. However, the rigidity of deontological ethics may sometimes lead to impractical decisions, especially when strict adherence to duties conflicts with broader societal needs.

Integrating the strengths of both theories provides a balanced and comprehensive approach to environmental ethics. Utilitarianism's focus on overall well-being complements deontological ethics' emphasis on moral duties and rights. Together, they offer a framework for policies that are both effective and ethically sound. For example, while utilitarian principles might justify the implementation of extensive flood control measures to benefit the majority, deontological ethics ensures that such measures are carried out in ways that respect the rights of affected communities and uphold ethical standards.

By combining these approaches, policymakers can develop strategies that not only prevent future disasters and enhance community resilience but also ensure justice and respect for individual

rights. This holistic approach is essential for addressing the complex ethical challenges posed by environmental disasters like the 2022 South Africa floods. It ensures that policies are not only effective in mitigating harm but also uphold the highest ethical standards, fostering a more just and resilient society.

References

- 1- Tandon, A. (2022, May 13). Climate change made extreme rains in 2022 South Africa floods ‘twice as likely’. *Carbon Brief*. Retrieved from <https://www.carbonbrief.org/climate-change-made-extreme-rains-in-2022-south-africa-floods-twice-as-likely/>
- 2- Udo, F. (2022, April 14). Floods in South Africa: Protecting people must include a focus on women and girls. *PreventionWeb*. Retrieved from <https://www.preventionweb.net/news/floods-south-africa-protecting-people-must-include-focus-women-and-girls>