Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561 P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume: 02 Issue: 01 January-2026

The Theoretical Landscape of Environmental Aesthetics: From Appreciation to Obligation

YinJi, UPSI
UPSI (Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris)

Ts. Dr. Muhammad Zaffwan bin Idris
UPSI (Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris)

Published Date: January 10, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E1/2026-06**

ABSTRACT: Environmental aesthetics has emerged as a vital philosophical subfield investigating our aesthetic engagement with nature and the environment. This article traces the theoretical development of the discipline from its eighteenth-century roots through contemporary debates. It examines three central issues: the historical foundations of environmental aesthetics in concepts of the sublime, beautiful, and picturesque; the fundamental tension between cognitive approaches emphasizing scientific knowledge and non-cognitive approaches privileging emotional and imaginative experience; and the complex relationship between aesthetic value and environmental ethics. The article further explores recent developments including everyday aesthetics, the challenge of appreciating human-impacted environments, and the implications of climate change. By synthesizing these theoretical perspectives, the article demonstrates that environmental aesthetics is not merely abstract philosophy but a critical mode of inquiry with profound implications for understanding human-nature relationships and environmental responsibility in the Anthropocene.

KEYWORDS: Environmental aesthetics, Aesthetic appreciation of nature, Environmental ethics, Cognitive vs. non-cognitive aesthetics, Sublime and picturesque.

INTRODUCTION

In an era defined by unprecedented environmental challenges, the philosophical discipline of aesthetics has undergone a profound transformation. Traditionally focused on the nature of art and beauty, aesthetics has expanded its purview to encompass the vast and complex realm of the natural world. This shift has given rise to environmental aesthetics, a vibrant and increasingly vital subfield of philosophy that investigates our aesthetic engagement with nature and the environment. It moves beyond the gallery and the concert hall to explore the aesthetic dimensions of forests, mountains, oceans, and even the everyday landscapes that shape our lives. This article delves into the theoretical underpinnings of environmental aesthetics, tracing its historical development, exploring its central debates, and examining its intricate relationship with environmental ethics. It argues that environmental aesthetics is not merely an abstract philosophical exercise but a critical mode of inquiry that has profound implications for our understanding of our place in the world and our responsibilities towards it.

The emergence of environmental aesthetics in the latter half of the twentieth century marked a significant departure from the art-centric focus of traditional analytic aesthetics. It was a response to a growing sense of unease about the human-nature relationship and a recognition that our aesthetic experiences of the natural world are a fundamental aspect of our humanity. Early pioneers in the field challenged the prevailing assumption that the aesthetic appreciation of nature could be understood through the same conceptual frameworks used to analyze art. They argued that nature is not a static object to be passively contemplated but a dynamic and immersive environment that engages all of our senses and faculties. This shift in perspective opened up a rich and fertile ground for philosophical inquiry, leading to the development of new theories and concepts that have transformed our understanding of the aesthetic.

This article will navigate the complex theoretical landscape of environmental aesthetics, beginning with its historical roots in eighteenth-century philosophy and the concepts of the sublime, the beautiful, and the picturesque. It will then explore the central debate that has shaped the field: the tension between cognitive and non-cognitive approaches to the aesthetic appreciation of nature. Does a proper appreciation of nature require scientific knowledge, or is it primarily a matter of emotional and imaginative engagement? From there, the article will examine the crucial and often contentious relationship between environmental aesthetics and environmental ethics. Can the aesthetic value of nature provide a justification for its preservation? And how do our aesthetic sensibilities shape our moral obligations to the environment? Finally, the article will consider some of the most recent and pressing themes in the field, including the aesthetics of everyday life, the challenge of appreciating human-impacted

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

environments, and the implications of climate change for our aesthetic experience of the world. By tracing the evolution of these theoretical debates, this article aims to provide a comprehensive overview of a field of philosophy that is more relevant and urgent than ever before.

Historical Foundations: From the Picturesque to the Sublime

The philosophical inquiry into the aesthetic appreciation of the environment is not a recent invention, though its formalization as a distinct subfield is a twentieth-century development. The intellectual groundwork for environmental aesthetics was laid in the eighteenth century, a period of profound intellectual and cultural change in Europe. It was during this time that philosophers began to systematically investigate the nature of aesthetic experience, moving beyond a singular focus on art to consider the aesthetic qualities of the natural world. This shift was driven, in part, by a growing cultural fascination with landscape, both in its cultivated and wild forms. The Grand Tour, the rise of landscape painting as a major genre, and a burgeoning interest in natural history all contributed to a new way of seeing and appreciating the environment (Andrews, 1989).

Three key aesthetic categories emerged from this period that would become foundational for environmental aesthetics: the beautiful, the sublime, and the picturesque. The concept of the beautiful, long associated with art, was re-conceptualized in the context of nature. Philosophers like Francis Hutcheson argued that the experience of beauty is a disinterested one, meaning that it is detached from any personal or utilitarian considerations (Hutcheson, 1725). We appreciate the beauty of a flower not because it is useful or valuable, but simply for its own sake. This concept of disinterestedness was crucial for establishing the aesthetic appreciation of nature as a legitimate and independent form of experience, distinct from scientific or economic valuation.

However, the category of the beautiful, with its emphasis on harmony, order, and proportion, was insufficient to capture the full range of aesthetic responses to the natural world. The wild and untamed landscapes of the Alps, for example, evoked a very different kind of experience, one that was characterized by awe, terror, and a sense of overwhelming power. To account for this, philosophers turned to the concept of the sublime. Edmund Burke, in his influential treatise A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful (1757), argued that the sublime is rooted in feelings of pain and danger, experienced from a safe distance. The sublime is a source of "delightful horror," a thrilling and awe-inspiring experience that reminds us of our own finitude in the face of the immense power of nature.

Immanuel Kant, in his Critique of the Power of Judgment (1790), provided a more complex and influential account of the sublime. For Kant, the sublime is not a property of objects themselves but a feeling that arises in us when we are confronted with the vastness or power of nature. The mathematical sublime is the experience of the infinitely large, the feeling of being overwhelmed by the sheer scale of the ocean or the starry sky. The dynamical sublime is the experience of the infinitely powerful, the feeling of being threatened by a raging storm or a mighty waterfall. In both cases, the experience of the sublime is a two-part process: a moment of displeasure, as our senses and imagination fail to grasp the object, followed by a moment of pleasure, as we become aware of the power of our own reason to transcend the limits of our sensibility. Kant's theory of the sublime was a major turning point in the history of aesthetics, as it shifted the focus from the object of appreciation to the subjective experience of the appreciator.

Between the serene order of the beautiful and the terrifying grandeur of the sublime lay the category of the picturesque. Popularized by William Gilpin, the picturesque referred to a kind of beauty that was characterized by roughness, irregularity, and variety (Gilpin, 1792). It was the beauty of a crumbling ruin, a gnarled old tree, or a winding country lane. The picturesque provided a new set of aesthetic criteria for appreciating the more humble and everyday aspects of the landscape, and it had a profound influence on the development of landscape gardening and tourism. However, the picturesque has also been criticized for its tendency to frame nature as a series of static pictures, to be passively consumed by a detached observer (Carlson, 2009). This "landscape model" of appreciation, as it has been called, has been a major point of contention in contemporary environmental aesthetics, with many philosophers arguing that it fails to do justice to the immersive and multi-sensory nature of our experience of the environment.

These eighteenth-century debates, while distant in time, continue to resonate in contemporary environmental aesthetics. The concepts of the beautiful, the sublime, and the picturesque, while often criticized and revised, remain essential tools for understanding our aesthetic engagement with the natural world. And the fundamental questions that were raised during this period – about the nature of disinterestedness, the role of emotion and imagination in aesthetic experience, and the relationship between art and nature – are still at the heart of the field today.

The Central Debate: Cognitive vs. Non-Cognitive Approaches

At the heart of contemporary environmental aesthetics lies a fundamental debate about the nature of appropriate aesthetic appreciation of the environment. This debate is often framed as a tension between two opposing camps: the cognitive and the non-cognitive. The central question that divides these two approaches is the role of knowledge, particularly scientific knowledge, in our aesthetic engagement with nature. Is a proper appreciation of the natural world dependent on an understanding of its underlying ecological and geological processes, or is it primarily a matter of subjective, emotional, and imaginative experience?

The Cognitive Approach: The Importance of Knowledge

The cognitive approach, most forcefully articulated by Allen Carlson, argues that the aesthetic appreciation of nature should be guided by scientific knowledge (Carlson, 1979, 2000, 2009). Just as a proper appreciation of a work of art requires an understanding of its art-historical context, a proper appreciation of a natural environment requires an understanding of its natural history. To appreciate a wetland, for example, is not simply to enjoy its picturesque qualities but to understand its ecological function as a habitat for diverse species, a filter for pollutants, and a buffer against floods. Without this knowledge, Carlson argues, our appreciation is likely to be superficial, sentimental, or even misguided. We may find a field of purple loosestrife beautiful, for example, without realizing that it is an invasive species that is choking out native plants and destroying the local ecosystem. For Carlson, a scientifically informed appreciation is not only more appropriate but also more rewarding, as it allows us to see and appreciate a deeper and more complex layer of beauty in the natural world.

This "scientific cognitivism," as it has come to be known, has been a dominant force in environmental aesthetics, and it has been influential in a wide range of fields, from landscape architecture to environmental policy. It provides a strong and objective basis for aesthetic judgment, one that

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

is not dependent on the vagaries of individual taste or fashion. It also offers a powerful argument for the preservation of natural environments, as it suggests that their aesthetic value is inextricably linked to their ecological integrity.

The Non-Cognitive Approach: The Primacy of Experience

Despite its influence, the cognitive approach has been met with a great deal of criticism. Proponents of the non-cognitive approach argue that it is overly intellectual and that it neglects the crucial role of emotion, imagination, and sensory experience in our aesthetic engagement with nature. They contend that the aesthetic appreciation of nature is not primarily a matter of knowing but of feeling. It is the sense of awe we feel in the presence of a giant sequoia, the feeling of peace we experience in a quiet forest, the sense of wonder we feel when we look up at the starry sky. To reduce these experiences to a set of scientific facts, they argue, is to miss the very essence of what makes them aesthetic.

Emily Brady, a leading proponent of the non-cognitive approach, has argued for a more pluralistic and inclusive model of aesthetic appreciation, one that recognizes the value of a wide range of different approaches (Brady, 2003). She argues that while scientific knowledge can certainly enhance our aesthetic experience of nature, it is not a necessary condition for it. We can appreciate the beauty of a sunset without understanding the physics of light scattering, and we can appreciate the grace of a soaring eagle without knowing its scientific name. For Brady, the imagination is a particularly important faculty in our aesthetic engagement with nature. It allows us to see the world in new and unexpected ways, to find patterns and meanings that are not immediately apparent to the senses. It is the imagination that allows us to see a gnarled old tree as a wise old sage, or a swirling river as a powerful and untamed spirit.

Other non-cognitive theorists have emphasized the importance of the body and the senses in our aesthetic experience of the environment. Arnold Berleant, for example, has developed a theory of "aesthetics of engagement," which argues that the aesthetic appreciation of nature is an immersive and participatory experience that involves all of our senses (Berleant, 1992). We do not simply look at the environment; we are in it. We feel the wind on our skin, we smell the scent of the pines, we hear the sound of the birds. For Berleant, the traditional model of aesthetic appreciation, which is based on the detached contemplation of a static object, is completely inadequate for understanding our experience of the natural world.

Beyond the Dichotomy: Towards a More Integrated Approach

In recent years, many philosophers have sought to move beyond the rigid dichotomy between cognitive and non-cognitive approaches, arguing that a more integrated and holistic model is needed. They recognize that both knowledge and experience are essential components of a rich and meaningful aesthetic engagement with the environment. Scientific knowledge can provide a framework for our experience, helping us to see and appreciate things that we might otherwise miss. But it is our emotional, imaginative, and sensory experience that gives that knowledge meaning and significance.

The debate between cognitive and non-cognitive approaches is not just an abstract philosophical dispute; it has important practical implications. It affects how we design our parks and gardens, how we manage our natural resources, and how we educate our children about the environment. A purely cognitive approach might lead to a focus on scientific education and ecological restoration, while a purely non-cognitive approach might lead to a focus on providing opportunities for recreational and spiritual experiences in nature. A more integrated approach, on the other hand, would recognize the importance of both, and would seek to create environments that are both ecologically healthy and aesthetically rewarding.

The Bridge to Obligation: Environmental Aesthetics and Environmental Ethics

The relationship between environmental aesthetics and environmental ethics is one of the most complex and contested issues in the field. While the two disciplines are closely related, they are also distinct. Environmental aesthetics is primarily concerned with the nature of our aesthetic experience of the environment, while environmental ethics is concerned with our moral obligations to it. The central question that connects the two fields is whether the aesthetic value of nature can provide a basis for its preservation. Can we argue that we have a moral duty to protect a beautiful landscape or a graceful animal simply because it is beautiful or graceful?

Aesthetic Value as a Justification for Conservation

Many environmental philosophers have argued that aesthetic value can and should play a crucial role in environmental ethics. Aldo Leopold, in his classic work A Sand County Almanac (1949), argued that a land ethic is not just a matter of economic self-interest but also a matter of "love, respect, and admiration for land, and a high regard for its value." This "value," for Leopold, is not just economic or ecological but also aesthetic. He believed that an appreciation for the beauty of the natural world is a crucial first step towards developing a sense of moral responsibility for it.

More recently, philosophers like J. Baird Callicott have argued that aesthetic value is a key component of the intrinsic value of nature (Callicott, 1989). Intrinsic value is the value that something has in and of itself, independent of its usefulness to humans. Callicott argues that the beauty, complexity, and integrity of natural ecosystems are all sources of intrinsic value, and that we have a direct moral duty to protect them. From this perspective, the destruction of a beautiful old-growth forest is not just a loss of a valuable resource; it is a moral wrong, a violation of the intrinsic value of the forest itself.

The Challenges of an Aesthetics-Based Ethic

However, the attempt to ground environmental ethics in aesthetics is fraught with challenges. One of the most significant is the problem of subjectivity. Aesthetic judgments are often seen as being subjective and relative, a matter of personal taste. If beauty is in the eye of the beholder, then how can it provide a firm and objective basis for moral obligation? What one person finds beautiful, another may find ugly or uninteresting. A swamp, for example, may be seen as a beautiful and fascinating ecosystem by an ecologist, but as a smelly and mosquito-infested wasteland by a developer.

Another challenge is the problem of "negative aesthetics." While we may have a strong intuitive sense that we should protect beautiful things, it is less clear that we have a moral duty to protect ugly or aesthetically uninteresting things. If our moral obligations to the environment are based on its aesthetic value, then what about the vast majority of species on Earth that are not cute, cuddly, or charismatic? What about the spiders, the snakes, the slugs, and the slime molds? Do we have a moral duty to protect them, even if we find them repulsive?

Furthermore, there is the danger that an aesthetics-based ethic could lead to a form of "aestheticism," a focus on the superficial and picturesque aspects of nature at the expense of its ecological health and integrity. We might be tempted to preserve a beautiful but ecologically impoverished

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

landscape, while neglecting a less beautiful but more ecologically valuable one. We might also be tempted to "improve" upon nature, to make it more beautiful or picturesque, by planting non-native species or by removing dead trees and other "unsightly" elements. This kind of aesthetic intervention can have disastrous ecological consequences, as it often disrupts the complex and delicate balance of natural ecosystems.

Towards a More Integrated Approach

In response to these challenges, many philosophers have sought to develop a more nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the relationship between environmental aesthetics and environmental ethics. They argue that aesthetic value is not the only or even the primary basis for our moral obligations to the environment, but that it can play an important supporting role. An appreciation for the beauty of the natural world can be a powerful motivator for environmental action, inspiring us to care for and protect the places we love.

Moreover, they argue that a deeper and more scientifically informed aesthetic appreciation of nature can help us to see the value in things that we might otherwise find ugly or uninteresting. By understanding the ecological role of a spider or a snake, we can come to appreciate its unique and intricate beauty. By understanding the geological history of a desert landscape, we can come to appreciate its stark and austere grandeur. In this way, environmental aesthetics can help to broaden and deepen our moral sensibilities, to expand our circle of moral concern to include the entire community of life.

Ultimately, the relationship between environmental aesthetics and environmental ethics is not a one-way street. Our aesthetic sensibilities can shape our moral values, but our moral values can also shape our aesthetic sensibilities. As we come to understand the ecological importance of a wetland, for example, we may also come to see it as beautiful. As we come to recognize the intrinsic value of all living things, we may also come to find a new and profound beauty in the diversity and complexity of the natural world. In this way, environmental aesthetics and environmental ethics are not two separate and distinct fields but two sides of the same coin, two different but complementary ways of understanding and valuing our place in the world.

New Frontiers: Recent Themes and Future Directions

Environmental aesthetics is a dynamic and evolving field, constantly responding to new challenges and opportunities. In recent years, a number of new themes and directions have emerged that are pushing the boundaries of the discipline and expanding its scope and relevance. These new frontiers reflect a growing recognition of the complexity and diversity of our aesthetic engagement with the environment, as well as a sense of urgency about the need to address the pressing environmental challenges of our time.

The Aesthetics of Everyday Life

One of the most significant developments in recent environmental aesthetics has been the turn towards the aesthetics of everyday life. This approach, pioneered by philosophers like Yuriko Saito, challenges the traditional focus on the grand and spectacular aspects of nature and instead directs our attention to the more humble and mundane environments that we inhabit on a daily basis (Saito, 2007). The aesthetics of everyday life is concerned with the aesthetic qualities of our homes, our workplaces, our cities, and our gardens. It is about finding beauty and meaning in the ordinary, in the familiar and often overlooked aspects of our surroundings.

This shift in focus has important implications for environmentalism. It suggests that environmental concern should not be limited to the preservation of pristine wilderness areas but should also extend to the improvement of the quality of life in our own communities. By cultivating an aesthetic appreciation for our everyday environments, we can foster a greater sense of connection to and responsibility for the places we live. This can lead to a more engaged and participatory form of environmentalism, one that is focused on creating more beautiful, healthy, and sustainable communities for all.

The Challenge of Human-Impacted Environments

Another major challenge for contemporary environmental aesthetics is the problem of appreciating human-impacted environments. In an age of ubiquitous human influence, the traditional distinction between the natural and the artificial has become increasingly blurred. The vast majority of the Earth's surface has been modified by human activity in some way, from agriculture and forestry to urbanization and industrialization. How are we to aesthetically appreciate these hybrid landscapes, which are neither purely natural nor purely artificial?

Some philosophers have argued that we should apply the same aesthetic criteria to human-impacted environments as we do to natural ones, focusing on their ecological health and integrity. Others have argued that we need to develop new aesthetic categories and criteria that are specifically tailored to the unique qualities of these environments. For example, we might appreciate the beauty of a well-designed and sustainable farm, or the industrial sublime of a massive wind turbine. The aesthetics of human-impacted environments is a complex and challenging area of inquiry, but it is also a crucial one, as it forces us to confront the reality of our own agency and to take responsibility for the aesthetic consequences of our actions.

Climate Change and the Aesthetics of the Anthropocene

The most pressing and profound challenge facing environmental aesthetics today is the reality of climate change. The climate crisis is not just an environmental problem; it is also an aesthetic one. It is changing the way the world looks, sounds, and feels. It is melting glaciers, bleaching coral reefs, and intensifying storms. It is creating a new and unsettling kind of sublime, the sublime of the Anthropocene, in which we are confronted with the terrifying power of our own collective agency.

How are we to aesthetically appreciate a world that is being so profoundly and irrevocably altered by our own actions? Can we find beauty in the midst of destruction? And what is the role of art and aesthetics in a time of ecological crisis? These are some of the urgent questions that environmental aestheticians are now beginning to grapple with. There are no easy answers, but the very act of asking these questions is a crucial first step towards developing a more adequate and responsible aesthetic for the Anthropocene.

Conclusion

Environmental aesthetics is a field in flux, constantly adapting and evolving in response to the changing world around it. From its roots in eighteenth-century philosophy to its contemporary engagement with the challenges of climate change, it has always been a discipline that is deeply engaged with the world. It is a field that reminds us that our aesthetic experience of the environment is not a luxury but a necessity, a fundamental

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

aspect of our humanity. And it is a field that offers us a powerful set of tools for navigating the complexities of the 21st century and for building a more beautiful, just, and sustainable world.

The Philosophical Foundations of Environmental Aesthetics: Disinterestedness and Beyond

To fully understand the theoretical landscape of environmental aesthetics, it is essential to examine one of its most fundamental and contested concepts: disinterestedness. This concept, inherited from eighteenth-century aesthetics, has been central to philosophical discussions about the nature of aesthetic experience. Disinterestedness refers to the idea that aesthetic appreciation is fundamentally different from other forms of human engagement with the world because it is not motivated by personal interest, desire, or utility. When we appreciate the beauty of a sunset, we are not doing so because we want to own it or use it for some practical purpose; we are simply appreciating it for its own sake.

The concept of disinterestedness has deep roots in Western philosophy. Immanuel Kant, whose influence on aesthetics cannot be overstated, argued that the aesthetic judgment of beauty is characterized by a lack of interest. This does not mean that we are indifferent to the object; rather, it means that our appreciation is not based on our personal desires or needs. This distinction is crucial for Kant because it allows him to argue that aesthetic judgments have a kind of universality and objectivity that mere preferences do not. If I say that a painting is beautiful, I am not merely expressing a personal preference; I am making a claim that others ought to agree with me, at least in principle.

However, the concept of disinterestedness has been subject to considerable criticism in contemporary environmental aesthetics. Some philosophers have argued that it is impossible and perhaps even undesirable to completely separate our aesthetic appreciation from our interests and concerns. When we appreciate a forest, for example, we cannot help but be aware of its ecological importance, its role in providing oxygen and storing carbon, its value as a habitat for countless species. To try to appreciate it in a completely disinterested way would be to ignore these crucial dimensions of its significance. Moreover, some have argued that the emphasis on disinterestedness has led to a kind of aesthetic elitism, a tendency to value only those experiences that are detached and contemplative, while dismissing the more engaged and participatory forms of aesthetic experience that are often more meaningful to ordinary people.

In response to these criticisms, many contemporary environmental aestheticians have sought to develop a more nuanced understanding of disinterestedness, one that acknowledges the legitimate role of interest and engagement in aesthetic experience. They argue that we can appreciate something both for its own sake and for its instrumental value, that these two forms of appreciation are not mutually exclusive but can be complementary. A forest can be beautiful both as an object of aesthetic contemplation and as a living ecosystem that sustains life. A river can be appreciated both for the grace and power of its movement and for its role in sustaining human and non-human communities. This more integrated approach to disinterestedness allows us to develop a richer and more meaningful aesthetic engagement with the environment, one that does not require us to ignore or downplay the practical and ethical dimensions of our relationship with nature.

Imagination, Emotion, and the Aesthetic Experience of Nature

Beyond the question of knowledge and disinterestedness, environmental aesthetics must grapple with the complex roles that imagination and emotion play in our aesthetic engagement with the environment. These two faculties have often been undervalued in traditional aesthetics, which has tended to emphasize reason and intellect. However, in environmental aesthetics, imagination and emotion are increasingly recognized as central to aesthetic experience.

The imagination is particularly important in our aesthetic appreciation of nature. It is the faculty that allows us to see beyond the immediate sensory data and to perceive patterns, meanings, and possibilities that are not directly apparent. When we look at a cloud, for example, our imagination allows us to see it as a dragon, a castle, or a sailing ship. When we contemplate a mountain, our imagination allows us to envision the geological forces that shaped it, the countless creatures that inhabit it, the human communities that depend on it. The imagination is what allows us to engage with nature not just as a collection of objects but as a dynamic and meaningful world.

Emotion, too, plays a crucial role in aesthetic experience. The emotions we feel in response to natural environments – awe, wonder, joy, fear, sadness – are not mere accompaniments to aesthetic experience but are integral to it. When we stand on the edge of a vast canyon and feel a sense of awe, that feeling is not separate from our aesthetic appreciation of the canyon; it is part of what makes the experience aesthetic. These emotions can also be important motivators for environmental action. The love we feel for a particular place, the grief we feel at its destruction, the hope we feel for its restoration – these emotions can inspire us to care for and protect the environment in ways that abstract reasoning alone cannot.

However, the role of emotion in aesthetics is complex and sometimes problematic. Emotions can be misleading; they can lead us to make poor aesthetic judgments or to value things for the wrong reasons. Moreover, there is a risk that an over-emphasis on emotion could lead to a kind of sentimentalism, a tendency to value nature primarily for the feelings it evokes in us rather than for its own intrinsic qualities. To address these concerns, many environmental aestheticians have sought to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the relationship between emotion and aesthetic judgment, one that recognizes the value of emotion while also acknowledging the importance of critical reflection and rational evaluation.

Environmental Aesthetics and the Politics of Nature

Finally, it is important to recognize that environmental aesthetics is not a purely theoretical or abstract discipline but is deeply connected to questions of power, politics, and social justice. The way we aesthetically perceive and value the environment has real consequences for how we treat it and for who benefits from its use and protection.

Throughout history, aesthetic judgments about nature have often been shaped by cultural, economic, and political interests. The Romantic movement's celebration of wild nature, for example, was closely connected to the rise of industrial capitalism and the need for a counterbalance to the ugliness and alienation of urban industrial life. The aesthetic idealization of the pastoral landscape, with its small farms and rural villages, has often been used to justify the displacement of indigenous peoples and the appropriation of their lands. The contemporary aesthetic preference for pristine wilderness, untouched by human hands, has led to the creation of national parks and protected areas that often exclude local communities and deny them access to the resources they depend on.

Recognizing these political dimensions of environmental aesthetics is crucial for developing a more just and equitable approach to environmental protection and conservation. It requires us to ask difficult questions about whose aesthetic preferences are being valued and whose are being

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

ignored. It requires us to consider how aesthetic judgments can be used to justify environmental destruction or exploitation. And it requires us to develop alternative aesthetic frameworks that are more inclusive, more attentive to the perspectives and experiences of marginalized communities, and more conscious of the political implications of aesthetic judgments.

This turn towards a more politically engaged environmental aesthetics is one of the most exciting and important developments in the field today. It represents a recognition that aesthetics is not separate from ethics and politics but is deeply intertwined with them. It is a call for environmental aesthetics to move beyond the realm of abstract theory and to engage more directly with the real-world struggles of communities fighting for environmental justice and sustainability.

REFERENCES

1) Andrews, M. (1989). The search for the picturesque: Landscape aesthetics and tourism in Britain, 1760-1800. Stanford University Press.
2) Berleant, A. (1992). The aesthetics of environment. Temple University Press.
3) Brady, E. (2003). Aesthetics of the natural environment. Edinburgh University Press.
4) Brady, E., & Prior, J. (2020). Environmental aesthetics: A synthetic review. People and Nature, 2(2), 254–266. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10089
5) Budd, M. (2002). The aesthetic appreciation of nature. Oxford University Press.
6) Burke, E. (1998). A philosophical enquiry into the origin of our ideas of the sublime and beautiful (A. Phillips, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1757).
7) Callicott, J. B. (1989). In defense of the land ethic: Essays in environmental philosophy. State University of New York Press.
8) Carlson, A. (1979). Appreciation and the natural environment. The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 37(3), 267–275. https://doi.org/10.2307/430781
9) Carlson, A. (2000). Aesthetics and the environment: The appreciation of nature, art and architecture. Routledge.
10) Carlson, A. (2009). Nature and landscape: An introduction to environmental aesthetics. Columbia University Press.
11) Gilpin, W. (1792). Three essays: On picturesque beauty; on picturesque travel; and on sketching landscape. R. Blamire.
12) Hutcheson, F. (2004). An inquiry into the original of our ideas of beauty and virtue in two treatises (W. Leidhold, Ed.). Liberty Fund. (Original work published 1725).
13) Kant, I. (2000). Critique of the power of judgment (P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1790).
14) Leopold, A. (1949). A Sand County almanac, and sketches here and there. Oxford University Press.
15) Parsons, G. (2008). Aesthetics and nature. Continuum.
16) Parsons, G., & Carlson, A. (2024). Environmental aesthetics. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2024 ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/environmental-aesthetics/
17) Saito, Y. (2007). Everyday aesthetics. Oxford University Press.
18) Shapshay, S. (2018). Environmental aesthetics, ethics, and ecoaesthetics. The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 76(4), 399–402. https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12586
19) Thompson, J. (1995). Aesthetics and the value of nature. Environmental Ethics, 17(3), 291–305. https://doi.org/10.5840/enviroethics199517319

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: YinJi, UPSI