

4

ETHICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY IN SPORT¹

Danny Rosenberg

This chapter will examine the ethical grounds for sustainability in sport, with particular reference to the growing awareness of our ethical responsibilities toward the environment. For a number of decades, the term sustainability has gained currency and refers to domains whereby human and non-human developmental goals and strategies are determined and realized. Sustainability is often understood in the contexts of the environment, society, and economy. Even though these three spheres are deeply intertwined, Shearman (1990) argues the latter two contexts are dependent on the first. Therefore, economic growth and social justice are parasitic on how we respond to and achieve environmental sustainability. This is so because human beings and the Earth are finite entities and exist interdependently.

For most of human history, people have viewed nature as an unlimited resource to be exploited for our own economic and social benefit. This prevailing attitude has led to a host of current problems in relation to pollution, clean water and air, waste creation and disposal, shrinking rain forests and ecosystems, biodiversity, global warming, acid rain, inefficient land use, urban sprawl, population explosion, endangered plants and animals, shortages of and genetically modified food sources, and climate change. We now recognize the environment is of vital concern to the current and future well-being of society and individuals and has far-reaching consequences for other species and nature on a global scale. But what does sustainability have to do with sport and its future?

Modern sport has an intimate and ultimate interest in the environment and makes a significant impact on issues related to the welfare of the economy and society. The notion of place or geography is a constitutive feature of what makes sport possible. Each sport is circumscribed by physical space and certain environmental conditions. The rules of sport define how the environment and human-made structures contribute to play to create circumstances whereby games are played under fair conditions for all, at least in principle. If sport is to continue to captivate the interest of human beings, it cannot do so without addressing and being committed to sustainability in all its forms, but primarily to its concern for the environment.

The development of sport, whether for public or private purposes, requires serious attention to the health and welfare of the environment and its influence to improve the economic and social lives of people today and into the future. Whenever public space is devoted for sport and other recreational pursuits, sustainability issues like clean water, air, and land and waste disposal are fundamental factors related to planning and design. For example, a major set of criteria for Olympic Games bids

includes environmental protection and meteorology assessments (International Olympic Committee, 2008b; see Chapter 8 for more details). This is but one example of the connection between sport and sustainability and the need for sport leaders and the public to understand and attend to this dimension of sport. Despite the significance and manifestations of sustainability, both generally and in sport, I will argue that sustainability basically involves making moral choices about how we ought to live and behaving ethically to realize fundamental, shared human values and goods.

In the remainder of this chapter, a more detailed, although not exhaustive, examination of the ethical foundations of sustainability in sport will be presented. I will begin by briefly characterizing the concept of sustainability. The next section will address the ethical grounds for sustainability of the environment. The fourth section will focus on environmental sustainability and sport, and the final section will draw several conclusions about this topic.

A characterization of sustainability

The term *sustainability* has been in use for several decades and is often defined in imprecise, ambiguous terms. To date, there is no consensus on what it means. Some have called the word “elusive,” “contested,” and a “slippery” concept and employ it, as it will be here, interchangeably with sustainable development (Jacobs, 1999; Lélé, 1991; Shearman, 1990). At times, sustainability refers to the process of maintaining and continuing positive change in the economic, ecological, and socio-cultural realms of human and non-human life. It is also linked to the designation of ideals and values and operational objectives, means, and assessments whereby sustainable conditions can be identified and presumably achieved. Kates, Parris, and Leiserowitz (2005) define sustainable development by addressing the history, goals, indicators, values, and practice of this expression, and their approach will be adopted in the section.

As noted elsewhere in this handbook, the 1987 Brundtland Report that emerged from the United Nations Commission on Environment and Development is the most widely cited definition of sustainable development, which is development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 8). In addition to continuity and intergenerational matters, the report elaborated on the need for environmental protection and economic improvement to better humankind.

After the Brundtland Report, a major international meeting on sustainability called the Earth Summit was held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). Although the focus of this conference was on environmental sustainability, it also addressed issues related to poverty, women, and health. The summit produced an action plan known as Agenda 21, a declaration of environmental and developmental principles, a statement of forest principles, and two binding conventions on climate change and biodiversity (UNCED, 1992).

Ten years after the Rio Earth Summit, a World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) took place in Johannesburg, South Africa. The official report of the 2002 WSSD encouraged “the integration of the three components of sustainable development – economic development, social development and environmental protection – as interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars (UN, 2002, p. 8). These three pillars, and some include culture as a fourth pillar, are enshrined in most definitions of sustainability and are reflected in the outcomes of the 2002 WSSD. Thus, key areas within the plan of action included water and sanitation, energy, global warming, biodiversity and natural resources, trade and global economy, health, and corporate accountability (Shah, 2002). By 2002, the concept of sustainability was fully entrenched in the narrative to better the world and the lives of people.

The next major gathering on sustainability was the Rio +20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development held in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012. The main issues addressed were the building of green economies and the elimination of poverty, assistance for developing countries to implement development paths, and improving international coordination of sustainable development (UN, 2012). By the end of the three-day conference, an agreement called *The Future We Want* fell short of expectations. Thus, climate change enforcement lacked teeth, powerful countries asserted their authority, government commitments were lukewarm, and many grassroots organizations and corporations pursued their interests without government approval (Romero & Broder, 2012). The Rio +20 Conference continued to expand the meaning of sustainable development by addressing more diverse issues.

Another approach to define sustainable development refers to the identification of goals it tries to achieve. In September 2000, after a three-day United Nations summit in New York City, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were produced with a 2015 deadline. The eight goals were (1) eradicate extreme hunger and poverty; (2) achieve universal primary education; (3) promote gender equality and empower women; (4) reduce child mortality; (5) improve maternal health; (6) combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases; (7) ensure environmental sustainability; and (8) develop a global partnership for development (UN, 2000b). A 2015 MDGs summary report indicated improvement was realized in many areas within each goal (UN, 2015a). However, the report also acknowledged gender inequality persisted among the poor and in the workforce; large gaps remained between rich and poor countries and urban and rural areas; climate change and environmental degradation continued to pose serious problems; conflicts around the world hampered human development; and millions still lived in poverty without access to basic services. As the MDGs and report show, the goals-oriented approach incorporated the three pillars of sustainable development on many fronts and broadened the meaning of sustainability.

A recent goals-oriented approach to sustainability was implemented in September 2015 when the United Nations General Assembly adopted new guidelines called *Transforming Our World*. This document identified 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) to be attained by 2030, including 169 targets and 304 compliance indicators (UN, 2015b). The 17 goals are

- (1) elimination of poverty,
- (2) end to hunger,
- (3) good health,
- (4) quality education,
- (5) end to gender inequality,
- (6) improve water and sanitation,
- (7) accessible affordable energy,
- (8) economic growth,
- (9) resilient infrastructure,
- (10) reduce inequities,
- (11) create sustainable cities,
- (12) sustainable consumption and production,
- (13) combat climate change,
- (14) conserve oceans,
- (15) enhance biodiversity and preserve forests,
- (16) promote peace and justice, and
- (17) forge partnerships.

These ambitious SDGs have been criticized for not being bold enough and being contradictory between their economic targets and sustainability goals.

In addition to goals, sustainable development is sometimes defined by how it is measured through different indicators and indexes that try to determine whether or not a sustainability project meets its goals. Because there are thousands of sustainable development projects at the local, national, and international levels, tens of thousands of indicators have been generated to evaluate the efficacy of sustainability (Kates et al., 2005). As noted earlier, the 2030 SDGs produced 304 indicators. Such indicators are useful to characterize sustainability because they explicitly and implicitly provide the rates and degree of progress of sustainable goals, they identify stakeholders and sustainable impacts like justice, and they account for the temporal and future-oriented dimensions of sustainability (Fredericks, 2012, 2014).

Underlying any definition of sustainable development are values. A value is typically a belief in or expression of what is desirable in an ideal, object, or behavior worthy of pursuit. The difficulty with stating a specific list of values is related to the following question: What values should be on the list and is the list thorough and sufficient? Perhaps the clearest statement of values that underlie the meaning of sustainability is contained in the 2000 Millennium Declaration. The six basic values are (1) freedom, (2) equality, (3) solidarity, (4) tolerance, (5) respect for nature, and (6) shared responsibility (UN, 2000a). Again, this list of values may be adequate for some and fall short for others, but it does, to a large extent, underscore the meaning of sustainability through its commonly shared tenets and what it is trying to achieve.

Finally, one may understand sustainable development in relation to its instantiation in practice that gives concrete expression to the features listed earlier. However, more than this, according to Kates et al. (2005), sustainability must be understood as a social movement that promotes a particular ideology and involves thousands of government and non-governmental agencies, grassroots organizations, community civic groups, trade unions, educational and religious bodies, corporate responsibility associations, and global solidarity movements. The practice of sustainability is also influenced by geography and affluence, or lack thereof, and is demarcated and set as a priority unevenly around the world. Other parts of the movement try to curtail excessive consumption in rich societies by encouraging people to make do with less. The idea of sustainable development is integrated in many international institutions like the United Nations, World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, and World Bank, as well as the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and other international and national sports organizations. Sustainability is implicated in the scientific community and technology industries that study and provide real solutions to the issues and problems posed by the three pillars of sustainable development. In fact, the latter have provided the impetus to take seriously and reach just and lasting compromises between the well-being of the environment, economic growth, and improving the lives of people.

In sum, sustainability will likely remain an ambiguous, fluid concept that encompasses many issues and challenges in diverse contexts. Yet despite its many interpretations, characteristics, and criticisms, there is acceptable agreement among most people that it is a positive ideal and the processes it establishes are worth pursuing.

Ethical grounds for environmental sustainability

As mentioned in the introduction, this chapter will take the position, arguably so, that environmental sustainability supports and is the basis of the economic and socio-cultural pillars of sustainable development. As such, the main focus of the remainder of this chapter will focus on sustainability of the environment, ethics, and sport.

Concerns about the environment and what to do about issues related to it are decidedly contentious matters. The first item in the ecological sustainability debate is the establishment of the need to be concerned. Although most can agree that climate change, pollution, biodiversity,

habitat, population, lifestyle, and technology are important factors that influence contemporary life in profound ways, the extent of their impact on the environment, society, and the economy leads to much disagreement. There are a number of schools of thought when it comes to the ethics of environmental sustainability, and only three prominent approaches and their variants will be examined here as discussed by Curry (2006) and others.

The first of these is called light green or shallow ethics and exemplifies an anthropocentric perspective (Barry, 2002). This human-centered approach may be understood in at least two senses. The first merely states that all values are generated by and for human beings as a factual matter. Therefore, any ecological sustainability discussion about the Earth and non-human beings will always involve human-centered interests and priorities. However, what this view does not capture is the idea that human beings may not be the core recipients or subjects of human interests. If non-human beings and entities are never given priority by people, then anthropocentrism takes on a second sense whereby it discriminates for no good reason and ignores a “concern for nonhuman lives and life forms for their sake rather than for our own” (Wenz, 2001, p. 13; see also Chapter 26).

The latter meaning of anthropocentrism characterizes light green ethics. On this view environmental sustainability issues are identified and dealt with as means toward the fulfillment of human goals, desires, and aspirations (Kohak, 2000). Human beings are the only ones capable of acting on behalf of nature and non-human beings to sustain the totality of life on Earth. Whereas non-human animals typically fend for themselves and nature just is, people have the capacity to engage other sentient beings and non-sentient entities to ensure human life flourishes (Davidson, 2000).

It is rather clear that light green ethics operates from a self-interested perspective where concern for the environment is limited and exploitation of resources is permitted to a certain degree. Encroaching on nature is mostly fueled by consumerism – the notion that human well-being is achieved by greater wealth and increased levels of consumption (O’Hara, 1998). The anthropocentric view is also supported in traditional religious thought. In the modern age, utilitarian proponents advocate human ends such as personal and collective happiness. On a utilitarian calculus, shared human interests and communal goods mainly take precedence and are the primary standard by which to gauge conflicts with environmental problems (Merchant, 2005).

The second sustainable ecological ethics approach is known as mid-green or intermediate ethics (Curry, 2006). Here, social theorists extend anthropocentrism and recognize the intrinsic value of other sentient beings. However, when human and non-human values are in conflict, human goals and interests are usually judged superior. There are at least two strands of this approach related specifically to non-human sentient beings. The first focuses on the liberation of animals based on the fact that animals suffer and feel pain just as humans. Two practical outcomes of mid-green ecological ethics are that people should become vegetarians and scientific experimentation using non-human animals should cease. Those who do not agree with these consequences are sometimes accused of speciesism, an unjustifiable and arbitrary prejudice where the interests of one species over another is held for no good reason, something only humans can determine.

The second strand of intermediate sustainable ecological ethics is called biocentrism, which stresses a fundamental and unconditional respect for every organism that makes up the natural world (Norton, 2007). Supported by a universal belief that each organism possesses inherent worth, such an attitude requires that rational beings have a duty to advance the good all organisms naturally try to realize. A difficulty with biocentrism is its rationalistic foundation which makes certain practical considerations untenable when two goods are in conflict. A second criticism is the inability of biocentrism to deal with organisms in a collective way as species and their interdependence within larger ecosystems.

The final ecological sustainable ethics approach embraces a holistic perspective and is known as dark green or eco-centric ethics (Curry, 2006). There are many strands of dark green ethics,

but generally they incorporate ideas linked to the value and integrity of human and non-human species and ecosystems, expectations of conflicts between these entities, and occasionally allowing non-human interests to prevail. One version of eco-centrism is known as the Land Ethic introduced by pioneer American conservationist Aldo Leopold (1887–1948). This view places a premium on granting ultimate concern for the preservation and flourishing of ecosystems. Judging between right and wrong from a Land Ethic perspective often requires an appeal to utilitarian principles where costs and benefits are weighed and the greatest good is advanced for the good of the majority (Banon Gomis, Parra, Hoffman, & McNulty, 2011). A difficulty with this particular stance is its emphasis on community where its members may be interdependent but little or no reciprocity exists between them. Moreover, by giving privilege to ecosystems, the Land Ethic viewpoint sometimes has no easy solution when certain opposing values arise, especially when choosing between doing what is good for the environment at large and one's personal preferences.

A second strand of dark green ethics known as deep ecology was founded in the 1970s by Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess. According to Naess, a new radical ecological paradigm is needed based on a totality of relational experiences of humans and all life forms. Through maturation and identification, people are able to care about entities and those whom they do not know personally. Therefore, humans have the capacity to empathize with and try to alleviate the suffering and pain of other beings the world over. Ultimately for some, this identification can expand to caring about the whole of existence, what Naess calls self-realization, such that we are united with the entire universe beyond the individual self (Wenz, 2001). An enriched human life, one that aspires to achieve deep satisfaction, requires a profound engagement in the world in all its human and non-human diversity. Having described three major ethical approaches of environmental sustainability, the next section will present an admittedly limited discussion of ecological sustainability and sport.

Environmental sustainability and sport

The sheer magnitude of all manner of sport participation throughout the world provides sufficient evidence to take seriously the influence of sport on sustainability and especially in relation to the environment. This concern is also evident in the growing body of literature related to sport and sustainability generally and environmental sustainability in particular (Barker, Barker-Ruchti, Wals, & Tinning, 2014; Brymer, Downey, & Gray, 2009; Camporesi & Knuckles, 2014; Chard, Mallen, & Bradish, 2013; Collins, Flynn, Munday, & Roberts, 2007; Dingle, 2009; Dolles & Soderman, 2010; Horton & Zakus, 2010; Lindsey, 2008; Loland, 2006; Mallen, Adams, Stevens, & Thompson, 2010; Mallen & Chard, 2011, 2012; Mallen, Stevens, & Adams, 2011; Mallen, Stevens, Adams, & McRoberts, 2010; May, 1995; Paquette, Stevens, & Mallen, 2011; Schmidt, 2006; Smith, 2009; Trendafilova, Babiak, & Heinze, 2013).

The deep interest in sport is not surprising given that millions of people play sport and the expansive infrastructure needed to support our competitive and health-conscious zeal is staggering and comes at a sustainable environmental cost. If one considers the diverse natural and human-made physical spaces of sport, the amount of pollution and waste related to sport, and numerous ecological hazards created by sport, it comes as no surprise that the impact of sport on the environment and the environment on sport has gained serious attention. As stated earlier, this interest is fundamentally grounded in ethics that support commonly shared values and practices, now and into the future, and fulfills a vision of how we wish to live.

Today, numerous organizations are specifically devoted to the development and promotion of green sports, another term that describes environmental sustainability. Lindsey (2008) identifies four levels of sustainability related to sports development, namely, the individual, community, organizational, and institutional. Today, many individuals in sports clubs and school and

community-based sports programs support and engage in sustainable practices. Further, most major professional sports leagues now have directors and divisions that oversee environmental issues, and all levels of government in many countries have environmental ministries and departments to ensure that the delivery of sports and recreation programs complies with ecological standards. The following will briefly highlight the efforts of some of these bodies.

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), for example, has a special unit dedicated to sports and the environment. Its mandate is to enhance public awareness of environmental issues related to sport and promote sports facilities and the manufacture of sporting goods that are eco-friendly (UNEP, 2009). The presence of sport and sporting events themselves leaves a substantial ecological footprint (Schmidt, 2006). In many instances, sport disrupts fragile ecosystems and makes use of scarce land; produces more air, water, soil, and noise pollution; consumes non-renewable and natural resources at high levels; adds to the emission of greenhouse gases through inefficient energy use; contributes to the depletion of the ozone layer; and generates enormous waste (UNEP, 2009). UNEP operates many general programs, workshops, and summits around the world to advance safer and healthier environments, and it also works closely with the IOC.

In the 1990s, the IOC formally added to the pillars of sport and culture environmental protection as the third dimension of the Olympic Movement (Paquette et al., 2011). In 1995, the IOC established the Sport and Environment Commission, included an environmental paragraph in the Olympic Charter in 1996, and accepted Agenda 21 in 1999 to encourage sustainable development. The 1998 Nagano Winter Olympics in Japan was the first Games to follow the IOC's new environment policy. Since then, all Olympic Games bids must adhere to a set of environmental criteria if a host city wishes to stage one of the world's most popular mega sporting events (Cantelon & Letters, 2000; IOC, 2008a). The IOC also produced a comprehensive guide and manual to spell out the principles and practical ways to achieve green sports (IOC, 2005).

Since 1994, the IOC has joined with UNEP to enhance awareness and educate people on sport and sustainable development. A number of biennial World Conferences on sport and the environment have been held, the most recent in October–November 2013 in Sochi, Russia. Although ecological sustainable theories, environmental requirements, and practical implementation recommendations are now fully entrenched within the Olympic Movement which no host city can ignore, how well environmental initiatives succeed in any given Olympiad is still contentious (Horton & Zakus, 2010).

For example, the environmental report card for Canada's Vancouver Winter Olympics in 2010, known as the "sustainability" Games, contains mixed scores. On the plus side, the Olympic Village built in the False Creek area achieved an LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver achievement rating (Lew, 2010). The village is now part of a sustainable neighborhood. Sustainable transportation was highlighted at Vancouver 2010, as well as carbon emissions and water quality tracking, the relocation of habitats, and low emission generators to reduce greenhouse gas. On the negative side, the most contentious issue was the failed but valiantly fought campaign to save the Eagleridge Bluffs from the expansion of the Sea to Skyway highway, part of the 120-kilometer distance between Vancouver and Whistler (Lenskyj, 2008). Tree and some habitat loss, plus chemically produced snow, were other environmentally harmful results (Shaw, 2008). As mentioned, the environmental report card for the "sustainable" Games in Vancouver contained high and low scores.

In addition to the Olympic Games, the trend to go green has found its way into professional franchise sport in the United States and Canada. In 2008, Major League Baseball (MLB) implemented a league-wide environmental protection strategy in conjunction with the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). Each MLB team makes use of a web-based software tool called Team Greening Program to assess and seek advice on many environmental factors

like energy use, waste management, recycling programs, purchasing, concession operations, and transportation (MLB, 2008). The National Football League (NFL) has an environmental program with a director, and over the past 15 years, several green initiatives have been implemented in staging the Super Bowl. Recent Super Bowls divert about 70 percent of waste material that would end up in landfills; décor, building materials, and office supplies are reused; and the planting of thousands of trees helps offset greenhouse gas emissions (Lennon, 2008).

The National Basketball Association (NBA) also teamed up with the NRDC and launched a green initiative in 2009 during All-Star week in Phoenix, Arizona. Since then, the NBA encourages and assists all teams to become more aware of environmental issues especially in the areas of community-based initiatives, transportation, waste, and arena and event management (Berry, 2009; NBA, 2009). Since 2008, the National Hockey League (NHL) has partnered with the NRDC and the GreenLife organization to implement its green program. The NHL Players Association has over 400 players committed to an initiative called the Carbon Neutral Challenge that tries to offset carbon emissions by buying travel credits with a Montreal-based non-profit organization (Love, 2009).

One professional and amateur sport that continues to have a dramatic impact on the environment and has come under serious scrutiny is golf. The proliferation of golf is a global phenomenon, with expansion in Asia particularly acute and where environmental laws have been and are less stringent. Some of these impacts include clearing of natural vegetation, deforestation, changes in topography, soil erosion, use of chemicals harmful to animals and humans, disrupting or destroying wildlife habitats and ecosystems, genetically engineered grass, and excessive water consumption (Wheeler & Nauright, 2006).

For over a decade, a number of organizations have been formed to make golf eco-friendly. For example, in the United States, the Golf & the Environment Initiative, founded in 1995, is one of the leading advocates dedicated to making sure golf protects and enhances the environment (GEI, 2009). In Canada, the Royal Canadian Golf Association has a green section devoted to research, turf management, and initiatives and programs to promote responsible environmental activities (RCGA, 2009). However, the Global Anti-Golf Movement which began in Japan in 1993 is one of the most vocal opponents of golf course development (Maguire, Jarvie, Mansfield, & Bradley, 2002). Other organizations are critical of certain golf practices, like Beyond Pesticides, which is opposed to the use of pesticides in the golf industry (Barton, 2008). The environmental controversies surrounding golf are extremely complex, yet despite the criticisms, there is an effort to make the sport sustainable for future generations to enjoy.

Another relevant area that influences sport and the environment is the role played by government agencies. In the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the national body that oversees and regulates the health and safety of the environment. The main sport areas of oversight involve fishing and hunting; however, the EPA partners with many leagues and teams to assist with green initiatives, especially in facilities management (EPA, 2009). In the case of golf development, the EPA Wetlands Division regulates excavations and the reconfiguration of land in and around aquatic areas (Barton, 2008). Natural Resources Canada is the federal body that governs the environment in Canada and, like its U.S. counterpart, it regulates hunting and fishing. However, another federal agency, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), has a Green Municipal Fund to assist communities in achieving higher environmental standards in different areas including sports and recreations facilities (FCM, 2009).

Individual states and provinces have government agencies modeled on federal bureaucratic structures that regulate sustainable development, water and air quality, conservation, natural resources, and other environmental areas. These bodies work closely with the private sector and with other public agencies like those that manage state and provincial parks, sports facilities, and sports programs. Similarly, major cities throughout the United States and Canada, like Seattle, Vancouver, San

Francisco, Chicago, and Toronto, have upper-level managers, departments, commissions, and review bodies that oversee environmental initiatives (cf. City of Toronto Environmental Portal, 2009). Municipalities have the most direct control and influence on people's lives and behavioral change in relation to the environment, including those that influence sport participation.

In addition to international bodies, professional leagues and teams, and government agencies that have a stake and interest in the environment, non-profit environmental organizations operate at the local, national, and international levels. An Internet search reveals over 3,800 grassroots ecological organizations around the world, and almost 2,300 of them are found in the United States (Environment and Nature Organizations, 2009). Some of these groups are well known like Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, World Wildlife Fund, and others who focus on global and local areas of environmental sustainability. Part of their efforts and initiatives has an influence on the production, delivery, and implementation of green sports.

Conclusion

As the earlier text has shown, the growing awareness of sustainability issues in so many areas of contemporary life is inescapable, and this includes sport. Responding to environmental and other sustainable challenges will not only require practical and technical changes, but an ethical response as well. Like all those who work in the private and public sectors, sport leaders and managers must comply with environmental and other sustainability laws, rules, and regulations that apply to their respective place of business and/or community. Beyond such conformity, to what extent should these individuals and all sport stakeholders be ethically responsible to the environment, as well as the sustainability of society, culture, and the economy? The following will offer a brief answer to this question.

Just as going green has influenced our everyday lives to some extent, sport today is following the same pattern. More people are aware of ecological and other sustainability problems and are demanding that governments, businesses, and sport address these issues and change their practices. This does not mean that if people recycle at home and use recycle bins at the ballpark they are radical eco-activists. From an ethical perspective, sport organizations, managers, and most industries operate at a basic level of ecological ethics – the light green ethics examined earlier. This means that human interests and happiness are primary values that usually trump contentious environmental and other sustainable needs. This is not a blanket conclusion because there are categories of sport like animal sports that operate, in principle anyway, with due regard for the welfare of animals. There may even be some sports, perhaps nature sports, that are structured and organized from an eco-centric approach whereby the worth of non-human beings and nature are inherently valued, sometimes above human interests. Rather than look to one or the other of these theories to know what sort of responsibility the sport community ought to have toward sustainability, perhaps a different approach is worth considering.

DeJardins (2006) proposes a view known as environmental pragmatism that outlines four areas of consensus in dealing with different ecological sustainable values and responsibilities. First, most people would agree that pollution ought to be reduced and waste be efficiently and safely disposed of because of their significant harm to people and the biosphere. Second, renewable resources should be favored over nonrenewable resources wherever feasible to create greater efficiencies and sustainability for future generations. Third, there should be agreement to preserve sensitive natural settings, habitats, wetlands, and ecosystems to sustain landscapes, plants, and animals in a balanced way with human development in urban and rural areas. Finally, responsibility is needed to encourage biodiversity and healthy and safe food sources to ensure flourishing ecosystems. If consensus in these four areas is reasonable and practical with

regard to environmental sustainability, then the sport community at all organizational levels ought to subscribe to this pragmatic approach, and in many ways, it is already doing so.

On this view, sport leaders and managers need to be creative and forward thinking on sustainability issues when it comes to structuring, organizing, planning, promoting, governing, and delivering sport. Taking on responsibility for the environment in the ways described earlier at all levels of public and private sport, in conjunction with many allied stakeholders, makes for good practice and is critical for the future of sport and the world at large. People in the sport community today want to see that corporations, institutions, governments, and grassroots organizations attend to environmental and other sustainability issues when they participate in sport, buy equipment and apparel, and support sport in myriad ways. They want to know that the sport industry is doing its fair share by assuming greater responsibility for the sustainability of the environment, society, culture, and the economy like many other industries. Engaging in sustainable practices is rooted in ethical behavior, and as such, sport leaders, organizations, and institutions will have to be innovative, balance costs and overall benefits, and demonstrate tangibly to stakeholders that the one world we live in and the betterment of people's lives must be valued and preserved for ourselves and future generations.

Note

1 This chapter is revised and expanded from the following:

DeSensi, J. T., & Rosenberg, D. (2010). Concern for the environment. In *Ethics and morality in sport management* (3rd ed., pp. 257–269). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Rosenberg, D. (2012). Light green ethics and the Olympic Games movement. In G. Tymowski & C. Weaving (Eds.), *Proceedings of sport and the environment: Philosophical dimensions conference* (pp. 62–70). Antigonish, NS: St. Francis Xavier University.

References

- Banon Gomis, A. J., Parra, M. G., Hoffman, W. M., & McNulty, R. E. (2011). Rethinking the concept of sustainability. *Business and Society Review*, 116, 171–191.
- Barker, D., Barker-Ruchti, N., Wals, A., & Tinning, R. (2014). High performance sport and sustainability: A contradiction in terms? *Reflective Practice*, 15, 1–11.
- Barry, J. (2002). The ethical foundations of a sustainable society. In T. Fitzpatrick & M. Cahill (Eds.), *Environment and welfare: Towards a green social policy* (pp. 21–42). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barton, J. (2008, May). How green is golf? *Golf Digest*, 59(5), 196.
- Berry, J. (2009, February 9). NBA going green for All-Star events. *The Arizona Republic*. Retrieved from www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/local/articles/2009/02/09/20090209allstar-green0209.html
- Brymer, E., Downey, G., & Gray, T. (2009). Extreme sports as a precursor to environmental sustainability. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 14, 193–204.
- Camporesi, S., & Knuckles, J. A. (2014). Shifting the burden of proof in doping: Lessons from environmental sustainability applied to high-performance sport. *Reflective Practice*, 15, 106–118.
- Cantelon, H., & Letters, M. (2000). The making of the IOC environmental policy as the third dimension of the Olympic movement. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 35, 294–308.
- Chard, C., Mallen, C., & Bradish, C. (2013). Marketing and environmental sustainability in the sport sector: Developing a research agenda for action. *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 3, 33–44.
- City of Toronto Environmental Portal. (2009). Retrieved from www.toronto.ca/environment/
- Collins, A., Flynn, A., Munday, M., & Roberts, A. (2007). Assessing the environmental consequences of major sport events: The 2003/04 FA Cup Final. *Urban Studies*, 44, 457–476.
- Curry, P. (2006). *Ecological ethics: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Davidson, J. (2000). Sustainable development: Business as usual or a new way of living? *Environmental Ethics*, 22, 25–42.

- DeJardins, J. (2006). *An introduction to business ethics* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dingle, G. (2009). Sustaining the race: A review of literature pertaining to the environmental sustainability of motorsport. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 11, 80–96.
- Dolles, H., & Soderman, S. (2010). Addressing ecology and sustainability in mega-sporting events: The 2006 Football World Cup in Germany. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 16, 603–616.
- Environment and Nature Organizations. (2009). Retrieved from http://dir.yahoo.com/Society_and_Culture/environment_and_nature/organizations
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (2009). *EPA, New York Giants and New York Jets team up to make new Meadowlands stadium a beacon of "green."* Retrieved from <http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/advpress.nsf/a883dc3da7094f97852572a00065d7d8/eb8bd7874db85f38852575c8005452a8!OpenDocument>
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM). (2009). Retrieved from www.fcm.ca/english/View.asp?mp=472&cx=666
- Fredericks, S. E. (2012). Justice in sustainability indicators and indexes. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 19, 490–499.
- Fredericks, S. E. (2014). *Measuring and evaluating sustainability: Ethics in sustainability indexes*. London: Routledge.
- Golf & the Environment Initiative (GEI). (2009). Retrieved from <http://golfandenvironment.com>
- Horton, P., & Zakus, D. H. (2010). How green will my (Lea) Valley be? Olympic aspirations: Rhetoric or reality. *The International Journals of the History of Sport*, 27, 2677–2709.
- International Olympic Committee (IOC). (2005). *Manual on sport and the environment*. International Olympic Committee: Lausanne.
- International Olympic Committee (IOC). (2008a). *Factsheet: Environment and sustainable development*. International Olympic Committee: Lausanne.
- International Olympic Committee (IOC). (2008b). *IOC technical evaluation criteria*. Retrieved from www.gamesbids.com/english/archives/2008eval.shtml
- Jacobs, M. (1999). Sustainable development as a contested concept. In A. Dobson (Ed.), *Fairness and futurity: Essays on environmental sustainability and social justice* (pp. 21–48). New York and Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kates, R. W., Parris, T. M., & Leiserowitz, A. A. (2005). What is sustainable development? Goals, indicators, values and practice. *Environment*, 47(3), 8–21.
- Kohak, E. (2000). *The green-halo: A bird's-eye view of ecological ethics*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Lélé, S. M. (1991). Sustainable development: A critical review. *World Development*, 19, 607–621.
- Lennon, L. (2008, February 2). Arizona, NFL going green for Super Bowl. *WBZTV*. Retrieved from <http://wbztv.com/seenon/Global.Warming.Environment.2.644458.html>
- Lenskyj, H. J. (2008). *Olympic industry resistance: Challenging Olympic power and propaganda*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Law, J. (2010, February 12). Vancouver 2010: The most environmentally friendly Olympics yet? *Good Environment*. Retrieved from www.good.is/post/vancouver-2010-the-most-environmentally-friendly-olympics-yet/
- Lindsey, I. (2008). Conceptualising sustainability in sports development. *Leisure Studies*, 27, 279–294.
- Loland, S. (2006). Olympic sport and the ideal of sustainable development. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33, 144–156.
- Love, N. (2009, March 26). NHL players join environmental challenge. *The National Post*. Retrieved from <http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/postedsports/archive/2009/03/26/nhl-players-join-environmental-challenge.aspx>
- Maguire, J., Jarvie, G., Mansfield, L., & Bradley, J. (2002). *Sport world: A sociological perspective*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Major League Baseball (MLB). (2008). *Major League Baseball goes green in collaboration with the Natural Resources Defense Council*. Retrieved from http://chicago.cubs.mlb.com/news/press_releases/press_release.jsp?ymd=20080311&content_id=2418580&vkey=pr_mlb&fext=.jsp&c_id=mlb
- Mallen, C., Adams, L. J., Stevens, J., & Thompson, L. (2010). Environmental sustainability in sport facility management: A Delphi study. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 10, 367–389.
- Mallen, C., & Chard, C. (2011). A framework for debating the future of environmental sustainability in the sport academy. *Sport Management Review*, 14, 424–433.
- Mallen, C., & Chard, C. (2012). "What could be" in Canadian sport facility environmental sustainability. *Sport Management Review*, 15, 230–243.

- Mallen, C., Stevens, J., & Adams, L. J. (2011). A content analysis of environmental sustainability research in a sport-related journal sample. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25, 240–256.
- Mallen, C., Stevens, J., Adams, L. J., & McRoberts, S. (2010). The assessment of the environmental performance of an international multi-sport event. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 10, 97–122.
- May, V. (1995). Environmental implications of the 1992 Winter Olympic Games. *Tourism Management*, 16, 269–275.
- Merchant, C. (2005). *Radical ecology: The search for a livable world* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- NBA tips off inaugural green week for environmental awareness. (2009, April 2). *Sports Business Daily*. Retrieved from www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/article/129062
- Norton, B. (2007). Ethics and sustainable development: An adaptive approach to environmental choice. In G. Atkinson, S. Dietz, & E. Neumayer (Eds.), *Handbook of sustainable development* (pp. 27–44). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- O'Hara, S. U. (1998). Economics, ethics and sustainability: Redefining connections. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 25, 43–62.
- Paquette, J., Stevens, J., & Mallen, C. (2011). The IOC: An interpretation of environmental sustainability, 1994–2008. *Sport in Society*, 14, 355–369.
- Romero, S., & Broder, J. M. (2012, June 23). Progress on the sidelines as Rio conference ends. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2012/06/24/world/americas/rio20-conference-ends-with-some-progress-on-the-sidelines.html?_r=0
- Royal Canadian Golf Association (RCGA). (2009). *Golf and the environment*. Retrieved from www.rcga.org/innerpage.aspx?x=XrdhG%2fmCc93KaNBSQXQlxSoA8KFEoFTRkETNx2UWD3FGXW1EMuxExVvbF1PUkaqaDY4YN0Tt3E%3d
- Schmidt, C. W. (2006). Putting the earth in play: Environmental awareness in sports. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 114, A286–A295.
- Shah, A. (2002, September 7). World summit on sustainable development. *Global Issues*. Retrieved from www.globalissues.org/article/366/world-summit-on-sustainable-development
- Shaw, C. A. (2008). *Five ring circus: Myths and realities of the Olympic Games*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society.
- Shearman, R. (1990). The meaning and ethics of sustainability. *Environmental Management*, 14, 1–8.
- Smith, A. (2009). Theorising the relationship between major sport events and social sustainability. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 14, 109–120.
- Trendafilova, S., Babiak, K., & Heinze, K. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability: Why professional sport is greening the playing field. *Sport Management Review*, 16, 298–313.
- United Nations (UN). (2000a). *United Nations millennium declaration*. Retrieved from www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm
- United Nations (UN). (2000b). *United Nations millennium development goals*. Retrieved from www.unmillenniumproject.org/goals/
- United Nations (UN). (2002). *Report of the world summit on sustainable development*. Retrieved from www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/131302_wssd_report_reissued.pdf
- United Nations (UN). (2012). *Rio +20 United Nations conference on sustainable development*. Retrieved from www.uncsd2012.org/about.html
- United Nations (UN). (2015a). *Millennium development goals summary report*. Retrieved from www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20Summary%20web_english.pdf
- United Nations (UN). (2015b). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. Retrieved from www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E
- United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). (1992). *The earth summit*. Retrieved from www.un.org/geninfo/bp/enviro.html
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2009). *Sport and the environment*. Retrieved from www.unep.org/sport_env/
- Wenz, P. S. (2001). *Environmental ethics today*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wheeler, K., & Nauright, J. (2006). A global perspective on the environmental impact on golf. *Sport in Society*, 9, 427–443.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.