MEDWIN PUBLISHERS
Committed to Create Value for Researchers

Annals of Bioethics & Clinical Applications
ISSN: 2691-5774

Conceptual Synergies in Ethics, Environmental Health, and the Spiritual Dimension Indicate That a Health-Centred Approach to Climate Change Can Address Its Ethical Challenges.

Bhatt M*

Surgeon, Author, Public Health Consultant, India

***Corresponding author:** Mahesh Batt Surgeon, Author, Public Health Consultant MD and CEO, MMBSHS Trust, Dehradun, India

Research Article

Volume 9 Issue 4

Received Date: November 19, 2026

Published Date: November 27, 2026

DOI: 10.23880/abca-16000295

Abstract

This article examines the conceptual convergence of ethics, environmental health, and spirituality in support of a health-centered approach to climate change and its ethical challenges. It is grounded in the recognition that climate change threatens human health and that exposure to polluted air remains nearly universal worldwide. We examined the constituent thought structures underlying these domains to identify potential synergies for addressing the ethical challenges of climate change. The four fundamental principles of ethics yield 12 constituent thoughts: respect for autonomy (2), justice (4), beneficence (4), and nonmaleficence (2). Spirituality comprises four constituent thoughts—connecting, correcting, balancing, and communicating—within the broader ecosystem of thought. Environmental health comprises five constituent thoughts: justice, prevention, promotion, rights, and equity. Their content, intent, and purpose align with health-related human values and suggest a conceptual basis for cooperation and collaboration, although prevailing global approaches often remain insufficiently holistic.

At both individual and collective levels, these synergies and balances may influence politics and policy by strengthening cooperation, collaboration, equity, and justice. Together, these four pillars of climate change and health provide a conceptual basis for addressing the ethical challenges of this interconnected crisis and for attracting broader synergistic action and global attention.

Keywords: Climate Change; Environmental Health; Bioethics; Spirituality; Health Equity

Introduction

Climate change and environmental degradation are increasingly recognized as major global public health challenges with profound ethical and legal implications. The World Health Organization estimates that approximately 99% of the world's population is exposed to air pollution levels that exceed recommended safety limits, thereby contributing substantially to the global burden of disease [1]. These harms are distributed inequitably, disproportionately affecting vulnerable and marginalized populations and raising urgent concerns about justice, equity, and the protection of fundamental health rights. In this context, climate change must be understood not only as an environmental and biomedical issue, but also as a matter of bioethical significance requiring sustained legal and policy attention [2]. Ethics provides a normative framework for understanding climate change as a challenge not only to ecosystems and public health, but also to justice, human rights, and responsible governance.

The health consequences of climate change- including increased morbidity, displacement, food and water insecurity, and the worsening of existing health inequalities—

underscore the need for interdisciplinary frameworks that can inform ethical reflection, legal analysis, and regulatory action [3]. These harms engage core bioethical principles, particularly justice, nonmaleficence, beneficence, and respect for human dignity, and support the view that climate inaction is both an ethical and a policy failure [4]. In this setting, health law provides mechanisms through which states may prevent foreseeable harm, mitigate structural inequities, and protect present and future populations.

Human thought processes may be understood as evolved cognitive and moral capacities through which individuals and societies interpret problems, assign value, and justify action. Ethics and law emerge from these processes as normative frameworks that guide conduct, decision-making, and social responsibility [5]. In the context of climate change, they help evaluate what is right, just, and beneficial amid competing interests across individuals, communities, institutions, and generations.

Within this broader framework, ethics may be understood as the systematic articulation of moral principles, values, and duties that guide human conduct, social responsibility, and collective decision-making. Because climate change and environmental degradation involve competing interests across individuals, communities, institutions, and generations, ethical reasoning is indispensable to evaluating what is right, just, and beneficial in both public policy and social action [6]. Spirituality, understood here as a dimension of meaning, interconnectedness, and moral responsibility, offers an additional conceptual resource for motivating engagement with these challenges [7]. This study therefore examines the conceptual synergies among ethics, environmental health, and the spiritual dimension, with particular emphasis on their relevance to bioethics and health law. It argues that a health-centered approach to climate change, grounded in ethical reflection and supported by legal responsibility, can help address its ethical challenges by strengthening cooperation, solidarity, and justice-oriented action at both individual and collective levels.

Methods

Climate change and environmental degradation are complex problems with multidimensional causes, far-reaching consequences, and no single straightforward solution. As a result, they generate interconnected ethical and legal questions that require integrative conceptual analysis. In this study, we used a conceptually grounded analytical approach to examine the foundational thought structures underlying the four principles of bioethics-autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice-as well as related frameworks in environmental health, law, and climate action. We treated these domains as products of broader human thought processes, each comprising constituent ideas that shape how problems are defined, values are prioritized, and corrective actions are justified at both individual and collective levels. By identifying and examining these constituent thoughts and their internal logic, we explored points of conceptual convergence among ethics, environmental health, and the spiritual dimension. This approach enabled us to assess their potential synergies in addressing the ethical challenges posed by climate change and in supporting a health-centered response.

Results

Our conceptual analysis indicates that ethics, environmental health, and spirituality converge around a coherent set of value-bearing thought structures directly relevant to climate change as a health and ethical challenge. Ethics, as a product of philosophical thought, addresses responsibility, fairness, prevention of harm, protection of human dignity, and human values in the service of the common good. Bioethics, as applied ethics, extends this normative framework to medicine, public health, the life sciences, biotechnology, and, increasingly, artificial intelligence. Within this framework, four foundational principles organize ethical reasoning: autonomy, which safeguards human dignity and the capacity for informed decision-making; beneficence, which obliges action to promote well-being and benefit others; nonmaleficence, which requires the avoidance of harm; and justice, which concerns the fair distribution of benefits, resources, risks, and burdens. We identified the constituent thought processes underlying each of these four principles as follows:

- **Autonomy – two Constituent Thoughts:** human dignity and informed decision-making, both of which are interlinked and interdependent. Human dignity encompasses the philosophical, social, and scientific thought processes that generate ideas of humanity and human values at individual and collective levels.
- **Beneficence – four Constituent Thoughts:** obligation, promoting or motivating, well-being, and benefiting. These constituent thoughts are governed by the idea of obligation, which renders human values binding on individuals, groups, communities, countries, and, ultimately, humanity as a whole.
- **Nonmaleficence – two constituent Thoughts:** do no harm and protection of life.
- **Justice – four Constituent Thoughts:** fairness, equity, equality, and uniformity in the distribution of resources, benefits, burdens, and risks.

Taken together, these findings identify 12 constituent thoughts that shape the broader human thought process of ethics, operating across both individual and collective spheres of human action. This conceptual structure provides

Copyright © Bhatt M.

a clear ethical foundation for interpreting climate change not only as an environmental problem but also as a matter of health, responsibility, and justice.

The concept of environmental health similarly reveals a structured normative orientation. It addresses the effects of physical, chemical, biological, and social environmental conditions on human health, with climate change and global warming acting as major determinants of these conditions. Our analysis identified five constituent thoughts within its fundamental principles:

- **Prevention:** prevention of harm, which means protecting life.
- **Protection:** protection of human health, which implies protection of humanity.
- **Equity:** a commitment to justice.
- **Health promotion:** support for health and, by extension, support for life.
- **Responsibility:** rights-based and grounded in human values.

Our analysis further situates these frameworks within a broader ecosystem of human thought processes generated by the human brain and constitutive of the human mind. These may be grouped into four broad domains—social, scientific, philosophical, and spiritual—ranging from more primitive to more evolved forms of thought. Within this framework, the spiritual thought process represents the most evolved domain and is characterized by four constituent thoughts:

- **Connectedness:** connection with the wider universe beyond its physical dimensions and with the ideas generated by other thought processes.
- **Correcting:** the creation of purpose, transformation, and moral direction within the ecosystem of human thought processes, including ethical meaning. It provides positive direction for ideas shaped by humanity and human values.
- **Communicating:** facilitation of communication among social, scientific, and philosophical thought processes, allowing spirituality to engage productively with religious, philosophical, and scientific modes of thought.
- **Balancing:** as the most evolved human thought process, spirituality functions as an inner and outer balancing mechanism within the ecosystem of thought at both individual and collective levels. These characteristics make it an important resource for defining human health and for supporting both the prevention and the promotion of health through the creation of inner and outer balance.

Taken together, this complex ecosystem of thought processes appears to orient toward the evolution of human values-ideas of what is good, right, desirable, and worthy at both individual and collective levels. These values arise from enduring principles, standards, and ideals that guide judgment, relationships, and social responsibility. In conceptual terms, they function as the normative bridge linking ethics, environmental health, and spirituality. The foundational constituent thoughts of human values identified in this analysis are as follows:

- **Human Dignity:** the intrinsic worth of everyone.
- **Respect:** for autonomy, differences, and shared humanity.
- **Responsibility:** obligation towards the well-being of oneself, society, and the natural world.
- **Justice:** commitment to fairness.
- **Equity:** sensitivity to unequal conditions
- **Compassion/Beneficence:** positive contribution to society and other people.
- **Protection of life/Non-harm:** commitment to preserve life in all its forms for health and well-being.
- **Connectedness/Solidarity:** interdependence and cooperativeness of human nature.

Discussion

This study supports the view that climate change is best understood through a health-centered ethical lens rather than as an environmental problem alone. The conceptual convergence identified across ethics, environmental health, and spirituality clarifies why climate change should be treated as a public health crisis with profound ethical consequences. Rather than merely restating established concerns, the findings offer a structured account of the value-bearing thought processes that connect dignity, protection of life, responsibility, justice, equity, and solidarity to climate-related decision-making [8,9].

The ethical structure identified in this study is especially relevant to contemporary climate discourse. The four principles of bioethics- autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice—together generate 12 constituent thoughts that provide a coherent framework for understanding what climate change demands of individuals, institutions, and governments [10]. Autonomy foregrounds dignity and informed decision-making; beneficence and nonmaleficence establish obligations to promote well-being and avoid foreseeable harm; and justice requires the fair distribution of burdens, benefits, resources, and risks. In the climate context, these principles support the conclusion that delayed or inadequate action is not ethically neutral. Rather, climate inaction exposes populations to avoidable harm, deepens inequalities, and undermines the conditions necessary for health and human flourishing. This interpretation is consistent with current global health assessments indicating that climate change is already harming human health and that health should be placed at the center of climate planning and response [11].

Copyright © Bhatt M.

The environmental health findings strengthen this argument by showing that prevention, protection, equity, health promotion, and responsibility closely parallel the normative commitments of bioethics and public health law [12]. Their alignment suggests that a health-based framing of climate change is not simply persuasive rhetoric but a conceptually robust basis for policy and action. The inclusion of spirituality adds a distinctive contribution by illuminating how moral motivation may be sustained across scientific, social, philosophical, and policy domains. Connectedness, correcting, communicating, and balancing together point to an inner and outer orientation capable of supporting cooperation, public engagement, and collective responsibility.

These findings also carry important implications for health law and governance. If climate change is recognized as a health crisis, legal and policy frameworks should move beyond fragmented environmental regulation toward approaches that explicitly incorporate prevention of harm, protection of vulnerable populations, intergenerational justice, and equitable access to health-supporting conditions [13]. The study therefore supports the view that climate action should be judged not only by emissions metrics but also by its capacity to protect life, reduce inequity, and strengthen collective responsibility. At the same time, this study is conceptual rather than empirical, and its conclusions should be interpreted accordingly. The constituent thoughts identified here are analytically derived and intended to clarify normative relationships rather than to measure behavioral outcomes or legal effectiveness directly. Future research may therefore test these conceptual linkages empirically across policy, institutional, and community settings. Even so, the present analysis makes an important contribution by showing that ethics, environmental health, and spirituality are mutually reinforcing frameworks whose synergies can help reposition climate change as an urgent, health-centered ethical challenge requiring coordinated and justice-oriented action.

Conclusion

This study shows that the conceptual alignment of bioethics, environmental health, and the spiritual dimension provides a stronger basis for interpreting climate change as a health-centered ethical challenge. By clarifying how these domains converge around shared human values, it offers a normative framework that may support more coherent policy, stronger public engagement, and more justice-oriented responses. A health-centered approach does not replace environmental concern; rather, it deepens it by locating climate action within obligations to protect life, reduce inequity, and strengthen collective responsibility across local, national, and global settings.

References

1. (2026) Air pollution. World Health Organization, Geneva.
2. (2024) Climate change and health. World Health Organization, Geneva.
3. (2024) COP29 special report on climate change and health: health is the argument for climate action. World Health Organization, Geneva.
4. Romanello M, Walawender M, Hsu SC, Moskeland A, Palmeiro-Silva Y, et al. (2025) The 2025 report of the Lancet Countdown on health and climate change: climate change action offers a lifeline. Lancet 406(10521): 2804–2857.
5. Bhatt M (2018) Spiritual Health. Notion Press, India.
6. (2023) Health needs to be front and centre of national plans to fight climate change. Pan American Health Organization, Washington (DC), USA.
7. Dhar N, Chaturvedi SK, Nandan D (2013) Spiritual health, the fourth dimension: a public health perspective. WHO South East Asia J Public Health 2(1): 3–5.
8. Singh JA (2012) Why human health and health ethics must be central to climate change deliberations. PLoS Med 9(6): e1001229.
9. Resnik DB (2016) Bioethics and climate change: a response to Macpherson and Valles. Bioethics 30(8): 649–652.
10. (2026) Environmental health. World Health Organization, Geneva.
11. (2025) Climate change and health. WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen, Denmark.
12. Gable L (2023) Global health law and the climate crisis: an unfulfilled opportunity. J Law Med Ethics 51(3): 694–697.
13. Toolan N, Marcus H, Hanna EG, Wannous C (2022) Legal implications of the climate-health crisis: a case study analysis of the role of public health in climate litigation. PLoS One 17(6): e0268633.

Copyright © Bhatt M.

YOUR RESEARCH DESERVES GLOBAL VISIBILITY

• Publish • Discover • Share • Connect

MEDICAL	CLINICAL	LIFESCIENCES	PHARMA
90+ OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS		400+ RESEARCH TOPICS	

SUBMIT YOUR RESEARCH
Submit your manuscript through our online submission system.

REPRINTS
If you require a reprint of any article, please contact us.
info@medwinpublishers.com

BECOME A REVIEWER
Share your expertise and contribute to scholarly publishing.

SCAN TO EXPLORE MEDWIN JOURNALS

• Journals • Submit Manuscript • Reviewer Program • Article Tracking

Our Journals indexed in

Embase® ELSEVIER | PubMed National Library of Medicine NLM | Crossref | Google Scholar | INDEX COPERNICUS INTERNATIONAL | ISSN INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INTERNATIONAL CENTRE | ROAD DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCESS SCHOLARLY RESOURCES | EuroPub | Scilit | WorldCat® | Academic Resource Index ResearchBib | ADVANCED SCIENCE INDEX | INTERNATIONAL Scientific Indexing | ICMJE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS

This article published by **Medwin Publishers,** 28475 Witherspoon Dr, Novi, MI 48377, United States, +1-248-247-6042, WhatsApp +1 (248) 275-1133, info@medwinpublishers.com

© 2026, by the Authors. The articles published from this journal are distributed to the public under "**Creative Commons Attribution License**" (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Therefore, upon proper citation of the original work, all the articles can be used without any restriction or can be distributed in any medium in any form.