

THE UNSEEN LANDSCAPE: ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS OF THE DIGITAL UNIVERSE AND THE FOUNDATIONS FOR AN ETHICS OF DIGITAL SUSTAINABILITY

Vareba Dinebari David¹

Abstract: The rapid expansion of the digital universe—encompassing data centers, network infrastructure, consumer devices, and emerging technologies like AI and blockchain—presents a profound and under-examined environmental crisis. This paper argues that the environmental ethics discourse has largely overlooked the materiality and ecological footprint of the digital ecosystem, focusing instead on traditional domains like wilderness preservation and pollution. We systematically outline the three primary environmental costs: the immense energy consumption and carbon emissions from digital infrastructure, the resource depletion and toxic waste associated with hardware lifecycle, and the ecosystemic alterations enabled by digital monitoring and control. Critiquing the prevailing anthropocentric and efficiency-focused narratives of "Green IT," we posit that these approaches are insufficient. Instead, we construct a multi-pronged ethical framework for digital sustainability, integrating an extended ethic of responsibility that encompasses global and intergenerational justice, a revitalized material virtue ethics for the digital age, and the application of the precautionary principle to technological innovation. By synthesizing insights from environmental philosophy, science and technology studies (STS), and political ecology, this paper provides a foundational ethical imperative: to render the digital universe's material impacts visible and to govern it not merely for human convenience, but within the ecological limits of a finite planet.

Keywords: digital sustainability; environmental ethics; e-waste; data centers; carbon footprint; virtue ethics; precautionary principle; Anthropocene.

INTRODUCTION

The prevailing cultural narrative surrounding digital technology is one of dematerialization—a world where physical goods, travel, and paper are replaced by efficient, weightless bits flowing through the cloud (Verkerk, 2021). This narrative, while appealing, obscures a fundamental truth: the digital universe is profoundly physical. It is constituted by a vast and growing infrastructure of data centers, transmission networks, and billions of end-user devices, all of which exact a heavy, and often hidden, toll on the Earth's systems. As we increasingly rely on digital solutions for everything from entertainment and social connection to managing critical infrastructure and combating

¹ Rivers State University, Nigeria

climate change, it becomes an urgent matter of environmental ethics to critically examine the sustainability of the digital realm itself.

Environmental ethics, as a discipline, has historically concerned itself with the moral relationship between humans and the natural world, exploring duties to wilderness, non-human animals, and future generations (Miao & Nduneseokwu, 2025). However, its gaze has often stopped at the edge of the server farm or the smartphone. The material footprint of our information society represents a critical blind spot. This paper seeks to bridge this gap, arguing that the environmental costs of the digital universe constitute a central, rather than peripheral, challenge for 21st-century environmental thought.

The scale of the digital ecosystem is staggering. As of the early 2020s, it is estimated that Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) account for approximately 2-4% of global greenhouse gas emissions, a share comparable to, or even exceeding, that of the aviation industry (Freitag et al., 2021). This percentage is projected to grow as rates of data consumption, fueled by video streaming, cloud computing, and artificial intelligence, continue their exponential rise. The environmental impact, however, extends far beyond carbon emissions.

This paper will dissect the environmental costs of the digital universe across three interconnected domains: energy consumption, material throughput, and systemic environmental risks. The first concerns the massive electricity demands of data centers and networks, which, despite efficiency gains, continue to grow in absolute terms. The second involves the entire lifecycle of digital hardware, from the mining of rare earth elements and other critical minerals under often socially and environmentally destructive conditions, to the burgeoning crisis of electronic waste (e-waste). The third domain explores how digital systems, through optimization and control, can reshape human relationships with nature in potentially problematic ways.

The dominant corporate and policy response to these issues has been framed under the banner of “Green IT” or “sustainable computing,” which primarily focuses on improving energy efficiency and powering data centers with renewable energy. While laudable, this approach is critiqued in this paper as being techno-optimistic and anthropocentric. It often relies on a logic of efficiency that can trigger rebound effects (where efficiency gains lead to increased overall consumption) and fails to address the deeper issues of material consumption, planned obsolescence, and the justice implications of where environmental harms are located.

Therefore, the central task of this paper is to move beyond a technical or managerial response and to construct a robust *ethics of digital sustainability*. This requires grounding our understanding of the digital not as an ethereal realm, but as a set of socio-technical systems deeply embedded in the Earth's biogeochemical processes. We will draw upon and extend established frameworks in environmental ethics to build a multi-faceted approach. This includes articulating an ethic of responsibility that acknowledges the global and intergenerational distributive injustices embedded in the digital supply chain, proposing a virtue ethics for the digital age that cultivates habits of mind like “digital frugality” and “technological mindfulness,” and rigorously applying the precautionary

principle to the deployment of highly energy-intensive and resource-hungry technologies like large-scale AI.

By undertaking this project, this paper contributes to the fields of environmental ethics and philosophy of technology by making the materiality of the digital explicit and subject to ethical scrutiny. It argues that a truly sustainable future requires not just greener technology, but a fundamental re-evaluation of our digital practices and their place within the broader community of life. The conclusion will not only summarize the argument but also point towards the policy and personal implications of adopting an ethics of digital sustainability, suggesting that the path forward lies in sufficiency and justice, not just efficiency.

THE MATERIAL FOUNDATION OF THE IMMATERIAL: UNPACKING DIGITAL ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS

The perception of the digital as “virtual” or “cloud-based” is a powerful metaphor that belies its physical reality (Caprotti, et al., 2022). To build an ethical framework, we must first render this material foundation visible, examining its three primary dimensions: energy, resources, and systemic risk. The most direct environmental cost of the digital universe is its colossal energy appetite. At the heart of this system are data centers—warehouse-sized facilities filled with servers that store, process, and distribute the world's data. A single hyperscale data center can consume as much electricity as a medium-sized city (Jones, 2018). While the industry has made significant strides in improving Power Usage Effectiveness (PUE), the sheer growth in data traffic, driven by high-definition video streaming, the Internet of Things (IoT), and complex cloud services, means that absolute energy consumption continues to climb. For instance, a 2019 study estimated that watching 30 minutes of Netflix on a smartphone led to emissions equivalent to driving almost 4 miles, a figure that accounts for data transmission and data center energy use (The Shift Project, 2019).

Beyond data centers, the network infrastructure that connects them to users—including transmission towers, fiber-optic cables, and routing stations—also constitutes a significant and growing energy sink (Baziana, 2024). Furthermore, the energy intensity of emerging technologies like blockchain and cryptocurrency presents an extreme case study. The Bitcoin network, for example, has an annualized energy consumption that rivals that of entire countries like Argentina or Norway, according to the Cambridge Bitcoin Electricity Consumption Index (CBECI, 2023). This highlights how specific digital architectures can have disproportionately large environmental footprints.

The second major cost lies in the resource footprint of digital hardware. Every smartphone, server, and network switch is a physical object composed of a complex assemblage of materials. The production of these devices requires the extraction of dozens of different metals, including rare earth elements (e.g., neodymium, dysprosium), gold, tantalum, and cobalt. The mining of these materials is frequently associated with severe environmental degradation, including deforestation, soil and water contamination, and significant carbon emissions (Maxwell & Miller, 2020).

The social and ethical dimensions of this resource extraction are stark. For example, a significant portion of the world's cobalt, essential for lithium-ion batteries, comes from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), where artisanal mining has been linked to human rights abuses and child labor (Sovacool, 2021). This creates a direct link between the sleek devices in the global North and social-ecological devastation in the global South, a distributive injustice that must be central to any ethics of digital sustainability.

The end-of-life phase of digital hardware presents the third part of this material cost: electronic waste, or e-waste. The world generated a record 53.6 million metric tonnes of e-waste in 2019, with only 17.4% being formally collected and recycled (Forti et al., 2020). This waste stream is toxic, containing heavy metals like lead, mercury, and cadmium, as well as hazardous chemicals that can leach into soil and groundwater when improperly disposed of in landfills. Much of the Global North's e-waste is illegally shipped to countries in Asia and Africa, where informal recycling operations, often involving children, use primitive methods like open-air burning to recover valuable metals, exposing workers and local communities to severe health risks (Lepawsky, 2018). This "toxic colonialism" represents a clear failure of extended producer and consumer responsibility.

The third dimension of cost is more subtle but no less significant: the systemic environmental risks posed by the application of digital systems to environmental management. While digital tools can undoubtedly aid conservation (e.g., using satellite imagery to monitor deforestation), they also foster a particular, and potentially problematic, worldview. Philosopher of technology Albert Borgmann (1984) distinguished between "things" that engage us contextually with the world and "devices" that deliver commodities without demanding engagement. The digital revolution, he might argue, risks turning nature into just another data stream to be optimized and controlled.

This logic of control is evident in precision agriculture, where sensors and data analytics seek to maximize yield with minimal input. While reducing fertilizer runoff is a benefit, this approach can further entrench industrial monoculture, reducing biodiversity and deepening human alienation from the land. Similarly, the concept of a "smart city" often prioritizes technological efficiency over ecological and social resilience, potentially creating new vulnerabilities and overlooking non-quantifiable values of urban nature. The environmental cost here is the potential erosion of a relational, empathetic connection to the more-than-human world, replacing it with an instrumental, data-driven management paradigm.

THE INADEQUACY OF PREVAILING NARRATIVES: A CRITIQUE OF "GREEN IT" AND TECHNO-OPTIMISM

Having established the scale of the problem, it is crucial to analyze the dominant responses. The corporate and policy narrative of "Green IT" or "sustainable computing," while appearing to address the issue, is often inadequate and can even be counterproductive when viewed through a rigorous ethical lens. This section critiques

this narrative for its anthropocentrism, its reliance on a flawed efficiency paradigm, and its neglect of justice.

The primary focus of the Green IT movement has been on improving energy efficiency. This includes designing more efficient microchips, developing advanced cooling systems for data centers, and optimizing software code to reduce processing loads. Major tech companies like Google and Microsoft have made significant investments in these areas and have committed to powering their operations with 100% renewable energy. On the surface, these are positive developments. However, this approach is fundamentally anthropocentric, as it seeks to sustain the digital service for humans while minimizing direct operational costs and reputational risk, without a deeper consideration of the broader ecological and social costs outlined in the previous section (Röpke, 2022).

A core ethical problem with the efficiency-focused approach is the phenomenon of the “rebound effect” or Jevons Paradox. In the 19th century, economist William Stanley Jevons observed that improvements in the efficiency of coal use led to an increase in total coal consumption, as efficiency made its use more cost-effective and spurred new applications. Similarly, gains in the computational efficiency of data centers do not necessarily lead to a net reduction in energy use. Instead, they can enable an expansion of services, higher-resolution content, and more data-intensive applications like widespread AI and virtual reality, which in turn drive up overall demand for energy and resources (Hilty & Aebischer, 2015).

This creates a vicious cycle where efficiency gains are continuously outstripped by growth in consumption. An ethical framework based solely on efficiency, therefore, is inherently limited. It fails to question the underlying driver of the problem: the assumption of perpetual growth in data consumption and hardware turnover. It treats the symptom (energy use per unit of data) while ignoring the disease (exponential growth in total data and devices). Furthermore, the Green IT narrative largely sidesteps the profound issues of material consumption and e-waste. A company can power its data centers with 100% renewables while still manufacturing devices designed for planned obsolescence and making them difficult to repair. The Right to Repair movement has emerged as a direct ethical challenge to this business model, arguing that restricting repair violates principles of ownership, generates unnecessary waste, and exacerbates resource injustice (Tennison, 2021). The prevailing narrative, focused on operational carbon, often ignores the “embodied carbon” and the social cost embedded in the hardware itself.

The distributive justice dimension is another critical failure. The benefits of the digital universe—convenience, connectivity, information access—are disproportionately accrued by wealthy populations in the global North. In contrast, the environmental and social harms of resource extraction and e-waste disposal are disproportionately borne by marginalized communities in the global South. This constitutes a form of “environmental racism” on a global scale (Pellow, 2007). An ethics that does not centrally address this asymmetrical distribution of benefits and burdens is fundamentally incomplete.

Finally, the prevailing narrative is steeped in a techno-optimism that assumes technological innovation will inevitably solve the environmental problems it creates. This faith in a “techno-fix” is dangerous, as it discourages the more profound, and potentially more effective, strategy of questioning the necessity of certain technologies and curbing demand. The ethical principle of humility, in the face of complex systems and unintended consequences, is largely absent from this corporate-led discourse. A robust ethics of digital sustainability must therefore move beyond the narrow confines of Green IT to ask more foundational questions about scale, purpose, and justice.

FOUNDATIONS FOR AN ETHICS OF DIGITAL SUSTAINABILITY

To address the shortcomings of the prevailing narratives, we must construct a positive ethical framework grounded in the traditions of environmental philosophy. This framework is not a single theory but a multi-pronged approach that integrates an extended ethic of responsibility, a virtue ethics for the digital age, and the rigorous application of the precautionary principle.

First, we must extend and apply Hans Jonas's (1984) “imperative of responsibility.” Jonas argued that modern technology has granted humans such power that our traditional, proximity-based ethics are insufficient; we now need an ethics that considers the long-term and global consequences of our actions, with a duty to ensure the continued existence of future humanity. This imperative can be directly applied to the digital universe. The power to build global infrastructures that consume vast resources and generate toxic legacies for millennia carries a correspondingly heavy responsibility. This responsibility falls not only on individual consumers but, more importantly, on corporations and governments who make systemic decisions.

This ethic of responsibility must be explicitly linked to distributive and intergenerational justice, as articulated by thinkers like Henry Shue (2014). It demands that we ask: Who bears the costs of our digital convenience? The communities near mines in the DRC, the children sorting e-waste in Ghana, and the future generations who will inherit a planet depleted of critical minerals and contaminated with toxic waste – these are the subjects of our digital responsibility. An ethical framework must therefore advocate for policies that internalize these externalized costs, such as Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) laws that hold manufacturers accountable for the entire lifecycle of their products, including take-back and recycling.

Second, we need a revitalized *virtue ethics* for the digital age. While systemic change is crucial, individual and collective character also matters. Virtue ethics, with its roots in Aristotle, focuses on the cultivation of character traits that lead to a flourishing life (*eudaimonia*). In the context of digital sustainability, we can identify several key virtues. “Digital frugality” is the habit of questioning the necessity of digital consumption – do I need to stream in 4K? Do I need to upgrade my phone? It is the mean between the vice of digital excess and the vice of digital rejection.

A related virtue is “technological mindfulness,” a concept drawing from both virtue ethics and phenomenology. This involves cultivating an awareness of the materiality behind the screen – remembering the servers, the cables, the mines, and the landfills that

constitute the digital system. It encourages a more intentional and less habitual use of technology. As Shannon Vallor (2016) argues in *Technology and the Virtues*, we must cultivate “technomoral virtues” to navigate the challenges of the 21st century. For environmental ethics, this means fostering habits that acknowledge our embodiment and our dependence on a physical world, countering the illusion of dematerialization.

Third, the *precautionary principle* must be rigorously applied to digital innovation. The principle states that where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation (UNESCO, 2005). This principle acts as a necessary corrective to techno-optimism. When considering the rollout of a new, highly resource-intensive technology—such as the metaverse or large-language models like GPT-4—the burden of proof should shift. Instead of proceeding until harm is proven, proponents should be required to demonstrate a reasonable certainty of no significant harm, especially given the rebound effects and systemic risks we have identified.

For example, the explosive growth in AI model size and computational demand (noted by researchers like Strubell et al., 2019, who highlighted the massive carbon footprint of training a single large AI model) should trigger the precautionary principle. This would mandate a search for less energy-intensive architectures and a justification for the social benefit of such models before they are deployed at scale. An ethics of digital sustainability, therefore, is not anti-technology but pro-responsibility; it calls for steering innovation towards truly sustainable ends, rather than being swept along by its momentum.

Together, these three ethical pillars—responsibility, virtue, and precaution—provide a robust foundation for critiquing current practices and guiding future action. They shift the focus from mere efficiency to sufficiency, from convenience to justice, and from blind innovation to wise stewardship.

CONCLUSION: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE DIGITAL FUTURE

This paper has argued that the environmental costs of the digital universe represent a critical and urgent frontier for environmental ethics. By systematically outlining the triple burden of energy consumption, material resource depletion, and systemic environmental risk, we have rendered visible the hidden materiality of our digital lives. The prevailing narratives of “Green IT” and techno-optimism, while making incremental contributions, have been shown to be insufficient due to their anthropocentric focus, their vulnerability to rebound effects, and their neglect of global distributive justice.

The path forward, as we have proposed, requires the construction of a robust ethics of digital sustainability. This framework integrates an extended ethic of responsibility that compels us to account for the global and intergenerational impacts of our digital infrastructure. It calls for the cultivation of digital virtues, such as frugality and mindfulness, to counteract the culture of excess and disposability. And it insists on the application of the precautionary principle to temper the reckless speed of technological innovation with ecological and social wisdom.

The implications of this ethical framework are profound. For policymakers, it argues for stringent regulations that enforce Extended Producer Responsibility, ban planned obsolescence, and promote a circular economy for electronics. It calls for digital policies that prioritize sufficiency and justice over mere growth. For corporations, it demands a radical transparency about supply chains and lifecycle impacts, and a business model shift from selling hardware to providing durable, upgradeable, and repairable services. For individuals and communities, it invites a cultural shift – a re-evaluation of our digital habits and a renewed appreciation for the physical world that sustains our virtual one.

The digital universe is a human creation, and its future is not predetermined. It can be a force for environmental destruction, accelerating resource depletion and injustice, or it can be harnessed as a tool for sustainability, but only if its own footprint is first mastered. Mastering that footprint requires not just better technology, but better ethics. By grounding our digital future in principles of responsibility, virtue, and precaution, we can begin to align the vast power of the digital with the ecological imperatives of our finite planet. The task is to ensure that the unseen landscape of the digital universe does not become the graveyard of the natural one.

REFERENCES

- Borgmann, A. (1984). *Technology and the character of contemporary life: A philosophical inquiry*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cambridge Bitcoin Electricity Consumption Index (CBECI). (2023). *Cambridge Bitcoin Electricity Consumption Index*. University of Cambridge.
- Forti, V., Baldé, C. P., Kuehr, R., & Bel, G. (2020). *The Global E-waste Monitor 2020: Quantities, flows and the circular economy potential*. United Nations University/United Nations Institute for Training and Research, International Telecommunication Union, and International Solid Waste Association.
- Freitag, C., Berners-Lee, M., Widdicks, K., Knowles, B., Blair, G. S., & Friday, A. (2021). The real climate and transformative impact of ICT: A critique of estimates, trends, and regulations. *Patterns*, 2(9), 100340.
- Hilty, L. M., & Aebischer, B. (Eds.). (2015). *ICT innovations for sustainability*. Springer.
- Jonas, H. (1984). *The imperative of responsibility: In search of an ethics for the technological age*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, N. (2018). How to stop data centres from gobbling up the world's electricity. *Nature*, 561(7722), 163-166.
- Lepawsky, J. (2018). *Reassembling rubbish: Worlding electronic waste*. The MIT Press.
- Maxwell, R., & Miller, T. (2020). *How green is your digital life?*. Polity Press.
- Pellow, D. N. (2007). *Resisting global toxics: Transnational movements for environmental justice*. The MIT Press.
- Røpke, I. (2022). The unsustainable nature of the digital economy: From illusion to sustainability. In *The Oxford Handbook of Digital Ethics* (pp. 1-22). Oxford University Press.
- Shue, H. (2014). *Climate justice: Vulnerability and protection*. Oxford University Press.

- Sovacool, B. K. (2021). When subterranean slavery supports sustainability transitions? Power, patriarchy, and child labor in artisanal cobalt mining in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 8(1), 271-293.
- Strubell, E., Ganesh, A., & McCallum, A. (2019). Energy and policy considerations for deep learning in NLP. *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3645-3650.
- Tennison, J. (2021). The right to repair and the future of the circular economy. *Journal of Environmental Law*, 33(2), 367-378.
- The Shift Project. (2019). *Lean ICT: Towards digital sobriety*. The Shift Project. <https://theshiftproject.org/en/article/lean-ict-our-new-report/>
- UNESCO. (2005). *The Precautionary Principle*. World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology.
- Vallor, S. (2016). *Technology and the virtues: A philosophical guide to a future worth wanting*. Oxford University Press.
- Miao, Q., & Nduneseokwu, C. (2025). Environmental Philosophy and Ethics. In *Environmental Leadership in a VUCA Era: An Interdisciplinary Handbook* (pp. 121-157). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Verkerk, J. (2021). *Cloud computing as Digital Imaginary. A critical making approach to user perceptions and experiences* (Doctoral dissertation, Open Access Te Herenga Waka-Victoria University of Wellington).
- Caprotti, F., Chang, I. C. C., & Joss, S. (2022). Beyond the smart city: A typology of platform urbanism. *Urban Transformations*, 4(1), 4.
- Baziana, P. A. (2024). Optical data center networking: A comprehensive review on traffic, switching, bandwidth allocation, and challenges. *IEEE Access*.