Dear Adriana,

Thank you again for the opportunity to attend the Reintroduction Specialist Group (RSG), as well as to share ethics resources with the group.

Below I’ve given a few ethics and conservation citations with brief explanations. These will supplement those offered by others, such as Mishra’s “Building Partnerships with Communities for Biodiversity Conservation” (2017). If anyone in your group would like to discuss these resources, or others in this vein, I would be delighted to assist.

As a short plug, please don’t hesitate to contact the Ethics Specialist Group (ESG) in circumstances where ethical questions are at play. For over a decade the ESG has participated in debates over global and sustainability ethics. We have some of the leading voices in the field in the group, including the father of sustainability ethics, J. Ron Engel. The chair of the ESG is Klaus Bosselman, and the deputy chair is Peter Burdon. More information, please see <https://ethicsspecialistgroup.wordpress.com> and <https://www.iucn.org/commissions/world-commission-environmental-law/our-work/ethics>.

\* Midgley, Mary. 1993. *Can’t We Make Moral Judgements?* New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press.

\* Weston, Anthony. 2006. *A Practical Companion to Ethics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ethics draws inspiration and form from many sources — individual experience, religious faiths, and cultural beliefs. Yet it is a common error to think of ethics as relative to personal preferences or social norms. There are several reasons why this is not the case. Ethics is an evolved capacity of empathy and reason that all humans and some non-humans share. Human needs are similar and there is wide overlap in ethical precepts from different traditions about what it means to live ethically. Various global ethics have been dialoging, forging agreements, and identifying disagreements since ancient history. And like science, ethics distinguishes between better and worse perspectives by using reason and evidence.

In the work of the IUCN specifically, we work with people who may have different views on say, the intrinsic value of animals or nature, or the relative weights of socioeconomic development versus biodiversity protection. So a sensitivity to the particulars of individual and community beliefs and contexts is also part of what it means to be in ethical dialogue. Midgley and Weston’s books do a fine job of explaining and finding this balance.

\* Midgley, Mary. 1998. *Animals and Why They Matter*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Midgley is hands down the best ethicist on animal issues around, and her *Animals and Why They Matter* kick-started the field of animal studies in the academy. In this work and as a whole, she makes a compelling case for considering people, animals, and nature (what she calls the mixed community) as three interwoven spheres of scientific and ethical concern. Hence the PAN principle I mentioned during the Skype — always consider the well-being of people, animals, and nature separately and jointly.

Per our Skype, this clearly extends to local communities. It also applies to reintroduced species and widening circles of other ecological and social communities. Crucially, this principle also means caring about the well being of individual people and animals, and not just the groups.

\* López-Bao, José Vicente, Guillaume Chapron, and Adrian Treves. 2017. “The Achilles Heel of Participatory Conservation.” *Biological Conservation* 212 139–43.

\* Treves, Adrian, Guillaume Chapron, Jose V López‐Bao, Chase Shoemaker, Apollonia R Goeckner, and Jeremy T Bruskotter. 2017. “Predators and the Public Trust.” *Biological Reviews* 92 (1): 248–70.

\* Treves, Adrian, Kyle A. Artelle, Chris T. Darimont, William S. Lynn, Paul Paquet, Francisco J. Santiago-Avila, Rance Shaw, and Mary C. Wood. 2018. “Intergenerational Equity Can Help to Prevent Climate Change and Extinction.” *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 2 204–7.

Adrian Treves has long been an advocate for widening the circle of participants in conservation decision-making. I think it fair to say he would of course expect local communities to be engaged with conservation efforts. Still, he also sees an important role for wider national and international communities as well as future generations starting with the youth who will inherit or failures and successes in conservation. The primary reasons for this broadening of who is a legitimate “stakeholder” is to make better conservation policies that impact the vital interests held by a diversity of people, as well as to protect these policies from manipulation by elites operating at varying political scales, local to global.

\* Santiago-Avila, Francisco J., William S. Lynn, and Adrian Treves. 2018. “Inappropriate Consideration of Animal Interests in Predator Management: Towards a Comprehensive Moral Code.” In *Large Carnivore Conservation and Management: Human Dimensions and Governance*, edited by Tasos Hovardos, 227–51. New York: Routledge.

\* Lynn, William S. 2006. “Between Science and Ethics: What Science and the Scientific Method Can and Cannot Contribute to Conservation and Sustainability.” In *Gaining Ground: In Pursuit of Ecological Sustainability*, edited by David Lavigne, 191–205. Limerick, IRL: University of Limerick.

\* Lynn, William S. 2018. “Bringing Ethics to Wild Lives: Public Policy and the Case of the Barred and Northern Spotted Owl.” In *Society & Animals: Special Issue on Wildlife*, edited by Monica Ogra, and Julie Urbanik, forthcoming.

These articles are a start at some of the practical and theoretical questions about how we ought to live with wildlife. Santiago-Avila’s chapter examines the ethical errors commonly made when managing predators — extant, reintroduced, or recolonizing. Mine discuss options for how we think bringing ethical considerations for animals into conservation discourse and policy.

\* Earth Charter, [www.earthcharter.org](http://www.earthcharter.org)

Finally, in the mid-2000s the ESG was successful in convincing the IUCN to adopt the Earth Charter as a set of values and principles for sustainability. This is a good point of departure for a “first think” about any issue of conservation or sustainability. The principles are:

1. Respect and Care for the Community of Life

2. Ecological Integrity

3. Social and Economic Justice

4. Democracy, Non-Violence, and Peace

In the document, each of these principles is briefly defined and then elaborated upon with sub-principles. Were we to look for insights on reintroductions and local communities, I think we find plenty of support for restoration, human dignity and democratic community engagement, and the mutual respect and flourishing of individual beings and the entire community of life.

There are many more resources to share depending on the subject. I hope these are of some help to you.

Sincerely, Bill

PS: I’ve attached what pdfs I have.
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