

RE-New (Opinion) ARTICLE

What is the value of wild animal welfare for restoration ecology?

Jane F. Capozzelli^{1,2} , Luke Hecht^{1,3}, Samniqueka J. Halsey⁴ 

The restoration community continues to discuss what constitutes good environmental stewardship. One area of tension is the extent to which the well-being of wild animals should inform restoration efforts. We discuss three ways that the perspective of wild animal welfare can augment restoration ecology: strengthening people's relationship with nature, reinforcing biotic integrity, and reducing mechanistic uncertainty. The animal welfare movement elevates sentient animals as stakeholders and explores how environmental context directly impacts the well-being of individuals. Viewing wild animals through this lens may encourage people to think and act with empathy and altruism. Second, we incorporate animal welfare into the concept of biotic integrity for ecological and ethical reasons. Restoring ecosystem processes may enhance animal welfare, and vice versa. Alternatively, there may be a trade-off between these factors, requiring local decision-makers to prioritize between restoring ecosystem function and promoting individuals' well-being. We conclude by discussing how welfare can impact population recovery, thereby adding insights about mechanisms underpinning restoration objectives. Ultimately, restoration ecologists and proponents of wild animal welfare could enjoy a productive union.

Key words: biotic integrity, ecosystem health, environmental stewardship, land ethic, rewilding

Conceptual Implications

- The perspective of wild animal welfare may deepen people's relationship with nature by cultivating empathy and altruism.
- Biotic integrity has both ecological and ethical components. There may be opportunities to reinforce biotic integrity in multidimensional ways, such as when enhancing wild animal welfare concomitantly restores ecosystem processes.
- Factors relevant to welfare, particularly physiology, behavior, and cognition, can impact the recovery of animal populations and communities.

Introduction

Restoration ecology has long been guided by ethics. The renowned conservationist Aldo Leopold (1966) wrote the land ethic, which "enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land... a land ethic changes the role of *Homo sapiens* from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it. It implies respect for his fellow-members, and also respect for the community as such... A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community." These statements shifted how nonhuman life forms were valued, placing them in a collective pact with humans and emphasizing how ecosystem function supports all of the biotic-community members (Callicott 2013).

Despite the value placed on animals in the land ethic (as "fellow-members"), practitioners of environmental

management have not resolved how to support the well-being of individuals while also maintaining the integrity of the ecosystem (Swaigood 2010; Lorimer et al. 2015; but see Dubois et al. 2017). Another challenge is the growing call for restoration to integrate with a broader suite of environmental issues and disciplines (Miller & Bestelmeyer 2016; Beausoleil et al. 2018), while also increasing the effectiveness of the projects under its auspices (Brudvig et al. 2017). To address these problems, we examine theories and case studies which illustrate the value of wild animal welfare for reducing uncertainty during ecological restoration, conceptualizing and restoring biotic integrity, and strengthening human-nature relationships.

Engagement Through the Lens of Wild Animal Welfare

Supporters of animal welfare, similarly to Leopold, want to expand society's moral circle to encompass more than humans' self-interest (Singer 2001; Callicott 2013). To achieve this goal,

Author contributions: all authors generated the ideas and revised the manuscript; SJH led the writing about biotic integrity; LH cowrote the subsection about uncertainty; JFC wrote the rest.

¹Wild Animal Initiative, PO Box 43568, Washington, DC, 20010, U.S.A.

²Address correspondence to Jane F. Capozzelli, email jane.capozzelli@wildanimalinitiative.org

³Department of Biosciences, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, U.K.

⁴School of Natural Resources, University of Missouri, 1111 Rollins Street, Columbia, MO, 65211, U.S.A.

© 2020 Society for Ecological Restoration

doi: 10.1111/rec.13114

Supporting information at:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/rec.13114/supinfo>

the animal welfare movement elevates animals as stakeholders. Some animal welfare advocates use the framework of utilitarianism, a moral philosophy that calls on society to reduce the suffering of individuals as much as possible. They extend the principle of equal consideration of interests beyond humans to consider the interests of all “sentient beings”—defined as humans and animals with the ability to have subjective, positive, or negative experiences (Singer 2001; but see Rose et al. 2012 for criticism). The enormous number of wild animals makes wildlife a compelling focus for supporters of animal welfare who seek to maximize their impact.

Many members of the animal welfare community use scientific research to make evidence-based improvements to animals’ lives (Dawkins 2006). The dominant method for assessing animal welfare is the Five Domains model. It measures an animal’s nutrition, environment, health, and behavior, and uses this information to infer their affect (i.e. subjective experiences such as hunger, security, etc.). The five domains are then reviewed to understand how the individual is functioning and feeling in relation to its environmental context (Mellor & Beausoleil 2015). It is worth noting that traditional ecological knowledge has viewed animals “on their own terms” for thousands of years, whereas considering animals as subjects is relatively new to Western science (Pierotti & Wildcat 2000).

To practically improve the welfare of wild animals, several ethical and ecological conundrums still need to be reconciled (e.g. Singer 2001; Driscoll & Watson 2019). Meanwhile, animal welfare and environmental management can foster an amicable relationship. In conservation medicine, for example, wildlife health is accepted as a driver and indicator of ecosystem health and the pragmatism of supporting animal health dovetails with its moral value (Zinsstag et al. 2011; Keenleyside et al. 2012).

The same collaborative dynamic between restoration ecology and wild animal welfare could be built around the shared goal of strengthening people’s relationship with nature (Seddon & Van Heezik 2013). Discussing wild animal welfare illustrates tangible impacts that the environment has on individuals. This lens ideally strengthens the role of humans as environmental stewards by encouraging people to empathize with animals and act to give them better lives (Ramp & Bekoff 2015). People, when challenged on a moral level, may be willing to forgo aesthetic or economic benefits to enhance animal well-being (Doak et al. 2014; Coon et al. 2018).

Reinforce Biotic Integrity Along Both Ethical and Ecological Dimensions

The consideration of wild animal welfare also has implications for conceptualizing and restoring biotic integrity. The first ecological assessment of biotic integrity surveyed fish community composition with reference to sex-age cohorts, body condition, and trophic structures as indicators of riverine ecosystem health (Karr 1981). Currently, the Society for Ecological Restoration defines ecosystem integrity as “the ability of an ecosystem to support and sustain characteristic ecological functioning and biodiversity (i.e. species composition and community structure)” (Gann et al. 2019). In addition to ecological components,

however, biotic integrity has ethical dimensions related to the treatment of nonhuman individuals, according to the precedent established in Leopold’s land ethic.

The support of animal well-being provides opportunities to address both components of biotic integrity (Zinsstag et al. 2011). For example, restoration efforts increasingly aim to resume ecosystem processes by reintroducing animals with roles as consumers or ecosystem engineers (Pettoirelli et al. 2018). Stress can cause negative behavioral and physiological reactions, such as immune responses, which compromise survival, reproductive fitness, and performance of keystone behaviors. Stress can also result in poor welfare (Broom & Johnson 1993; Blumstein 2010; Tarszisz et al. 2014). Therefore, reducing stress in animals that facilitate ecosystem processes may lead to concurrent improvements to ecosystem functioning and animal welfare. In other contexts, these two targets may be incompatible objectives and their prioritization will vary depending on stakeholders’ values (Lorimer et al. 2015; Beausoleil et al. 2018). Even if the conflict between supporting ecosystems or individuals cannot be entirely resolved, the deliberation itself illustrates the ecological and moral consequences of human decisions on the nonhuman members of the biotic community.

When individual well-being and ecosystem health are entwined, the divide between wild animal welfare and restoration ecology should shrink (Swaisgood 2010). Interdisciplinary projects could aim to provide relief from stressors, including, but not limited to, human-caused degradation. The scale and severity of impacts on animal welfare could be estimated by evaluating the number of animals affected, the cause and duration of the harm, and the capacity of animals to suffer (Kirkwood et al. 1994; Dubois et al. 2017). One metric for evaluating a restored area could be the quality of life the site provides to humans and animals, especially in areas with no historical analogue or reference baselines. These approaches create common ground to address contemporary environmental problems by bridging the perceived dichotomy between supporting wild animal welfare and functioning ecosystems.

Reduce Mechanistic Uncertainty by Focusing on Individuals

In practice, restoration outcomes are largely uncertain (Brudvig et al. 2017). Many efforts fail to recover animal populations after the vegetation and physical environment are restored, due to insufficient knowledge regarding whether these areas provide focal taxa with adequate resources. What is “adequate” depends upon the animals’ tolerances, adaptive abilities, and perceived opportunities to exploit these resources (Simenstad & Cordell 2000; Jones & Davidson 2016). Particularly in the context of animal restorations, attention to individual-level processes, such as physiology, behavior, and cognition, can be used to predict restoration outcomes or meet other key objectives (Cooke & Suski 2008; McKenzie et al. 2016).

This integration is applicable to projects that target population recovery, as demographic rates often depend on an individual’s sex, age, organismal performance, perceived social rank, exposure to stressors, or combinations of these characteristics. Thus,

breaking analyses down into finer cohorts more accurately predicts population structure and growth (Gerber & Heppell 2004; Caswell et al. 2018). A focus on welfare can further reveal nuanced drivers of population change. For example, vulnerability to mortality in albatrosses (*Diomedea exulans*) was shown to decrease with age (until senescence) because juveniles were less competent at foraging and navigating than adults. The difference in vulnerability between age cohorts explained the recovery projections for this population (Riotte-Lambert & Weimerskirch 2013). Furthermore, foraging and navigating performance depended on early-life experiences formed through learning, in addition to environmental context (Fay et al. 2018), illustrating how animals' mental, physical, and functional states interrelate (Beausoleil et al. 2018; Cordeiro et al. 2018; Louison et al. 2019). The use of animals' activities and experiences to understand patterns at population, community, or ecosystem levels continues to grow in the context of management, reflecting the benefits of focusing on individuals to reduce mechanistic uncertainty.

Conclusions

Several aspects of animal welfare, such as health, physiology, behavior, and cognition, are processes that can modify the patterns of species, communities, and ecosystems. We can therefore reduce uncertainty regarding the mechanisms underpinning restoration objectives by increasing our understanding of individuals. There is the potential for optimal outcomes when improvements to ecosystem function and individual well-being reinforce each other. These synergies may enhance biotic integrity in multidimensional ways, by supporting two levels of biotic organization and encompassing multiple ethical stances regarding what is good stewardship. Finally, restoration ecology could engage with the perspective of animal welfare to advance a human-nature relationship that is infused with empathy and altruism. Proponents of wild animal welfare and the land ethic already agree that humans and animals are part of one biotic community with a common stake in environmental decision-making.

Acknowledgments

C. Meyer Shorb, H. Howe, W. J. Bradshaw, S. Eckerström-Liedholm, and M. Graham provided valuable feedback on drafts of this manuscript. The work was further improved by comments from S. J. Murphy during peer review. J.F.C. and L.H. note that Wild Animal Initiative is a nonprofit that advocates for improving wild animal welfare. J.F.C. and L.H. are supported through private donations and grants from the Effective Altruism Foundation, the Centre for Effective Altruism's Animal Welfare Fund, and Animal Charity Evaluators. We thank these supporters. S.J.H. received no external funding related to this work and declares no conflicts of interest.

LITERATURE CITED

- Beausoleil NJ, Mellor DJ, Baker L, Baker SE, Bellio M, Clarke AS, et al. (2018) "Feelings and fitness" not "feelings or fitness"—the *raison d'être* of conservation welfare, which aligns conservation and animal welfare objectives. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 5:296
- Blumstein DT (2010) Conservation and animal welfare issues arising from forestry practices. *Animal Welfare* 19:151–157
- Broom DM, Johnson KG (1993) *Stress and animal welfare*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands
- Brudvig LA, Barak RS, Bauer JT, Caughlin TT, Laughlin DC, Larios L, Matthews JW, Stuble KL, Turley NE, Zirbel CR (2017) Interpreting variation to advance predictive restoration science. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 54:1018–1027
- Callicott JB (2013) *Thinking like a planet: the land ethic and the Earth ethic*. Oxford University Press, New York
- Caswell H, De Vries C, Hartemink N, Roth G, Van Daalen SF (2018) Age × stage-classified demographic analysis: a comprehensive approach. *Ecological Monographs* 88:560–584
- Cooke SJ, Suski CD (2008) Ecological restoration and physiology: an overdue integration. *Bioscience* 58:957–968
- Coon JJ, Morton LW, Miller JR (2018) A survey of landowners in the Grand River Grasslands: managing wildlife, cattle and non-native plants. Report 04-18. University of Illinois Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences, Urbana, Illinois
- Cordeiro EMG, Campbell JF, Phillips TW, With KA (2018) Behavioral and social mechanisms behind pattern formation: an experimental study of animal movement. *Landscape Ecology* 33:1881–1894
- Dawkins MS (2006) A user's guide to animal welfare science. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 21:77–82
- Doak DF, Bakker VJ, Goldstein BE, Hale B (2014) What is the future of conservation? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 29:77–81
- Driscoll DA, Watson MA (2019) Science denialism and compassionate conservation: response to Wallach et al. 2018. *Conservation Biology* 33:777–780
- Dubois S, Fenwick N, Ryan EA, Baker L, Baker SE, Beausoleil NJ, et al. (2017) International consensus principles for ethical wildlife control. *Conservation Biology* 31:753–760
- Fay R, Barbraud C, Delord K, Weimerskirch H (2018) From early life to senescence: individual heterogeneity in a long-lived seabird. *Ecological Monographs* 88:60–73
- Gann GD, McDonald T, Walder B, Aronson J, Nelson CR, Jonson J, et al. (2019) International principles and standards for the practice of ecological restoration. Second edition. *Restoration Ecology* 27:S1–S46
- Gerber LR, Heppell SS (2004) The use of demographic sensitivity analysis in marine species conservation. *Biological Conservation* 120:121–128
- Jones ME, Davidson N (2016) Applying an animal-centric approach to improve ecological restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 24:836–842
- Karr JR (1981) Assessment of biotic integrity using fish communities. *Fisheries* 6:21–27
- Keenleyside KA, Dudley N, Cairns S, Hall CM, Stolton S (2012) *Ecological restoration for protected areas: principles, guidelines and best practices*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland
- Kirkwood JK, Sainsbury AW, Bennett PM (1994) The welfare of free-living wild animals: methods of assessment. *Animal Welfare* 3:257–273
- Leopold A (1966) The land ethic. Pages 237–264. In: *A Sand County almanac with essays on conservation from Round River*. Oxford University Press, New York
- Lorimer J, Sandom C, Jepson P, Doughty C, Barua M, Kirby KJ (2015) Rewilding: science, practice, and politics. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 40:39–62
- Louison MJ, Hage VM, Stein JA, Suski CD (2019) Quick learning, quick capture: largemouth bass that rapidly learn an association task are more likely to be captured by recreational anglers. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 73:23
- McKenzie DJ, Axelsson M, Chabot D, Claireaux G, Cooke SJ, Corner RA, et al. (2016) Conservation physiology of marine fishes: state of the art and prospects for policy. *Conservation Physiology* 4:cow046

- Mellor DJ, Beausoleil NJ (2015) Extending the “Five Domains” model for animal welfare assessment to incorporate positive welfare states. *Animal Welfare* 24:241–253
- Miller JR, Bestelmeyer BT (2016) What’s wrong with novel ecosystems, really? *Restoration Ecology* 24:577–582
- Pettorelli N, Barlow J, Stephens PA, Durant SM, Connor B, Schulte to Bühne H, Sandom CJ, Wentworth J, du Toit JT (2018) Making rewilding fit for policy. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 55:1114–1125
- Pierotti R, Wildcat D (2000) Traditional ecological knowledge: the third alternative (commentary). *Ecological Applications* 10:1333–1340
- Ramp D, Bekoff M (2015) Compassion as a practical and evolved ethic for conservation. *Bioscience* 65:323–327
- Riotte-Lambert L, Weimerskirch H (2013) Do naive juvenile seabirds forage differently from adults? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 280:20131434
- Rose JD, Arlinghaus R, Cooke SJ, Diggle BK, Sawynok W, Stevens ED, Wynne CDL (2012) Can fish really feel pain? *Fish and Fisheries* 15:97–133
- Seddon PJ, Van Heezik Y (2013) Reintroductions to “ratchet up” public perceptions of biodiversity. Pages 137–151. In: Bekoff M (ed) *Ignoring nature no more*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois
- Simenstad CA, Cordell JR (2000) Ecological assessment criteria for restoring anadromous salmonid habitat in Pacific Northwest estuaries. *Ecological Engineering* 15:283–302
- Singer P (2001) *Practical ethics*. Third edition. Cambridge University Press, New York
- Swaigood RR (2010) The conservation-welfare nexus in reintroduction programmes: a role for sensory ecology. *Animal Welfare* 19:125–137
- Tarszisz E, Dickman CR, Munn AJ (2014) Physiology in conservation translocations. *Conservation Physiology* 2:cou054
- Zinsstag J, Schelling E, Waltner-Toews D, Tanner M (2011) From “one medicine” to “one health” and systemic approaches to health and well-being. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 101:148–156

Coordinating Editor: Stephen Murphy

Received: 31 October, 2019; First decision: 3 November, 2019; Revised: 20 December, 2019; Accepted: 2 January, 2020; First published online: 4 February, 2020