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Abstract: For interspecies justice, animal welfare, and animal rights, the planet needs to be divided on the basis of species' natural resource requirements. The Half-Earth View is that to maintain viable populations of the Earth's remaining species, half of landscapes and seascapes need protection from intensive economic activity. This protection is needed outside the nature preserve system, such as in agricultural areas or cities, so nature can co-exist with local communities.
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Treves et al. (2019) write that “authentically non-anthropocentric worldviews that incorporate multispecies justice are needed for a legitimate, deliberative, and truly democratic process of adjudication between competing interests”. If ecojustice (Baxter 2005), ecodemocracy (Gray and Curry 2010), animal welfare and animal rights (Singer 1977; Regan 1986) are to be taken seriously, the planet needs to be divided on the basis of species' natural resource requirements or bio-proportionality (Mathews 2016) rather than just what one species (Homo sapiens) claims it is entitled to (Piccolo et al. 2018; Washington et al. 2018). As humans turn entire habitats into their own domain, they are excluding billions of nonhumans from moral consideration (Souël and Wilcox 1980). Reserving some areas for the exclusive use of nonhuman species and sharing the areas already dominated by humans is consistent with deep ecology (Naess 1973), animal rights law (Borràs 2016), and nature rights law (Chapron et al. 2019). This commentary accordingly focuses on this Half-Earth View (H-EV).


Treves et al. note in connection with "soft anthropocentrism” that some social scientists have warned there is little research on the social and economic costs of H-EV (Fletcher and Büscher 2016). Schleicher et al. (2019) point out that the impacts of protected areas vary widely, “from physical and economic displacement to positive socio-economic outcomes for well-being or industry”. Schleicher et al. estimate the number of humans affected and reflect on how human needs and justice should be considered, with millions of
people potentially disadvantaged by H-EV. These criticisms are directed particularly against strict conservation policies that seem to disadvantage local communities. But it is not only the social and economic impacts of H-EV on humans that matter; the survival of billions of individuals of other species needs be given weight too (Crist and Kopnina 2014; Piccolo et al. 2018; Washington et al. 2018).

**In support of strict protection.** It is doubtful that a viable human population of the present size can be sustained on a severely degraded earth, even in the short-term. Climate change, biodiversity loss (IPBES 2019) and rapidly declining environmental indicators (Steffen et al. 2015) are problems for both present and future generations, human and nonhuman.

Extinction of species reduces the evolutionary potential of the Earth’s living beings: “Death is one thing – an end to birth is something else” (Soulé and Wilcox 1980). Biological extinction can be seen as a kind of “super-killing” (Rolston 2012) that negates the rights of nature (Chapron et al. 2019). Some early humans were “part of nature”, in balance with the nonhuman inhabitants of their shared habitats, without a measurable negative effect on biodiversity (Sponsel 2013). But early humans were already playing an important role in shaping ecosystems in pre-industrial times (Turner 1993; Barnosky et al. 2004), including human-caused extinctions (Burney and Flannery 2005).

The romantic idea of pre-industrial peoples living in harmony with nature is suspect (Koot 2016). Some indigenous people might have evolved and subsisted without immediately endangering their environments; but human territorial expansion, extractive activities (Holt et al. 2004) and modern hunting weapons (Jerozolimski and Peres 2003) radically altered this relationship (Shoreman-Ouimet and Kopnina 2016). Traditional swidden (“slash and burn”) farming is hardly an environmentally benign practice (Henley 2011). When cleared, tropical forest soils' nutrient-holding capacity is limited due to erosion of the thin layer of fertile top-soil, making it very difficult for vegetation to reestablish itself afterward and rendering the land more vulnerable to fires (Alexander et al. 2011). Hence whatever grows back after clearing is likely to be an altered system with reduced ecosystem function and resilience. As for traditional hunting practices, their “sustainability” in a natural system kept in balance by apex predators depends on the number of hunters. In simple biological terms, having eight billion relatively large apex predators cannot be "balanced" with the availability of "bushmeat" (Peterson 2012) without intensified agricultural production and the associated maltreatment of animals used for consumption or medical experimentation and entertainment (Kopnina and Gjerris 2005).

Human-centered critics ignore the fact that there is a growing imbalance between the growing population of a single species – humans – and all other (wild) species (Kopnina and Gjerris 2005). Treves et al. point out that the current trends in the loss of nonhuman life “include massive declines in wilderness areas”. The highest concentrations of biodiversity are found in areas with the highest rates of human population growth (Cincotta et al. 2000). Low-consumption lifestyles are less harmful to the environment, but per capita human consumption has a significant effect on biodiversity (Crist et al. 2017). The global destructive reach of the large landowners and corporations is certainly profound; but deforestation by local people for subsistence agriculture and fuel, or hunting for “bushmeat”, is also substantial, giving rise to the “empty forest syndrome” (Crist and Cafaro 2012). Species need to be protected *beyond* designated preservation zones.

Strategies for multispecies coexistence accordingly need to be extended to areas dominated by humans. There needs to be sharing in agricultural lands through regenerative
agriculture (Rhodes 2017), retaining at least some biodiversity hotspots and corridors next to growing crops, and roads protecting roadside vegetation. Cities too could accommodate more biodiversity (Yigitcanlar et al. 2019) through cradle-to-cradle designs (Braungart et al. 2007). The objective is not to displace or disadvantage local communities but to coexist with them.
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The Foundations of Animal Sentience project (ASENT), a five-year ERC-funded project led by Dr. Jonathan Birch, aims to study the methodological foundations of animal sentience research and the link between sentience and animal welfare. The project seeks to recruit one PhD student. The student will contribute to the project either by exploring the methodological foundations of animal sentience research, or by investigating the pathway from animal sentience research to consequences for animal welfare legislation and policy and/or animal ethics.

The student, at the time of starting the PhD, should have an excellent undergraduate degree and a completed Masters degree in philosophy or another relevant subject, such as comparative psychology, cognitive science, or animal welfare science. The primary supervisor of the PhD project will be Dr. Jonathan Birch. If you have any questions or want to know more about the project, please write to Jonathan at j.birch2@lse.ac.uk.

The successful applicant will receive full funding for a 4-year PhD at the LSE, including full payment of tuition fees AND a maintenance stipend of £18,000 per annum. To apply, please apply to the MPhil/PhD in Philosophy at the LSE in the usual way, carefully following all the requirements described on the LSE’s website: http://www.lse.ac.uk/study-at-lse/Graduate/Degree-programmes-2020/MPhilPhD-Philosophy. When you apply, please indicate clearly in your application (in both your Statement of Academic Purpose AND your Research Proposal) that you wish to be considered for the ASENT scholarship.

You should include, in your research proposal, a substantial description (of at least 1,500 words) of a research project relevant to ASENT. You MAY, if you wish, include TWO research proposals in the same document: a proposal relevant to ASENT, and a proposal on a different subject that you would pursue if awarded an LSE Studentship or a LAHP (AHRC) scholarship. If you do this, please indicate clearly which of the two proposals is relevant to ASENT.

It is expected that interviews will be conducted in late January or in February.

www.lse.ac.uk/philosophy/asent-scholarship/