

Moral Considerations on Individual Animals, Species and Endangerment

EUROPE EDITION

The ethics of managing invasive or endangered species while maintaining respect for the well-being of individual animals in ecosystems

Tony Macelli

Europe: one continent, many conservation landscapes	2
Two ways of seeing the same living world	2
Why a species can matter	2
Southern Europe: what the Iberian lynx recovery teaches	3
Why endangerment changes the moral weather	3
Central Europe: when the 'common' hamster is no longer common	3
And why ordinary, abundant animals still count	4
A layered map of responsibility	4
Wolves crossing borders - and moral categories	5
Where good intentions collide	5
Northern Europe: saving the Arctic fox by managing a community	6
A word for Christians - and for anyone who speaks of stewardship	6
Keeping evidence and imagination in the right relationship	7
A practical moral compass	7
References: General & Europe bibliography	8



Picture a conservation meeting where everyone agrees that nature matters - and then immediately disagrees about what that means. One person is thinking about the suffering of a particular animal. Another is thinking about an invasive species or an endangered species, an ecosystem, or a future in which a unique lineage has vanished. Both concerns are real. The challenge is learning to hold them together.

This is not merely an academic puzzle. It appears whenever conservationists consider controlling introduced animals, breeding endangered animals in captivity, restoring predators, protecting habitat, or spending scarce funds on one species rather than another. The choices affect feeling individuals, ecological communities and human communities at the same time.



Europe: one continent, many conservation landscapes

Europe's wildlife lives among some of the world's most intensively used farmland, forests, rivers, coasts and cities.

The European Environment Agency's 2025 assessment reports that 81% of protected habitats, 39% of protected bird populations and 62% of other protected species assessments are in poor or bad condition. The recurring pressures are familiar: intensive land and sea use, over-exploitation, pollution, invasive species, urban growth, fragmentation and climate change.

Yet the continent also offers genuine recoveries. Some species have returned through habitat repair, law, captive breeding, reintroduction and patient cooperation with local communities. Others that were once abundant are slipping away almost unnoticed. Looking south, centre and north shows why moral attention cannot be reserved for either charismatic rarities or individual welfare alone.

Two ways of seeing the same living world

Animal ethics usually begins close up. It asks: What does this animal experience? Can it feel pain, fear, comfort or curiosity? Does it form relationships, pursue goals or have a life that can go better or worse? Conservation ethics often pulls the camera back. It asks whether a population is viable, whether a species will survive, whether ecological processes are intact, and what evolutionary possibilities may be lost.

Neither view is sufficient on its own. A species is not normally a single conscious patient. It is a historical lineage: an evolving population carrying genes, adaptations, behaviours, ecological relationships and possibilities for the future. Individual animals, by

contrast, are the beings who can suffer and flourish. Endangerment adds powerful reasons to protect a lineage, but it does not preempt all the moral value of the animals who belong to it or to an introduced species identified as the endangering factor or to a predatory species. Common animals still matter.

Why a species can matter

The disappearance of a species is unlike the ordinary death of one member. Extinction closes a door permanently. It removes future generations, ecological functions, culturally meaningful relationships and an unrepeatable route through natural history. We lose not only what a species is now, but what it might have become.

Even so, we should be careful with the word species. Nature does not always fit tidy boxes. Species boundaries are scientific ways of describing evolving populations, and those boundaries may be blurred or debated. Moral importance can also belong to a subspecies, a locally adapted population, a migratory tradition, a socially learned way of feeding, or an animal culture. A taxonomic label is useful, but it is not the only container of value.

Southern Europe: what the Iberian lynx recovery teaches

At the beginning of this century, the Iberian lynx was close to extinction. Its decline was tied to habitat loss, human-caused mortality and the collapse of its principal prey, the European rabbit. Long-term work in Spain and Portugal combined Mediterranean scrub and woodland restoration, rabbit recovery, road-safety measures, genetic management, captive breeding, translocation and community cooperation.

The result is one of Europe's clearest conservation successes. In 2024 the IUCN moved the species from Endangered to Vulnerable after the number of mature animals rose from 62 in 2001 to 648 in 2022; the total population exceeded 2,000. More than 400 lynx had been reintroduced since 2010. Research tracking released animals found that captive-born lynx could establish wild-like home ranges, while also identifying behavioural differences relevant to careful release planning (Cisneros-Araujo et al. 2024).

Success does not make the ethical questions disappear. Captive breeding manages the bodies and reproduction of particular animals. Release exposes them to unfamiliar landscapes, roads, disease and competition.

Rabbit management affects another species whose own conservation status is troubled. The responsible aim is not merely a higher lynx count, but self-sustaining populations of animals able to live good wild lives in connected habitat.

Why endangerment changes the moral weather

Endangerment is best understood as a moral amplifier, not an on-off switch. Several considerations become more urgent as extinction risk rises.

Irreversibility. Extinction prevents recovery, future adaptation and future relationships.

Vulnerability. Small populations are unusually exposed to chance events, inbreeding, habitat fragmentation and exploitation.

Human responsibility. When habitat destruction, climate change, pollution, trade or human-assisted introductions create the danger, we acquire duties of repair.

Ecological role. The loss of a pollinator, predator, grazer, seed disperser or ecosystem engineer can spread harm far beyond one lineage.

Evolutionary information. Distinctive lineages embody histories and biological possibilities found nowhere else.

Cultural and spiritual meaning. A species may be known as kin, neighbour, teacher, symbol, or part of a sacred place.

Urgency, however, is not a blank cheque. A conservation proposal must still consider animal welfare, the rights and knowledge of local people, uncertainty, proportionality and the moral cost of its methods. Saving a species by casually mistreating its members, or the members of another species such as an introduced rival species or a predator species, would be a deeply incomplete victory.

Central Europe: when the 'common' hamster is no longer common

The European or common hamster is a useful antidote to the idea that only famous predators carry moral weight. Across parts of France, Germany, the Low Countries, Poland, Czechia and Hungary, populations associated with farmland have declined through simplified cropping, fragmented habitat, roads, urbanisation and changing climate. The IUCN classified the species as Critically Endan-

gered in 2020.

Its social history is as important as its biological one. In Alsace, the hamster moved within a few decades from an animal killed as an agricultural pest to a strictly protected flagship. Kletty and colleagues (2021) use the case to ask whether all conservation measures are legitimate: thousands of captive-bred animals have been released, individuals are trapped and tracked, and farmers are asked to modify land use for a species they were once paid to destroy.

Captive breeding can preserve a population, but genetic studies warn that small local populations and breeding stocks may lose irreplaceable diversity (Reiners et al. 2011). Release is not automatically rescue: survival depends on cover, food, weather, farming schedules, predators and connectivity. The deepest lesson is preventive. Diverse crops, year-round cover and less fragmented landscapes can benefit hamsters, insects, farmland birds, soil, water and farmers before emergency breeding becomes necessary.

And why ordinary, abundant animals still count

A common bird, fish, rat, pig or insect does



not suffer less because many others of its kind exist. If the harm at issue is pain, fear, deprivation or frustrated agency, conservation status is secondary. Labels such as 'pest,' 'vermin,' 'invasive' and 'livestock' describe human conflicts, origins or uses; they should not operate as verdicts on moral worth.

Abundant species may also be ecologically indispensable. Their very abundance can make nutrient cycling, pollination, prey support or habitat formation possible. Waiting until a species is in crisis is both ethically and practically shortsighted. Caring for ordinary species and ordinary habitats is usually

gentler, cheaper and more effective than attempting an emergency rescue after decline has become severe.

A layered map of responsibility

It helps to name the different things we may be trying to protect. They overlap, but they are not interchangeable.

The individual animal. We value experienced welfare, agency, relationships and a life of its own. Duties include avoiding severe or unnecessary suffering, providing humane treatment and respecting important preferences.

The population. We value viability, local adaptation, social knowledge and continuity. Duties include maintaining numbers, connectivity, genetic diversity and learned traditions.

The species or lineage. We value evolutionary history, distinctiveness and future possibility. Duties include preventing human-caused extinction and preserving habitat and evolutionary potential.

The ecological community. We value interactions, resilience, function and the integrity of place. The aim is to protect living process-

es, not merely assemble a list of charismatic species.

The human-animal relationship. Domestication, exploitation, displacement and conservation intervention can create special responsibilities. Dependence and past harm matter morally.

Wolves crossing borders - and moral categories

The return of wolves to many European landscapes is a conservation achievement and a source of real anxiety for livestock keepers. Wolves do not recognise national boundaries, while the costs of their return fall unevenly on particular rural families and grazing systems. European policy therefore has to protect a recovering species without treating farmers, shepherds or killed livestock as abstractions.

In 2025 the European Union reduced the wolf's protection level, increasing national flexibility over management and killing. Supporters presented the change as relief for rural communities; conservation organisations warned that culling could threaten still-fragile populations and fail to resolve conflict. Research on wolf-livestock coexistence recommends reliable monitoring, preventive hus-

bandry, fair compensation, stakeholder participation and management adapted to local conditions rather than a single continent-wide slogan (Ostermann-Miyashita et al. 2025).

This is exactly where individual, population and relationship-based ethics meet. A wolf may be killed to prevent losses; a sheep or calf is also an individual animal; a viable wolf population has ecological and evolutionary value; and pastoral communities possess livelihoods, knowledge and cultural attachments. Coexistence is not sentimental tolerance. It is the practical work of distributing both protection and burden more justly.

Where good intentions collide

Individuals versus species protection

Suppose killing some animals is proposed to protect a threatened species or ecosystem. An absolute rule that individuals may never be harmed can ignore ecological catastrophe; an automatic appeal to biodiversity can ignore real suffering. A responsible decision begins by establishing how serious and probable the threat is. It asks who caused it, whether nonlethal and preventive alterna-

tives exist, how many animals would be harmed, and whether the least-suffering method is genuinely being used. Outcomes should be monitored, and ineffective programmes should stop.

Cognitive and social complexity also matters. Where animals maintain close bonds, transmit learned behaviour or possess local cultures, intervention can destroy more than bodies. It can break families, erase knowledge and reduce the very resilience that conservation hopes to protect.

Introduced and 'invasive' animals

Introduced organisms can cause grave ecological damage. But causal impact is not moral blame. The animals did not choose to be transported, released or given access to altered landscapes; many are themselves casualties of human action. Prevention, biosecurity, habitat repair, fertility control, barriers, responsible relocation and changes in human land use deserve serious consideration before lethal control. If killing is truly necessary, welfare does not cease to matter.

Captive breeding and de-extinction

A captive-breeding programme can preserve a lineage while imposing confinement, reproductive management and release risk on indi-

vidual animals. Its goal should therefore be viable habitat and good lives, not a collection of genetic specimens. The animals through whom a species survives are not storage vessels.

De-extinction raises a related warning. The excitement of technological possibility should not draw money and attention away from living species and ecosystems, nor should it create animals for environments that cannot sustain them. We remain responsible to present beings even while imagining biological restoration.

Northern Europe: saving the Arctic fox by managing a community

The Fennoscandian Arctic fox shows how saving one species can require sustained intervention in an entire ecological community. After severe historic hunting, the population remained extremely small despite decades of legal protection. Conservation programmes in Norway, Sweden and Finland have used captive breeding and release, supplementary feeding, monitoring, and the control of larger red foxes that compete with Arctic foxes in the mountain tundra.



The work has produced measurable gains. Genetic research found increased variation and improved connections among Scandinavian subpopulations after releases and management (Hemphill et al. 2020). A Norwegian study following 915 foxes found similar survival and breeding prospects for released captive-bred animals and their wild-born descendants, but warned that food cycles, habitat capacity, red-fox expansion and climate change could prevent populations from becoming self-sustaining (Landa et al. 2022). Fennoscandian monitoring recorded 139 litters in 2024, while still concluding that continued conservation was necessary.

Here the moral tension is unusually plain. Arctic foxes are fed and bred under human control; red foxes are killed for competing successfully in landscapes that human-driven warming has helped them enter. The programme can be justified by human responsibility for past persecution and present climate pressure, but the red foxes do not become morally worthless. The long-term goal should be a functioning tundra system requiring less intensive control, not permanent dependence on feeding stations and culls.

A word for Christians - and for anyone who speaks of stewardship

Christian readers need not choose between care for creatures and care for creation. The biblical language of creation as good, of human dominion interpreted through service rather than domination, and of creatures belonging ultimately to God - all these can support a layered ethic. The neighbour before us matters, including the vulnerable animal whose suffering is easy to overlook; so does the wider household of life that sustains communities across generations.

Stewardship is therefore more demanding than keeping a few rare species from disap-

pearing. It asks for humility about human power, repentance where human activity has caused damage, mercy in the methods we use, and hope expressed through practical restoration. People of other faiths, spiritual traditions or secular outlooks may use different language - kinship, responsibility, justice, reverence or ecological citizenship - while arriving at overlapping duties of care.

Across Europe, this Christian vocabulary is ecumenical as well as Catholic. The Conference of European Churches and the European Christian Environmental Network have described care for creation as inseparable from theology and Christian service, and their phrase 'Every Part of Creation Matters' fits the layered ethic developed here. It encourages churches to connect prayer and teaching with land management, food systems, energy use, advocacy and practical care for local species.

Europe's Nature Restoration Regulation, in force since 2024, gives public expression to a related insight: protecting the last remnants is not enough; damaged wetlands, forests, grasslands, rivers, lakes, dunes and marine habitats must also recover. Christians and others may understand restoration as gratitude, repentance and service to the common good. Others may ground it in justice, inter-generational responsibility or nature's intrinsic

value. Either way, restoration should improve the conditions in which human communities, individual animals and wild populations can flourish together.

Keeping evidence and imagination in the right relationship

Environmental ethics draws on more than one kind of source. Empirical studies can tell us about population trends, ecological effects, sentience and behaviour. Philosophical arguments help us ask what those facts mean morally. Theology and spiritual reflection explore ideas such as creation, kinship, purpose and responsibility. Anecdotes can alert us to possibilities and deepen attention, while speculative proposals can stretch the imagination.

These forms of thought should converse without being confused. A moving story is not the same as controlled evidence, and a theological conviction is not a biological measurement. Yet science alone does not decide what ought to be done. Educated care requires both intellectual hospitality and clear labels: strong evidence where we have it, honest uncertainty where we do not, and moral reasoning that remains open to correction.



A practical moral compass

A balanced position gives direct moral consideration to individual animals according to their likely sentience, needs and relationships. It gives additional, possibly non-reducible consideration to populations, species and ecosystems according to rarity, ecological role, evolutionary distinctiveness, cultural meaning and human responsibility.

In practice, that means asking several questions together: Who can suffer here? What ecological relationships are at stake? Is the threat reversible? How much of the problem

did people create? Which options prevent harm rather than merely react to it? Are local communities involved? Is the intervention proportionate, humane and open to revision?

Endangered status is a strong reason for urgent protection. It is never a reason to disregard the welfare of the individuals through whom a species exists. Conversely, compassion for individual animals should not make us indifferent to the irreversible loss of lineages and ecological communities. The wisest environmental ethic keeps the camera moving: close enough to see the animal, wide enough to see the living world around it, and long enough to remember the future.

References

General bibliography

The papers used in this article are available from www.acadmia.com.

- Ahmed, A., with C. Corradi. 2022. Animal Sentience and Consciousness: A Review of Current Research.
- Birch, J., A. K. Schnell, and N. S. Clayton. 2020. 'Dimensions of Animal Consciousness.' Trends in Cognitive Sciences 24(10): 789-801.
- Brooks Pribac, T. 2023. 'Flourishing Bodies: Spiritual Entanglements and Psychobiological Imperatives.' Religion 54(2).
- Cunningham, P. 2022. 'The Case for Animal Spirituality - Part 2: Logical Arguments, Empirical Evidence, and Practical Consequences for Human Society.' Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture 16(2): 225-263.
- Di Rupo, S. F. 2025. 'Animal Religiosity: Opportunities and Ontological Limits of an Impervious Philosophical Proposal.' AUC Theologica 14 (2): 151-172.
- Kastrup, B. 2018. 'The Universe in Consciousness.' Journal of Consciousness Studies 25(5-6): 125-155.
- Le Neindre, P., et al. 2017. Animal Consciousness. EFSA Supporting Publication 14(4): 1196E.
- Schaefer, D. O. 2012. 'Do Animals Have Religion? Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Religion and Embodiment.' Anthrozoos 25(sup. 1): S173-S189.
- Stroumsa, G. G. 2010. A New Science: The Discovery of Religion in the Age of Reason. Harvard University Press.
- Trestman, M., and J. Birch. 'Evidence Concerning Animal Consciousness.' Reference paper in the ANIMALS corpus.
- Waldau, P. 2019. 'Religion as Animal and Alive.' Religions 10: 354.
- European bibliography and further reading
- Associated Press. 2024. 'The Iberian lynx is back from the brink of extinction, thanks to conservation efforts.' 20 June 2024.
- Associated Press. 2024. 'Landmark EU nature restoration plan gets the green light despite months of protests by farmers.' 17 June 2024.
- Associated Press. 2025. 'European Parliament votes to lower protections on wolves.' 8 May 2025.
- Banaszek, A., et al. 2020. Cricetus cricetus. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2020: e.T5529A111875852.
- Cisneros-Araujo, P., et al. 2024. 'Born to be wild: Captive-born and wild Iberian lynx reveal space-use similarities when reintroduced.' Biological Conservation 294: 110646.
- Conference of European Churches. 2022. Every Part of Creation Matters. European Christian Environmental Network discussion document.
- European Commission. 2024. 'Nature Restoration Law enters into force.' 15 August 2024.
- European Environment Agency. 2025. Europe's Environment 2025: State of Europe's Biodiversity.
- Hemphill, E. J. K., O. Flagstad, H. Jensen, K. Noren, J. F. Wallen, A. Landa, A. Angerbjorn, and N. E. Eide. 2020. 'Genetic consequences of conservation action: Restoring the Arctic fox population in Scandinavia.' Biological Conservation 248: 108534.
- IUCN. 2024. 'Iberian lynx rebounding thanks to conservation action - IUCN Red List.' 20 June 2024.

Kletty, F., M. Pele, F. Capber, and C. Habold. 2021. 'Are All Conservation Measures for Endangered Species Legitimate? Lines of Thinking With the European Hamster.' *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 8: 536937.

Landa, A., L. Rod-Eriksen, K. R. Ulvund, C. R. Jackson, A.-M. Thierry, O. Flagstad, and N. E. Eide. 2022. 'Conservation of the endangered Arctic fox in Norway - are successful reintroductions enough?' *Biological Conservation* 275: 109774.

Norwegian Environment Agency, Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Swedish Museum of Natural History, and Metsahallitus. 2025. Population Status for the Arctic Fox in Fennoscandia 2024.

Ostermann-Miyashita, E., et al. 2025. 'Bridging the gap between science, policy, and stakeholders: towards sustainable wolf-livestock coexistence in human-dominated landscapes.' *People and Nature*. DOI: 10.1002/pan3.10786.

Reiners, T. E., K. M. Encarnação, K. Wolters, and A. Nowak. 2011. 'Strong decline of gene diversity in local populations of the highly endangered common hamster in the western part of its European range.' *Conservation Genetics* 12: 311-322.

Science. 2026. 'Wolves are reconquering Europe. Can people learn to live with them?' 9 July 2026.

The Guardian. 2024. 'Eagle attacks, red invaders and a genetic bottleneck: inside the fight to save Arctic foxes.' 13 June 2024.

Yle News. 2024. 'Finland gets EU funding to save the Arctic fox.' 21 March 2024. -o-

Tony Macelli may be contacted on
imaginetony@gmail.com



Europe's Shared Community of Life

From forests and mountains to rivers, wetlands and seas, Europe's animals remind us that protecting species, habitats and individual lives is an inseparable part of our ethical responsibility.