What we're talking about when we're talking about wildlife?

A philosophical distinction with a practical implication



Maarten Jacobs, Wageningen University, the Netherlands

Wildlife raises public concern



- Need to talk with the public
- Public debates with stakeholders
- People express thoughts about wildlife

"There are too many elk in RMNP"

"There are approximately 3000 elk in RMNP"

"Elk are beautiful"

3 Statements, all about elk, but nevertheless about different phenomena

There are approximately 3000 elk in RMNP

- Elk as they exist "out-there"
- There are too many elk in RMNP
- An ideal we should collectively strive for Elk are beautiful
- A personal meaning assigned to elk

Goal: making explicit sense of the distinction

- 1. Ontology
- 2. Epistemology
- 3. Consequences

Conceptual sense provides intellectual tools for dealing with public debates

Ontology is the philosophical study of what there is

Many ontologists make a disctiction between:

- 1. The physical realm
- 2. The social realm
- 3. The mental realm

Phenomena in those realms have different characteristics

Phenomena in the physical realm:

- Are constituted by matter
- Have material properties (e.g. size)
- Exist objectively (i.e. "out-there" independent of thoughts of people)
- There is exactly 1 physical realm

Phenomena in the social realm:

- Are constituted by social rules
- Are arbitrary, not completely arbitrary, taken seriously, necessary to coordinate behaviour, everywhere
- Can be explicit or implicit
- Exist intersubjectively (i.e. among a group of people)
- There are many social realms

Phenomena in the mental realm:

- Are constituted by mental dispositions
- Exist subjectively (i.e. depend on thoughts/feelings of individual)
- There are as many psychological realms as there are conscious minds

Wildlife exists in 3 realms as 3 very different phenomena

Material realm	×
Social realm	d
Mental realm	ife

Material wildlife, social wildlife, mental wildlife

Epistemology is the study of knowledge

Question: when is statement valid?

- Statement about material wildlife is valid if true
- Statement about social wildlife is valid if just
- Statement about mental wildlife is valid if truthful

A potential misconception to be avoided:

Are psychologists not concerned with the truth?

A potential misconception to be avoided:

Are psychologists not concerned with the truth?

Yes they are.

BUT: not the truth about wildlife!

	Material wildlife	Social wildlife	Mental wildlife
Exists as	Things out there	Social rules for dealing with wildlife	An individual's thoughts/feelings about wildlife
Made of	Matter	Norms	States of mind
Wildlife as	Object	Organisation	Story
Mode of existence:	Objective	Intersubjective	Subjective
Validity claim:	Truth	Justness	Truthfulness
If valid, valid for:	Everybody	A social group	An individual

Consequences for wildlife managers involved in public debates

- **1.** Identify the aboutness of a statement
- Disagreement about material wildlife
 → joint fact finding
- 3. Disagreement about social wildlife
 → identify normative basis
- 4. Disagreement about mental wildlife
 → accept differences
- 5. Disagreement across realms is fake-disagreement

Suggestion for discours analysis

Distinction might be analytical tool?

Message for intergration of various scientific disciplines

Don't expect too much:

- 3 Realms are really different,
- Ontologically, and
- Epistemologically

Questions/discussion

	Material wildlife	Social wildlife	Mental wildlife
Exists as	Things out there	Social norms for dealing with wildlife	An individual's thought/feelings about wildlife
Made of	Matter	Norms	States of mind
Wildlife as	Object	Organisation	Story
Mode of existence:	Objective	Intersubjective	Subjective
Validity claim:	Truth	Justness	Truthfulness
If valid, valid for:	Everybody	A social group	An individual