

Contents

1	Introduction: Sharing the Fruits of the Open Society	1
2	The Interspecies Democratic Theory	13
2.1	Cavalier Agnosticism	15
2.2	Opposing Arguments	18
2.2.1	Animals Have No Interests	18
2.2.2	Animals' Interests Are Unfathomable Phenomena	21
2.2.3	Animals' Interests Are A-Political	22
2.3	Non-human Animals as Political Patients	23
2.3.1	The Political Animal Agents School	24
2.3.2	Intention as a Necessary Requirement for Political Agency	27
2.4	Political Patients and Their Consideration Right	31
2.4.1	Children's Consideration Right in Theory and Practice	32
2.4.2	The Identity of Interests as a Core Characteristic of Democracy	35

2.4.3	The Demos	42
2.4.4	Non-human Animals and the Demos	46
2.5	Conclusion	52
3	Animals in Liberal Democracies in Theory and Practice	65
3.1	Enfranchisement Criteria	68
3.1.1	The Legitimacy Criterion	68
3.1.2	The Non-contingency Criterion	70
3.1.3	The Independence Criterion	72
3.1.4	The Human Assistance Criterion	76
3.1.5	The Residency Criterion	78
3.2	The Current Position of Animals in Liberal Democracies	81
3.2.1	Basic Outlines	81
3.2.2	Promising Developments	86
3.3	Normative Assessment of the Status Quo	99
3.3.1	The Legitimacy Criterion	99
3.3.2	The Non-contingency Criterion	101
3.3.3	The Independence Criterion	103
3.4	Similarities and Differences with the Enfranchisement of Future People	106
3.5	Conclusion	112
4	Enfranchising Animals in Political Institutions	123
4.1	Challenges of Politically Institutionalizing Regard for Animal Interests	127
4.1.1	The Challenge of Representing Non-human Animals	128
4.1.2	Content of Representation and Political Guardianship	131
4.1.3	Abuse of Power	145
4.1.4	Distribution of Political Power	164
4.1.5	Democratic Costs	176
4.1.6	Conflicting Interests	182

4.2	Recapitulation of Politically Institutionalizing Regard for Animal Interests	187
4.3	Conclusion	193
5	Enfranchising Animals in Legal Institutions: Constitutional State Objective	205
5.1	The Constitutional State Objective and Its Political and Legal Effects	207
5.1.1	Effect I: A Basis for Limiting Fundamental Legal Rights	210
5.1.2	Effect II: Conflicts of Interests, Interpretation of Open Norms, and Fuller Review	214
5.1.3	Effect III: Presence in Legislative and Executive Considerations	216
5.1.4	Effect IV: Safeguarding Progress	218
5.2	Difference with Fundamental Legal Rights	218
5.3	State Objective on Animal Welfare in Switzerland	223
5.4	Normative Assessment of the Constitutional State Objective	232
5.4.1	The Independence Criterion	232
5.4.2	The Non-contingency Criterion	234
5.5	Conclusion	248
6	Enfranchising Animals in Legal Institutions: Fundamental Legal Rights	263
6.1	Unbreaking News: Animals Not Granted Rights	264
6.2	Characteristics of Fundamental Legal Animal Rights	269
6.3	Justifying Fundamental Legal Animal Rights	272
6.3.1	The Welfare of Animals and Liberal Pluralism	273
6.3.2	Interests and Fundamental Legal Rights	277
6.3.3	The Enhancement of Legal Systems	284
6.4	Normative Assessment of Fundamental Legal Animal Rights	293

6.4.1	The Legitimacy Criterion	293
6.4.2	The Non-contingency Criterion	300
6.4.3	The Independence Criterion	311
6.4.4	The Human Assistance Criterion	316
6.4.5	The Residency Criterion	320
6.5	Conclusion	323
7	Conclusion	337
	Glossary	347
	Bibliography	351
	Index	367