of animals can be seen to be the single most effective and least destructive method of preventing injustice to a specific animal at risk of injury or death."

It seems to me that the question of how to address the systems Liszt has described, if we grant for a moment her description of their characteristics, is a vastly complex and difficult one. It in no way follows from the description of these structures that liberating animals will be particularly effective. It was not the underground railroad that ended slavery, after all. It took a civil war to do that. It could easily happen that the individuals who are devoted to defending these structures will use the liberation of animals as a weapon to portray the animal rights movement as a pack of terrorist criminals. In fact, the AMA has currently launched a national smear campaign designed to do just that. It could be that a far more effective tactic against such structures would be open acts of civil disobedience in which massive amounts of people are jailed. After all, those who liberate animals seek to break the law, and they also seek to get away with it, which in the eyes of many makes them more like terrorists than heroic revolutionaries. Animal liberation as a political tactic puts the animal rights movement in a precarious position. We have already seen efforts, such as the Fran Trutt case, to link the movement with violence. Most recently, the shooting of the Dean of a southeastern veterinary school was linked in the news media to animal rights activists. The allegations had no grounds, but a little of this sort of thing can go a long way and do a great deal of damage in the press.

In saying all this I am not trying to claim that animal liberation is ineffective or inappropriate but to point out that this question is much more difficult to answer than Liszt makes it out to be. I also would disagree with her description of the characteristics of the structures. Not all social structures need have the characteristics she describes, and the question is, how to create structures which do not. I particularly object to her characterization of science. Like most scientists, the physicist she quotes, von Weisacker, is no particular authority on the overall nature of science or scientific method, and most philosophers of science, myself included, would take strong exception to what he says, to the extent that it is clear. For example, what is the force of the claim, "The great scientific discoveries are miracles of holistic thinking"? Does this imply that scientists should give up experimentation for holistic thinking? No one would object to the claim that science

is not the absolute truth—no one since Descartes has proposed that it should be.

It seems to me important not to characterize social or political structures such as science as inherently violent and menacing. The real question is how to change such structures so that they are nonviolent and not exploitive.

PRAYER FOR A WHALE CHILD

My newly-born,
we will share the warmth
of the moon at night.
I sing to you
of ocean's fragile beauty.
A dark green heaven,
alive with color and movement.
I pray you live long,
and sing your children
the ancestors' songs.
You will have the strength of a giant;
and the gentleness of a breeze.
It is too soon to tell you
of a creature called man.
A few hear our music;
fewer still understand the song.
In your lifetime,
perhaps man will seek
our brotherhood.

Kathleen Malley