

## Reviews

The Review Section of E&A consists of three parts. The first is made up of brief reviews of books and articles (and perhaps films etc.) which are concerned in some way with the rights and wrongs of human treatment of non-human animals. These reviews will be both critical and reportive--primarily reportive in the case of most scientific and historical material, and increasingly critical as the material is more argumentative and philosophical. The second part of this Section is entitled 'Second Opinions' and contains second (and usually dissenting) reviews of works reviewed in the first part in earlier numbers of E&A. After a review appears in E&A (and after the 'second opinion' if one appears within the next two numbers) the Editor will invite the author of the original work to submit a brief rejoinder to the review(s). Rejoinders received will appear in the third part of the Review Section. Members of the SSEA who wish to submit reviews (first or second), or recommend works for review, should contact the Editor.

### Books

ANIMALS' RIGHTS - A SYMPOSIUM, EDITED BY DAVID PATERSON AND RICHARD D. RYDER (LONDON, CENTAUR PRESS LTD., FONTWELL, SUSSEX) 1979. (244 pp., £6.50)

Not the first animal rights volume of this century, Animals' Rights, A Symposium commands, nevertheless, first rank attention for its varied and valuable contributions to this new era in animal-human relationships. For those freshly involved with the subject, this book falls in the category of "must" reading. It marks the "coming of age" of the animal rights movement in the 20th century, if, for no other reason than it bears the seal of approval of the establishment--the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

The RSPCA, thanks to new and progressive leadership, sponsored on August 18-19, 1977, at Trinity College, Cambridge University, a well-attended symposium on the "Ethical Aspects of Man's Relationship with Animals." This book puts between covers the well phrased thoughts of a stimulating mix of 23 philosophers, scientists, theologians, professional animal welfarists. The result is heady stuff.

In his introduction, the unavoidably absent (and modest) Peter Singer, author of Animal Liberation, wrote that "...it is not impossible when a century hence, people ask where the newly victorious animal rights movement got started, historians will point to the meeting at Trinity College in 1977."

Well organized into five specific areas, the symposium papers move with the swiftness of a flaming arrow, piercing many status quos along the way. Richard Ryder's opening overview of the philosophical and literary background of humanitarianism provides a bouncy springboard for future struggles against "speciesism."

RSPCA Council Chairman Ryder, a clinical psychologist, first coined this term at a small animal rights symposium at Oxford University in 1970. And he gave it further currency in his own Victims of Science. (It

was the Oxford meeting, giving rise to Animals, Men and Morals in 1971, that also drew the attention of Peter Singer and lit the flame for his 1976 classic.)

Free of frowning abbots-bishops-board chairmen, Buddhist Jack Austin and "ecospherist" veterinarian-author Michael Fox ably present their not too dissimilar perspectives on life's interrelationships. But the going is less easy for protestants against foot-dragging Christianity such as the young Anglican priest Andrew Linzey or Canon Eric Turnbull of Worcester Cathedral. Linzey, author of Animal Rights: A Christian Assessment of Man's Treatment of Animals, looks to moral evolution changing the church's perspectives and most cherished assumptions. His faith, indeed, is great. Canon Turnbull, likewise, looks to a reawakening and turnabout.

Though Henry Salt authored the controversial and prophetic Animal Rights in 1892, it was largely forgotten by the mid 1960's. So when professional author Brigid Brophy wrote on "The Rights of Animals" in the Times of London in 1965, it caused something of a stir. (It was not Salt, however, who spurred her, but Tom Paine and his Rights of Man.) The provocative Brophy's "Darwinist's Dilemma" calls for the ranking of all of us animals by our adaptability to our ecological niches, rather than our intelligence.

Author Maureen Duffy, an early animal rightist, calls for an inter-species declaration of independence. And Tom Regan of North Carolina State, co-author with Peter Singer of Animal Rights and Human Obligations, reminds that animal rights are meaningless unless accompanied by the human duty not to permit those rights to be infringed for trivial or frivolous reasons. From Stephen R. L. Clark of the University of Glasgow and author of The Moral Status of Animals, the advisement that no benefits to man can outweigh costs intolerable for animals. R. G. Frey, of the University of Liverpool, takes issue with "sentience" as the only criteria for moral valuation.

The brass tacks of factory farming, abuses of wildlife and laboratory animals are addressed by such experts as Ruth Harrison, author of Animal Machines, Jenny Remfry of the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, and Jon Wynne-Tyson, author of The Civilized Alternative. Of special significance, the paper by Bernard Dixon, editor of the New Scientist, looking toward further development of laboratory animal substitutes.

Changing the attitude of some scientists, who view their research animals merely as tools, was the concern of clinical psychologist David Spurlinger. As a leader in the RSPCA's animal experimentation reform group, he has given this much thought. (Helping people to change themselves, after all, is his profession.) Spurlinger believes that many humanitarians, through self-examination, have liberated themselves from the ambivalent attitudes of their upbringing. So, he reasons, cannot animal-exploiting researchers be persuaded to do the same?

The Cambridge symposium climaxed Britain's Animal Welfare Year, commemorating the centenary of the first anti-cruelty law in 1876. The Year's president, Lord Houghton of Sowerby, RSPCA vice president, and its chairman, Clive Hollands of the Scottish SPCA, set the tone for the next hundred years: more political action! Since then, there has been some progress on the government's approach to livestock, laboratory and wildlife problems. But the goals of the symposium's Declaration Against Speciesism still remain elusive. Signed by most of the conferees, including this reviewer, it may one day rank with other declarations that, at inception, were little recognized.

#### A DECLARATION AGAINST SPECIESISM

Inasmuch as we believe there is ample evidence that many other species are capable of feeling, we condemn totally the infliction of suffering upon our brother animals, and the curtailment of their enjoyment, unless it be for their own individual benefit.

We do not accept that a difference in species alone (anymore than a difference in race) can justify wanton exploitation or oppression in the name of science or sport, or for food, commercial profit or other human gain.

We believe in the evolutionary and moral kinship of all animals and we declare our belief that all sentient creatures have rights to life, liberty and the quest for happiness.

We call for protection of these rights.