

REVIEWS

The Review Section of Ethics and Animals 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 Ethics and Animals. After a review appears in Ethics and Animals (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.

JAMES AND MARY JO KOVIC, THE CASE AGAINST HUNTING: THE TRUE FACTS ON SLAUGHTER FOR SPORT (BALTIMORE: DEFENDERS OF ANIMAL RIGHTS), pp. 14, 1977.

This tract against hunting contains a letter by Mary Jo Kovic, the President of the Defenders of Animal Rights, appealing for anti-hunting letters to the editors of major newspapers; a list of addresses for fifteen metropolitan dailies; a question-and-answer format to present DAR's "case against hunting"; and a bibliography of fourteen books and articles. The tract is printed on 8 1/2 by 11 paper with a stapled card stock cover. It was first printed in August, 1977 and again in August,

1979. The credentials of James and Mary Jo Kovic are not given other than the mention of their foundation of DAR in 1975 and that James Kovic is an ex-hunter born and raised in Michigan. Frequent appeals are made for financial assistance of DAR and supporters are invited to send "extra \$ ___ for the animals."

The questions answered in the tract are "What is DAR's position on hunting?," game animal overpopulation, the manipulation of wildlife and habitat, the introduction of exotic game species, the extinction of animals through hunting, the National Wildlife Federation's position on hunting, hunting preserves, and income derived from license fees and excise taxes on arms and ammunition.

Anything negative that can be quoted about hunting is provided as a proof or a fact that the sport must be banned. Non sequiturs, caricature, and hyperbole abound.

This tract is propaganda for raising income for the DAR, not a resource for the researcher building a case against hunting. In the struggle between anti-hunters and hunters to win the minds of the uncommitted non-hunters, the Case Against Hunting is fourteen pages of material that serve the hunters well.

Douglas C. Stange, Ph.D.
Department of Religion
Central Michigan University