

entirely eliminate, the negative consequences he foresees. Indeed, the spectre of these fourteen possibilities would itself provide adequate incentive quickly to develop alternative businesses, industries, occupations, and pleasures to replace the losses occasioned by liberating animals. Furthermore, the liberation of animals would likely take place gradually, which would also help to moderate the negative consequences Frey envisages. Finally, the problems Frey outlines are, by and large, only transitory dislocations which we would have to go through to switch from an animal consuming to a liberated way of life. On the other hand, the relief for animal distress and frustration attained through liberating animals would go on indefinitely. Consequently, as time progressed, the negative impact of these transitory dislocations would become more and more insignificant in comparison with these accumulating benefits.

Thus, while Frey is certainly correct that liberating animals would have pervasive consequences--that is part and parcel of animal liberation being a major liberation movement--he is wrong in thinking that the dislocations which would be involved in accomplishing this revolution constitute a significant objection to the consequential superiority of animal liberation over continued animal consumption.

Another, more substantive argument against the consequential superiority of animal liberation over continued animal consumption is the so-called "replacement argument." However, since I have dealt with that argument at length elsewhere,[7] I shall pass over it here and conclude this section by responding to the objection that our references to the great number of animals which would benefit from animal liberation is mistaken. This is because, it has been claimed, if we were no longer permitted to consume animals, we would cease to raise them, and, consequently, many animals would never exist to benefit from being liberated.

Such an objection suffers from tunnel vision. While it is likely that liberating animals would lead to a substantial reduction in the number of chickens, white mice, and other animals bred for our consumption, it is also likely that the number of wild animals would increase substantially. That increase would be due in part to our not needing to

MICHAEL W. FOX
The Humane Society of
The United States

The first people knew
The One Mind in many
And the many in One.
The bear was sacred,
Like the wolf and the deer
And all creatures of the air and waters.

The first people knew
The One Soul in many
And the many in the One.
So they lived in harmony
In reverence of all.
It was a Golden Age.

Now this Age has gone
Except in memory
And in our feeling for the Earth.

This poem and others by
Michael W. Fox are from a
long narrative poem pub-
lished by Bear & Company,
Tucson, Arizona.

farm as much land to support ourselves on a vegetarian diet as on a meat diet, thereby releasing land for wild animals to live on. That increase would also result from our recognizing the right of wild animals to their own homeland, thereby halting our continual expropriation of their habitats for our benefit.[8] Furthermore, given our moral goal of making life more enjoyable and fulfilling and our ability to care for animals, we would be obligated (*ceteris paribus*) to act as nature's caretakers, in order to insure the flourishing of sentient life on earth. Consequently, there is no reason to believe that liberating animals would leave significantly fewer animals to benefit from that liberation.

Thus, the extensive distress and frustration occasioned by our current consumption of animals constitutes a serious obstacle to