that are able to predict when the shock will occur, and/or are able to avoid the shock, do not develop learned helplessness or reactive depression. It may be argued, therefore, that a dog that has the security of its owner or a close emotional attachment to one particular person while on the dog show circuit would be less insecure than a dog being handled by one or more strangers or persons with whom the dog has not developed a close bond. Owners of show dogs should therefore be advised to accompany their dogs whenever possible to the shows, provided of course their dogs are emotionally attached to them. As an alternative, they should endeavor to place their dogs with the same reputable handler so that the animals may develop a strong secondary social attachment (Scott and Fuller, 1965). This attachment should be sufficient to provide the animals with the emotional security that will help protect them from developing the "show dog" syndrome.

This syndrome may be particularly relevant to those researching the companion animal-human bond. Further research is needed to verify that the "show dog" syndrome is a consequence of treating dogs as mere "objects," during which time the animal's emotional bond is disrupted, leading ultimately to complete withdrawal and reactive depression.
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The current interest in animal welfare and animal rights often leads to questions as to why this issue should have suddenly burst upon the scene and also why so many of the protagonists seem to have been raised and/or educated in Britain. Neither of these questions is easy to answer and perhaps there are no clear and unequivocal causal connections. There are many persons who are interested in animal issues and who do not have the British connection—Professor Teutsch in Germany and Professors Regan and Rollin in America being notable examples. Comments have also been made about the British love of animals. But this aspect definitely does not have anything to do with animal rights and animal liberation; if anything, "loving" animals may preclude any notion of animal rights. It is respect for animals which is important.

Leaving the issue of the British connection—why should there have been the sudden growth of interest in animal rights? The republication of Henry Salt's first-rate book, Animal Rights, by the Society for Animal Rights clearly indicates that the ideas and arguments enunciated by Peter Singer are anything but new. In fact, Singer himself acknowledges this in the preface to the 1980 version of Salt's book. However, the growing interest in the environment may have been a predisposing factor as may purely fortuitous events—such as the gathering together of a group of interested philosophy students and other academics in Oxford at the end of the
sixties. This particular event is described below by Peter Singer, one of the philosophy students, whose life was changed as a result of his meeting with the “Oxford Vegetarians.”

The Oxford Vegetarians — A Personal Account

Peter Singer

People coming together more or less by accident can have a catalytic effect on each other, so that each achieves more than he or she would have done alone. The Bloomsbury Group — G.E. Moore, Virginia and Leonard Woolf, E.M. Forster, J.M. Keynes, Vanessa and Clive Bell, Lytton Strachey and others — is a famous example. It would be immodest to suggest that the group of vegetarians who were together in Oxford from 1969 to about 1971 can compare with these illustrious figures; yet if the animal liberation movement ever succeeds in transforming our attitudes to other species, the Oxford Vegetarians may one day be seen to have been a significant force.

My wife, Renata, and I, arrived in Oxford in October 1969. I had come to do a graduate degree in philosophy — the natural climax to the education of an Australian philosophy student preparing for an academic career. My interests were in earlier political philosophy, but the connection between my philosophical studies and my everyday life would have been hard to discern. My day-to-day existence and my ethical beliefs were much like those of other students. I had no distinctive views about animals, or the ethics of our treatment of them. Like most people, I disapproved of cruelty to animals, but I was not greatly concerned about it. I assumed that the RSPCA and the government could be relied upon to see that cruelty to animals was an isolated occurrence. I thought of vegetarians as, at best, worldy idealists, and at worst, cranks. Animal welfare I regarded as a cause for a kindly old ladies rather than serious political reformers.

The crack in my complacency about our relations with animals began in 1970 when I accidentally met one of the Oxford group, Richard Keshen, a Canadian, who was also a graduate student in philosophy. He and I were attending lectures given by Jonathan Glover, a Fellow of New College, on free will, determinism, and moral responsibility. They were stimulating lectures, and when they finished a few students often remained behind to ask questions or discuss points with the lecturer. After one particular lecture, Richard and I were among this small group and we left together, discussing the issue further. It was lunchtime, and Richard suggested we go to his college, Balliol, and continue our conversation over lunch. When it came to selecting our meal, I noticed that Richard asked if the spaghetti sauce had meat in it, and when told that it had, took a meatless salad. So when we had talked enough about free will and determinism, I asked Richard why he had avoided meat.

That began a discussion that was to change my life.

The change did not take place immediately. What Richard Keshen told me about the treatment of farm animals, combined with his arguments against our
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