

Book News

BOOK REVIEWS

SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES ON ANIMAL WELFARE, edited by W. Jean Dodds and F. Barbara Orlans (1982). Academic Press, New York \$14.50.

This is a collection of papers by various persons involved in laboratory animal care and research, which was presented at the First Conference on Scientific Perspectives in Animal Welfare sponsored by The Scientists Center for Animal Welfare. The book is divided into five sections with an introductory overview on the history of the use of animals in medical research by Dr. Franklin M. Loew and a paper by Dr. Thomas E. Malone, Acting Director, National Institutes of Health, entitled "Towards Refinement, Replacement, and Reduction in the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals." The book is divided into five sections, dealing respectively with: investigator responsibilities in animal experimentation; institutional responsibilities in animal experimentation; funding agency responsibilities; and journal editor responsibilities in relation to the care and use of animals, the findings from which are submitted for publication in technical journals.

Each of the above sections concludes with a summary of conclusions and recommendations drawn up by a small task force of participants. The fifth and final section deals with public policy and recommendations. This symposium proceedings is a welcome contribution to the field of laboratory animal science and to such related areas as public concern over the care and use of laboratory animals and the responsibilities of those involved in their care and exploitation for biomedical and other purposes.

M.W. Fox

ALL THAT DWELL THEREIN. ANIMAL RIGHTS & ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS, Tom Regan, University of California Press, Berkeley, California. (1982) \$18.95.

This series of essays written between 1975 and 1981 deals with the rights-based theory for more humane treatment of animals, and later essays also explore the question of environmental ethics from the rights perspective.

With reference to vegetarianism he states, "The question of the obligatoriness of vegetarianism...can arise only if and when the animals we eat are the kind of beings who have interests." His critique of the limitations of such concepts as kindness and cruelty, which are widely used by animal welfarists, is extremely perceptive, and reveals how judgmental and human-centered these concepts are. There might be less judgmentation and more constructive dialogue between animal protectors and their perceived adversaries (especially animal researchers) if the former were more aware of the shortcomings of their own attitudes and perceptions.

While the author states that "fundamentally...my intentions are practical, not theoretical," the major impetus of his book is to expand the scope of concern for the treatment of animals in society by appealing to reason and moral sensibility. But since his position is stolidly against using animals in re-

search, raising farm animals for food, and the exploitation of wildlife and the natural environment, his position will seem ideologically unreasonable to many. However, Regan's work should be widely read by all who are involved in one form of animal exploitation or another since his views are gaining wide acceptance by the more militant animal-liberation faction of the humane movement.

He is rightly critical of the Cartesian view that animals are "unfeeling machines" and in many of the essays fairly attacks his nemesis, the Benthamite utilitarianism of Australian Peter Singer, another leading philosopher in the animal liberation movement. His attacks on Singer's utilitarianism seem to reflect his own ideological resistance to make the necessary integration of his animal rights ideology with the pragmatic necessity of having to exploit life in order to sustain human life. He is right, I believe, in pointing out Singer's weaknesses in being unable or resistant to incorporating animal rights into his strictly utilitarian philosophy, which is anthropocentric and thus flawed with potential "speciesism." It is ironic that these two philosophers, whose ideas have much to offer the animal welfare movement, have yet not seen the wisdom of their paradoxically complementary views, a reconciliation of which would allow for much greater strength and clarity. Such a necessary unity, of utility and respect for the life of the individual (both human and non-human) is the penultimate step toward a more unified theory which casts the paradoxical, yet complementary, dualities of Bentham-Singer utilitarian exploitation (i.e., objectivity) and Schweitzer-Regan reverence for life, animal rights and intrinsic value (i.e., subjectivity) into an ecological/cosmological framework. This ecological view, although mentioned repeatedly by Regan, is not, unfortunately, incorporated into his animal rights argument because, no doubt, it contains that element of utilitarian exploitation between animal and plant communities to which he has become allergic. This is quite understandable, since to penetrate

the depths of reason, as he has, entails much suffering through empathizing with those creatures whose lives are cruelly and trivially exploited by "civilized" man, for profit and pleasure.

His essay entitled "The Nature and Possibility of an Environmental Ethic" echoes, in its preservationist conclusion, the same vegetarian-antivivisectionist anti-utilitarian position argued for in earlier essays. Likewise in his last chapter which explores the native American Indians' relationship with nature (and who engaged in widespread commercial trapping soon after contact with the white man, in apparent violation of their alleged spiritual attitude toward nature) he asks if the Indians "viewed nature primarily as having value in its own right...(or) primarily as a system of resources...." In questioning which view is primary, Regan creates a polarity which again reflects his own inability or resistance to accepting the paradoxical dialectical quality of existence. But perhaps he is right in doubting that man can have an ethical, spiritual relationship with animals and nature and a utilitarian one, such that we can respect and exploit at the same time when the exploitation is on a wholesale, commercially industrialized scale for profit, rather than on an ecologically sound and more humane scale for subsistence.

By integrating a more ecological utilitarianism with animal rights, both views would be strengthened. The former lacks reference to the animal's *telos* or intrinsic qualities (other than sentience, in Singer's philosophy) and the latter, as presented by Regan, lacks the empiricism and ecological perspective that utilitarianism can give. The negative ecological (and long-term economic) consequences of "factory" farming of livestock and poultry, for example, provide a rational and realistic utilitarian basis to question the ethics of such industrialized exploitation which violates animals' rights. Utilitarianism, combined with respect for the intrinsic worth (or rights) of animals, could more effectively lead to the social reforms Regan hopes for, through enlightened self-interest. This dialectical tension be-

tween the rights of individuals and the good of the whole may be resolved, I believe, by integrating Regan's respect for the life of the individual with a deep understanding of the dynamic relationships of all individuals within the ecological whole which, through reciprocal maintenance, (possibly the highest form of utilitarian enlightened self-interest) insures balance and harmony (philosophically, an egalitarian ecology).

I also think that if Regan were to discuss the importance of empathy and the reasons why animals are treated inhumanely and unethically, his work might be even more influential. Furthermore, the philosophical, rational approach to this entire issue, if it is not to beach itself upon some barren and impractical ideology (which appeals to moral anarchy), must address reality: the tragedy of reality that we must kill life (but not over-kill) in order to sustain our own. But the increasing anxiety of the times, along with self-righteous moral indignation and outrage at man's inhumanity, can paralyze the ability to reason, empathize and love. Regan helps us begin to reason, to objectively and dispassionately look at ourselves, and for this reason, his book should be read by all who are involved with animals in whatever mode — research, teaching, biology, psychology, medicine, farm animal science, and wildlife biology and management, as well as conservation and animal welfare.

M.W. Fox