

and they came to realize the “sad havoc” and “wanton destruction” they had perpetrated on the native animal populations. Some emigrants regretted the slaughter of the “creatures that God has made,” claiming that it seemed wicked to kill an animal just to prove one’s ability to do it (p. 80).

Well-researched and well-written, Ahmad’s study is an important contribution to the history of the emigrants and their animals during the overland trail migrations of the mid-19th century. Ahmad has ably demonstrated the emigrant’s growing relationship with domestic and free-living animals. Yet, she also points out that most emigrants were driven by practical concerns and “understood that the relationship would be a temporary, practical one that lasted only until the destination or the death of the animal” (p. 64). The emigrants often sold or traded their worn-out animals when they made it to their destination, claiming that the price offered for the animals proved too good to turn down (p. 64). Yet, Ahmad also demonstrates that “without a positive relationship between emigrants and the animals, a successful journey likely would not have occurred” (p. 86).

Dictionary of Ethics, Theology and Society. Edited by Paul Barry Clarke and Andrew Linzey. (London, England: Routledge, 1996 [transferred to digital printing 2006]. 926 + xxxiii pp. Paperback. £34.99. ISBN: 978-0-415-86767).

SCOTT COWDELL
Charles Sturt University

This is the unaltered reissue of a useful reference book from the mid-1990s. Its aim was to advance dialogue between Judeo-Christian traditions of faith and practice and a range of key ethical issues, pointing out areas of mutual influence and generally helping readers to navigate morally relativistic waters. Oxford theologian Andrew Linzey

is one of the editors, which has helped ensure more representation for issues of animal ethics than might otherwise have been expected in a book of this vintage.

There are around 250 entries, varying in length from under a thousand to nearly 10,000 words, with many in the 1,000- to 2,000-word range. A number of leading theologians from the second half of the 20th century are among the contributors. Articles set out to provide an overview of options and the history of each particular issue. The amount of bibliography provided by each author varies significantly.

Entries relevant to the theme of this journal appear to be limited to 13, or just over 5% (i.e., a bit under 50 pages). They are “animal rights,” “countryside,” “creation” (by the fine theologian Dan Hardy), “cruelty,” “environment,” “farming” (with a discussion of the mechanization, commodification, and “thingification” of animals), “green,” “hunting,” “speciesism,” “suffering,” “vegetarianism,” “vivisection,” and “zoos.” Andrew Linzey is either author or coauthor of most of these, which shows how he has sought to secure a place for animal ethics in this volume.

There is a lot of excellent, balanced material here. Perhaps this project was undertaken because earlier versions are out of print and, hence, not widely available. Well and good, but an updated edition would have made an even stronger claim to our attention.

A Rational Approach to Animal Rights: Extensions in Abolitionist Theory. By Corey Lee Wrenn. (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 239 + xvii pp. Hardback. \$100. ISBN: 978-1-137-43464-7.)

CLIFTON P. FLYNN
University of South Carolina Upstate

In her insightful analysis, Wrenn skillfully makes the case for a rational, scientific approach calling for the elimination of animal

oppression—in Wrenn’s words, “vegan abolition”—not just “kinder” oppression. And while others have written thoughtfully and effectively about the strategic and theoretical differences between “welfarist” and “rights” approaches to animal liberation (and the strengths of the latter), Wrenn’s analysis stands out for several reasons. First, she insists on a scientific, empirical analysis of the movement’s effectiveness—its claims-making and its tactics. Second, she takes a critical sociological approach, drawing effectively from the literature on social movements, bureaucracy, and inequality, to examine the current status of nonhuman animal liberation efforts. And she powerfully argues that a professionalized welfare industry does little to end animal exploitation (and, in fact, likely normalizes it) and is more concerned with fund-raising, the bureaucracy, and animal advocates than the well-being of nonhuman animals.

Further, her critical sociological lens leads Wright to identify and challenge structural and systemic causes of all oppression, not just that of other animals. Embracing an intersectionalist theoretical perspective, Wrenn effectively argues that animal liberationists must fight to end all oppression:

Vegan advocates must extend abolitionist theory to include the interests of all nonhumans, women, people of color, disabled persons, elderly persons, children, homosexual persons, transgender persons, intersex persons and others. That is, *all* persons, regardless of demographic affiliation, are included in a rationalist, abolitionist ethic. (pp. 180–181)

Included in her critique are the roles of capitalism and religion in creating, reinforcing, and reinventing inequality between human and nonhuman animals, as well as between other human groups.

After an overview of her arguments and a preview of what is to come in Chapter

1, Wrenn begins her analysis by examining the irrationalities of the bureaucratization and professionalization of the animal welfare movement in the second chapter. She artfully applies the sociological writings of Weber—who first warned of the pitfalls of rationality—as well as Ritzer’s notion of McDonaldization to her critique. Her sociological analysis reveals how these tendencies toward irrationality have produced a welfare movement that is more focused on the survival of the professional agencies, which includes, among other things, an emphasis on fund-raising and working within “the system,” which undermines meaningful social change on behalf of nonhuman animals. “Nonhuman animal activists have become trapped in the iron cage of nonhuman animal welfare hegemony. Squandering resources with the continued implementation of tactics that do not work or that even *worsen* the condition of other animals is irrational” (pp. 59–60).

In Chapter 3, Wrenn moves on to assess the tactics used of nonhuman animal advocacy, which she rightfully points out have been subjected to little empirical analysis. The limited research that has been done has been conducted by movement agencies themselves, producing not only a conflict of interest but a lowering of standards based on a welfarist philosophy and the questionable assumption that increased fund-raising means social change. In assessing these tactics, she argues it’s important not to “throw the baby out with the bathwater,” and Wrenn presents ways in which they may be reconceptualized and applied in a vegan abolitionist movement.

The next two chapters take on the issue of institutionalized oppression and inequality within the nonhuman animal advocacy movement, specifically as they relate to gender (Chapter 4) and race (Chapter 5). In Chapter 4, Wrenn claims that a rational

approach must not only be scientific but also feminist. But feminist concerns have been largely left out of the movement, a movement that, although comprised predominantly by females, has historically been led by males. In her critique, Wrenn effectively attacks what she calls “vegan pornography”—the sex objectification of one exploited group, women, in campaigns to liberate another, nonhuman animals. According to Wrenn, “The movement invites society’s privileged to consume and overpower female-identified advocates in order to tap into the language of patriarchy with the hope of persuading viewers to not consume and overpower *other* animals” (p. 102).

Similarly, in the next chapter, Wrenn identifies the animal advocacy movement as being a white, Western phenomenon that has at best ignored and at worst exploited those of different racial and ethnic backgrounds—whose socioeconomic status often contributes to their marginalization (e.g., employees in animal industries such as slaughterhouses)—in the name of animal liberation. This chapter, drawing on the work of Nibert, also cites capitalism for its role in the entangled oppressions of humans and animals, arguing here and throughout the book that “human and nonhuman animal oppression are not only related but indeed entangled. Nonhuman animal oppression cannot be abolished so long as human oppression goes unchecked” (p. 124).

In Chapter 6, Wrenn adds religion to the ideologies of sexism, racism, and capitalism that support inequality. “Religion, then,” she writes, “can also be situated alongside racialized, patriarchal, capitalist ideologies of inequality and subjugation. This is because religion, too, often presupposes that some will benefit, and others will submit” (p. 146). Wrenn argues religion supports speciesism and provides a justification for animal use and misuse (as it has his-

torically been used to justify racism, sexism, and other oppressive ideologies) and that, consequently, a rational approach to animal rights must also be secular. And while I agree that theoretical perspectives on behalf of animal liberation should be secular in nature, it’s not clear to me that nonhuman animal advocacy can ignore either the religious perspectives that support the ethical treatment of other animals (e.g., the writings of Andrew Linzey) or the millions of believers for whom a sacred rationale might become persuasive in leading ultimately to vegan abolition.

In the final chapter, Wrenn summarizes her approach, highlighting its emphasis on empirical evidence, intersectionality, and the problems with capitalism and calling for a new definition of abolitionism:

Abolition involves the dismantling of physical and ideological structures of oppression. . . . To abolish speciesism means to end the institutions that oppress other animals. . . . That said, abolition should mean more than working to end the violence against other animals; it must also entail working to end violence against all sentient beings. (pp. 192–193)

All in all, *A Rational Approach to Animal Rights* is excellent (vegan) food for thought for scholars, advocates, students, and all who care about the lives of nonhuman animals.

Corporal Compassion: Animal Ethics and Philosophy of Body. By Ralph R. Acampora. (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006. 201 pp. Paperback. \$25.95. ISBN: 978-0-8229-6323-X.)

STEVEN SHAKESPEARE
Liverpool Hope University

One thing we share with nonhuman animal life is embodiment. Can this be the basis for