

Reading response

[Literature](#), [Russian Literature](#)



Animal Liberation The article talks about animal liberation and land issues. In order to explore the issue of land ethics and animal liberation, Sagoff explores various views of various animal and environmental liberators (1).

The first aspect of animal protection intervention that the author talks about is the total environmentalist. This group, according to the author believes that animals and the environment have the same rights just like human beings. This group of people believes in the idea of environmentalism.

According to the author, the group argues that animals and other creatures should not be subjected to any kind of suffering because they have the same rights like human beings. Sagoff however, argues against this idea (Sagoff 2).

Sagoff states that animals and trees can be given the same rights as human beings (3). It further states that it is hard to protect animals just because they are capable of suffering. In his argument against environmentalism, he gives an example that if man is to be prevented from hunting a deer, then a cat should also not hunt a mouse. This, the author says is one of the reasons why environmentalism principle cannot be fully implemented. He also argues against the claim by this group that groups and organizations like the Wildlife Fund have failed in their duties. Sagoff indicates that the duties of such organizations are based on biological factors and not on total environmentalism.

The second group which the author talks about is the liberators who argue that animals have legal rights. This group advocate for equality. According to the author, the group advocates that it is the moral duty of the human beings to protect the environment and other wild animals since they have

rights (Sagoff 5). This second group extends the moral boundaries so as to include the animals and all other creatures including trees. The liberators believe that tree and animals have legal standing and because of this, their interest should be represented in the courts, just the same way human interest is represented in court. This, the author says is totally impossible. Sagoff goes ahead to indicate that the welfare of all animals is in the hands of the society (4). Moreover, the society should not only attend to the needs of the domestic animals, but also the animals without help who are miserably out there in the wild. This he said is because the domestic animals are not in any special class. In defending his claim, the author argues that his stand should not be taken to be similar to those of animal liberators or the environmentalists (Sagoff 6). He indicates that animal liberators cannot be environmentalist and the environmentalist cannot be liberators. Sarnoff states that his argument is based on the ecological system and not on liberalism or environmentalism.

In conclusion, Sagoff says that there are complexities in both environmentalism and liberalism ideas. Due to these complexities, the two principles cannot be used to solve animal and environmental issues. A humanitarian approach that focuses on the welfare of the animals and not nature cannot therefore be used to provide a valid foundation to environmental laws (Sagoff 7).

Works Cited

Sagoff, Mark. “ Animal Liberation and Environmental Ethics: Bad Marriage, Quick Divorce”. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 22. 2(1984): 297-307. Print.