

Book Reviews

a writer and activist who has worked on small organic farms in Ireland and Connecticut. Among patristic and medieval theologians, it was fairly common to refer to gluttony as the first sin, the one committed by Adam and Eve when they ate the forbidden fruit. Killheffer first summarizes the writings of two theologians who made the most influential contributions to the Christian understanding of this sin: John Cassian in the early fifth century and Gregory the Great in the late sixth century. Writing for a monastic setting, Cassian classified three distinct ways that gluttony is expressed, while Gregory, who moved the concern of gluttony outside the ascetic ideals of the monastery, made a couple of alterations to Cassian's classification scheme. Killheffer then discusses gluttony from a contemporary perspective and concludes his essay with some possible remedies. Citing modern writers such as Michael Pollan, he summarizes his argument with the following rules: "Always eat with other people. Always eat at a table. Don't eat food with ingredients you can't pronounce. Eat food, not too much, mostly plants." These guidelines mirror those of John Cassian whose teaching regarding food consumption can also be summarized in a few words: eat communally, eat simply, and eat moderately.

Topics addressed by some of the other essays include the following: sustainability from a Franciscan perspective; land use and household stewardship; animal flourishing and suffering; evolutionary theory and the promise of restoration for all creation; and liturgy as the space in which all creation is consecrated before the cross of Christ. Finally, David Vincent Meconi, who edited this book and teaches at St. Louis University, has included his own essay, entitled "Establishing an I-Thou Relationship between Creator and Creature."

While a few of the essays are more philosophical in nature, most of them combine theological wisdom with practical application. The majority of the authors teach at Catholic seminaries and universities, so environmental concerns are mainly addressed through the lens of Catholic theology. The Bible is referenced in most of the essays and an index of scripture references is provided at the end of the book. This book should be required reading for those in leadership positions within the Roman Catholic church. Anyone with an interest in environmental ethics from historical and contemporary Christian perspectives will also benefit from reading this book. Hopefully, by reading it, more Christians will strive to become better stewards of God's creation.

Reviewed by J. David Holland, Department of Biology, University of Illinois at Springfield, Springfield, IL 62703.



VORACIOUS SCIENCE AND VULNERABLE ANIMALS: A Primate Scientist's Ethical Journey by John P. Gluck. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2016. ix-xx + 313 pages. Hardcover; \$27.50. ISBN: 9780226375656.

"It's just a rat, for God's sake" (p. 36). So spoke a surprised lab supervisor to John Gluck at Texas Tech University in the 1960s. At the time, Gluck was an undergraduate student whose clumsy first attempt to remove brain tissue from a living rat resulted in the animal's death. It surprised him to learn that the rat's death mattered so little in that place (it was "an extra"), that there was no interest in determining the actual cause of death, and that the only thing remaining to do after the botched experiment was to throw the corpse into a garbage bin. His initial assumption that nonhuman subjects mattered was misguided, in the opinion of this supervisor. What else did he expect? It's just a rat.

This philosophical memoir (my term, though, cf. pp. 284-85) includes many such episodes. *Voracious Science and Vulnerable Animals* is the story of the author's evolving relationships with other creatures and his emerging awareness of the researcher's moral responsibility to them. He begins with his childhood fascination with wildlife and love for family pets, but he then charts the steady "erosion" of an instinctive abhorrence at causing harm to other living things. His own development of an "it's-just-a-rat" attitude was gradual, and he describes several small steps that, in time, wore down his childlike revulsion at cruelty. Among them is an account of hunting rabbits with friends—often maimed, not always killed "cleanly"—and another of temporary work on a ranch that included the brutal castration, branding, and dehorning of cattle (pp. 25-29). In both cases, the acceptance of others proved intoxicating and encouraged him to stifle any squeamishness about inflicting pain on defenseless animals. A similar craving to belong and gain the respect of others occurred while at university, especially from professors whose research, they insisted, required the sacrifice of some for the sake of a higher good. Their approval of the young scholar further steeled him against sentimentalism (see, e.g., p. 33).

But chinks in the logical armor defending against emotional attachment to research animals gradually emerged during his long career and much of the book documents how justifying deprivations, electric shocks, and more on monkeys and rats proved problematic. He builds that case in a variety of ways

(see esp. chaps. 5 and 6), but one poignant turning point in Gluck's "ethical journey" serves to illustrate the kinds of dissonances with which he grappled. He credits a stray dog with bringing "warmth and a focus of care beyond my self-centered attention" into his home and marriage, and further describes the extraordinary efforts he and his wife took to care for this German shepherd mix. The costs in time, money, and convenience were considerable, even to the point of buying a house with a yard to accommodate the new pet. He admits that the sharp contrast between domestic and professional behavior, between his efforts to keep a dog contented and healthy and his daily treatment of animals in the lab, proved startling. Beyond providing clean cages and fresh food, the comfort of those animals was "not an issue" (pp. 131-32). Other pangs of conscience would follow.

The use of animals for scientific advancement is a polarizing subject, of course, and frequently those invested in the debate one way or the other speak past one another. One thing made clear in the book, however, is that altruism motivates those on both sides. Those wanting to empty the laboratory cages altogether often insist that any knowledge gained by experimenting on living animals is ill gotten. But Gluck reminds us that compassion motivates many working in research facilities too. He writes movingly about his father and the "life-destroying repercussions" of early onset Parkinson's disease that transformed his life and the lives of other family members caring for him (p. 21). Watching his father's struggle "weighed heavily" on his mind, contributing to his interest in neuroscience (p. 171). He also refers to the anxiety and depression that "plagued" his sister and grandmother, which also explained in part his career choices (p. 40). This insider's account of his educational formation, and professional and personal motivations, is potentially a bridge builder by helping those on opposite sides of the animal ethics question to find common ground in compassion. He writes knowingly of the concerns of both. One stated aim is to help protectionists better understand what he calls "the scientists' plight" and to thereby encourage more effective dialogue with them (p. xiv). Gluck writes as a scientific insider, as a one-time practitioner of the animal research methodologies he now critiques.

Gluck worked as a behavioral scientist from the 1960s through to the 1990s but eventually left this work to devote himself to the complexities of animal research ethics. This was no easy decision. (To illustrate his intellectual reservations, see, e.g., pp. 157-60, regarding his first response to Peter Singer's seminal work *Animal Liberation*). Some colleagues were suspicious

of the "turncoat" who changed sides (pp. 280-81), but this double perspective is what makes this book so fascinating. It is easy for scientists to mock the emotional outbursts or sentimentalism of sometimes-shrill advocates who, they insist, do not understand the importance of scientific inquiry and the costs of progress. At the same time, those advocates often caricature all those working in laboratories as insensitive sadists. What we find here is a beautifully told story of one who sees the issues from both sides, who challenges both stereotypes, and in the process, presents compelling reasons to consider the animal's point of view, which is a key concern in the unfolding argument (e.g., pp. 38, 147-50). His extensive work with laboratory animals, which he describes with often-disturbing detail, assures him an audience with others doing similar work. At the same time, what he describes as his "ethical awakening" (pp. xiv; cf. 143-52) is a remarkable turn toward animal compassion sure to inspire advocates.

The book urges animal welfare reform. Gluck has much to say about institutional animal care and use committees (IACUCs), and he puts forward ways for them to improve how they operate (xiv; chap. 7). He argues that philosophical analyses of animal ethics and political and institutional regulations alone do not result in significant protections for animals unless certain conditions inform the work of IACUCs. Heading a list of eleven such conditions (pp. 279-80) is the crucial need for committee members to value animal lives "at least as much as they value animals' usefulness in research." This captures well the argument put forward in the book.

Reviewed by Michael Gilmour, Associate Professor of English Literature and New Testament, Providence University College, Otterburne, MB R0A 1G0.



HISTORY OF SCIENCE

GOD IN COSMIC HISTORY: Where Science and History Meet Religion by Ted Peters. Winona, MN: Anselm Academic, 2017. 356 pages, index. Paperback; \$39.95. ISBN: 9781599828138.

History is getting "bigger" these days. To be sure, universal history, the attempt to provide a single overarching story of the past, received considerable popular attention in the mid-twentieth century with massive multivolume projects by the likes of Arnold Toynbee and Will and Ariel Durant. Dismissing such universalist approaches as too speculative, academic historians focused instead on monographs dealing with much smaller chunks of the past. So many historians became enamored with increasingly smaller-scale, even microhistorical, studies that the