**Final Exam Study Guide: Rel St. 170/Philos 130, Animal Ethics and Religions (60pts)**

**The final exam will be open five days (Monday Dec. 11, 5pm – Friday December 15, 5pm).** The exam is open book and should reflection your own work only, as aligned with the perfect duty of truth telling toward self and others. Exams must be done in one 2 hour and 15 minute sitting. Accommodation time will be added.

**Pre-Exam Preparation:**

1. **Part F:** Be ready to copy your first “Snapshot of Animal Ethics” assignment from Week 1 into the exam in order to update your response (prompt provided in the exam)
2. **Part G:** Choose one of the below Case Studies (from two options), watch/read the two brief sources provided so you are prepared to craft your three Assertions. You can prepare your assertions ahead of time or just during the exam.

**All exams and late course work are due by Friday, December 15, 5pm**

The Exam will consist of 4 parts:(A) Matching, Multiple Choice, and T/F (≅25pts); (B) Image analysis (≅10pts); (C) short answer/case study reflection (≅15pts); (D) End-of-quarter analysis of your Personal Snapshot (10pts)

Optional Extra Credit (2 paragraphs max) (up to 4 pts extra credit: choose one of the nine stories linked in the Week 10b syllabus, and briefly (1) Name your chosen article and explain the issue (0.5pts), (2) Note any personal/social/economic factors that may have inspired the ethical change (1.5pts); (3) Identify how the work of this group/s or individual/s reinterprets existing views of animals or human-animal relations, noting whether you see an identity, difference, and/or indistinction approach **and/or** other animal ethics theories/approaches we've looked at (2pts).

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Below is a study guide for the parts of the exam addressing matching, multiple choice, T/F and short answer. This should not be considered exhaustive; much of the final exam will be drawn from our course quizzes, as well as slides and discussion.

1. **Possible Terms/Theories/Concepts**

Binary logic

Reincarnation/transmigration

Great Chain of Being

*Ahiṃsā*

Karma

Speciesism

Logocentrism

Anthropocentrism

Theocentrism

Subject-of-a-life (deontology) and its foundation in Kant’s Categorical Imperatives

Argument from marginal cases

Moral patient

Moral agent

Utilitarianism (consequentialism) and its foundation

Define and identify examples of Identity (Regan, Singer, Darwin), Difference (Derrida), and Indistinction-based approaches (we had many) within animal ethics (Calarco)

Capabilities Approach (Nussbaum)

Threshold Concepts (Barrett et al.)

Challenging “humanization” and “animalization” (Ko and Walker)

Feminist ethics of care (Gilligan)

“absent referent” (Carol Adams)

Animal machines (Descartes)

The potential and limits of natural and political rights (Aristotle and Aśoka, Cavalieri, Regan, Singer, Wise, others?)

Virtue Ethics (and the “Golden Mean”) as relates to animal ethics (Aristotle)

Replaceability argument

Four U.S. federal welfare laws

3 Rs of animal research

NAMs (new approach methodologies in animal research)

1. **Reflections, positions, and perspectives related to:**

What are some of the “lacks” that have justified the exclusion of “the animal” from moral community?

What is the role of data in animal ethics

How to overcome epistemic narrowness through threshold concepts

Ethical views on: (1) Hunting, (2) Animal research, (3) Eating Animals, including various arguments such as utility, rights, care, virtue, sexual politics, etc.)

Becoming animal (Temple Grandin and Henning and Henning)

Investigating the research attitude (Fox, Hartung, Gluck)

1. **Possible Figures** (these are some of the primary figures, but you will see other names throughout this study guide who have helped us to think with animals

Jeremy Bentham

Immanuel Kant

Tom Regan

Peter Singer

Jacques Derrida

René Descartes

Val Plumwood

Paola Cavalieri

Martha Nussbaum

1. **Early Religious Roots: Animal Ethics and the Supreme Way of Life**

Neoplatonists (such as Plotinus, Porphyry) and inter-Greek debates on animals

Indian context of rebirth, karma, and nonviolence (*ahiṃsā*)

Theriomorphism

Ontology-informed politics: Aristotle and Emperor Aśoka

Great Chain of Being and Christian/Jewish Theism

Views of Augustine and Aquinas

Descartes “Cartesian” dualism and “animal machines”

Animals and “theodicy” (the defense of God’s goodness in the face of evil/suffering of animals; Augustine, Aquinas, Descartes, David Hume)

Producing “the human” in secular humanities and European middle class (Durkheim, Eliade, Cassirer, Ko)

1. **Reinterpreting existing religious, legal, or scientific frameworks (you’ll have at least 3 options to choose from)**

Rethinking a Christian approach to animals (Christopher Carter)

Rethinking a sacrificial framework (Saadullah Bashir [Islam] or accounts in Genesis)

Rethinking a secular scientific approach to animals (John Gluck and Thomas Hartung)

Rethinking “conservation” and wild ethics (Marti Kheel, Fox [in Taylor], #EvictCoyote)

Rethinking the “human” (Derrida, Syl Ko, indistinction approaches, who else?)

Rethinking the sexual politics of meat and the “absent referent” (Carol Adams)

Rethinking natural and political rights (Aristotle, Aśoka, Steven Wise of Nonhuman Rights Project, Paola Cavalier, Peter Singer, or Tom Regan)

Pursuing Virtuous sensibilities (Justin Fifield, Ethics of Care, Neoplatonists)

1. **Snapshot Reflection**

You’ll be invited to copy your first “snapshot” responses into the exam and offer a reflection (prompt provided in the exam) on your present view

1. **Possible Case Studies (choose 1 and watch/read the two sources prior to the exam; you can prepare your 3 assertions prior to or during the exam, as you wish)**
2. **Case Study Option 1: Lolita the Whale**

**Option 1 Background:** Public outcry over ending the captive use of cetaceans such as whales and dolphins has grown louder over the last decade notably spurred on by documentaries such as “Blackfish,” “The Cove,” and new information provided by industry whistleblowers, or emboldened animal behavior scientists. For this question, you will consider arguments for how best to release an orca whale named Lolita from a captive tank back into an appropriate habitat. Please read and watch the below short sources for more details on these debates.

* Source 1 (watch imbedded video [5 min] and read text): [Chabeli Herrera, “Lolita May Never Go Free. And that Could be What’s Best for Her, Scientists Say”](https://www.miamiherald.com/news/business/article185517463.html)
* Source 2 (video, 3.5 min): [WPLG Local 10, “Efforts Underway to Liberate Lolita from Seaquarium and it’s Not the First Time”](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rGSIpgVKRhM&t=151s)

**Question 1:** If you were on a decision-making body considering how best to release the captive orca Lolita, develop three distinct assertions, drawing upon our animal ethics course, that you feel are essential for the committee to consider in their decision-making process. The aim is not for you to solve the dilemma in this outline, but to develop three critical assertions for the committee’s consideration of releasing Lolita. **You are making three overall assertions, each of which should be supported by relevant terms or concepts** (including relevant figures or theories drawn from religious, legal, and scientific sources we’ve explored).

**Example assertion** (this is a sample only and you need not use this structure; it’s just one possible way): (Assertion 1) The committee first has to consider Lolitas as \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, based on the approach of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ which states \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

**Case Study Option 2**

**Option 2 Background:** When considering how one can eat animal flesh and minimize harm, some environmental arguments have been made to eat certain species—such as certain fish or chickens—due to the lower environmental impact of their production. Others have argued that this approach magnifies the suffering of individual animals considerably, since fish and chickens are small-bodied animals who are killed for every “wing” or “fillet” and whose production makes up the majority of industrial animal farming. For this question, you will consider these arguments on harm reduction. Please read and watch the below short sources for more details on these debates.

* Source 1: [Gemma Alexander, “Bad, Better, Best: The Climate Impact of Meat”](https://earth911.com/how-and-buy/bad-better-best-climate-impact-of-meat/#:~:text=Best%20%E2%80%93%20Poultry&text=Poore%20%26%20Nemecek's%20international%20study%20found,10.9%20kg%20CO2%2Deq).)
* Source 2: [Faith Marnecheck, “Ditching Beef for Chicken and Fish May Cause More Harm than Good”](https://sentientmedia.org/ditching-beef-chicken-fish/)

**Question 2**: If you were on a strategy-making team for a non-profit organization aimed at reducing industrial farming harms to animals, develop three distinct assertions, drawing upon our applied animal ethics course, that you feel are essential for the team to consider in their strategy-making process. The aim is not for you to solve the dilemma in this outline, but to develop three critical assertions for the committee’s consideration to reduce industrial farming harms to animals. **You are making three overall assertions, each of which should be supported by relevant** terms or concepts (including relevant figures or theories drawn from religious, legal, and scientific sources we’ve explored).

**Example assertion** (this is a sample only and you need not use this structure; it’s just one possible way): (Assertion 1) In its strategic planning, the committee must consider how fish and chickens are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. This view, stated by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, explains . . .