

prey, symbiont, competitor, parasite and predator are the ones that can be found to exist between other pairs of species. Basically, we are not unique in these respects. We carry the relationships much further than other species, but they are the same types of relationships. As I said earlier, they can be lumped together as the economic approach to animals. In addition we have our own special approaches, the scientific, the aesthetic and the symbolic.

The scientific and aesthetic attitudes are manifestations of our powerful exploratory drive. Our curiosity, our inquisitiveness, urges us on to investigate all natural phenomena and the animal world has naturally been the focus of much attention in this respect. To the zoologist, all animals are, or should be, equally interesting. To him there are no bad species or good species. He studies them all, exploring them for their own sake. The aesthetic approach involves the same basic exploration, but with different terms of reference. Here, the enormous variety of animal shapes, colours, patterns and movements are studied as objects of beauty rather than as systems for analysis.

The symbolic approach is entirely different. In this case, neither economics nor exploration are involved. The animals are employed instead as personifications of concepts. If a species looks fierce, it becomes a war-symbol. If it looks clumsy and cuddly, it becomes a child-symbol. Whether it is genuinely fierce or genuinely cuddly, matters little. Its true nature is not investigated in this context, for this is not a scientific approach. The cuddly animal may be bristling with razor-sharp teeth and be endowed with a vicious aggressiveness, but providing these attributes are not obvious and its cuddliness is, it is perfectly acceptable as the ideal child-symbol. For the symbolic animal, justice does not have to be done, it has only to appear to be done.

The symbolic attitude to animals was originally christened the 'anthropoidomorphic' approach. Mercifully, this ugly term was later contracted to 'anthropomorphic' which, although still clumsy, is the expression in general use today. It is invariably used in a derogatory sense by scientists who, from their 196