

The Earth is for All: Developing a Jurisprudence for Animal Rights

Tapan R Mohanty*

*Dean, Department of Distance Education, National Law Institute University,
Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India*

***Corresponding Author:** Tapan R Mohanty, Dean, Department of Distance Education, National Law Institute University, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India.

Received: November 23, 2021

Published: December 22, 2021

© All rights are reserved by **Tapan R Mohanty**.

Abstract

The concept of right, justice and equity are sentinels of jurisprudence thus creating a parasol of safety and security for ordinary human beings from a rapacious state at least in a democratic structure. The libertarians have claimed that liberty is essential to the flowering of human personality which is sine qua non for human existence. Though not essential but the presence of a democratic state and existence of 'rule of law' are desirable precondition. But this process has been arduous, contested and full of hurdles. But the context and contours for such a concern for animals, our co-inhabitants of earth rather non-existent. The current paper intends to examine the issue of developing an animal jurisprudence based on the foundation of ethics and empathy surrounded by law, justice and equity which it believed will make life better for humans and animals.

Keywords: Rights; Justice; Law; Ethics; Rule of Law

Introduction

The cacophony of Covid and threat of global have necessitated a systematic examination of our relationship with the planet earth, its other inhabitants and the impact of anthropogenic interreference. The news of global warming, drying of glaciers, Tsunami, forest fire and consequent effects of climate change have forced us to take a pause and look at destruction and damage that has caused enormous environmental damage but what is alarming is that have we missed the forest in search of woods and done irreversible damage. In fact, our lifestyle and approaches to the nature which ravaged the earth and brought to brink many other forms of life. At the top of the food chain and armed with intelligence, knowledge and weapons human beings have led a lifestyle which has questioned the very ethics of civilization and compassionate conduct. A significant amount of literature on various dimensions

and the effects of industrialization and colonialism particularly their divisive and deleterious detours. Critics have evaluated both processes in terms of their fissiparous and fragmenting traits. They have found industrialization and colonialism as two main facets of social change responsible for spreading the canard of ethnocentrism, exploitation and ennui.

It is believed that global ecological crisis is a product of unbridled consumerism immanent in capitalist economy. The forces of consumerism bolstered by globalization and liberalization have commenced a witch-hunt to plunder natural resources. Ruthless exploitation of nature to thrive economic imperialism probably has constraint nature to retaliate. Hence, the crisis, it is in fact, is the vengeance of nature against the nefarious nexus of capitalism and consumerism, and their nasty design to exploit and exterminate.

Continuous assault of man over nature has resulted in serious difficulty and damaged irreversibly the natural eco-system of many parts of the globe. It has denuded Himalayas, depleted ozone layers, damaged millions of hectares of forest cover, deserted thousands of acres of land and has exterminated many a species from the earth. The serenity of Siberia, the scenic beauty of Savanna and the sublimity of Himalayas are replaced by smokes emanating from the chimneys of Europe, dungeons of slums from Africa and burgeoning population of Asia.

At this critical juncture of human history, the intensity and enormity of environmental degradation rings the alarm bell for the civilization. Negligence of this may well end in writing the obituary of the fragile planet. Rio conference and subsequent concern at the grassroots level have somehow been able to foster the belief of a rising a consciousness among the governments as well as laymen regarding environmental degradation. Simultaneously intellectual exercise continues to explore the subtleties of relationship that exists between man and nature. Emphasis is being made at all levels to promote the spirit of eco friendliness and protect the nature from further degeneration. Various public and private organizations are also in the fray to spread the message of eco-friendliness across the limits of caste, class, nations and nationalities.

The topic concerning the relationship between man and nature is a subject matter of many a disciplines notable among them being philosophy, sociology, anthropology, ecology, forestry etc. But these disciplines view this aspect rather differently and with a particular perspective in mind and that have created a problem of being extremely specific and narrow in scope. The onset of interdisciplinary approach has brought new dimensions and directions to this highly sensitive and ever-expanding area.

The exigencies of ethereality and instrumentality of civilization presupposes an interrelationship that needs to be explored. But the quintessential question is how to delve and design such an expedition. Whether global environment concern in general and animal rights is restricted to mainliners or marginals? Do we have a role to play? Does one stick to understanding of environment in the context of deep forests and wildlife or one must go beyond than

that? Further how important it is to assess the need of the people and understand the nuances of human actors and agency while delineating an issue that affects everybody's life? These are some questions that a present paper intends to address. The mode and method of presenting the analysis is based on law, legal method of analysis and interpretation.

As Roscoe Pound observed, law is a mechanism of dispute resolution between competing parties with conflicting interest [1]. Similarly, another jurist Lon Fuller stated that law is an enterprise of subjecting human conduct to the governance of rules [2]. Donald Black goes further to write that law is essentially 'governmental social control' [3]. These definitions taken together will indicate that law is essentially a statist institution, an instrumentality of governance which exercises coercion that may be physical or psychological either to settle dispute or maintain social order. Furthermore, law creates, fosters and manages structures symbolic or instrumental to facilitate conformity and punitive measure in deviation. It may also have restrictive, repressive or repressive design intended to a have minimalistic or developmental goal. It was Montesquieu-the first lawyer to start looking at law as legal theory-who described law in its most general signification as 'the necessary relations arising from the nature of things' ¹.

The growth of Jurisprudence as a discipline associated with the study of law primarily located in Western countries and generally considered as foundation of Western legal system tracing its origin to Roman law. Its Eurocentric bias does not remove its shackles that limits the definition of law into defined structures of binding obligation for politically inferiors to politically superiors. Its complete negation of existence of law in traditional and primitive societies of politically fails to fully capture the meaning of law yet it became the dominant narrative. Consequently, early discourses and notions of law were conceived and developed in the context of Western history and ideology, with systems of government based on the concept of a state that is ruled by a sovereign, with its central maxim of separation of powers with Courts to administer laws. Therefore, law has often been perceived commands of a sovereign, metaphysical concepts, natural phenomena, basic principles, what Courts do or stages in a unilinear theory of historical evolution².

¹Asiata Vaai, The idea of law: A Pacific perspective, The Journal of Pacific Studies, Volume 21, 1997, 225-245 Journal of Pacific Studies, Vol.21, 1997)

²Ibid

From margin to mainline law, human rights and culture

The emergence of human rights as the central concern for development of a civilizational norm for equity, equality and excellence besides a force multiplier for human dignity and inclusivity has drastically altered the nature and dimension of sociological inquiry. The rise, growth and development of human rights has not only enlarged the domain of culture but has also influenced political and economic spheres of nation-states and their citizens. From the norms of social interaction to military security— a bundle of rights come under the umbrage of human rights distinguishing them rather sharply from mere political, economic, civil, social or constitutional rights. Thus, opening new vistas for approaching the field of human existence, development and participation in societal action. The incremental development of human rights as an umbrella for protection of marginalized and excluded provide a key to comprehend and actualize animal rights. The second similarity is the nature of emergence of these rights and their frailties. In fact, both human rights and animal rights suffer from the problem of definition, meaning, intersubjectivity and encapsulation. This paper will deal with the intricate relationship between rights of animals, culture and law from a theoretical, substantive and analytical perspective.

The relationship between evolution of rights of human being, animal rights ethics and human rights is not only intricate but deeply engaging at least from socio-cultural perspective. The dimension of human rights and emergence has been brought into this framework to buttress the point regarding the evolution of societal concern and ethics to underline the importance of rights of deprived and excluded people. Further, like many of human rights, the issue of animal rights is too resulting of either cultural constructions, social practices, or moral compass. It is equally important to note that culture and cultural argument can be used either as a shield to protect animal rights or destroy in the name of consumerism and development.

The loci of law: Conversing with meaning and logic

Culturally diverse views on the rule of law date from antiquity, from the ancient civilization of Vedic India to the times of Greeks. The conflict with divine law and human law finds a very interesting mention in Sophocles' *Antigone*. Further, in Plato's *Crito*, Socrates refuses to escape from jail which will undermine the law of the State. Socrates's speech and teachings too denotes towards the link between law, state and importance of the rule of law for social

order. But his emphasis on social order and its rules rather than law found it resonance in thought of Confucius. For Confucius not justice but righteousness and social harmony based on role obligations are the symbol of the ideal society. In fact, a careful reading of Ashokan pillars establish the fact that the great emperor was instrumental in creating a society based on justice rather than law aptly realizing the distinction between the means and end at the one end and the hegemony of human misery and inequality at the other. Further, in Indian context one can cite the Sanskrit maxim of 'yato dharma, tato jaya', thus meaning the victory of righteousness, the foundation of law, justice and human rights.

Justice has been one of the key values of human society, in fact, it is law that is used to attain justice. The entire jurisprudence revolves around the concept of justice. Then the moot point becomes what do we mean by justice? Is there any general and comprehensive definition of justice? These questions eventually lead to the theory of law and justice and link it to morality. For a common understanding justice simply means acting reasonably and without jeopardizing the genuine interest of others. What is just and equitable is justice. Hence, justice and equality often go together. For lawyers, administration of law is justice and the creation of a rule of law society is sine qua non to attain justice. In the language of Aristotle justice is the achievement of highest moral standard that brings equitableness. Therefore, he talks about distributive and compensatory justice. However, Aristotle's concept of justice limits and resonates with nature and therefore, called natural justice. According to Aristotle there is Universal justice and Particular justice, universal justice is about obedience to law, which is virtuous. Contemporary jurisprudence also talks about restorative justice.

Amartya Sen another modern philosopher identifies justice with right and entitlement [4]. Therefore, generally it can be said that justice is a concept on ethics and law that means that people behave in a way that is fair, equal and balanced for everyone. There are mainly three types of justice mainly distributive, procedural and retributive. The main characteristics of justice are impartiality, consistency and trust.

Philosophers describe justice in the domain of economics, politics and law. Legal justice is about being fair, reasonable and just. According to Selznick justice is about bringing non-arbitrariness in the decision-making process and administration of law [5]. We can find the reflection of these ideals and virtues of justice in the ideal and practice of law in all countries including India.

John Rawls is one of the most influential thinkers on justice, in his book, *A Theory of Justice* deals with in detail about the concept of justice and defined justice as 'fairness' and for him what is not fair is injustice. But as far as justice to animals are concerned Rawls [6] writes.

Certainly, it is wrong to be cruel to be animals. The capacity for feeling of pleasure and pain and for the forms of live for which animals are capable clearly imposed duties of compassion and humanity in their case³.

Animals surely deserve to live their lives free from suffering and exploitation. Jeremy Bentham, the founder of utilitarianism believed right has to be based on reason, talking and suffering. Further, for Bentham capacity to suffer by animals generate the compassion from human beings. The capacity for suffering as the vital characteristic that gives a being the right to equal consideration [7]. The capacity for suffering is not a question of intelligibility or reasoning rather it is realization of self, of body and mind. This puts the animals and human beings in the same pedestal both in terms of degree and kind. They display the same facts of emotion, affection and feelings. It is this ability in animals that makes them a definite living entity, hence, any harm we do against them will have to make us morally obligated to show compassion and kindness.

Similarly, another jurist Finnis argues that animals do not participate in basic aspects of well-being and that limits their essential capacity of morality hence, they do not show necessary capabilities to treated at par with human beings. The notion of human rights duly grounded in human nature reaffirms the biological similarity provides basis for universal human rights. In this context, it may be argued that the capacity for rational action is inherent in human nature, therefore, granting them human rights is justifiable while leaving it open for all other animals. But focus on human rationality as necessary precondition for recognizing the virtues of human rights and distinguishing them from other forms of animals suffers from the limitation of excluding people with lower intelligence or lower level of rationality. Further, even if a level of rationality greater than that possessed by most or all other animals were typical in fact of essential human nature, it could still be the case that some lower level-rather than mere sentience, if one were disposed to reject this criterion-was required for moral standing

and that this level was reached by other animals. Since, all humans are provided with basic human rights, non-availability of rationality among animals should not deprive from receiving compassion, care and rights.

For example, Emile Durkheim while discussing his theory on suicide clearly mentioned that he is not concerned with suicide among animals simply because they do not have necessary self-consciousness. In the same token Marx in his *German Ideology* wrote that human beings tend to distinguish themselves from all other forms of animals as soon as they into production process. Though Max Weber, never dealt with animals but his focus on rationality would have certainly excluded animals from his world of sociology [12]. But if we stick to the Aristotelean understanding of man as a social animal then we need to give a space to the animals in the moral and ethical world of us. It is increasingly clear that many non-human animals are intelligent creatures. Some mammals do exhibit self-awareness and probably some reflection as we see from many instances. It may be noted that if rationality reflects capacity to use language, then it may be said with certainty that at least some hominids have limited capacities to use language.

Human and animal world: law, ethics and rationality

The spread and destruction that novel coronavirus has brought to the world over has changed the way look at the world, our relationship and aspirations. As we mourn the deaths of millions of people across the globe somewhere we do the introspection as human beings that our consumerists and destructive lifestyle is at least partially responsible for chaos, anarchy and destruction. The Cartesian dualism that permitted brutal exploitation of nature to ensure domination of culture in general and human domination in particular has essentially destroyed an ethos, a sort of larger responsibility and commitment towards every other animal that roams planet Earth. The vulnerable, insecure and defenceless animals require both our compassion and conscious realization of their share on the resources of mother earth as well as their right to life.

Inherent in that charter of divine understanding is the notion that as conscious, autonomous and sensual beings it is the responsibility of human beings to protect, preserve and promote the life animals. We have to ensure a safer living place for all living crea-

³J. Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, p.512

tures and denounce as well as limit social, economic and ecological practices that has propensity to endanger the lives of people and animals. The relationship between animals and humans is symbiotic in nature and inherent to the principle of coexistence. We need to respect intrinsic and inherent bio-social symmetry that ensures the stability, sustainability and social dynamism in the earth, thus creating a symphony between nature and culture.

The consumerists and developers have often argued that animals do not have the capacity to realize and react to either sentiments or feelings and they are necessarily subservient to human growth and development. However, this has been fallen flat in the context of scientific evidence and ethical considerations. With their status as property, animals are unable to bring a civil suit for themselves if they are harmed. To bring a case in court, a party must have, what we call is law as 'locus standi', the legal right to contest at least in an adversarial justice system. The development of legal system enables a person to seek protection of law when some wrong has been done either to himself or his property. The principle of 'locus standi' requires the existence of a party who has suffered damage or harm which needs either to restituted or protected from another party. However, over the years the Courts have diluted the principle and we have recognized the corporates at entities using the concept of 'Juristic person'. In the absence of the capacity of animals to protect their interest in court of law through participation in judicial process as a litigator they should certainly have opportunity to seek legal redressal through a guardian.

This is illustrated by the case of Kama the dolphin, which was decided in October 1993 (Citizens to End Animal Suffering and Exploitation, Inc. v. New England Aquarium). Raised in captivity, Kama was transferred in 1986 from Sea World in San Diego to the New England Aquarium in Boston. A year later, Kama was transported from the aquarium to a U.S. Navy base in Hawaii, where he was held for research studies.

Freedom and facilities for animals in India

India, the land of ancient wisdom has a history of treating non-human beings in general and animals in particular with lot of love, affection and care. The Hindu scriptures have been replete with instances and references where animals and birds are not only worshiped either independently or as scared creatures but also as foundation of civilization. Further, both Jainism and Buddhism too

have enormous kindness and compassion towards animal world. In fact, India has the distinction of being the first country in history of human civilization to make a hospital dedicated to animals.

The Indian high court in Delhi has recently banned the certain animals, including lions and tigers, from use in circuses. The government is now in the process of creating animal rescues where lions and tigers currently in circuses may live out their lives.

In an important judgment in 2000, the Kerala High Court observed that, 'we hold that circus animals. Are housed in cramped cages, subjected to fear, hunger, pain, not to mention the undignified way of life they have to live, with no respite and impugned notification has been issued with the. values of human life, philosophy of Constitution. Though not homosapiens, they are also beings entitled to dignified existence and humane treatment sans cruelty and torture. Therefore, it is not only our fundamental duty to show compassion to our animal friends, but also recognize and protect their rights. If humans are entitled to fundamental rights, why not animals?

All zoos in India are established under a central authority known as the Central Zoo Authority (CZA), which administers a law known as the Recognition of Zoo Rules (1992). The purpose of zoos is clearly defined within the statute: "the primary objective of operating any zoo shall be the conservation of wildlife and no zoo shall take up any activity that is inconsistent with the objective." 40 All facilities showing live animals must be closed at least one day out of the week.4 1 Animals which are sick or injured may not be displayed. The law outlines required staff, on-site veterinary requirements, proportion of display to visitor amenities, and landscaping. Each zoo must have a graveyard on site; larger zoos must also have a crematory. The Recognition of Zoo Rules requires annual submission of records on all animals held within the zoo, including birth, death, and transfer records. These files must be submitted to the CZA by 30 April of each year. Death records must include the results of post-mortem analysis. Within two months of the end of each fiscal year, each zoo must furnish their annual business report to the CZA and make this document available to the public at a reasonable cost.43 Zoos must also put forward to the CZA a long-term master plan, laying out strategy for the next six 44 years. Zoos in India are divided into four classes depending upon size and the types of animals on display; licensing requirements vary according to class.

Indian animal welfare law is based on five precepts, known as the five freedoms: 1. Freedom from thirst, hunger, and malnutrition 2. Freedom from thermal and physical discomfort 3. Freedom from pain, injury and disease 4. Freedom to express normal behaviour 5. Freedom from fear and distress. There are many rights that are entirely irrelevant to animals, such as freedom of religion, freedom of speech, the right to vote, the right to an education and so on.

The human consequences of animal rights

Accepting that non-human animals have rights requires human beings to accept that:

- Non-human animals are conscious beings not machines or objects.
- Non-human animals have interests of their own.
- Human beings should respect the interests of non-human animals.
- Human beings should not exploit non-human animals.
- Human beings should not treat non-human animals as objects.
- Human beings should not kill non-human animals.
- Unless non-human animals have the right not to be killed, any other rights are pointless since they can be circumvented by killing the animal.

Conclusion

Community awareness and strengthening law society

In the times of this crisis and the need to resuscitate the society in its compassionate form it is imperative that we find a mechanism to deal with the troubled waters of animal rights. It is further believed that neither the state nor the market is in a position to provide a solution as far as 'duty of care' and 'compassion for life' of animals is concerned. The option to my mind lies squarely in the creation of a vibrant, autonomous and functioning civil society which will take upon the task of providing justice and equanimity to all living beings. Although there is no single accepted definition or conception of civil society even in Western societies, the dominant prevailing conceptions in the Western literature have emphasized an intermediate space between the state and the individual populated by voluntary, self-generating, largely self-supporting social groups independent of the state [12]. In contemporary times

civil society is seen as playing a major role in holding the government accountable and limiting the power of the state: interest groups and other social groups participate in the legislative process of making laws and administrative regulations; along with the free media, they monitor and expose corruption; and, in the Habermasian ideal deliberative democracy, they express opinions and engage in civil, reasoned debates in the public sphere on key social, economic and political issues and thereby influence decisions by state actors [13]. The emergence of globalization as a process of macro sociological change with a focus neo-colonial economy and conspicuous consumption, the threat to animal worlds has exacerbated manifold. Notwithstanding the minor concessions to environmentalism and climate change within the ambit of market forces, the power of fashion and passion for consumption coupled with need for more land and human habitation, the erosion of animal habitat and their existence is a fiat accompli. But in the dynamics of state-market competition, the rise of civil society as pillar of strength for the voice of the voiceless provide a scope for debate, discussion and dialogue. This engagement coupled with the spirit of compassion and an understanding of limits of consumerist society that negates the space to others forms of life and subject them to human use, has the potential to develop a just, fair and equitable world for all its inhabitants and not essentially prioritize human beings at the cost of others [14-30].

Notes

- Pound, R., *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law*. New York: Routledge. 1999.
- Fuller, L. *The Morality of Law* (2nd Edition). New Haven: Yale University Press. 1969.
- Black, D. 'The Boundaries of Legal Sociology', 81 *YALE L.J.* 1972 available at <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/ylj/vol81/iss6/2>
- Sen, A. *The Idea of Justice*. Harvard: Harvard University Press. 2009.
- Selznick, P., *Law, Society and Industrial Justice*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation. 1969.
- Rawls, J. *A Theory of Justice*. New York: Belknap Press. 1971.
- Bentham, J., *An Introduction to Principles of Morals and Legislation*. New York: Hafner Publishing. 1948.

- Finnis, J. M., *Natural Law and Natural Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1980.
- Durkheim, E. 1951. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*, translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson, New York: The Free Press.
- Marx, K., and F. Engels, *German Ideology*. New York: Plagrave. 2014.
- Weber, M. and A. Sica., *Methodology of Social Sciences*. New York: Routledge. 2011.
- Daimond, L. 'Rethinking Civil Society: Towards Democratic Consolidation', *Journal of Democracy*. Vol. 5 No. 3. July, 1994. Pp.4-17.
- Habermas, J. *The Structural Transformation of Public Sphere*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 1991.
- 11. Frank J. "Law and the Modern Mind". Stevens, London (1949).
- 12. Fuller L. "The Morality of Law (2nd Edition)". New Haven: Yale University Press (1969).
- 13. Habermas J. "The Structural Transformation of Public Sphere". Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press (1991).
- 14. Hart HLA. "Essays in Jurisprudence and Philosophy". Oxford: Clarendon Press (1983).
- 15. Hohfeld WH. "Fundamental legal conceptions as applied in judicial reasoning". in Lloyd and Freeman, "Lloyd's Introduction to Jurisprudence". Steven, London (1923): 541-547.
- 16. Lloyd D. "The Idea of Law". Billing and Sons, London (1966): 104.
- 17. Lloyd DL and MDA Freeman. "Lloyd's Introduction to Jurisprudence". 5th edn, Steven, London, (1985): 874.

Bibliography

1. Arnold TW. "Symbols of Government". Yale University Press, Newhaven (1935): 36-37.
2. Barry Brian. "Justice as Impartiality". Oxford: Clarendon Press (1991).
3. Bentham J. "An Introduction to Principles of Morals and Legislation". New York: Hafner Publishing (1948).
4. Black D. "The Boundaries of Legal Sociology". 81 YALE LJ (1972).
5. Chanock M. "Law, Custom and Social Order: The Colonial Experience in Malawi and Zambia". Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1985): 4.
6. Coetzee JM. "The Lives of Animals" ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Coetzee's Lectures 15-69.
7. Daimond L. "Rethinking Civil Society: Towards Democratic Consolidation". *Journal of Democracy* 5.3 (1994): 4-17.
8. Davis FJ. *et al* "Society and the Law: New Meanings for an Old Profession". The Free Press, New York (1962): 41.
9. DeGrazia and Daniel. "Taking Animals Seriously": Mental Life and Moral Status. Cambridge University Press (1996).
10. De Waal F. "Good Nature: The Origin of Right and Wrong in Human and other Animals". Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (1996).
18. Nassbaum MC. "Animal Rights: The Need for a Theoretical Basis". *Review of Life* (2000). *Harvard Law Review* 114 (2001): 1506-1549.
19. Nassbaum MC. "Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Species Membership". Oxford: Oxford University Press (2007).
20. Pound R. "An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law". New York: Routledge (1999).
21. Pospisil LJ. "Anthropology of Law". Harper & Row, New York (1971).
22. Rawls J. "A Theory of Justice". New York: Belknap Press (1971).
23. Rogers Tom. "The Case for Animal Rights". Berkeley: University of California Press (1983).
24. Salmond J. "Jurisprudence". Sweet & Maxwell, London (1957): 54-55.
25. Sen A. "The Idea of Justice". Harvard: Harvard University Press (2009).
26. Singer Peter. "Animal Liberation". New York: Avon Books (1975).
27. Sorabji Richard. "Animal Mind and Human Morals". *The Origin of Western Debate*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
28. Stone J. "Legal System and Lawyers' Reasonings". Maitland, Sydney (1964): 179-183.

29. Sunstein CR. Can Animal's Sue', in Sunstein and Nassbaum (eds) "Animals Rights: Current Debates and New Direction". New York: Oxford University Press (2004): 251-262.
30. Wood Allen. "Kant's Ethics and Theory". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1999).

Assets from publication with us

- Prompt Acknowledgement after receiving the article
- Thorough Double blinded peer review
- Rapid Publication
- Issue of Publication Certificate
- High visibility of your Published work

Website: www.actascientific.com/

Submit Article: www.actascientific.com/submission.php

Email us: editor@actascientific.com

Contact us: +91 9182824667