Editorial

Thanks to all of those who were able to respond to our recent appeal for contributions, *Between the Species* now has the funds necessary to insure continued publication through 1987. We're likely to need additional help in 1988, but for now the situation faced by the journal six months ago has been reversed. Our thanks again to all of you—and there were many—who contributed.

The Editors

Dear Editors:

The first installment of the analysis of the animal rights movement by David Macauley was interesting, provocative and timely. However, it seems to me that there were several false notes in the analysis, and I would like to offer my own comments in the interests of a vigorous and healthy debate.

First, Macauley seems to equate anti-vivisection and animal rights organizations. In fact, anti-vivisection groups are motivated by complex factors. Their members and workers have traditionally not been interested in general animal welfare nor in animal rights, and many are enthusiastic carnivores. Even though there have been some recent changes in the anti-vivisection groups, before the PETA takeover of NAVS there were very few people in leadership positions who could be characterized as either vegetarian or left of center politically.

Second, the funding information seems to be somewhat dated, and figures from different years are juxtaposed in a misleading way. One has to be very careful in comparing income and assets and in listing incomes for
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animal rights groups, the International Society for Animal Rights and Trans-Species Union, stands out for its efforts in the animal rights movement. The figures for 1976 indicate that the Humane Society of the United States had approximately 35,000 members and an annual income of $2.7 million, $1.6 million of which came from bequests. In 1986, the HSUS had approximately 350,000 members and an annual income of $9.4 million, $1.5 million of which came from bequests. In 1980, PETA had about 20 members. In 1996, it is reported to have 50,000 members and an income around the $1 million mark. Thus, any analysis of the movement that uses figures from the 70's is likely to be misleading.

It should be mentioned that the animal movement has grown substantially in the past decade. In 1978, the Humane Society of the United States had approximately 35,000 members and an annual income of $2.7 million, $1.6 million of which came from bequests. In 1986, the HSUS had approximately 350,000 members and an annual income of $9.4 million, $1.5 million of which came from bequests. In 1980, PETA had about 20 members. In 1996, it is reported to have 50,000 members and an income around the $1 million mark. Thus, any analysis of the movement that uses figures from the 70's is likely to be misleading.

Third, in discussing Kellert's survey of giving behavior in animal organizations, Macauley must be careful about being too glib in applying the animal welfare data uncritically to the animal rights movement. The evidence indicates, in fact, that the public is not, on the whole, particularly supportive of animal rights efforts although, as noted above, it has become increasingly supportive of animal welfare. For example, two "pure" animal rights groups, the International Society for Animal Rights and Trans-Species Unlimited, have not been very successful in raising funds. ISAR's income of around $250,000 is small compared to many animal welfare organizations and NSF exists on a shoestring budget. PETA, which might be claimed to be an animal rights success story, in fact raises its funds by appeals to the public's concern for the welfare of the animals (although, the literature certainly includes a rights message). For example, consider such PETA fund-raising issues as the Silver Spring monkeys, horses starving to death, animal suffering in head trauma research, and animals used to test the safety of Gillette products. One does not have to be an animal rights activist to be upset by such stories. It has also been reported that PETA lost several big donors after the Washingtonian published an article that represented PETA as a hard-line animal rights group. Whether these reports are true, it is doubtful that PETA would be as successful in its membership drives and fund-raising if it concentrated on a "pure" animal rights message.

Fourth, the discussion of the preponderance of women in the movement does not mention some interesting features of the phenomenon. Coral Lansbury's book on the Old Brown Dog Case (University of Wisconsin Press) identifies an empathy with the helplessness of the research animal as an important motivating feature for Victorian women. Lansbury notes that women were strapped into gynecological stirrups (and hence rendered helpless) by male doctors; these women could thus empathize more readily with the immobilized laboratory animal. Also, it is standard dogma (and probably correct) that women are more solicitous and nurturing than men in caring for animals. Women, therefore, probably find it easier to cross the empathetic chasm between human and animal and extend their concern to beings other than humans.

Finally, I cannot let the somewhat positive comments about the Mobilization for Animals pass. The MFA did not contribute much that was constructive or positive to the animal rights movement. It is true that the demonstrations organized by MFA were the biggest yet seen in America—but to what end? The net results of the MFA action against the primate centers (after the emotional catharsis of the gatherings) was a $2 million addition to the Primate Research Centers' budget for capital improvement. Richard Morgan and MFA were either not interested in using the energies aroused by the demonstrations in a constructive and focused way, or they did not know how to. Certainly, in my one discussion while at the HSUS with Richard Morgan about directions and goals, I was not impressed by either his knowledge of the lobbying process or his plans for follow-up action after the demonstrations were over. Also, far from providing funds and support for nascent ani-
mal rights groups, the MfA's main talent seemed to lie in using local organizations to increase the income flowing into the central office.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew M. Rowan
Director, Center for Animals
Tufts University
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life in it. "You know I'm going to get you," he said grimly and whacked at her paw as if it were evidence of her trickiness. "I know you know what I'm doing. Why don't you just come out and make things easier for both of us?" he smelled her damp, stiff fur and fetid blood, the foul diseases inside her body. The smells victimized him. They claimed half his brain. They reminded him of everything about himself, of dark holes unknown to sun and air, of slime and the swelling furies of his own body. "I'm going to get you," he said with grim conviction. The overwhelming certainty goaded him even further. His was one of the oldest jobs in the world. Maybe not as old as the age of cave dwellers but soon after, when houses were built above the caves and civilization became a two-story affair or multi-leveled, with living and working quarters above the basements, excrement slipped loose from her body, as if an organ had disintegrated and turned into sludge. She did not attempt to move away from it. The dissolution of her body was invincible.

Behold, death was good.
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group of sentient beings is the kind of mentality and emotional state that breeds our own destruction to the point of making ground fertile for more knowledge at any price, for more control at any cost, for the needs of "our own kind" being placed far above the needs of others, and even for making ground fertile for the kind of nuclear mistakes that most of us fear.

Opyion

JOHN STOCKWELL

In the last issue I expressed my opinion that there are two visions of the future that are preferable to one in which our relations with the animal world are established through arrangements made possible by biotechnologically assisted animal welfare. The first of these preferable approaches, I said, is derived from James Hillman's work of ensouling the world, while the other is bound up with the bioregional/reinhabitant ethic. Before discussing how the first of these might figure in guiding humanity's relations with other species, it is necessary first to come to some initial terms with Hillman. It is to that project that I will devote my efforts in this issue.

For those readers who may have been following this discussion, I urge that you go back to BTS 1/2, "James Hillman on Animals: A Correspondence," because it was from my own need to question Hillman on certain matters that I set those questions for him. For me that correspondence met much of my own need to come to terms with Hillman (although I do not consider that process complete), and so my efforts here will seek only to carry that conversation, albeit now a monologue, somewhat farther in order to prepare the ground for attending in the next issue to a description of several matters: the meaning and practicality of ensouling the world, the benefits to animals of such ensoulment, and the reasons why such ensouling is preferable to a future in which human-animal relationships are established by biotechnologically assisted animal welfare.

For gaining access to Hillman several of his books are essential. Best known are the Myth of Analysis (1972) and Revisioning Psychology (1975). In addition, one should read The Dream and the Underworld (1979), one of his collections of essays (I recommend Loose Ends, 1975), and for a brief formal introduction to archetypal psychology (of which Hillman is known as founder) Archetypal Psychology...