POLITICAL ANIMALS: A Study of the Emerging Animal Rights Movement in the United States

DAVID MACAULEY

Washington, D.C.

(Continued from preceding issue)

VI. A Typology of Animal Rights Organizations

A. Professional-Institutional Groups

One important unifying factor for people in the AR groups centers on the profession, institution, or belief which individuals

ACTIVISM / COMMENT

Jim Barter, Animals: 14-19
Copyright-Free Illustrations.
New York: Dover, 1979

share. For some of these groups--those containing psychologists, veterinarians, attorneys, and the religious--AR gives them a new perspective on their vocation and beliefs; for others--students, artists, and actors--the issue is one that is only peripherally related to their activity, so that a common bond with other persons in the group is more of an afflatus toward organization. The former groups could be spoken of in terms of internal motivation, while the latter are more externally motivated. One would expect, and the data bears witness to this expectation, that in internally motivated groups, a pre-existing social, professional, or religious structure is essentially provided in which the idea of AR must be accommodated. These groups have influence in that the idea can have force and affect a structured institution or practice in society. However, the rigidity and tradition of that framework are not only givens which may resist change but in some cases are barriers in the sense that there are certain entrenched attitudes toward and interpretations of the role value or purpose of animals. This fact is especially true in AR groups with a basis in law, psychology, and religion, professions or institutions with deep historical roots.

On the other hand, where an idea gives rise to an organization, one would expect that the structure of the organization would more closely reflect the issues surrounding that idea. This is especially true of the newer organizations in the movement. Moreover, because the issue is not necessarily internal to the activity, it does not threaten the participant's career or image in the same way that it affects the former category of groups. Consequently, members may more reasonably take chances, utilize more radical tactics and risk failure or embarrassment for the possibility of greater success. However, when the issue is too far removed from the activity, it is much easier for frustration, apathy, or a drop in interest or commitment to arise.

Finally, when a conflict occurs between the demands of the organization and the demands of the activity, the likelihood that one will opt to meet the requirements of the latter is much greater, unless there is a strong outside factor (ethical, religious, or otherwise) that encourages a different action. Student AR organizations are often

illustrative in this regard, for they are not necessarily endemic to the perceived role of student qua student, and when a competing concern arises, there is a strong incentive to meet the demands of the activity most closely bound up with one's role as student, i.e., course work. The bond, then, to the profession or institution must be strong enough to instill a sense of commitment but not so strong that it hinders freedom and risk.

Three groups, in particular, are representative of the class of institutional/professional organizations which have arisen from within the structure of established practices: The Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights (AVAR), Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PsyETA), and the Animal Legal Defense Fund (ALDF--originally, Attorneys for Animal Rights, AFAR).[40]

Like a number of AR groups, AVAR was formed in the year 1981 to heighten consciousness within the public and the profession concerning the proper treatment of animals. Founder Dr. Neil Wolff, D.V.M., of the Blue Cross Animal Hospital in Greenwich, Connecticut, wants to present the organization as a "sensible, constructive, 'morally-disturbed' group of doctors" who can provide a "sounding board for veterinarians and others in the field on animal rights issues."[41]

While veterinarians, by virtue of their occupation, are closer than most groups to animals and animal issues, they have not been perceived as an important voice in the fight for animal welfare and rights. In fact, the responses to a reader survey by Agenda indicates that veterinarians are seen as the group which has contributed the least to furthering animal rights.[42] The task of AVAR is not so much to change these perceptions within the AR movement as to challenge attitudes and practices within the veterinary profession. In addition to disseminating information, publishing a magazine, and educating veterinarians, AVAR is involved in legislative and court hearings, advising AR groups, and participating in demonstrations. The list of its concerns and possible areas for future endeavors ranges from animal rights information centers in animal hospitals to efforts to deter animal research and

cosmetic industry injustices and from exposing race track practices to anti-hunting and anti-trapping campaigns. Perhaps a potentially more important contribution to the movement, however, lies in its capacity to help shift the locus of discussion toward animal suffering and moral issues in major veterinary journals and schools, and away from the sole attention to techniques and facts and to confront and educate pet owners about AR issues. As Dr. Wolff has stated:

Many of my clients who "love" animals would unabashedly lend their support to constructive animal rights projects if they only knew about them, . . . if their friendly local veterinarian or animal hospital calmly offers them literature, films, and an animal rights library. . . . This can present a more propitious atmosphere and go a long way towards gathering up steam for animal rights awareness.[43]

Related to this potential contribution is one which lies at the theoretical heart of the animal rights controversy—the attempt to extend protection for animals beyond welfare. To this point, veterinarians have, on the whole, focused their thoughts and activities around the less inclusive idea of animal welfare. In fact, some veterinarians go as

far as to assert that "the raison d'être of the veterinary profession is the over-all well-being of man—not lower animals." [44] For example, in 1966, the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) actively opposed legislation to license and regulate research facilities, because such action would interfere with research.[45]

Veterinarians and the AVMA are also concerned about the increasing number of inexpensive spay/neuter programs run by humane organizations, since these programs threaten the economic security of their profession. Consequently, they have tended to be cautious in their views of dealings with AR organizations. Increasingly, however, with the promptings of groups like AVAR, veterinarians are realizing the necessity (both morally and practically) of fighting for and speaking in terms of animal rights as well as welfare. Richard E. Brown, D.V.M., asserts that

the rights of animals are, have been, and will be a most important factor in man's interactions with his pets, his working animals, and animals of the wild in the future.

He argues that even if veterinarians choose to ignore this factor, rights will be imposed from outside the professions and asks:

How can we in the future offer such modern medicine for our patients if we do not recognize that they do indeed have rights? How can we justify several hundred dollar reconstructions, repairs, or treatment modalities when we condone a non-status to our patients.[46]

Speaking in terms and standards less internal to the profession, Michael W. Fox, President of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems and writer on animal rights and veterinary issues, raises the question,

Do we not violate the sanctity and dignity of healthy animals (including rats and mice) when we make them sick or subject them to repeated surgeries solely for educational purposes in veterinary schools?

After contrasting these practices with those

of the human medical profession, he queries,

Therefore why should the veterinary profession compromise its ethics in this way?[47]

Such questions remain largely unanswered.

Due to the nature of these problems, AVAR's role is at once both political and ethical, as well as educational, for it must deal with many subtle and controversial questions that may threaten traditional practices and underscore the fact that the veterinarian's role is closer to that of a pediatrician than an auto mechanic.[47] Moreover, many of the veterinarians in this 250 member organization do not approve of euthanasia for animals and, like other AR organizations, it believes that animals have definite "interests and intrinsic value that are not dependent upon our interests or the value we may place upon them." [48] These philosophical and political positions do not always parallel those of the veterinary profession as a whole, and when the Detroit Zoo recently decided to euthanize three tigers in extreme pain, the decision caused a public uproar that has raised questions about the role of the veterinarian.[49]

A recent survey of veterinarians' attitudes on animal rights issues also indicated the large extent to which they either do not realize the amount of animal cruelty or are indifferent to it. In response to the question "Do some animals have rights?," thirty percent answered in the negative. To either a greater or lesser degree, ninety-one percent approved of hunting, eighty-six percent thought that economic considerations should take precedence over humane ones, and sixty-six percent felt that animal husbandry practices which improve productivity are in the animals' best interests.[50] Like the general character of the movement, veterinarians who support animal rights positions tend to be young, urban, and female. Finally, AR organizations are forcing veterinarians and scientists to consider more difficult questions, such as whether fish are animals and thus subject to protection under anti-cruelty laws.[51] In all likelihood, attempts by veterinarians to grapple with the controversial issues surrounding domesticated animals will aid ethical philosophers who have relied on ethologists for facts about non-humans.

A second profession which is bound by nature with questions about the proper treatment of animals and which, as a whole, is a primary target of the AR movement, is psychology. A large percentage and many of the most painful experiments on animals are performed by psychologists. A conservative estimate, based on the number of published results in journals like Psychological Abstracts and the average number of animals used in experiments in 1972, suggests that well over 40,000 animals were subjects in brain research in one year.[52] Of course, brain research is just one area of psychological research. Such numbers have undoubtedly increased arithmetically, if not geometrically, since that time. The most common victim is the laboratory rat, which has been blinded, drowned, starved, deafened, tortured, and forced to engage in homosexual behavior, among other things. The number of rodents and rabbits alone which are used for experimental purposes each year is near 100 million. But psychologists do not confine their research solely to the smaller animals, and a perusal of such publications as The Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology not only attests to this fact but to the high number of trivial results, the indefensible degree of suffering inflicted on animals, and the amount of antiseptic scientific jargon employed to translate terms into seeming objectivity. An example is illustrative:

At Princeton, three scientists deprived 256 young rats of food and water, watching them die of hunger and thirst. They concluded that such rats under conditions of scarcity are much more active than another study group given food and water.[53]

The case against many psychological experiments is particularly cogent because as animals become more dissimilar to humans, experiments correspondingly serve little purpose beyond expanding the amount of trivial knowledge we possess, and as they are sufficiently like us to make conclusions applicable, experiments are increasingly unjustifiable, for the same reasons that experiments are not performed on humans.

The recently formed group, Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, hopes

to change many of the most cruel and unnecessary practices within the profession. As an organization, PsyETA is similar in many regards to AVAR, including its origin and development, structure, tactics, and goals. Like its counterpart in veterinary medicine, PsyETA is a 250 member organization formed in 1981 and composed of professionals concerned about the treatment of animals. Both groups have a small income which is maintained by membership dues and small donations, and both support the idea that animals are entitled to certain rights in addition to a minimum level of welfare. PsyETA's strategies and goals closely parallel those of AVAR in that they involve education, reform within an established institution, and changing attitudes. The organization seeks to improve the conditions of animals used in research, revise the educational curriculum in psychology, refine and reform procedures to reduce the number of animals in experiments, and to develop institutional mechanisms which regulate animal use and deter animal abuse. Its past and current activities have included sponsoring research and essay contests for students, encouraging authors of psychology texts to include sections on ethics in their works, and offering support for the conviction of Dr. Edward Taub, the Maryland researcher accused of cruelty to animals. One of PsyETA's main tactics is to influence reform within the American Psychological Association (APA).[54]

Finally, while both PsyETA and AVAR are perceived as radical within their respective professions, they are more moderate groups within the AR movement as a whole. This fact is understandable, given the generally conservative nature of the professions from which they are outcroppings. The direction which PsyETA may take in the future is indicative of the general trend of organizations within the movement: President Kenneth Shapiro asserts that "if no move [is made] within the American Psychological Association, I see us becoming more politically active." [55]

Student groups constitute a third subcategory of institutional organizations. Usually small in size and in need of resources, these groups represent an exception to the general lack of interest in and awareness of AR issues among this age group. In response to a question about whether college students are a potential support group for the movement, Animalines, an AR organization

ORCA'S GREATEST HITS

A compilation of musical improvisation between humans and orcas recorded in the wild and entirely underwater.

Cassette is available for eleven dollars (including tax and mailing) from:

Interspecies Communication
273 Hidden Meadow Lane
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

For newsletter and membership information please write to the same address.

in California, put the matter laconically, summing up the general perception of the college population: "too busy." [56]

The University of Chicago Animal Welfare Group is one organization fighting against such characterizations. Like other college-related organizations, it is funded by the University, although it receives some money from Mobilization for Animals (MFA), one of the larger AR groups. Its strategies for effecting change are varied and include lectures, lobbying, and educational information. Formed in 1982, the group has organized or participated in about twelve protests each year, with small turnouts. Thus far, the members see their role as one of educating others and, in this sense, they are typical of most of the student organizations. Their main concerns center around practices which are visible in the college and community: vivisection and pound seizure. Depicting themselves as a moderate organization within the movement and, as their name indicates, a welfare group, they support gradual change, rather than more immediate action, and regulation over abolition. Co-leader Martin Stephens also expresses the sentiment that the powerful MFA is "too dictatorial" in its dealings with the University group.[57]

Numerous other college AR groups are scattered throughout the country at schools like Purdue, Virginia Tech, Maryland, Oberlin, North Carolina State University, Bowling Green, and the University of Wisconsin. One organization located in Pasadena, California and called Students United Protesting Painful Research Experiments (SUPPRESS) is particularly active in distributing educational material and staging demonstrations.

The most prominent and influential student organization, however, is Student Action Corps for Animals (SACA), based in Washington, D.C., whose purpose is to develop a national network of high school and college activists and to help them "realize their huge potential and strength in the animal rights movement." [58] SACA and its more than 500 members are engaged in a melange of activities in addition to publishing pamphlets and increasing public awareness, including grass roots organizing, finding homes or shelter for unwanted animals, supporting writing and research efforts, distributing films, targeting local laboratories and live poultry markets, and participating in boycotts and demonstrations. "SACA News," the organization's newsletter, serves as the medium through which students can exchange ideas, learn about AR activities throughout the country, and print personal stories and poems about their thoughts or animals and animal abuse. [59]

SACA considers itself a more radical rights organization that approves of the use of illegal tactics and favors total elimination of vivisection. SACA opposes euthanizing strays because, as co-founder Ross Feldman notes, "this is an animal rights concern" and, moreover, one that "has not been addressed by the movement." [60] The student organization's several thousand dollar yearly income is funded by small donations, membership dues, and the personal savings of its leaders, and part of its resources are given to direct rescue operations. SACA publishes information on student organizations and groups, and it plans to extend its activities in this area while enlarging its constituency through the support of alternative media groups.

Several other AR groups may be included in the category of institutional-professional organizations by virtue of a common element which they share. One such unifying thread is religion. Religion, and particularly Christianity, has played a major historical role in the justification and perpetuation of the wrongful use and killing of animals, but two organizations are challenging this trend. Christians Helping Animals and People (CHAP) has the goal of fighting speciesism from a Christian perspective--"a compassionate heart knows no species"--while Buddhists Concerned for Animals, Inc., (BCA) "sees consideration

of animals and responsiveness to suffering, as an integral part of Buddhist practice." [61] A last uniting agent among professions appears to be creativity, art, or fame, since groups such as Actors and Others for Animals, Writers for Animal Rights, and Artists for Animals have recently arisen.

B. Groups United by a Common Concern

Another similar category of organizations is groups united by a particular goal or concern. The two major sub-types are those which are united in their opposition to vivisection and those against intensive livestock agriculture, while other groups rally against hunting or certain products. With the exception of a few groups, this category is dominated by an attitude of opposition, although positive change is often associated with and comes about through such an approach. That is, despite its seeming drawbacks, this method has the merit of keeping an issue and goal clearer because the enemy or practice under protest is readily visible.

The anti-vivisectionists--those who oppose experimentation on live animals and, more broadly, the inflicting of pain or death upon animals for any research purposes--constitute the first class of organizations. One of the more influential members of this group, the American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS) is also the oldest. Founded in 1883 by Caroline White under the influence of Francis Power Cobbe, the grande dame of English anti-vivisectionists, the organization confined its activities at first to Pennsylvania, despite its more ambitious title. Until this time, vivisection had not evolved into much of an issue in the United States, because experimental physiology was still in its formative stages relative to British advancements. Consequently, the activities of AAVS were initially regarded as exercises in folly by the medical community. With the introduction of some restrictive bills in the state legislature, the addition of several apostates from the field of science, the unexpected support of the media, and the increased activity of humane societies, AAVS began to gain some respect, and by 1887 it was issuing calls for the complete elimination of vivisection.

AAVS remained firm in posture until the end of the century, but a number of trends

and events transpired to weaken the organization and, concomitantly, the anti-vivisection campaign, including a drop in membership, increased opposition from the medical profession, and the death of Henry Bergh, founder of the ASPCA, in 1888. The most significant factor contributing to the diminishing influence of the anti-vivisection campaign is also a bete noir for the current AR movement: the success and prestige of science and, particularly, the medical advances which were claimed to result from experimenting on animals. Animal research, many argue, led to the eradication of yellow fever in the southern part of the U.S., the control of tuberculosis, and the treatment of diabetes.[62] As these diseases were thwarted, the credibility of the medical profession grew, while anti-vivisectionists were, and still are in large part, seen as reactionary luddites.

In 1983, AAVS celebrated its centennial with a symposium entitled "100 Years Against Cruelty: New Directions through Cooperation." According to its pamphlets, it still "opposes all forms of cruelty to animals and especially experimentation on animals for medical or other 'scientific' research." Its goal is still the total abolition of vivisection "without compromises." Since the early days of experimentation in the U.S., when "there was simply not much of an enemy for anti-vivisection to battle,"[63] AAVS has been busy fighting many foes. The number of animals used in laboratory experiments has increased exponentially since that time. In the United Kingdom, where statistics are published on the number of animals used in laboratories each year, the rate of increase has been phenomenal: in 1885, 797 animals were killed; in 1910, 95,731; in 1930, 450,822; in 1950, 1, 779,215; and in 1969, 5,418,929.[64] The corresponding figures for the United States in the latter time periods would have been many times higher. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, an AR group based in Washington, D.C., claims that three animals die every second in U.S. laboratories.

AAVS views itself mainly as a "stable, unifying force with an increasingly active role in professional education efforts"[65]

in the AR movement. The group produces and distributes a wealth of information on AR issues, presents conferences, engages in

boycotts and lobby efforts, and finances alternative research projects. In conjunction with several other groups, AAVS awarded a \$176,000 grant to the Medical College of Pennsylvania to develop an alternative research method to the Draize irritancy test. The 10,000 member organization has also been a source of harassment to researchers at Temple University and the Medical College of Pennsylvania.

The Coalition to End Animal Suffering in Experiments (CEASE) is a newer, smaller, and fairly militant organization formed initially with the goal of eradicating vivisection. CEASE is now, however, a grass roots coalition dedicated to numerous animal issues. Operating out of Cambridge, Massachusetts, the group bases its actions on the belief that 'animal experimentation represents not only a great moral crime but a scientific farce as well.'[66] In its leaflets, the group calls attention to the fact that the Federal government spends nearly four billion dollars for animal experiments each year. Formed in 1979, the coalition claims that it is an independent entity which is not affiliated with or dependent upon any other anti-vivisection societies. Many of its members belong, however, to the Animal Rights Coalition (ARC), an activist group with broader concerns than CEASE.

CEASE's approach is three-fold and calls for: (1) heightening public awareness through education and demonstrations, (2) instigating and maintaining public protest, and (3) initiating and supporting radical reforms. To this end, it participates in boycotts, interacts with other groups through information, and targets particular businesses for protest. "We work mostly by outreach on the street," declares volunteer Jessica Kespohl. "Leafletting, setting up of tables for educational purposes, doing school programs, etc., that's the 'grass roots' nature of CEASE." [67] Finally, CEASE is quite candid and strong about the barriers which the organization faces:

We are fighting national and international corporations which command huge financial, legal, and legislative resources; we are fighting a commonly accepted value system which places the selfish interests of humans disproportionately above the rights of other animals . . .

so that the human may abuse the nonhuman relentlessly and without conscience; we are fighting public ignorance of the horrendous techniques and scientifically pointless nature of animal research; and we are fighting complacent personal acceptance among scientists and nonscientists alike of the fraudulent dictates of animal experimenters within the academic, industrial, and military societies.[68]

In capsule form, these remarks depict the difficulties of the AR movement as a whole.

The second large anti-vivisection society in the triumverate, which includes AAVS and the National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS), is the New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS). NEAVS is a much more traditional organization and one that embodies many elements and practices which are more analogous to animal welfare than to animal rights groups: it has a budget of more than a million dollars, is composed of many senior citizens, lawyers, and professionals, and does not oppose all forms of vivisection, despite its name. Consequently, NEAVS has been a frequent subject of attack from smaller, more radical organizations. On January 29, 1982, PETA and CEASE attempted to gain control of the large, wealthy organization at NEAVS's annual election. PETA called NEAVS's work since 1972 a "do-nothing decade," and, according to activist Ingrid Newkirk, the organization has a history of a "lack of accountability" to its 20,000 members.[69] After many speeches and arguments, traditional elements retained control of NEAVS, in part because they had bussed in several hundred members to vote. The event underscored the wide philosophical and organizational differences within the movement, and it also made clear the intentions of the most vocal and active segment of the movement. The more moderate groups have apparently shown some willingness to change their policies since that time, because both NAVS and NEAVS contributed \$10,000 to MFA's 1983 primate rallies. NEAVS also pledged \$15,000 to support the making of Maria Carusello's anti-vivisection film, "Tools for Research" and awarded a Tuft's scientist \$100,000 to do research for alternatives to the Draize test. There is also evidence that the three major anti-vivisection societies in this country are beginning to cooperate more effectively. At their 1983 meeting, they reached two impor-

tant agreements: to inaugurate a nationwide student outreach program and to establish a Scientific Research and Information Center which will compile and correlate information relating to animal experiments. This trend is obviously not a welcome sight to the medical community.

Several other groups which adamantly oppose research on animals and use tactics similar to the large groups include the Coalition to Abolish the LD50 and the Coalition to Stop the Draize Test, Advocates for Moral Reevaluation of Animal Experimentation (AMRAE), and the American Fund for Alternatives to Animal Research (AFAAR). The two coalitions are under the direction of powerful activist Henry Spira of New York and have been especially influential forces, each comprising over 400 humane and AR organizations. They have brought to the political and public fore strong opposition toward two controversial experimental tests. AMRAE, in Gainesville, Florida, argues that it is time for the anti-vivisection movement to move "from the phase of data collection into the phase of decision-making." [70] AFAAR, under the direction of Ethel Thurston in New York, has been an effective voice in the drive to develop alternatives to animal experiments and has awarded a number of grants for more than \$100,000 to researchers seeking non-animal tests.

Factory farming issues provide another major rallying point for individuals concerned about animals, since most of the institutional exploitation occurs in this area. One of the most vocal and influential organizations in this regard is Animal Liberation, a federation of seven AR branches in six states and the capital territory of Australia.

lia. Started in 1976 by Christine Townsend, author of two books on animal issues, it has grown to gain international respect. The branch in Victoria is representative of the organization. This 800 member group is headed by Peter Singer, author of Animal Liberation, the most important and influential work on animal treatment issues to date. Like the other branches, Animal Liberation in Victoria can be classified as a radical, abolitionist, rights group which favors immediate action over gradual change. The group engages in a diversity of tactics which range from the political (lobbying efforts and use of law and courts) to the more educational (producing films and printed material). The members are very active in boycotts and protests of factory farming, participating in about five demonstrations each year with two to three hundred activists.

The Victoria branch also publishes Animal Liberation (formerly Outcry), the national journal of Animal liberation and Beauty Without Cruelty, with a print run of about 6000 copies. The journal is like much of the material disseminated by the AR movement, a mixture of news, factual reports on animal abuse, legislation, and demonstrations, emotionally charged criticism, and serious philosophical and political discussion. A typical issue carries a picture of an abused animal on the cover or words like "The chicken in your freezer has more room than it had when it was alive" and contains articles about cruelty-free cosmetics, Kangaroo and sheep farming, and the emergence of tissue culture studies.

The nature of the movement in Australia appears to be somewhat different from the movement in the U.S. First, the main issues in Australia are predominantly centered around farm animals—the exportation of sheep to the Middle East, the slaughtering of Kangaroos to produce toys or meat, and the production of battery eggs and chicken—while groups in the U.S. concentrate more heavily on experimentation. Another major difference is the much greater level of public awareness of factory farm conditions in Australia. An American activist visiting Australia is recorded in some of the movement literature as saying that "I have lived over twenty years in Illinois, where there were millions of caged hens virtually in my backyard, and it was only after I moved to Melbourne and came across a book called Animal Liberation that I

knew anything about it." [71]

Finally, the Australian movement seems to be more centrally coordinated than the U.S. movement. Forty-five organizations, comprising over 50,000 individual members and a majority of the more progressive groups have formed the Australian Federation of Animal Societies (AFAS) to unite the nation's AR groups and to form a powerful lobby organization at the federal level. AFAS has conducted detailed surveys of the positions of parliamentary candidates in Victoria on animal matters, monitored campaigns against the exportation of sheep, and attempted to acquire a tax-deductible status for donations to animal groups. The movement's meet common barriers, however, in the form of public institutions and established humane societies. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, for example, resents the media attention of Animal Liberation, their more radical policies, and their emphasis on the necessity of vegetarianism. [72]

Another major organization which focuses on food animals is American Vegetarians, in Takoma Park, Maryland. One of the older AR organizations, American Vegetarians was formed in 1947 and has been effective in targeting the practices of international corporations. The group believes that the most powerful tool of the AR movement is the extensive use of the media and economic boycotts. In these regards, American Vegetarians has been very influential, for they specialize in reaching thousands of individuals by calling into network talk shows and utilizing press releases and public service spots. Their most important campaigns have been the organization of economic boycotts against Burger King and McDonald's. These boycott coalitions contain 170 and 180 different membership organizations, respectively. According to President Nellie Shriver, such action is "faster than lobbying," because corporations respond more quickly to monetary losses than to government regulations and public opinion. [73] Declares the group's newsletter with the masthead of "Meat is Murder:"

McDonald's is the biggest butcher in the world. How many cows are 45 billion burgers? How many units of suffering? How many children die in our livestock economy? How many rainforest trees have been razed so that cows can be raised for

the cheap meat fast food U.S. market?
How many are suffering from cancer, heart
disease, food poisoning?[74]

The pressure that these coalitions have applied to national food chains appears to be relatively effective, because several popular restaurants have introduced alternative food products. The Humane Farming Association (HFA), based in San Francisco, is similarly committed to protecting consumers from the dangerous misuses of chemicals in food production and to eliminating the senseless suffering to which animals on factory farms are subjected. Like FARM, HFA has initiated a campaign against "milk-fed" veal. In conjunction with the campaign, the group has sponsored such activities as a national "Night on the Town" to protest selected restaurants.

Two additional factory farm organizations are the Farm Animal Reform Movement, Inc. (FARM) and Farm Animal Welfare Trust (FACT). FARM is a national public interest organization which is dedicated to reducing and eliminating abuse in animal agriculture and its detrimental effects on world hunger, natural resources, and the environment. FARM lists as its programs the investigation of adverse impacts of factory farming on the economy, maintaining relevant legislation, training and mobilizing other groups, and public information efforts. FACT has similar concerns but is primarily an information center on intensive livestock husbandry issues. FACT's bulletin, "Fact Sheet," is its main political weapon and represents a compilation of information and analysis of the effects of intensive animal farming methods on the food supply, health, and the environment. The increasing emphasis on securing accurate information before taking action and the gathering awareness that farm animals account for more than ninety percent of those which are killed augurs well for the movement.

At the present time, there are at least three other concerns which provide the raison d'etre and uniting force for an organization: the desire to abolish hunting, opposition to clothing and cosmetics which depend upon animal death, and the promotion of an alternative style of life. Beauty Without Cruelty, founded in England, with branches in New York, Los Angeles, New Zealand, Scotland, and

Wales is, as U.S. chairperson Ethel Thurston notes, "the only animal protection group which specializes in first learning [them]-selves, then informing the public as to which fashions and cosmetics and toiletries involve suffering, confinement or death to animals in their manufacture or testing." [75] The organization also encourages people to boycott products which are not free from animal cruelty. The name "Beauty Without Cruelty" was coined by the founder of the organization, Lady Dowding, wife of the British Air Chief Marshall whose Hurricane and Spitfire fighters prevented Hitler from entering England in 1970. In 1959, she organized the group, which presented imitation fur shows, distributed information on animal cruelty in the fashion industry, and eventually began a cosmetics company by the same name. Beauty Without Cruelty continues to sell and advertise many alternative products, to support legislation like the Kangaroo Protection Bill, which would ban the importation of Kangaroo products into the U.S., and the bill against the steel-jaw, leghold trap, and to engage in protests.

Since Beauty Without Cruelty is concerned about household products and fashions, over eighty-five percent of its members and all of its staff are female. Their brochures depict in graphic form the suffering inflicted on fur-bearing animals. Minks, for example, are kept in very small cages and often starve or freeze to death if they are not first chloroformed, electrocuted, or gassed. The organization reports that due to breeding efforts, about half of all minks are mutations which are susceptible to chronic diseases and defects, including total deafness, painfully deformed reproductive organs, and bleeding membranes. These facts, pictures of animal abuse, and efforts of movie stars and celebrities appear to be successful in winning much support to the cause. At AR conferences, it is common to see buttons like "Real People Wear Fake Furs."

A smaller program called "Fashion with Compassion," under the direction of professional model Marcia Pearson, is creatively informing the public about the availability and importance of cruelty-free products, as well. With respect to the future, Beauty Without Cruelty's policy goals parallel those of many organizations in the movement: to create a nexus of interwoven internal, legal,

and extralegal sanctions against the use and mistreatment of animals and animal products. Thus, the aim of their appeal is not just to secure the enactment of legislation but also "to awaken your conscience to the inconceivable agonies" inflicted on animals and "to make wearing fur so criticized that this will substantially interfere with trapping and ranching furs." [76]

The American Vegan Society (AVS), formed in 1960, exemplifies the redemptive and ideological elements which are present to a lesser extent in the movement in toto. Their interest in the well-being of animals is emblematic of a broader concern which is ethical, political, and religious in nature. They seek not only to change institutions and practices but to change the attitudes, habits, and lives of their members. Vegetarianism and veganism, the abstinence from all animal products, including milk, cheese, and eggs, often requires a deep and lasting commitment which many individuals are either unable or unwilling to make. Since AVS welcomes persons to join who have not made such a commitment, in this sense the group is not as purely redemptive or ideological as some political organizations, like the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, but its outlook and purpose, in the main, may be classified as such, rather than as goal-oriented. The foundation of AVS, the concept of Ahimsa, is indicative of its religious-ideological underpinnings. "Ahimsa" is a Sanskrit word that means non-killing and non-injuring. In a more comprehensive form, however, it is a positive way of dealing with the exigencies of life. AVS has made the term into an acronym that epitomizes six pillars of the kind of life which they advocate: Abstinence from animal products, Harmlessness with reference toward life, Integrity of thought, word, and deed, Mastery over oneself, Service to humankind, Advancement of understanding and truth. Each pillar, in turn, corresponds to a more positive approach to living: Abstinence from animal products, for example, "is a meaningful, highly practical manifestation of the inward attitude of kinship with all life, simple justice, or the Golden Rule."

AVS is a non-traditional AR organization in these respects, but it also furthers the aims of the movement by heightening consciousness about AR issues. It prints a

newsmagazine, publishes and sells books on vegetarianism and animal issues, and participates in activities like the World Vegetarian Congress. In its publication, Ahimsa, articles span such topics as Albert Schweitzer's philosophy, Australia's sheep industry, and an evaluation of Marxism and Capitalism in relation to the Gandhian view that just means must be used to attain good ends. [77]

Finally, one section of the movement is united in its opposition to game hunting. The Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting (CASH), with more than 2000 members and affiliates in four states, is at the vanguard of this cause. "Gaining the support of the general public in the fight against sport hunting is vital" to the movement, according to CASH president, Luke Dommar. [78] In this respect, the group has been instrumental in reaching the public through the media and Dommar's regular debates with representatives of the hunting establishment. CASH's most important success has been in the legal field, where in 1983 it won an embattled two-year lawsuit to stop plans to allow the first hunt in New York's Harriman State Park. The victory was a significant one, because CASH was pitted against sport hunting organizations which are financially well-endowed and supported by many federal and state politicians. Moreover, the case received much media attention for the AR cause.

Another strategy employed by those against hunting and trapping is the state referendum. In November, 1983, a group called Save Maine's Only Official State Animal (SMOOSA) gathered enough signatures to place the issue of the moose hunt on the public ballot, the first time the status of a game animal was decided in this manner. Due in part to the \$400,000 pre-hunt campaign of their opponents, the results indicated, much to the dismay of AR advocates, that sixty percent of the voters wanted the moose to be hunted. Similar referenda have failed in Ohio and Oregon, where the leghold trap survived protest, and in South Dakota, where citizens voted in favor of dove hunting.

Hunters, who comprise only about seven percent of the population in the U.S., represent one of the strongest and most well-organized opponents of the AR movement. For example, a report issued by the National Rifle Association and the Institute for Le-

gislative Action which referred to Dommer as "an aggressive vegetarian anti-hunter who seems intent upon forcing his lifestyle on others" was distributed to over two million sportswriters, hunting groups, and hunt magazines.[79] Much of the debate that takes place between hunters and anti-hunters centers around factual questions like the effects of hunting on surplus animal population. AR groups such as CASH claim that the \$500 million annual hunting business is designed to create its own surplus of game animals for hunters, and a study conducted by two researchers in biology and wildlife law concluded that "there does not exist anything denoted as surplus population which requires hunting." [80]

Ultimately, the differences between hunters and anti-hunters or non-hunters appears to be attitudinal rather than factual in nature. People who strongly object to sport hunting, including twenty-nine percent of the U.S. population, tend to exhibit more humanistic and moralistic attitudes than hunters, according to Kellert's study. This fact, coupled with a general opposition to a wide variety of activities involving animal exploitation among anti-hunters, suggests that ethical considerations are a more important basis for sentiment against hunting than an emotional attachment to animals. Anti-hunters are most likely to be females, live in large, urban centers, and live on the eastern or western coast.[81]

(To be continued in the next issue)

Notes

40. The Animal Legal Defense Fund will be examined within the class of political-legal-legislative organizations.

41. AVAR, Animal Rights: News and Views 2/2 (September, 1983), p. 3; The Animals' Agenda 2/4 (July/August, 1982), p. 11.

42. The Animals' Agenda 3/3 (May/June, 1983), p. 26.

43. AVAR, Animal Rights: News and Views 2/2 (Sept., 1983), p. 3; AVAR, June, 1981 Press Release, p. 1; The Animals' Agenda 2/4 (July/August, 1982), p. 11.

44. Journal of American Veterinary Medical Association 173/9 (Nov. 1, 1973).

45. Ibid., 182/6 (March 1, 1983), p. 444.

46. Ibid., 182/12 (June 1, 1983).

47. See Bernard Rollin, Animal Rights and Human Morality (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1981), for an elaboration of this distinction.

48. Animal Rights: News and Views 2/2 (September, 1983), p. 3.

48. Louise Williams, "D.V.M.s Threatened by Euthanasia Backlash," DVM 14/2 (Feb., 1983).

50. The Animals' Agenda 3/6, (November/December, 1982), p. 15.

51. See the March, 1983, issue of Veterinary Economics for the affirmative legal ruling on this case.

FOR A FALCON SHOT BY A HUNTER IN ASSISI, ITALY

FEBRUARY 8, 1987

Beauty grace and power
Alling from the sky
Terror in the eye,
A lonely cry.
The sacred symmetry
Of wings defiled:
The heavens sigh
For falcons shot
In flight and torn apart
By hunters not yet reconciled
With life or death
To reverence all in every breath,
Or free of fear enough
To put away their guns
And fly with falcons in the air.

Michael W. Fox

52. See Richard Ryder, "Experiments on Animals," in Animal Rights and Human Obligations, edited by Peter Singer and Tom Regan (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 35.
53. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology 78/2 (1972), p. 202.
54. PsyETA brochure, "Animal Rights Groups Protest the APA."
55. Kenneth Shapiro, response to questionnaire distributed by David Macauley, November, 1983.
56. Edward Duvin, response to questionnaire distributed by David Macauley, November, 1983.
57. Martin Stephens, response to questionnaire distributed by David Macauley, November, 1983.
58. Rosa Feldman, response to questionnaire distributed by David Macauley, November, 1983.
59. Student Action Corps for Animals, "SACA News" 1/2 and 2/1.
60. Rosa Feldman, response to questionnaire distributed by David Macauley, November, 1983.
61. The Animals' Agenda 3/5 (September/October, 1983), p. 8.
62. James Turner, Reckoning with the Beast (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 92, 117.
63. "American Anti-Vivisection Society, 1883-1983--100 Years Against Cruelty: A Brief History," pamphlet.
64. Ryder, op. cit., p. 43
65. AAVS, response to questionnaire distributed by David Macauley, November, 1983.
66. "CEASE," leaflet on the organization.
67. Letter to David Macauley from Jessica Kesphohl, CEASE volunteer, January 21, 1984.
68. Ibid.
69. The Animals' Agenda 2/3 (May/June, 1982), p. 6; Harvard University Office of Government and Community Affairs, The Animal Rights Movement in the United States, report distributed by the International Society for Animal Rights (September, 1982), p. 18.
70. Ibid., 2/4 (July/August, 1982), p. 3.
71. The Animals' Agenda 3/2 (March/April, 1983), p. 16.
72. Outcry 6 (Winter, 1982), 7 (Spring, 1983).
73. Nellie Shriver, letter to David Macauley. February, 1984.
74. "Meat is Murder," American Vegetarians newsletter.
75. Ethel Thurston, response to questionnaire distributed by David Macauley, November, 1983.
76. Beauty Without Cruelty, "News Abstracts" leaflet (Summer, 1983), "The Compassionate Shopper" pamphlet (Winter, 1983-84), "Please Excuse Me for Approaching You" leaflet (no date). Also, The Animals' Agenda 1/2 (September/October, 1981), p. 9.
77. American Vegan Society, AHIMSA 22/2 (1981), 24/4 (1983), 25/1 (1984).
78. The Animals' Agenda 2/2 (March/April, 1982), p. 10.
79. Ibid.
80. David S. Faure and Gretchen Olsen, Surplus Population: A Fallacious Basis for Sport Hunting, published by the International Society for Animal Rights, (1982), p. 7.
81. Ibid.; Stephen R. Kellert, Policy Implications of a National Study of American Attitudes and Behavioral Relations to Animals (Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1978), pp. 19-24; The Animals' Agenda 1/2 (September/October, 1981), 2/4 (March/April, 1982), 3/4 (July/August, 1983), and 4/1 (January/February, 1984).