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

---

continued from page 148

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.

---

continued from page 156

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.
(1983). Essential also is an article, "Psychology: Monotheistic or Polytheistic" (1971, 1981), included in David Miller's The New Polytheism (1974, 1981). References to nature and animals are found many places in Hillman's writings, but the main importance of the aforementioned works lies in both the critique provided of the dominant culture (and its psychology) and the establishment of a psychology truly based on the imaginal. Certainly the situation of animals today is the result of a moral failure on the part of humankind, but coming from Hillman's writings is the sure conviction that even more importantly involved is a failure of imagination; further, that which in culture has suppressed and damaged imagination is the same which has exploited and destroyed nature and the animal world. Hillman's published writings more specifically on animals are an essay, "The Animal Kingdom in the Human Dream" (Ernanos Yearbook, 1982) and his responses to my questions in BPS 1/2 (1985): 4-6. Of great interest also is a section ("... and Monkeys," pp. 43-50) in Puer Papers (1979).

Many in the animal rights movement who have heard James Hillman lecture (during an evening performance titled "Animal Liberation: Their Souls and Ours," for example) or who have participated in the workshops on animals in which Hillman has taken part ("The Animals, Our Souls and Theirs") in the past few years have come away both intrigued and dissatisfied. Dissatisfaction has mostly stemmed from the manner in which Hillman's ideas seem to ignore the reality of the exploitation of animals and of their pain and suffering. It has seemed that while many of those in the animal rights movement would be moved to indignation and rights/welfare based efforts to set matters right, Hillman is not so moved. There are important differences between how Hillman and advocates of animal rights will respond to the same data, but it cannot be accurately said that Hillman's recognition of the situation of animals is lacking in realism (although there is reason to believe that his awareness of the plight of animals in factory farming, for example, is sketchy by comparison with his realization of the desperate condition of nature); after all, in the Ernanos Yearbook essay he writes, as I noted in the earlier BPS conversation, "We know the record of extermination. The animal kingdom from the caver to the Darwin through the Galapagos and Melville on the Whaler is no more. Insecticides lie on the leaves. In the green hills of Africa the bull elephants are brought to their knees for their tusks."

Is then, Hillman's unconcern with enlisting in the animal rights movement or his passing up of what appear in his lectures to be opportunities to move his audiences to ethical action, either a moral lapse or a failure to perceive reality? It is neither, although I believe it may be possible to harmonize urging of ethical action with the activity of revisioning secular humanism which in the earlier BPS conversation Hillman says is his preferred course. Hillman is not less concerned with "real" animals than with dream animals. It is simply that his conversation is commonly about dreams and images, and so one may get the idea that he is solely concerned with fantasy animals. Hillman would not, I think, allow that animals in dreams are any less real than the animals that we in the animal rights movement seek to enfranchise, but neither would he say that the latter are less real than animals in dreams.

ENSOUling THE WORLD

COMING TO TERMS WITH HILLMAN

It is Hillman's belief that correcting the distortions of culture, which include the devastation visited by humanity on nature, is more dependent upon again giving the world soul than upon ethical action. While there remain edges of issues here and there where I might want to make a dispute (as in the BPS 1/2 reference, for example, to the possibility of "an ecological restoration of the [animal] kingdom"), which might be appropriate in some other context, it seems best now to outline those areas where Hillman's critique of culture has something of importance, I think, to say to the animal rights movement, offering in the enmation of the world a prospect more attractive than that held out by biotechnologically assisted animal welfare. In the next issue of BPS I will attempt to provide such an outline.