VII. Division in the Movement

Despite the similarities between organizations which allow one to speak of animal rights groups and an animal rights movement proper, there are deep divisions within the ranks of the cause in a number of related areas. These include differences in philosophical position, disagreements concerning strategies and tactics, and conflicts of interest, personality and organizational style. The effect of these divisions has been to hinder the long and short term coordination of efforts and hence to reduce the amount of change that can be brought about.

In terms of philosophy, the movement is ostensibly united in at least one sense: its opposition to utilitarianism. This stance embodies a rejection of two related understandings of the term. First, it is a rejection of utilitarianism as a pragmatic, calculating and consequentialist way of operating an organization or approaching questions about treating humans and animals. Animalines' remark, "We are dismayed by the passivity and utilitarian posture of the leading national organizations" depicts the meaning of this use of the term. The organizations in the movement also generally object to utilitarianism as an ethical theory (in so far as they understand it) that prescribes the maximization of pleasure either qualitatively or...
quantitatively. Rather, they tend to favor the view that animals possess certain moral rights independent of utilitarian considerations. The North Carolina Network for Animals defends this belief, asserting "Animals have rights — utilitarianism is anachronistic and selfish" and Trans Species Unlimited has argued that Peter Singer's position of utilitarianism provides no theoretical trumps against the painless killing of animals.104

This overt and "theoretical" agreement is rather misleading, however, because in practice many AR organizations resort, either by necessity or expediency, to measures which kill or positions which defend the killing of animals in a way that is incompatible with the philosophical view that animals have certain minimal rights (often associated with the work of Tom Regan). Many groups, for example, defend the humane killing of stray and unwanted companion animals. This fact, coupled with the general emphasis on the reduction of pain, suggests that the AR movement may be closer to utilitarianism as an ethical theory than many groups are willing to admit. The unrecognized adherence to consequentialist ideas is understandable in light of the fact that a large part of movement does not, and perhaps need not, understand all the conceptual distinctions and implications of utilitarianism and rights theory. These persons often rely on intuition rather than argument, emotion rather than calculation, and in some ways they may be said to represent the generational link between the older humane movement and the newer rights or liberation movement. It should be noted, too, that some individuals and groups working in the broadly-defined animal "rights" movement, including the author of the present study, subscribe to neither the rights nor the utilitarian view and still hold that animal liberation is a worthy and obtainable goal.105

There is, therefore, an important sense in which the AR movement is nonphilosophical despite its philosophical underpinnings. (All social movements may begin with philosophy although they are not necessarily maintained by it.) However, it might be mistaken to agree completely with philosopher Steven Sapontzis who held in response to a survey question about the differences between rights theory and utilitarianism that "this is too philosophical an issue to affect the movement, and they may ultimately help to determine whether the movement is successful in the same way that they helped to give rise to it. Those who work for animal liberation through education, outreach and public debate generally need to have a firm grip on the deeper reasons and justifications for their beliefs in order to have meaningful and open discourse with others. This may mean an understanding of scientific and medical information as well as rudimentary philosophical and political thought.

One of the most divisive issues concerns the role of animal welfare (AW) groups in relation to the AR movement. This matter appears to consist of two separate questions: first, what place should and do AW organizations play in the movement to protect animals and, secondly, to what extent may AR groups and the AR movement embody elements of an AW philosophy that emphasizes more gradual change. A large percentage, if not a majority, of AR groups have expressed a strong sentiment against the work and structure of the larger AW organizations. They feel that these organizations are less influential or more unwilling to effect changes because they must, in the words of ISAR president Helen Jones, pay "more attention to investment portfolios and balance sheets than to issues."108 On this topic, which has much support from political research, size, monetary resources and moderateness tend to increase in unison. Another explanation is that the movements and methods for protecting animals have been greatly altered in recent years and that AW organizations have been slow to respond to these changes due to their institutional structures.

Nevertheless, the criticism of these groups has been strong from "some currents in the AR movement as exemplified by the statement of activist Karen Urtnowski:

Animal welfare groups concern themselves with issues that don't require a lot of sacrifice or significant change. They concentrate on easy issues, far removed from people's daily lives, ones in which public support is easy to win. Animal Welfare's ... motto could be 'Save the Cute.' They are really saving animals because they like to look at them.109

Others groups take a more pluralistic view of
animal protection since they regard AR and AW groups as working within separate spheres or believe that AW organizations contribute to as well as detract from the AR cause. It does seem to be the case that individuals working within the AR movement have sometimes underemphasized or ignored the contributions of AW organizations which have been historically responsible for helping to change public perceptions, introducing humane education into schools, caring for millions of stray and injured animals, and securing legislation to eliminate many animal abuses, but as TSU notes, they may actually "reinforce the foundations of animal abuse by failing to act radically."110 For example, in working to secure regulations or legislation to make the living conditions of animals in labs or factory farms more comfortable, welfare groups may, over time, make it more difficult for those seeking to question and challenge the institutions of vivisection and agribusiness in toto. Reform, in this sense, is humanized inhumanity that only cleans up domination and makes it more attractive and better able to withstand attack. In this regard, it might be wise to keep a remark by Raoul Vaneigem in mind. "Every time slaves try to make their slavery more bearable," he said, "they are striking a blow for their masters."111 Concerning the acceptability of AW strategies and goals, the differences center on the degree rather than the mere existence of these elements in the AR movement. The range of attitudes varies from more ideological groups like ISAR and UAA which will not support legislation unless it has fairly sweeping and far-reaching consequences to the more pragmatic groups which work toward gradual change and which tend to be more characteristic of AW organizations in structure than other AR groups. This correlation between an organization's willingness to accept gradual tactics and moderate goals on the one hand and its own structure and more moderate outlook on the other hand suggests one tentative conclusion: as the AR movement is more narrowly defined so as to include only those groups which most fully exhibit the features of AR organizations (as previously enumerated on the rough schema), then the philosophical and other divisions within the movement as so defined decrease dramatically and in some cases become non-existent. Put simply, as AR groups become more radical, they are less likely to disagree with each other. A corollary to this statement is that if the animal protection movement (AR and AW) continues to evolve in its current direction, differences will diminish. Rosa Feldman of Student Action Corps for Animals (SACA) expresses a deep hope in this respect — namely, that "there should be attempts to carry all welfare issues to their animal rights ideals."112 Finally, an ideological or philosophical conflict exists between those who ask that activists completely exhibit the goals of AR in their life by not using animal products and those who are less stringent in their demands. Some organizations like The Animal Liberation Collective have required their board members to be vegans and suggest that activists become vegans as well because some of the worst forms of animal suffering are perpetrated in the dairy and egg industries. They seek, in effect, to eliminate all possible contradictions between one's personal conduct and political work. Harriet Schliefer, speaking on behalf of The Animal Liberation Collective asserts:

Vegans in the movement are tired of having lacto–ovo vegetarians project their guilt about their lifestyle onto us. It reminds one of the meat–eater, who accosts vegetarians with totally unsolicited and irrational arguments ... It is time that vegetarians ceased defensively sniping at animals, and attended to the very real business of liberating animals from oppression, both personally and as political organizers.113

The opponents of this view feel that such purity can keep away potential supporters. "In being too pure," claims Sally Gearhart, "we are not acknowledging in ourselves our capacity to be anything less than our best selves."114

A second but related area of division concerns the specific strategies and tactics which might be used to bring about change, the intensity, frequency and manner in which they might be employed, and the animals who and issues which these tactics might focus upon. Again, the positions on these matters fall along a continuum, and they are usually indicative of the deeper philosophical disagreements previously mentioned. On the whole, the movement is becoming increasingly more radical, and there has been a corresponding acceptance of direct action as a legitimate form of political protest. Of the organizations included in this survey, most approve of illegal activities and destruction of property if
necessary and when animal and human lives are not endangered. Nevertheless, there are some organizations which object to such activity because, in their view, it can be inimical to the public’s perception of the movement and other groups which only advocate non-violent civil and economic pressure.

Dissension also centers around the kinds of projects which groups spend their time and resources on. Many organizations feel that while issues like seal hunting and companion animal abuse are important, they are better left to humane societies. They argue that AR groups should focus upon the institutional exploitation which involves the largest number of animals and the greatest amount of suffering. Similarly, some groups have questioned the merit of large or national demonstrations, rallies and civil disobedience either because they feel that the time and resources could be used more effectively at the local level or because these protests create a grand appearance but translate into little action.115

The length of time between when the need for action is detected and the planned realization of a corresponding goal is another matter of controversy. The debate over the “Research Modernization Act” in 1979 which would have provided humane treatment before and after but not during experimentation on animals is illustrative. Many organizations supported this legislation because it represented a "step" in the right direction that would hopefully lead to more encompassing enactments in the future. More ideological organizations like UAA, however, opposed it in their lobbying efforts:

The research literature doubles every 10-15 years — which means that animal research also doubles in that time. How can you purport to be helping laboratory animals if you creep along "step-by-step" while vivisection is outracing you?116

UAA and other groups prefer to ask for too much and risk not getting it all in the political arena rather than either asking for too little or being ridiculed for not understanding the nature of the problem. "Simply stated," UAA claims, "what you can 'ask for' depends on how much you know."117 In this regard, UAA criticizes organizations which develop policy without thorough research. The debate over the “Improved Standards for Laboratory Animals Act” (often referred to as the Dole Bill) from 1984 to 1986 was marked by a similar kind controversy as the “Research Modernization Act.”

A final area of contention with respect to strategy and goals is related to whether the AR movement should identify with other progressive or radical social movements. It has been associated historically with feminism and, more recently, activists have launched assaults on the military and supported the peace and anti-nuclear movements. The ALF and more direct action elements of the movement often have an anarchist orientation and approach as well, particularly in the United Kingdom.118 Along with an increasing number of individuals, George Cave of TSU sees "profound ideological connections between animal rights and these progressive movements."119 He claims that “the principle which these movements share at their roots is an ethic of reverence and respect for life as an organic, interconnected whole, all the members of which are entitled to equal consideration and freedom from violence, exploitation and abuse.”120

The attack on the military is particularly justified because each year the U.S. government kills and maims hundreds of thousands of animals in an effort to prepare human beings for war. Monkeys, burros, pigs, cats and dogs are routinely used in experiments to test the effects of chemical and biological toxins, atomic fallout and neutron bomb radiation. The federal government, for example, recently awarded 1.3 million dollars to Brooks Air Force Base in Texas for a high-energy laboratory to test "Star Wars" weapons on animals with lasers, microwaves and particle beams and to study how such weapons affect the animals' performance. Over 4,000 primates have been killed at Brooks in studies on the ability of animals to still-fly a simulated plane after having been exposed to radiation.

A vast amount of animal suffering and death can also be linked directly to the economic system of the U.S. which encourages the profit-seeking of agribusiness, the vivisection industry and the fur business. Cave's philosophy epitomizes one of the most radical positions on this issue: "To work for the liberation of animals here (human and non-human alike) is thus to work for the overthrow of capitalism."121 Some activists view this association with other movements...
and issues as unnecessary or detrimental because, in their opinion, it draws resources and energy away from AR and obscures the issue, but this single-issue perspective may show a lack of understanding about the connections which animal liberation shares with ecological and radical social thought.

A third category of movement conflicts is related to the organizational structure and composition of AR groups. One of the main charges is that there is a large amount of patriarchy and sexism in the movement. Many women have complained that while they do most of the work, men tend to have the "leadership" positions. There seems to be merit to this claim because women have largely pioneered the movement, contributed the most to its development and represent the majority of activists. Moreover, much of the credit and attention has gone to the authors of books on animal issues who are predominantly male and to many of the most visible male activists like Henry Spira, Cleveland Amory and Alex Pacheco. Richard Morgan, former coordinator of Mobilization for Animals, was also criticized repeatedly for exhibiting a trait that is present throughout the movement: dominance and authoritarianism. "Too many of the so-called leaders seem intent on having the last word," asserts the International League for Animal Rights. This phenomenon gives rise to personality conflicts and hence disagreement between organizations.

Closely related to this kind of disagreement is the problem of sharing and distributing credit between organizations. When a successful rally is held or animals are saved, groups are sometimes quick to claim credit for the achievement and fail to mention other activists and organizations involved. As this happens it creates tensions between groups and obscures the important matters related to animal liberation. SACA coordinator Rosa Feldman offers her opinion on this issue, which is generally referred to as "egotism" in the movement:

When media ask about an issue at a demonstration, instead of all the group leaders clamoring over each other to give the media their flyer and get their name in the paper, there should be information, hard facts given ... I've seen this ego stuff happen too many times.

Finally, the internal conflicts of interest within an organization often divide different groups. Beauty Without Cruelty views this as a major problem in the movement. "Like other groups," writes Ethel Thurston, "the animal protection groups are infiltrated with people who like animals well enough but have certain plans or interests that come first." Their aim," she adds "is to steer their group in such a way as to satisfy these interests" which include receiving a significant amount of money for speaking engagements and profiting from the use of animals in other ways.

As if to call attention to an underlying strength and unity in the AR movement, some individuals have pointed out that the cause requires a diversity of strategies, tactics and approaches. At a January, 1984 conference in Washington, DC, philosopher Tom Regan characterized the movement as one of "many hands on many oars" and advised the persons that were present to "keep your hand on your oar." One of the virtues of the movement, he suggested, "is that it is so fractured." While it is accurate to say that the movement needs a wide variety of tactics, it is not possible to substitute diversity for unity. The lack of coherent goals and efforts is more a sign of the movement's divisiveness than a planned assault from many fronts. UAA is candid about this fact: "Ironically, the research lobbies' chief weapon is awkwardness on our side of the issue."

The lack of coherency in the movement is most apparent in the number of failed attempts to unite organizational efforts into coalitions. ISAR President Helen Jones had been particularly active in this area for a number of years but when asked whether the aforementioned differences threaten to undermine the movement, she asserted, "They already have undermined it." Since most of the AR organizations believe that the animal protection movement involves AW organizations as well, they have tended to be pessimistic about its current state, viewing the differences between AR and AW as major and possibly unresolvable. The organizations which perceive the movement as one whose participants are increasingly AR rather than AW in orientation are typically more optimistic about resolving differences. Responding to the same question as Jones and referring to the conflicts of interest within organizations, George Cave points out that "the movement is increasingly moving away from such hypocrisy and becoming more radical and militant."
Mixing vitriol with his vision, he adds that "this is where the future lies, not with the meat-eating hypocrites of the traditional animal welfare/humane movement." 131

Thus amidst the tension, there is a profound hope and even optimism about surmounting the differences that separate the organizations within the AR movement and moving on to the essential task of confronting a common opponent.

VIII. Toward Growth and Unity

The methods for moving toward this unity, if it is to emerge, will in all likelihood, parallel those which have helped to strengthen the movement thus far: interaction, public successes, dialogue and direct action. Interaction between organizations to this point has mainly involved information, demonstrations and occasionally group conferences, but eventually it needs to assume more substantial forms like resource sharing, more lasting coalitions and multi-group projects. Before disbanding, the coalition of about thirty organizations called Mobilization for Animals was influential in this regard, uniting sentiment against vivisection; while the multi-group efforts to eliminate the LD50 and Draize tests and to boycott selected companies like Gillette and restaurants like McDonalds and Burger King have been effective in initiating the introduction of alternative testing methods and foods, respectively. In California, too, several networks have been established, such as the Animal Rights Direct Action Coalition (ARDAC), which allow many individuals and groups to work together. This kind of interaction not only enables activists to achieve important goals but it allows them to do so collectively, thereby helping to eradicate internal differences. Interaction between groups which share similar concerns, despite their individual differences of opinion, necessarily involves coordination and it would correspondingly provide a common skeleton for the movement as a whole. Successful interaction underscores the need for respecting the role of other individuals and groups in a way that breaks down distinctions and differences between large and small, rights and welfare, moderate and radical organizations.

Continued legislative, legal and public successes also tend to be unifying factors. The shutdown of Gennarelli's head injury clinic at the University of Pennsylvania, the protest of the Pentagon's use of dogs in their wound laboratory and the rescue of animals from major research facilities around the country have served as rallying points for the movement. However, these victories should not overshadow the less glamorous work which needs to be undertaken everyday at the grass-roots level. It is this work which enables a ground swell to be created and hence assures more visible actions a place in the public eye.

Dialogue and critical discussion is another area which must be emphasized. In addition to the interaction between U.S. groups, dialogue exists in at least a minimal sense in a number of different areas. First, there is a considerable amount of communication between AR groups and philosophers defending a conception of animal rights or animal liberation. Peter Singer, Bernard Rolfin, Steven Sapontzis, and Tom Regan are all active in the movement and to a large extent these individuals, along with Stephen Clark in Scotland and Mary Midgley in England, have been responsible for providing the issue of AR with at least a small, theoretical niche in contemporary ethical debate. A more controversial area of dialogue is between anti-vivisectionists and scientists or researchers who experiment on animals. Some groups like the Coalition to Abolish the LD50, UAA and AFAAR are open and articulate with scientists because they feel it is necessary for gathering accurate information about alternatives to animal experiments and to be properly informed when lobbying for legislation. Other groups like ISAR view discussion as adversarial and a mistake, and thus follow an ALF-type approach of non-cooperation with animal users. Beauty Without Cruelty's method, on the other hand, provides a model for those groups which choose to engage in discussion. Dr. Ethel Thurston relates in a letter:

We have scientific advisors who are people we have met at conferences and who have convinced us that they are sincere with us. Scientific advice is necessary if one is to know which research project is likely to provide a feasible nonanimal alternative to an animal test.132

Another possibility for activists to advance the ideas of animal liberation, especially among humanitarians and political leftists, would be to stress the potential link
between, AR and the movement to alleviate world hunger. This connection concerns the vast amount of grain and protein which is wasted in the conversion process from feed to animal protein and then to human consumption. Common estimates suggest that a meatless diet in America alone would free enough grain to feed the entire population of India, which exceeds 600 million people. Again, this fact does not entail that the grain would actually be distributed in this manner; rather it implies that this is the kind of matter which could be more fully explored through the combined energies of both movements. Presently there is very little dialogue between these two forces, except for interaction on a local scale in Melbourne, Australia and possibly a few of the vegetarian organizations in the U.S. 133

In recent years, a fourth area of dialogue has developed between groups in the U.S. and those in Canada, the United Kingdom, the European continent and Australia, and the movement has looked to the future in hope for a kind of global as well as national unity. The approaches to change and the opponents in question are often very dissimilar in these countries but the organizations share a concern for the well-being of animals which transcends their cultural and linguistic differences. AR groups in the U.S. are increasingly implementing ideas and direct action techniques developed in other countries. Hunt Saboteur Association activist Marley Jones has remarked that American activism is possibly in the stage now that British activism was in the 1960's and Paul Watson of the Sea Shepherd Society claims that the British have always been more militant in their protection of animals in part because they have received so much press coverage. Animal Liberation in Australia points out that there is much letter writing and exchange of news material between activists in the two countries but cooperation has not been pursued much beyond an informational stage, except for a few instances of international protest.

Fifthly and finally, the individuals who must engage in discussion are people in the AR movement and the general public. Despite the efforts of activists, a tremendous informational gap still exists between these two groups. The distance must not only be closed with well-researched data, but it must be done carefully and systematically. Misperception and ignorance need to be eliminated before any meaningful dialogue can result. The debate in California over what was perhaps the first AR resolution — which stated "the Legislature should take effective measures to protect the rights of animals by enacting humane and environmentally sound legislation, and that [it] should work with the representatives of animal welfare organizations" — is emblematic. 134 Senate opponents of the bill advanced arguments such as "Can't accept this business of rights — it troubles me — the word raises them to a level of us," or invoked statements reminiscent of Orwell's Animal Farm like "Beware, if you give animals an inch, they'll take over the nation." 135 It may finally turn out that this movement, like many political causes, stands or falls on the reconcilability of values, but it certainly does not need to turn on the availability of facts.

The addition of support from other social movements and institutions is a further possible catalyst, though by no means one easily obtained because of the numerous ideological barriers which exist. Environmentalists, for example, would appear to represent an obvious ally, however they have been reluctant to become involved on any meaningful level, preferring to focus mainly on
protecting endangered species and wild animals. Animals in Politics feels that environmental organizations are AR allies only in as much as the environment is perceived as including animals, and the now-defunct Californians for Responsible Research has noted that anti-vivisection is a "dirty word" to the Sierra Club. In opposing the AR resolution in California, the Wildlife Conservation Fund of America myopically declared:

The exceedingly dangerous concept that animals should have legal rights has gained a toehold in the U.S. The push for animals represents an increasingly important strategy of the anti-movements ... Rights is a special word in this country ... It represents a principle sacred to us. To associate this word with lower animals is a desecration. AR and environmental organizations, it should be noted, have worked well together on certain major issues like the Alaska Lands Bill. A more likely possibility for cooperation, though, lies with those individuals and groups which have challenged the shallowness of "environmentalism" — its patriarchal, anthropocentric, bureaucratic and reformist tendencies — and advanced more radical conceptions of ecology. These new thinkers and activists include bioregionalists, eco-feminists and social ecologists, some of whom have taken an interest in the idea of animal liberation.

Except for a few groups, religious organizations have not provided much support either, and in many ways they have contributed to animal subjugation. As TSU asserts, "Christianity is the fountainhead of homocentric attitudes and abuse." Some activists do not believe this to be the case, however, and are working to change attitudes within western religious institutions. More promising support might come from feminists and college students. A strong philosophical linkage exists between radical feminist ideas and animal liberation in some of the political literature, and there is mutual support for these concerns in the San Francisco Bay area. Feminists for Animal Rights in Berkeley is one group of vegetarian women who believe that "violence towards animals is inherently the same type of violence that is directed against women." Another is the women of the Bloodroot Collective in Bridgeport, Connecticut who operate a restaurant and have published The Political Palate, a feminist vegetarian cookbook. Students, as many individuals in the movement recognize, constitute a potentially formidable group of activists that has not yet fully materialized either. The organization, Student Action Corps for Animals (SACA), and numerous campus groups around the country represent exceptions to this general rule.

The peace movement is another potential ally but, on the whole, anti-war activists have not expressed much interest in AR to this point, despite a number of attempts to enlist their aid. Other possible allies include the alternative health community, naturalists and, as one activist suggests, biologists in fields which do not perform animal research. Consumer interest groups may join the struggle only once they realize that the AR movement is not against safety or science per se. "All of these groups have potential," writes the American Anti-Vivisection Society, "but conflicts arise from a basic misunderstanding of AR issues." Some feel it is trivial in light of their own focus, and are unaware that oppression comes from a number of sources which are frequently interconnected.

In the last analysis, the potential for movement growth brought about by external forces lies mainly with human rights groups, broadly construed, and their ability to see these connections. "The conflict," Animals in Politics notes, "is that they, too, exploit animals." Amnesty International, for example, while campaigning for the rights of political prisoners was once instrumental in having painful tests performed on pigs in an attempt to acquire information about torture. And, despite good intentions, many liberals establish and contribute toward charitable organizations which direct a large portion of their funds to vivisection. In 1984, the American Cancer Society spent $45 million on "basic" research, much of it conducted on animals, rather than applying it to humans through clinical and epidemiological studies.

Finally, the differing views of AR groups on the methods of achieving growth and unity itself reveal the extent to which progress must still be made and divisions overcome. AR groups have been divided over the question, "In your opinion, should smaller, more radical organizations infiltrate the leadership positions of the more moderate ones?" as presented to them by my survey. While many of the more radical organizations answered in the affirmative, some of groups would not condone such action. ISAR replied that smaller groups...
"should have the sense to start their own organizations reflecting their point of view and goals." Others felt that more "positive" efforts could be made in lieu of infiltration as PETA and CEASE attempted to do in the 1982 NEAVS election and PETA succeeded in doing in the 1987 NEAVS election.

The possible role of the human–animal bonding boom is also a matter of controversy among activists. The field, which involves an exploration of the social and emotional relationships between humans and animals (particularly companion animals), is seen by some persons as a legitimate concern for the welfare of animals and by others as a commercial and media effort to make money and foster exploitation. Lastly, the organizational structure of AR groups and the AR movement is perceived as a key factor in the effort to bring about growth and unity. Most of the younger and more radical groups associate highly structured, hierarchical organizations with non–democratic, and hence undesirable, characteristics. Animals in Politics, for example, lashes out: "We are intolerant of conflict of interest within an organization and believe in a democratic institutional style." Similarly, most groups hold that a decentralized movement best promotes unity. "Think globally — act locally" is a phrase echoed among activists. Nellie Shriver of American Vegetarians, however, has objected to these views, asserting a less than egalitarian position:

Those groups which last the longest and are the most powerful are those not democratic but authoritarian ... Coalitions depend on the vision of a handful of strong minded people who by their dynamism convince others to follow their vision ... Democracies end up fighting different groups potentially and animal rights activists work out their ego and anger through the movement.

This kind of hierarchy and elitism, though, promulgated now by groups such as PETA, has caused much tension in the movement and must be challenged at all times if the fight for animal and human liberation is to make any significant strides.

Finally, and maybe most importantly, the AR movement would benefit tremendously from an increased emphasis on direct action, including the liberation of animals from research facilities and factory farms and widespread economic sabotage. When complemented by educational efforts, direct action can strike at the very root of problems and reverse the perspective of power immediately by revealing the exploitive nature of the relationships involved. Direct action, as Murray Bookchin, a pioneer in the field of social ecology, has pointed out, "is the means whereby each individual awakens to the hidden powers within herself and himself, whereby individuals take control of society directly ... Direct action, in short, is not a 'tactic' that can be adopted or discarded in terms of its 'effectiveness' or 'popularity'; it is a moral principle, an ideal, indeed a sensibility."

The message of the animal rights movement is simple yet demanding: let's abandon the self-fulfilling nightmares of an agricultural and medical realpolitik for some vision and courage. It calls for a vivisection of attitudes before animals. For a growing number of individuals, the systematic exploitation of the animal world is a form of biocide, a kind of crime against life. The animal rights movement tells us that even if one chooses not to actively oppose such destruction, it is incumbent, as Thoreau would say, to at least wash our hands of it. But the animal rights movement, too, must take a critical look at its own state and examine the direction which it is going. "Movement" implies fluidity, motion and change, and it would behoove activists to develop a more visionary politics for the future, for the sake of both humans and non–humans alike.
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This study of the animal rights movement is by no means a complete one and undoubtedly suffers from a number of shortcomings that cannot be fully addressed here. Since conducting most of the original research four years ago, I have come to modify my views about the movement substantially in light of my ongoing interactions with individuals and groups working for animal liberation. Nevertheless, I feel this study can provide an initial basis for discussion. I sense a number of dangerous currents in certain parts of the animal rights movement that have not been considered in this work, most notably the fanatical single-mindedness, media pandering, moralism, managerial radicalism and money-grubbing of certain groups. I believe now that individuals working cooperatively and directly can achieve as much, if not more, than established organizations who are often seduced by a kind of bureaucratic epistemology and feel that those concerned with animal liberation might work to develop a deeper critique of the way in which technology, commodity capitalism and consumer society affect our relationship with nature. I remain optimistic, however, and welcome comments from others on these matters. For some of my own thoughts, see “Animal Enslavement: Are there any insights from earlier Abolitionists,” Lomakatsi #1 and “An Open Letter to the Animal Liberation Movement,” Lomakatsi #2.
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This is for beauty
the scientist said
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think if they knew?
What would they think,
the beautiful?
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