

AGENDA

A JOURNAL OF ANIMAL LIBERATION

NUMBER 4

OCTOBER 1980

CONTENTS

Notes

Letters

Articles

- **The Assault on Speciesism**
-some recent developments
in Europe
by Richard D. Ryder
- **Veganism: #1**
by Jean Pink

- **Veganism: #2**
by Kim Stallwood

- **Veganism: #3**
by Daryl Elliott

"That's Speciesism"

Reading For Revolution

Comment

- **Feminism: our sister**
movement
by Andrew Dagilis

NOTES

AGENDA, a quarterly journal of animal liberation, is devoted to fostering greater cooperation and unity within the animal liberation/rights/welfare movement. We provide a forum in which the movement can exchange ideas and discuss the problems and issues before it. We strive to activate and facilitate two processes vital to the building of a more effective, progressive movement: (1) the refinement and filling of our theoretical base, and (2) the evolution of strategies and tactics for political change. *Agenda* is independent of any animal welfare or animal rights organization. Our publishing costs are borne by Animal Rights Network, Inc. as one of its movement-building activities. It should not be assumed, however, that Animal Rights Network, Inc. endorses any of the ideas, reports, or other material published in *Agenda*. Nor, for that matter, should it be assumed that everything published herein reflects the views of the editors and staff of *Agenda*; we provide space for discussion, that's all.

Our last mailing of *Agenda* went out to 2,800 addressees—groups and individuals. A bit ambitious, perhaps, but we wanted to let it be known to the animal welfare/rights community what we are trying to do. We're sending this issue out to most of those addressees—but just this one last time. We're finding that we can't finance this project by asking for voluntary donations, as we have been doing. So, you'll be getting a mailing soon that will lay it on the line: If you are interested in *Agenda's* content and purposes, please pay a subscription rate. This way, we can go out to just those who are interested and our printing and postage bills will go down accordingly.

Sexist language policy

We received a letter criticizing our policy on sexism in language announced in the last *Agenda* (see Dudley Giehl's letter in "Letters"). After thinking the whole matter over and after discussing it with some of our feminist sisters, we're sticking to our guns on this policy—with a modification or two. Our reasons for following such a policy are stated in the last *Agenda* (No. 3) and we see nothing in the criticism that would knock out any of those reasons. As we are an ethical movement, we are more concerned with principles than with style, grammar and other superficialities of language. Besides, language changes daily for the most mindless of reasons; it might as well change for principled ones. We cannot, on any animal liberation principles that we know of, continue to use language that reinforces the very cultural prejudices that we are trying to overcome.

So, from now on our policy, as modified, will be:

1. Letters, articles and other material written especially for *Agenda* must show that the writer has attempted to use gender-free language. There are various devices that can be used to do this. See, for example, those used by Kim Stallwood in his piece about Veganism in the "Articles" section of this issue. If the writer does not make these attempts, we will either gender-neutralize the language ourselves or we will return the manuscript to the writer with a request that s/he make the necessary changes.

2. When we use material not written for *Agenda*, we will take it as we find it—sexist language and all. But, again, as we are an activist publication for an ethical movement, one of our responsibilities is to constantly and unswervingly attack cultural prejudices and stereotypes. We will, therefore, follow

our previously stated policy of italicizing sexist language—not for sarcasm or irony—but to call attention to the cultural biases that we have inherited so that they can be disinherited. We believe we have to do this whether the writer be Isaac Bashevis Singer, William Shakespeare, or anyone else.

International networking: linking with C.A.W.

Kim Stallwood, an English animal rights activist and one of the founders and co-ordinators of Co-ordinating Animal Welfare (CAW), visited in this country for approximately three weeks in late August to talk to U.S. activists and animal welfare/rights organization leaders and staffers. Fortunately, several vegetarian and animal rights groups held conferences and meetings while he was here making it easier for him to meet a broad range of people active in the U.S. side of the movement. In Washington D.C., the activist group People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and in Boston, the activist group Coalition to End Animal Suffering in Experimentation (CEASE) held receptions at which Stallwood spoke about movement building, international networking and activism in the animal liberation movement. Stallwood sees two key strategies for going “forward to animal liberation”. One is the use of *political agitation* and the other is “*self-education* so that we will understand what society needs to change in order to make that liberation possible.” Stallwood argued that every activist should hold the highest loyalty to the movement rather than to any particular animal welfare/rights organization. “We must build an international movement”, he said, “which will use the *facilities* of the various animal welfare/rights organizations.” Stallwood spoke also of CAW’s similarities to the Animal Rights Network and of the two groups’ mutual intentions to work together more closely and effectively.

During Stallwood’s meetings with U.S. activists, several important new ideas emerged that should receive the widest possible circulation:

Conference

First, there is much talk about the need for a working conference for animal rights activists, and it was felt that it should be held in the next year. The U.S. media are taking a keen interest in our movement, but, embarrassingly, we don’t really have a real movement yet. The news of Henry Spira’s successful campaigns and of England’s success at “putting animals into politics” has whetted the appetites of U.S. activists who sense that things could be moving more rapidly on this side. A lot of people are motivated, but they feel frustrated and apathetic because they are isolated and devoid of knowledge about what should be done. Many of us feel that a conference is needed that will address this problem and, we hope, lead to a new order of animal rights work in the U.S.

At this point, the discussions have suggested that the conference be based on an overall theme of: “Promoting Effectiveness, Co-operation and Unity,” at three levels:

(1) at the individual and local level—find ways to increase the effectiveness of individual activists and local groups; (2) at the national level—begin efforts to get the national groups to work together to support some kind of national campaign, e.g., one urging that animal protection be made a social responsibility, rather than having it continue as a nice sort of do-good work done by private charities, as at present; and (3) at the international level—the conference could bring together activists and representatives of groups from as many countries as possible who would draft and sign a Declaration of Animal Rights and give it to the press and to an appropriate U.N. official.

In the course of these discussions, activists and AWO staffers repeatedly expressed the need to work together better and to move toward co-ordination as an international movement. Many felt that the time has never been riper for a conference organized by and for the “grassroots” of the movement.

The plan so far is that all groups and activists are to carry on discussions of ideas for the conference over the next two to three months and to “network” these ideas to others. By January 1981, a planning committee should be formed made up of activists from groups throughout the movement. As soon as AWO’s and individuals can be persuaded to contribute to the financing of such a conference, special co-ordinators should be employed to carry out the wishes of the planning committee.

It was felt that lectures and workshops should be organized so that they increase our understanding of what society has to change in order to make animal liberation possible, and, further, so that they increase our effectiveness in making those changes.

If you feel that such a conference is needed on the U.S. side of the movement, discuss it with your group or with activists in your area. Form your own planning committee and, if necessary, *Agenda* and Animal Rights Network will aid in linking you up with activist groups elsewhere. The movement needs your ideas, so please put forth.

Strategy for activism

The second major topic to emerge from discussions held during Stallwood’s visit was the need for the U.S. movement to select a suitable target issue and the strategy that will put us “on the map”. There was considerable discussion of Henry Spira’s successes with well-planned, carefully targeted campaigns against selected forms of animal abuse. (For details on Spira’s methods, see his piece in *The Beast* magazine, No. 7, August 1980.) It was suggested that the best all-around action might be one against Pentagon-funded research involving the use of animals to test bombs, poison gas or weapons. This is so because a large sector of the public would at once perceive this kind of use of animals as indefensible. Imagine the researchers and the school administrators trying to argue that this animal suffering is “necessary” to perfect better killing and maiming devices! Moreover, our action against this kind of animal abuse would establish the political and ethical relevance of our movement, and how it relates to other great progressive efforts for peace, non-violence, social co-operation and global justice. These actions should bring in more people to the cause for animal rights because they could then relate it to their concerns and they could embrace it as a part of them.

Let *Agenda* and its readers know what you think about these ideas; that’s what we’re here for.

Notes, letters, articles, comments and other written submissions are welcome and should be sent to *Agenda*, Box 5234, Westport, CT 06881. Please try to keep the length of your letters down as much as possible. If you have a lot to say, try to put it into article form or compose a piece for our “Comment” section. Our deadlines are the 15th of each December, March, June and September. We try to publish on the first of each January, April, July and October.

We cannot be responsible for the return of unaccepted material unless it is sent to us with adequate postage and a self-addressed envelope of sufficient size to hold the material.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Please find enclosed a contribution to your magazine which I have found stimulating and perceptive. I am particularly happy with the broad view which you take which makes a refreshing change from the parochial attitudes too commonly found in the Animal Rights movement. To me one of the most hopeful signs on the horizon is the increasing contact between activists on an international level, and your magazine should, if it continues in the same vein, make an important contribution to the vital exchange of ideas worldwide.

Jean Pink—Tonbridge, Kent, England

(See her piece on *Veganism in Articles*, this issue.—Eds.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

I think *Agenda* is coming along extremely well in defining its purpose, has good organization and variety of material. I totally agree with Christian J. Eilers on the necessity to convene major and periodic conferences of AWOs and with everything he says in his article, if we ever want to achieve some cohesion and strength. I also think your own particular concern with this movement's position in regard to other movements ought to get away from generalities and down to specifics, i.e. opposition to "exploitation of certain beings by other beings" is an abstraction that needs to be demonstrated by concrete examples our movement is faced with. What about exploited beings who in turn exploit other beings or fight for their right to do so? What, for example, about the Eskimos fighting for the right to kill the bowhead whale for no better reason as that it is part of their "culture"? Since animals are the last to be liberated do we just disregard these issues and in line with "historical perspective" relegate them to some utopian time when all human rights, including the Eskimos, will have been achieved? I understand what you are trying to say but I think you have to be more specific or the readers will be confused as to just what you mean.

I would also like to have some continuity in the information given. I read in both *Agenda* and *The Beast* about the Hawaiian and Japanese (Dexter Cate) dolphin cases and it would be interesting to know what their current status is. Is D. Cate still in prison and what, if anything, is being done about it by the movement? Perhaps this could be pursued by ARN News.

Doris Primack—New York, New York

(We're glad you raised these questions. Can anyone out there help with the answers?—Eds.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

I was pleased to see in the latest issue of "AGENDA", (No. 3, July 1980), the emphasis which contributors placed on the need for unity within the Animal Welfare Movement. As Chairman of the Animal Welfare Year campaign in Britain, 1976/77 and Secretary to GECCAP (the General Election Co-ordinating Committee for Animal Protection) in the campaign to "Put Animals Into Politics" 1978/79, I can confidently state that this was almost certainly the most important aspect of these campaigns.

Unity of purpose and co-operation between Societies is an issue which should concern us all and is the main theme of my book — "COMPASSION IS THE BUGLER-The Struggle For Animal Rights", which deals with these national campaigns.

I agree completely with your anonymous correspondent regarding the problems involved in trying to achieve united action. The Animal Welfare Societies of the world must find a way of overcoming these difficulties if we are ever to be a force to be reckoned with, even if this means some loss of individual sovereignty.

I think your Editorial comment in adding a further item to the list of reasons for disunity: "lack of historical and political perspective" has a considerable bearing on the other four reasons. While most of us in the Movement are idealistic in our personal views (e.g. we would like to see the total abolition of Vivisection) publicly our attitude must be realistic if we are going to make any progress. The uncommitted public in this country, and I have no doubt in the U.S.A., are not ready to accept total abolition. As I have said in my book,

"We are on the verge of great changes in both public and private attitudes towards animals and the rights of animals. Having said that, however, no one should think that the animal rights movement is going to achieve its objectives overnight. Nobody can really believe that whatever legislation results from the present manoeuvring in Parliament, vivisection can be abolished at one stroke. As I have said, the public and indeed Parliament have to resolve the conflict between the welfare and protection of animals from suffering on one hand and the fear of disease, injury and death of humans on the other".

"The automobile could not have been invented prior to the wheel" and animal rights cannot advance more quickly than does public opinion. If the Animal Societies accept this fact of life, whatever their field of endeavour happens to be, then many of the difficulties caused by the four points made by your correspondent would disappear.

Finally, may I offer my congratulations on an excellent magazine, which I believe will be of considerable value to the Animal Welfare Movement throughout the world.

Clive Hollands—Edinburgh, Scotland (Director or the Scottish Society for the Prevention of Vivisection and Secretary of the St. Andrew Animal Fund, 10 Queensferry Street, Edinburgh, Scotland 4EH 2PG.)

(Clive Hollands' book, *Compassion is the Bugler*, is reviewed in the September-October 1980 issue of *Animal Rights Network News*.—Eds.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

You note that one of the principal functions of *Agenda* is to foster "greater cooperation and unity within the animal liberation/rights/welfare movement." However, your editorial policy certainly belies this stated intent. You are constantly interjecting your own political views into the pages of *Agenda*. Although I actually agree with many of these views, I hardly

think that imposing your own standards on people in the animal rights movement at large will further your stated goal of bringing about unity in this movement.

Take, for instance, your compulsion to add your own epistle ("Lack of an Historical and Political Perspective") to the list of "reasons behind non-unity" that was contained in a letter sent to you by one of your readers. Don't you think that was rather presumptuous? If the anonymous reader felt this was an important point, it would have been included in the letter this person sent to you. Moreover, the position you took here appears to contradict one of the points raised in that reader's letter (item 3, "Different Ideas on Means of Accomplishing Goals").

Another instance where you have sought to impose your personal views on people in the animal rights movement at large is found in your policy of italicizing the words *man* or *men* if a writer uses these words to denote female as well as male Homo sapiens. I personally share your sentiments on the issue of sexist language. I raised this issue in a review I did of the book *Animals, Men and Morals* (*Animal Liberation News*, Fall 1974). Also, you will note that I, myself, did not use sexist language in my book *Vegetarianism: A Way of Life* (words such as man and mankind do appear, but only as part of quotations or in Isaac Bashevis Singer's foreward—they are not my words). I might add that my use of non-sexist words or terms to replace sexist words was done over the objections of the chief editor of the trade department at Harper & Row.

I think it is a good idea for people to abstain from using sexist language. However, you place yourself in a rather precarious position when you make a value judgement about a person's commitment to social reform by italicizing words in that person's article which do not conform to your idea of furthering "the boundless ethic called for by the animal liberation movement." A friend of mine who became a vegetarian at the age of six (for ethical reasons) is a linguistics scholar who uses sexist language. He is, in fact, very much opposed to the use of non-sexist language for grammatical reasons—not because he is a male chauvinist. He knows several languages (including ones you probably didn't know existed) and can certainly give you cogent arguments on his position regarding this issue. Isaac Bashevis Singer, to cite another example, uses sexist language. Would you use that cheap editorial trick (italicizing sexist words) if this vegetarian, Nobel Prize-winning author sent a letter to *Agenda*?

You only serve to alienate people you desire to bring together in a unified movement by interjecting extraneous issues into an animal liberation journal. There will always be differences of opinion amongst us; but we should try to deal with the numerous controversies that exist in the animal rights movement before we set out to save the world. I am sure that *Agenda* will continue to be an interesting and worthwhile journal whether or not this admonition is heeded. Indeed, the issue here is not a question of quality—it is a question of purpose. Although *Agenda* is a good animal rights publication, many people will not take you seriously if you continue to tell them that the purpose of this publication is to bring about "greater cooperation and unity within the animal liberation/rights/welfare movement." Your effort to link the issue of animal rights with various other causes which you happen to favor will serve to divide—not unify—your animal liberation readers.

Dudley Giehl—Pittsford, New York

(As for sexist language, please see Agenda Notes. We believe we have a right—even a duty—to state our own opinions and views in the pages of Agenda. It would be pretty sneaky to claim to do otherwise, wouldn't it? We believe the best policy is to clearly state our own views, taking care to separate them from those of our contributors. If we didn't do this, our readers would still be injected with our biases, prejudices and preferences although they would not be aware of it. You're going to get an editor's biases no matter what; it's better to put them out in the open so that everyone can have a shot at them.)

By the way, we hardly intend to maintain exclusive control over Agenda's editorial process. If any of you out there want to join in the fun, let us know what you would like to do.—Eds.)

(Dudley Giehl's book, Vegetarianism: A Way of Life, Harper & Row, 1979, was reviewed in the January, 1980 issue of Animal Rights Network News.—Eds.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

I would like to expand on Professor Tom Regan's thoughts on cruelty. Historically, courts have ruled that cruel experiments on animals are not cruel if the experimenter does not intend cruelty, and these rulings have been made precisely because the vivisection lobbies have developed that argument to defend all cruel experiments.

Regan also states: "It is on unnecessary pain. . . that we must focus our attention." Who is to be the judge as to which pain is "necessary" and which is not? The animal experimenter doesn't live who will admit that the pain he inflicted on laboratory animals was "unnecessary." It is for this reason that those who would regulate vivisection have had to back down over the years to equate most laboratory animal pain and suffering with "conditions," rather than with what the experimenters do to the animals. That's why, under the Animal Welfare Act, the veterinary inspectors may not interfere with research per se.

Our own experience with "cruelty" may be of interest. In 1970, we were sued for \$2 million by a researcher as a result of a report we published on his experiments. In this, he was joined by the National Society for Medical Research, which has a self-interest in our destruction, since it exists to promote the procurement and use of laboratory animals and to defend the right of researchers to do whatever they please to the animals. They were not satisfied that we won the case; they carried it to the Appellate Court, where we won again, then to the Supreme Court of the United States which refused to review the case—meaning that we won again.

During the trial, they charged that *we had called the researcher cruel*. We denied that we had ever called him cruel because we did not know him and had no way of knowing whether he was cruel or not (and this is true of most humane society/researcher confrontations). We said that HIS EXPERIMENTS were cruel. And under the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, we had the right to say that his experiments were cruel IF WE BELIEVED THAT THEY WERE CRUEL.

That case cost us a lot of money. But it set an important precedent for ALL SOCIETIES AND INDIVIDUALS: that if *they believe* an experiment is cruel, *they have the right to say*

so. Thus, there is no reason for humanitarians to cringe, to cave in, to talk about "unnecessary" cruelty, when what they mean is "cruelty". But they should *not* say that the EXPERIMENTER is cruel, because they don't know him and thus could not defend such a statement.

Christian Eilers' article on the need for more effective political mobilization was particularly relevant to the cause of laboratory animals. In that field, to our knowledge there has never been any political mobilization or lobbying at the national level, except for the regulation of vivisection and our own work in promoting the Research Modernization Act. Antivivisection societies no longer talk about "outlawing" vivisection, but about "abolishing" it. And how would they "abolish" it? By "educating the public." But how can an unorganized, un-mobilized, leaderless "public" abolish vivisection or anything else?

The missing ingredients in Eiler's thoughtful article are goal and leadership. He speaks of the fragmentation of the humane movement. These fragments can be united providing there is a clearly-stated goal and strong leadership. How can you lobby Congress with no goal—that is, no legislation, proposed or pending? Will you wait for Congress to write the legislation you want? Congress doesn't know how! You've got to do it yourself.

How can you influence Congress unless you lead a strong national movement to bring pressure on the nation's legislators *in their home districts*—which is what political action is all about? The small, fragmented societies cannot do this. They don't have the money nor the expertise. Only a major society, having the necessary funds, can lead the kind of political action/mobilization effort needed. Let the movement remain fragmented! ONE strong leader can unify the fragments. We found that out in our work for the Research Modernization Act.

Furthermore, in our own work, we found to our great surprise that the public is far better "educated" to the cruelty and immorality of vivisection than most humanitarians think. Many people wrote us that they had become sick and tired of being "educated" about vivisection, had given up all hope, but that our work had given them new faith that something COULD be done for suffering laboratory animals. Tens of thousands of members of "the public" signed our Petition to Congress on the Research Modernization Act. Thus, for those whose goal is to abolish vivisection, the obvious need is one strong leader, willing to spend the money and do the backbreaking work of mobilizing the antivivisection movement and conducting the political action necessary to achieve that goal.

Eleanor Seiling—New York, New York (President, United Action for Animals, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, NY 10017.)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

The humane and environmental movement are relatively young and are still growing. Making mistakes and not working with other groups as it is needed is a part of the growth process to maturity. If the humane/environmental movement would work on speeding up this process to make good our deficiencies, it could turn the tables to give us more victories, as well as make us much more effective.

Unfortunately, I have been quite frustrated in dealing with the tremendous amount of competition that goes on between these groups. Instead of focusing entirely on solving the problem when working together, competition for publicity and funds often becomes an important aspect to groups. Often organizations want to appear that *they* are the lead and most effective group dealing with a certain issue. A lot of ugliness goes on.

Another predominate problem is a lack of awareness and hypocrisy that exists within each organization. For instance, several groups take an active role against trapping. Yet the majority of functions I have attended that were sponsored by these national and local groups serve meat. And the majority of leaders and staff and volunteers eat meat. Additionally, quite a number of these people also wear cosmetics that used laboratory animals for research purposes. My point is that these activists are trying to influence and change others, yet do not incorporate certain values and practices in their own lives. We have to make these changes within our own lives and educate ourselves first. How can we convince others otherwise?

I agree with a statement in July's issue that consciousness raising is important. Only I believe it is extremely critical to raise our consciousness not only of various issues but also in relating to one another as human beings emotionally and spiritually. We cannot continue to exploit one another while trying to stop the exploitation of animals. Each of us needs to be more sensitive and compassionate to one another. This lack of awareness is also a big factor in what is wrong with this movement.

The outcome of cooperation, mutual accommodation, wider communication and understanding will give us not only more meaningful and fulfilling lives, but will lead to less exploitation of all living creatures that share the earth.

Jan A. Walker—Gambrills, Maryland (Director of the Trapping Reform Program, Defenders of Wildlife.)



ARTICLES

The Assault on Speciesism - some recent developments in Europe

by Richard D. Ryder

I enjoyed reading Joyce Lambert's catalogue of charters of Animals Rights (*Agenda* No.3 July 1980). She did, however, omit the Declaration Against Speciesism signed by about 200 people attending the R.S.P.C.A.'s Animal Rights Symposium at Trinity College Cambridge in 1979. One of the distinguished signatories, the author Richard Adams, is now the R.S.P.C.A.'s new President a vigorous campaigner for the cause. The Declaration reads as follows:

"Inasmuch as we believe that there is ample evidence that many other species are capable of feeling, we condemn totally the infliction of suffering upon our *brother* animals, and the curtailment of their enjoyment, unless it be necessary for their own individual benefit.

We do not accept that a difference in species alone (any more than a difference in race) can justify wanton exploitation or oppression in the name of science or sport, or for food, commercial profit or other human gain.

We believe in the evolutionary and moral kinship of all animals and we declare our belief that all sentient creatures have rights to life, liberty and the quest for happiness.

We call for the protection of these rights."

Although I am British, it was while I was in the U.S.A. that I began to formulate the idea of speciesism, as I mulled over the rights and wrongs of using non-humans in research. I saw some terrible sights in the laboratories of New York and California. That was in 1963 and 1964 but little has changed in the laboratories of the so-called civilized world since then except one thing—the issue of Animals Rights has now become conscious in the minds of most scientists. When I was experimenting with animals it was a taboo subject—even to think about it would have seemed to denote weakness, sentimentality and a lack of scientific acumen.

It might interest some readers of *Agenda*, who are still mostly (I imagine) in the North American Continent, to have a thumbnail sketch of what is happening elsewhere. In Britain, the militant campaigns of David Wetton's Hunt Saboteurs Association began in the 1960's and helped to shatter the image of animal welfare as being just middle-aged and middle-class. The Animal Liberation Front began sabotaging laboratories and liberating animals from factory farms about 1973 and Ronnie Lee and Cliff Goodman were sent to prison for this in 1975—the year in which the British media really began to show an interest in animals' rights.

The late 60's and early 70's saw an attempt by bloodsportsmen to take over the world's oldest (founded 1824) and probably most influential animal welfare organization, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (R.S.P.C.A.).

This was fought off by the R.S.P.C.A. Reform Group, although currently there is again an attempt being made by intensive agricultural influences to infiltrate the R.S.P.C.A. and to split progressive from more conservative members (who rarely seem to comprehend what is happening). Although the R.S.P.C.A. shows most of the problems of an over-large bureaucracy (it employs over 650 full time staff), the younger members of its unpaid Council have managed to keep it going more or less in the right direction.

Ruth Harrison's *Animal Machines* spotlighted factory farming as early as 1964, my own book *Victims of Science* tried to do the same for animal experimentation in 1975 and Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation* started the spate of more recent writings in 1976. One should also remember Godlovitch and Harris' *Animals Men and Morals* of 1971. They—like so many in the movement (Andrew Linzey, Peter Singer, Stephen Clark and myself for example)—were inhabitants of Oxford in the early 1970's. Brigid Brophy, whose *The Rights of Animals* (*Sunday Times*, October 10th, 1965) helped launch the modern movement, introduced me to Rosalind and Stanley Godlovitch who later influenced Singer and Clark.

One of your contributors (*Agenda* No.3, July 1980) has rightly warned that the movement should not lack a historical perspective. May I therefore suggest for historical purposes (not conceitedly I hope) my own contribution to Paterson and Ryder's (eds.) *Animals Rights - A Symposium* (Centaur 1979), Vera Sheppard's *My Head Against the Wall* (Moonraker 1979) and Clive Holland's *Compassion is the Bugler* (Macdonald 1980). For the approximately 2,000 years up to 1964 one should consult the excellent *All Heaven in a Rage* by E.S. Turner (Michael Joseph 1964).

The idealism and militancy of ten years ago still continue, but added to these have been the attempt to get the many disparate welfare groups in Britain to work together. Sufficient unity was attained for us to "put animals into politics" by persuading all the major British political parties to formulate official animal welfare policies before the General Election of 1979. Much credit goes to Lord Houghton and Clive Hollands for this historic achievement.

Looking back on the 1970's one can see scattered reforms and improved enforcement of protective legislation. Much more significant has been the revolution in attitudes so that Animal Rights is a subject that all educated people have now heard of and with which most can agree in principle.

What for the 1980's? Already some of the leading groups in the nine member states of the European Community have come together to form a powerful coalition called *Eurogroup for Animal Welfare* with which to lobby the Commission in Brussels and the Council of Europe in Strassbourg. Since cruelty has become truly international (whale oil, seal skins, the trade in livestock and animal testing regulations for example), so also must animal protection efforts become truly international.

In that other "western" culture, Australia, a lively Animal Liberation Movement recently started by Christine Townend and Peter Singer is already getting results.

Governments the world over must be forced to realize that this is an issue they cannot afford to ignore. Campaigners must badger politicians, interest the media, and keep the pressure until attitudes and laws both recognize that Speciesism is as unintelligent and wrong as racism or sexism or slavery.

Richard D. Ryder studied Experimental Psychology at Cambridge and Columbia Universities. An active campaigner for animals rights for more than ten years, he was elected to the R.S.P.C.A. Council in 1972 and was R.S.P.C.A. Chairman 1977-79. He is author of Victims of Science (1975) and co-editor of Animals Rights - A Symposium (Centaur 1979). Currently, he serves as Chairman of the R.S.P.C.A.'s Political Committee and as the U.K. delegate on Eurogroup for Animal Welfare. Dr. Ryder, who coined the word Speciesism in 1970 is by profession a Senior Clinical Psychologist at the Warneford Hospital, Oxford.

Veganism: #1

by Jean Pink

You ask in issue No. 3 for views on the case for Veganism. I adopted a Vegan diet about six months ago. I have stuck to it except for occasional backslidings (mainly when away from home) although these are getting less as my taste for eggs, milk and, to a lesser extent, cheese has now almost deserted me.

The reason for taking this step was simple. I wanted to live a life based as far as possible on compassion. Some people will argue that plants feel pain so on that basis the only answer is to starve! But surely this is the point at which we bring in common sense, for I'm sure most people would agree that there is a considerable difference between pulling up a lettuce and removing a three-day old calf from its mother, imprisoning it in a crate in a darkened shed for several months and then murdering it for the veal market.

It is clear that until animals are released from their role as instruments of profit, animal abuse on a massive scale will continue. To give up eating meat is not enough. One has to do without dairy products and eggs and hope that others will do the same so that cows will no longer be kept in an almost continual state of pregnancy, so that calves are no longer torn from their mothers a few days after birth and so that male calves, the inevitable by-products, no longer spend their short lives in narrow crates too small for them to turn round. Neither will chickens any longer be reared in those appalling battery farms.

This, then, was my primary reason for adopting the Vegan diet. However, I can now see there would be important benefits for humankind if this way of life became universal. Since so much of the world's protein is consumed by animals (a high percentage of the protein value being destroyed in the process),

if present farming methods were changed to provide vegetable protein only, I understand that starvation would largely disappear. So surely on this basis alone it is an urgent matter to promote the Vegan diet.

One of the side-benefits of changing to this vegetable-based diet has been the enjoyment of excellent health, as well as a certain lightness of heart, so I can therefore happily recommend it to others who may be hovering on the brink.

Jean Pink is Founder and Hon. National Organizer of Animal Aid, an activist anti-vivisection society which has attracted over 5500 members—many of them extremely active—in under two years. For a copy of their excellent bi-monthly magazine, OUTRAGE!, send a dollar to Animal Aid, 111 High Street, Tonbridge, Ken TN9 1DL, England.

Veganism: #2

by Kim Stallwood

To understand the importance of Veganism in the Animal Rights Movement, one has to be aware of the fundamental differences between 'Animal Welfare' and 'Animal Rights'.

Animal Welfare implies an acceptable level of animal exploitation: as is suggested in the popular phrase "unnecessary suffering". Unnecessary suffering—as opposed to "necessary" suffering—permits animal usage provided that the welfare of the animal is maintained. This situation opens the door to all the examples of animal exploitation that we know. British legislation concerning Animal Protection is built around the phrase "unnecessary suffering" and it can easily be imagined how difficult it is to prove in a court of law what is necessary or unnecessary suffering.

Animal Rights puts forth fundamental principles that can be applied generally to animals and to specific cases of animal abuse. For example, when the Hunt Saboteurs Association decided that foxes had a right not to be hunted, this declaration was used in the fox's defence when saboteurs were confronting bloodsports people chasing a particular fox in the field. Animal Rights does not permit the *exploitation* of animals by wo/man under any situation. In fact, there are differences of opinion as to when it is right for wo/man to interfere with animals' lives even when it would be of direct benefit to the animals concerned.

This, then, is the difference: Animal Welfarists would say that it is permissible for wo/man to eat dead animals provided that no "unnecessary suffering" was involved. Animal Rights activists, however, would quite simply declare that an animal has a basic right not to be eaten. And as animals are so extensively exploited in society today, this leads to the Vegans' rebellion against the use of *all* animal products.

It is vitally important for the activist to be a Vegan. Not only is s/he not contributing to the continuation of animal exploitation by supporting its products (after all, a Vegan or vegetarian is the title given to someone who boycotts products of cruelty),

but s/he is providing an example to society and proving that it is possible to live a life that is not dependent on animals. It is also a genuine indication of one's commitment to Animal Liberation.

WARNING

Vegans have to be aware of striking the balance between Veganism and fanatical Veganism where the pursuit of dietary purification is the only end, not a means to Animal Liberation.

Beware of those who talk of Animal Rights when meaning Animal Welfare/Exploitation. They will confuse the issues in the media and, inevitably, in the public's gaze; this will dilute the strength of the concept of Animal Liberation.

Kim Stallwood is an animal rights activist based in England. With Angela Walder and Fay Funnell, he organized and now coordinates Coordinating Animal Welfare, an English movement—building group similar to Animal Rights Network. CAW puts out an excellent "Bulletin". CAW, P.O. Box 61, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 4EN, U.K.

Veganism: #3

by Daryl Elliott

In the ongoing discussion of defining veganism called for by Jim Mason in *Agenda* No. 3, I would like to delineate yet another perspective. While many definitions may already have been published hitherto, my perspective will emphasize tangential and clarificative points. The generally accepted definition is the abstention from ingestion and use of animal products and by-products.

Superficially, this appears simple enough, but, if one were to take this definition literally, to be a true vegan one would have to nearly ostracize her- or himself from society. Abstention from ingestion of animal by-products: stearic acid; stearal sulfate; lecithin; and mono- and di-glycerides is as easily done as is abstention from use of leather, wool, silk, honey and lanolin. But, abstention from the use of rubber car tires, postage stamps, stainless steel, some inks and dyes, and shoe- and other glues is more easily said than done for those of us living in mainstream society—especially—since not everything is clearly labeled.

In addition to these complications is the problem that many nonanimal products have been tested on animals. We're rarely given any indication of these practices by labels, although we are now compiling more and more information on which companies use these tests. Thus we are able to avoid some animal-free products that have been tested on animals (by avoiding certain manufacturers like Revlon), and to wage a small-scale boycott in protest of vivisection. This practice, however, leaves the strict vegan with little, if any, choice of some kinds of products.

The question before us is whether or not a person who drives a car and sends and receives letters can be a Vegan. My opinion is yes, of course, that person can be a Vegan. What we do have to keep in mind, though, is that it is quite important that we exercise restraint in our purchases of quasi-vegan and questionable products. The greater the quantity of animal products we buy, the more we finance death. (This same principle holds true for every other humanitarian movement; when we spend our money, there are often unsatisfactory implications!)

The Veganic implication depends on the degree to which we take Veganism. Film, for instance, which is covered with animal gelatin, is one of the borderline cases. To use film indiscriminately, in my opinion, is not in keeping with the Vegan ethic. Using it indiscriminately and writing the film companies to explain that a nonanimal gelatin is available, may absolve guilt, but this still falls short of the Vegan ethic as I see it. Prudent use of film in general may be only a rationalization. However, the filming of a slaughterhouse and using the film to teach others about the atrocities that occur there seems to have a net positive effect for animals. But, then again, aren't there already enough pictures of slaughterhouses in circulation which could be used? Just buying a TV, paying to attend a movie or even posing for a picture necessarily implicates us in the killing of animals. The point here is that there is no clear-cut rule for all of us as to which level we should take Veganism.

As there are animal by-products in so many products now, I feel that we can't justly set limits for others in these gray areas of veganism. In the meantime though, we of like mind should attempt to fit some letter writing into our schedules telling firms of our objections and asking them to offer vegan substitutes.

It is a rare person that would go to the absolute extreme of where Veganism could take us in this day. That doesn't mean that the rest of us aren't Vegans.

At a minimum, a Vegan should, in my view, not eat any animal product or derivative thereof whatsoever, nor wear any animal product or by-product externally (except perhaps in the case of shoe glue as it is virtually unavoidable) nor apply any product or by-product topically (to the skin). Nor should a Vegan topically use any nonanimal product that has been tested on animals. A Vegan should, wherever possible, avoid animal products and by-products used apart from the body as well.

Who is or is not considered a vegan is unimportant. If we spend excessive time categorizing ourselves, we will have less time to work on liberating animals. Moreover, any categorizing of any group, from without or within the movement, could lead to elitist behavior in some members and as a result, that would be divisive. The quintessential point in this discussion is that each of us should go as far as s/he feels comfortable (or even uncomfortable) in going. It's the animals, after all, that we want to help, so each of us should try harder to minimize our complicity in our species' long-standing practice of enslaving and killing other animals.

Daryl Elliott is an animal rights activist based in Amherst, Massachusetts.



Feminism: Our Sister Movement

by Andrew Dagilis

It is better to work from the bottom up rather than from the top down. Ask any architect. Yet working from the top down is precisely what proponents of animal rights are asked to do when they are told that they should be "working for the betterment of humankind instead of wasting your time on animals". But since every worthwhile cause demands total commitment from its active supporters, and because that commitment often makes it impossible for the same person to be equally involved and effective in more than one field, it makes the most sense to concentrate on those causes whose victims are the most numerous, the most brutally assaulted, whose oppression is most widespread and most popularly accepted: animals' and women's rights.

There exist too many parallels between the fight for women's rights and the struggle for animal rights for there to be so little understanding and cooperation between the two. Moreover, the animal rights movement shows in the microcosm of its own activities the state of phallocentric patriarchy that pervades our society as a whole. How often have proponents of animal rights been accused of being "emotional and hysterical" while those who profit from animal exploitation pride themselves in being "rational" (a word too many of them mistakenly think is synonymous with detached aloofness)? Are these not expletives used to chastise women who have become too "strident" in demanding what is their rightful due? How often have we been told that we love animals more than people? Haven't radical feminists endured such accusations also? ("They're all lesbians", the phallocrats say, as if there was anything wrong with that anyway, or as if it didn't make sense that, treated as they are by men, women *shouldn't* turn to those who genuinely care for them.) Haven't our actions been misunderstood to mean that we are trying to make animals "the same as people", just as feminists are accused of attempting to deny that there exist differences between the genders? Both affirmations are patently untrue, of course; equal consideration and non-discrimination in no way imply identical treatment.

How many women make up the animal rights movement? How many men constitute the animal-exploitation interests? Think back on all those radio and television debates you've heard and seen where animal rights proponents were pitted against vivisectioners, ranchers, etc. How often were these debates a male-female confrontation, where the subliminal communication spoke deafeningly of sexual role-playing, where the merits of a point came second to the gender of its defender?

The animal rights movement not only reflects the rampant sexism of our society, it also parallels the aspirations of the women's movement. Both seek to 1) foster cooperation, 2) to promote equality and benevolence, 3) to arouse empathy, 4) to speak directly to the masses, 5) to condone use only through harmony and consent, and 6) to enlarge humankind's existing sphere of ethical consideration. Conversely, the forces both these movements oppose are built around 1) competition, 2) power struggles and social status, 3) callousness, 4) patrician elitism, 5) materialistic exploitation, and 6) social conformity. With their inflexible gender- and species-based compartmenten-

talization, both the speciesist and the sexist seek to maintain their social power and concomitant security by reinforcing the barriers that have until now guaranteed them their dominance. For both the animal rights and women's movements: the evil opposed is culturally accepted and promoted, the victims are often without any true legal recourse, and the numbers of victims are staggering. But, bewilderingly, both causes still prompt the reaction from many people: "Problem? What problem?"

While many progressive causes claim to oppose mutilatory practices on humans, only the animal rights and women's movements speak of a very special kind of physical abuse and exploitation: that where the victims' entire sexual, affectional and reproductive lives—where their bodies' very shapes—are controlled by others for their own selfish purposes.

To my mind, there is no better barometer of how far we still have to go than by evaluating the quality of those men who choose to work for animal rights and their motivations for doing so. First, there are fewer men in the animal movement than, in say, the anti-nuclear field, the labor movement, or the various anti-dictatorship groups and for good reason. The animal rights movement offers very little socially accepted peer praise or personal glory. The rise to prominence and the promise of equal societal footing with activists laboring in the more approved human-related fields (minority rights, civil rights, disarmament, etc.) is presently slim; animal rights is not a cause for the selfish, and men are raised to be very selfish. As we gain more prominence and respectability, there will be a proportionate increase in our male membership. Within the movement, you'll find most men in those domains where the dividing lines are most clear-cut and simple, where the chances of rough-and-tumble confrontations are most numerous: i.e., the wildlife causes. The John Wayne-ism displayed there makes me think that if Mickey Spillane were to defend animals, that's where he'd go.

It's another reflection of the patriarchal nature of our society and our unconscious relationships with each other that, though women are the backbone of the movement and have always been the driving force behind it, those who are best at grabbing the public spotlight are usually men. For every Alice Herrington, Helen Jones, Eleanor Seiling or other well-known female leader, there are now about ten Cleveland Amorys, Paul Watsons, Brian Davies, Roger Carases, Richard Ryders, Hans Ruesches, Peter Singers and other well-known male leaders in the animal movement. Though their contributions to our movement are not negligible, recognition of these men and recognition of males in general is out of all proportion to the actual number of males working in the movement. For most of them, too, their level of recognition is all out of proportion to the comparative quality of their work.

I get depressed and dully angry every time I hear a person say, "We need to attract more men to the movement to give it more credibility". I can't dismiss such remarks as easily as I can those usually uttered by business-types who rant that, "What this outfit needs is more balls!" I can't because, in our

case, the remark reflects a deeper malaise pervading our movement—one that undermines our effectiveness and might eventually lead to a co-opting of our true aims in favor of a stance less “emotional” and more “rational” (“rational”, in this contest, tends to mean “more willing to compromise”).

I believe in working from the bottom up. At the bottom of the oppression ladder lie the animals, and on the next rung, women. I don't have enough years in my life or energy in my body to allow myself to work for any other causes, nor do I need to. No other movements than these two, if popularly accepted, would bring on the kind of complete social and cultural overhauls which are so desperately needed now. The “trickle-down” theory of social benefits has historically proven itself to be bankrupt; we must work where the need is greatest, and the need is greatest in the gutters beneath egalitarian philosophy, where lie the underdogs of underdogs.

Andrew Dagilis, an animal rights activist based in Quebec, has worked actively in anti-nuclear and anti-war efforts, in womens' rights and in environmental campaigns in both Canada and the United States. He serves as co-Executive Director of the Animal Liberation Collective, 148 South Durham, Quebec, Canada JOH 2C0.

*(For more on the relationship between the women's and animal rights movements, see the review of Elizabeth Fisher's book, *Woman's Creation* in “Reading for Revolution”.—Eds.)*

Agenda people: Sunshine Beyer, Amy, Randy & Geri Gould, Jim Mason, Doug Moss, Pat Valentino

THAT'S SPECIESISM!

Monsanto Company advertisement in *National Hog Farmer*, September, 1980

“Our selection process is tough. Only one out of three boars make it to our Sales Center. Others are culled and sent to the packer.

“At the Sales Center, you can personally select and inspect your new boar in a concrete environment similar to your own confinement setting.

“Farmers Hybrid gives you a written guarantee on every boar they sell.

“Find out how you can get better results from Boar Power boars.

“Our boars are all business.”

“Our boars spend an average of 4,000 hours on concrete to stress a point.

“Our boars' tough feet and legs can stand up to confinement stress.

“The average Boar PowerTM boar from Farmers Hybrid lives on concrete for over 4,000 hours before he's sold.

“This kind of strenuous feet and leg conditioning is important. Especially when you're looking for boars that can take the tremendous stress of confinement.

(Farmers Hybrid companies, Inc. is a subsidiary of Monsanto chemical company)

READING FOR REVOLUTION

This section, a collection of quotes, references, reviews and excerpts, aims to present animal liberation as the political movement that it is, with its roots closely bound up with the moral foundations of other liberation struggles.

What kind of an animal are we?

A review of *Woman's Creation: Sexual Evolution and the Shaping of Society*, by Elizabeth Fisher (hardcover - Anchor Press/Doubleday, New York, \$12.95; paperback - McGraw-Hill, \$6.95)

Reviewed by Jim Mason

Our movement already has a body of literature sufficiently voluminous (Professor Charles Magel's bibliography lists some 211 books and 163 articles relating to animal rights and the ethics of human/animal relations) that the arrival of an exceptionally important new book must be announced with whistles and bells. Unfortunately, I can't sound whistles and bells on these pages but I can tell you that you must get and read this book. Once you do, I believe you will agree with me that it ranks among the top two or three books of importance to our movement. Consider this excerpt from a review of *Woman's Creation* by feminist author and poet Marge Piercy (published in *Second Wave*, a feminist magazine, Vol. 5, no. 4, Box 344, Cambridge, MA 02139):

“(Fisher) locates the historical moment when she believes our current sex roles were invented and with them that mad need to dominate both the environment and the “other”—whether slave or stranger or woman or child—that still causes trouble and may yet melt down the whole ball of wax.

“She fixes the original sin of our civilization, if you like, on the discovery of predictable animal husbandry, with finding out, for example, that if you castrated bulls (making them manageable and docile) cows could not bear calves; that you could freely abuse other animals for profit and use them as wealth and as things on which to exercise power.”

Or, consider the same idea in Fisher’s own words:

“I believe the sexual subjugation of women, as it is practiced in all the known civilizations of the world, was modeled after the domestication of animals. The domestication of women followed long after the initiation of animal keeping and it was then that men began to control women’s reproductive capacity, enforcing chastity and sexual repression. Originally, land was held in common, and individuals had rights to its use and cultivation but not exclusive ownership. Animals, on the other hand, may well have been the earliest form of private property on any considerable scale, making animal domestication the pivot also in the development of class difference.”

But there is more to this book than it’s location of the source of sex, class and species oppression. Fisher reviews and discusses recent findings in human and primate ethology, primatology, archeology and anthropology—all with a view toward finding a more complete and honest understanding of what kind of animal we are and why we have such stinking, rotten cultural institutions as war, slavery, prostitution, class oppression, animal oppression and the like. She takes a look at the ideas of dominance and possession in animal behavior that are found throughout the writings of male scientists like Darwin, Lorenz, Morris, Yerkes and others. In contrast, she examines views on the same material put forth by women scientists such as Phyllis Jay, Jane Goodall, and Ruth Herschberger who have tended to observe rather than manipulate animals to get their conclusions. In the process, Fisher reveals ideas about human sexual behavior—homosexuality, maternal sexuality and sexuality between males and females—that correspond much more closely to the real world than do the lies, myths and distortions that currently pass for “knowledge”. Once it is realized that we were once (and perhaps still could be, but for patriarchal culture) sensual, affectionate, highly social animals, one is at once outraged and encouraged—*outraged* to think of the losses over the centuries, and of what could have been . . . *encouraged* because we have a clearer understanding of what kind of thing we are up against.

Why have male scientists and thinkers persisted in labeling our species “Man the Hunter”—stressing our supposed proclivities for violence and aggression and speaking as if only men with their hunting weapons ever contributed anything to human history and culture? Why

have they pushed this view of human nature? Could it be male cultural projection?

Why this male-oriented view instead of one based on the evidence which tends to support a view of humanity that corresponds more closely to a label of “Woman the Gatherer”? For instance, in the few remaining gathering/hunting societies whose ways of life correspond to those practiced by our ancestors for more than 99.5 per cent of our existence, women supply most of the food—often as much as 80 per cent—with the men bringing in the minor portion. Moreover, it was probably the women’s carrier bag made of human hair or vines rather than the spear point that was the first and most important human invention. The bag or container was probably used to carry quantities of food back to camp or to carry an infant thus leaving the arms free for other activities. Women figure more heavily, too, in the invention or discovery of other tools such as baskets, pottery, and fire and in the acquisition of knowledge about plants and raw materials. As the primary users, women, then, would have been the primary developers of a whole complex of tools and skills around which human society first became organized, then cultured and, finally, civilized.

Then something happened. About twelve thousand years ago, societies in the Near East began to systematically cultivate crops, to live in permanent settlements and to keep animals. Fisher discusses the archeological evidence gleaned from the digs at Zawi Chemi Shanidar, Tepe Sarab, Catal Huyuk, Ramad, Beidha and other of the earliest known human settlements. It is from this evidence that it can be seen how animal keeping led to the “discovery of fatherhood” and how this changed the human outlook on society, the sexes, the environment and just about everything else. Once again, Fisher’s words say it best:

“Now humans violated animals by making them their slaves. In taking them in and feeding them, humans first made friends with animals and then killed them. To do so, they had to kill some sensitivity in themselves. When they began manipulating the reproduction of animals, they were even more personally involved in practices which led to cruelty, guilt and subsequent numbness. The keeping of animals would seem to have set a model for the enslavement of humans, in particular the large-scale exploitation of women captives for breeding and labor, which is a salient feature of the developing civilizations.”

There is more, much more, in *Woman’s Creation*: Ideas about sadism and masochism in the culture of sexuality, ideas about possessions and property, about wealth and accumulation, about rape—of both women and environment, about deities and worship, about the authoritarian state and the authoritarian family, and still more.

I’ll have to say it again: This book is *must* reading for any serious animal liberationist.



U.S. Postage
PAID
Non-Profit Organization
Permit No. 51
Westport, CT 06880

A JOURNAL OF ANIMAL LIBERATION
BOX 5234
WESTPORT, CT 06881

AGENDA

Need for self-education

When we grasped the significance of animal liberation ideas, most of us made deliberate changes in our own lives—changes in diet, in clothing and even, perhaps, in habits of speech. Unfortunately, however, the liberation of animals won't come about simply because a few of us choose to cleanse animal abusiveness from our personal habits. This near-obsession with self-purification is, in many instances, distracting us from effective political activism. It amounts to only a *personal withdrawal* from the crimes of animal abuse and, while it is certainly important to end one's own participation in these crimes, that action by itself won't do damage enough soon enough to "save" animals from the rest of society. To do that, we'll have to start thinking beyond mere withdrawal (an essentially passive activity) and get on with actions that will uproot and destroy animal oppression out in the mainstream.

What, then, can be done to stimulate and guide this kind of activism?

How about, for starters, a campaign of self-education? Just as we made a commitment to self-purification and acted on it, we must now make a commitment to self-education and act on that to give ourselves a greater understanding of the politics, economics, history and culture of animal exploitation. This knowledge will be our most forceful tool in any campaign against animal oppression.

As the review below indicates, the literature of animal rights/liberation is already quite large and it's growing more each year. Since not everyone can read everything on the sub-

ject, it's important to single out a few of the richest sources of new ideas. These are, we think, the handful of periodicals on animal rights/liberation that have cropped up in the past year. Unlike the usual "house organs" put out by established animal welfare organizations, the publications below report on the *movement* for animal rights instead of the few activities and accomplishments of a single organization. Not that some of the larger AWO's periodicals aren't informative, mind you, it's just that, geared as they are to dues-paying supporters, they tend to emphasize their own activities over those of other groups. (If you receive several of them, you may often be confused as to just which group really *did* stop the seal hunt, save the whales, etc.!) The publications listed below, however, are independent of any one animal rights group and they report in depth on the wider range of activities going on in the movement internationally. Moreover, their ideas and perspectives are considerably more advanced and progressive than any AWO publication that we know of.

Therefore (and this is an exhortation), subscribe at once to the following: (in alphabetical order)

Animal Rights Network News
Box 5234
Westport, CT 06880

C.A.W. Bulletin
Co-ordinating Animal Welfare
Camberley, Surrey GU15 4EF U.K.

(The) Beast
Clanose Publishers

2 Blenheim Crescent
London, W11 U.K.