



FEMINISTS FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS

\$3.50

Semiannual Publication • Volume IX • Nos. 3-4 • Winter 1995-1996

IMPORTANT NEW FEMINIST BOOK CLAIMS NEW ANIMAL ADVOCACY PHILOSOPHY

BEYOND ANIMAL RIGHTS: A Feminist Caring Ethic for the Treatment of Animals. Edited by Josephine Donovan and Carol Adams, Continuum, New York, January 1996, \$22.95

Reviewed by Zoe Weil

Josephine Donovan and Carol Adams have compiled an important and challenging collection of essays in their book *Beyond Animal Rights: A Feminist Caring Ethic for the Treatment of Animals*. For the past two decades, discussion of ethics concerning nonhuman animals has been generally narrowed to three philosophies: animal rights, animal liberation and animal welfare. Animal rights philosophy has been largely articulated by Tom Regan, and animal liberation philosophy by Peter Singer. Animal welfare philosophy is expressed in a range of places and by many different people, and is defined in a variety of ways depending upon the

bias of the one defining it. For example, many of those who exploit animals define themselves as animal welfarists while many people who have devoted their entire lives to helping animals also describe themselves as supporters of animal welfare. While some—philosophers, historians and activists, among others—may have defined themselves and their efforts in different terms and with different ideologies, there have been few published works that define and describe other philosophies concerning nonhuman animals than rights, liberation and welfare. *Beyond Animal Rights*, is a collection of essays which does just that. In the introduction to the book, the editors

explain the need for this book, citing Feminists for Animal Rights past-president, Batya Bauman's feeling that "many activists were uncomfortable with the abstractness and hyperrationalism of the 'animal rights' position and that they sought an alternative that would valorize the emotional dimension of the human-animal relation."

What else is lacking in an animal rights or animal liberation philosophy that can be benefited by the additional perspective of a feminist ethic of care? Imagine the following, the real-life scenario, described to me by a colleague: you leave a concert with thousands of people. Walking along, you come to a very sick, dehydrated dog lying on the sidewalk. Everyone around you is walking by and even over the dog. Are they violating the animal's rights? While animal rights theory requires that we do not harm animals, it does not demand that we

(continued on page 8)

AN ECOFEMINIST REPORTS ON BEIJING '95: A PALE GREEN

by Cathleen McGuire

The Fourth World Conference on Women took place in Beijing, China, September 4 to 15, 1995. Concurrent with the United Nations event was the NGO (Non-governmental Organizations) Forum on Women August 31 - September 8, held over an hour's drive away in the town of Huairou (pronounced Wyrow). Security at the UN Conference was tight. Since I was not a credentialed NGO delegate, I could not attend the meetings at which the wording for the "Platform for Action" (the official UN document) was negotiated. Thus, my re-

port focuses exclusively on the NGO Forum on Women.

As one of the largest gatherings of women in history, the UN Conference and the NGO Forum offered an extraordinary opportunity for over 40,000 women from around the world to network, organize, and return to their home countries with reinvigorated agendas. Choosing which workshops to attend from the 3,000-plus options was a daunting task. When I realized that the Forum activities were spread out over a two-to three-mile radius, I wasted no time in purchasing a spunky Chinese bicycle for

(continued on page 10)

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

- PETA's Dangerous Liason with *Playboy*
- Ecofeminists Gather in Ohio

BOOK REVIEWS:

- Always Rachel
- The House of Life
- Animals and Women

FILM REVIEWS:

- The Collector and The Silence of the Lambs

- Plus News, Resources, and more

GUEST EDITORIAL:

The Company They Keep: PETA's Dangerous Liason With Playboy

by Lisa Robinson Bailey

The *FAR Newsletter* represents a plurality of opinions. The articles do not necessarily reflect an official position of the publication or of FAR. Submissions of manuscripts and graphics by women are welcomed. Manuscripts should be typed and double spaced. FAR reserves the right to edit manuscripts received for length, clarity, and grammar.

Semiannual Publication
Volume IX • Nos. 3-4
Winter 1995-1996

Editorial Committee

Batya Bauman, Editor in Chief
Trisha Lamb Feuerstein
Lisa Finlay
Virginia Kallianes

Production

Lisa Finlay

FAR Regional Coordinators

Austin, TX
Delora Wisemooon
(512) 477-6002
Decatur, IL—
Margaret Ford
(217) 428-1214
Durham, NC
Lisa Robinson Bailey
(919) 833-5722
Massapequa, NY
Christine Freund
(516) 798-1069
Seattle, WA
Claudine Erlandson
(206) 363-4987
Toledo, OH
Carol Dunn
(419) 242 3910
Washington, DC
Kelly Marbury
(301) 585-6969

Advisory Board

Marti Kheel, Co-founder
Carol J. Adams
Helene Aylon
Cristina Biaggi
Judy Chicago
Joyce Contrucci
Gena Corea
Marjorie Cramer
Mary Daly
Karen Davis
Alix Dobkin
Josephine Donovan
Elizabeth Farians
Greta Gaard
Sally Gearhart
Elizabeth Dodson Gray
Merle Hoffman
Joanna Macy
Robin Morgan
Helen Nearing
Sudie Rakusin
Rosemary R. Ruether
Merlin Stone
Rebecca Taksel
Alice Walker

National Office

P.O. Box 16425
Chapel Hill, NC 27705
(919) 286-7333
e-mail: finla001@mc.duke.edu

Editorial Office

P.O. Box 694
Cathedral Station
New York, NY 10025
(212) 866-6422
e-mail: BatyaB@aol.com

Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse, PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) dumps another toxic spill for the rest of the animal rights movement to clean up with their most recent in a long line of sexist, one-dimensional portrayals of women who have lent their celebrity status to the animal rights cause. PETA's August ad campaign to promote organ donation—another joint venture with Playboy Enterprises—features Kimberly Hefner, *Playboy* centerfold and wife of Hugh Hefner, making a plea for organ donation by asserting that "Some people need you inside them." This ever-so-clever witticism, paired with a sexualized, head and shoulders shot of Ms. Hefner—and by sexualized, I mean an image which is intended to provoke a non-intellectual sexual response—leaves me wondering about which organs—and whose—PETA is concerned.

PETA has maintained, particularly in the case of Patty Davis's *Playboy*/PETA photo session for the "I'd rather go naked than wear fur" campaign, that Davis, like the other women featured nude in the ads, was expressing her empowerment—implying personal and political empowerment as well as her presumed sexual empowerment. *Playboy* magazine, with its depictions of women as ever-ready sexual receptacles, its cartoons which laud child sexual abuse and perpetuate the myth that children desire sexual encounters with adults, and its racist depictions of the sexuality of women of color, has never been a forum for women's empowerment—regardless of *Playboy's* claims that the corporation has always been at the forefront of women's equality. *Playboy's* success as a business relies not on the idea of women as thinking beings who exist independent of men, but on men's ability and willingness to view women as objects and to ascribe to them all sorts of false ideas which suit male domination, for example, that women exist for them to ogle, fondle, and fuck at will.

Furthermore, it is no coincidence that PETA's anti-fur and organ donor campaigns exploit the physical appearance

of these actors and models. We have to question why it is not sufficient to design an ad campaign featuring the same celebrities clothed. Is it not persuasive enough to permit Cindy Crawford to express her feelings about killing animals for fur outside of the context of her sexuality? PETA's womanizing campaigns are really just an extension of the message these women receive from society at large every day of their working lives. We really aren't interested in what you think—don't bare your soul, just your skin.

As an erstwhile, long-time advocate of PETA, I attended many PETA-organized demonstrations and enthusiastically shared PETA literature with people new to the idea of animal rights. My disenchantment with PETA grew over the course of the "naked" campaign, but the real turning point for me occurred at the 1994 National Alliance for Animals Conference during a panel discussion that included Ingrid Newkirk and philosopher Tom Regan. When Regan raised questions about PETA's alliance with *Playboy*, Newkirk was dismissive. Regarding Hugh Hefner's well-known penchant for pornography depicting bestiality, which Carol Adams and others pointed to as an example of the incongruity of the PETA/*Playboy* association, Newkirk ridiculed charges made by Linda Lovelace in her autobiography, *Ordeal* (specifically p. 104) that she and a male dog were forced to perform a sex act for the entertainment of Hugh Hefner. Newkirk challenged with a snicker Lovelace's credibility on the basis of her past involvement in the pornography industry.

So how is it that Linda Lovelace is incredible and Kimberly Hefner, PETA spokesperson, is credible? My theories: 1) Kimberly Hefner is, at present, sanctioned by the Grand Phallus Hugh Hefner and Lovelace has been renounced (it is, after all, a man's world—we just live in it); 2) Linda Lovelace is "hard-core" and Kimberly Hefner is only "soft-core"; or, more practical for PETA's purposes, 3) Lovelace's charges of forced bestiality could actually be true, and if Newkirk/

(continued on next page)

(Bailey, continued from previous page)

PETA had to acknowledge that not only a woman, but a dog may have been hurt by Hefner/*Playboy* /pornography, they would have to rethink PETA's tack and its alliance with *Playboy*. Better to decry the former porn star. Better to assimilate the dominant culture (patriarchy) and its privileges than risk being relegated to the ranks of the disempowered (animals, women, people of color, homosexuals...).

There is some perverted logic in PETA's stance: how can one reasonably expect to wield any power and effect change in a power-driven society by allying oneself with the powerless? PETA's approach, as we've seen repeatedly, from Kim Basinger to Patti Davis to token lesbians Melissa Ethridge and July Cypher (But how can PETA be sexist if it uses lesbians? Sorry, next article...) to the milk-moustachioed Kate Moss, recruited simultaneously by PETA and the Milk Producers' Council is one of complicity with patriarchal exploita-

tion and reduces the cause of other-than-human animals to a paternalistic usurpation of their suffering. To appropriate an oft-appropriated metaphor, PETA has become the animals' *Uncle Tom*.

I am now too embarrassed and disgusted by PETA's disregard for women's issues to refer anyone to them, despite all the good work they do for animals outside of their blind media-chasing. It is difficult enough to persuade the general public of the legitimacy of animal advocacy as a social justice issue without having to defend frivolous media stunts. We, as a movement, need to reevaluate what means we use to convey our message, including cartoon images of animals and street theater, like the sledgehammer-wielding rabbits. As many detractors of the "naked" campaign have pointed out, no human social justice movement would resort to such buffoonery. These tactics are ultimately damaging to animals, because they imply that

animal issues are less important than human issues. If animal advocacy activists won't take animal rights seriously, who will?

As a late 20th-century movement, we have access to vast media technology to convey what's really happening to animals. And as always, the truth speaks for itself. Is it worth it to PETA to lose the solidarity of activists who are interested in ending all forms of oppression in an attempt to attract a base of support as shallow as their media campaigns? I, for one, would like to see solidarity on animal issues, but I won't support PETA at the expense of women. When PETA stops using demeaning ads to promote animal advocacy, I'll stand shoulder to shoulder with them again.

Lisa Robinson Bailey is a radical vegan ecofeminist witch with a fine sense of humor. She has no hang-ups about sex or nudity, and has only the deepest contempt for the term "neo-Victorian."

OBITUARIES

Helen Nearing

The end came suddenly to a life lived vigorously, simply, thoughtfully, and productively. Helen Nearing, whose life and writings inspired millions died on September 17, 1995 in Maine when her car, which she was driving alone, hit a tree. She was on her way to see a film. She was 91.

Death was something Helen Nearing had faced and examined. In her book, *Loving and Leaving The Good Life*, she gave an intimate account of her own life, and contemplated its ending. Her latest book, *Light On Aging And Dying* was just released at the time of her death.

However, Ms. Nearing was best known for her living—living her life based on a desire for the common good of people, animals and the Earth. With her husband, Scott Nearing, she left New York City during the great depression and established a homestead in Vermont and later moved to Maine. Living self-sufficiently, with modest needs, a vegetarian ethic, and a back-to-the-land



Helen Nearing and friend

lifestyle, Helen Nearing made a home known for hospitality to the community and to visitors seeking to learn first-hand about "the good life." Reflecting fondly on her 53-year productive and harmonious partnership with Scott Nearing, she said, "I don't think I could have married him had he been a carcass-eater." Helen Nearing was a member of the Advisory Board of Feminists for Animal Rights.

Evelyn Kimber, of the Boston Vegetarian Society, compiled some of the information for this tribute to Helen Nearing from The Boston Globe and Ahimsa Magazine.

Brigid Brophy

Brigid Brophy, a powerful and often cantankerous writer, died at aged 66 on August 7. She devoted her life to the advocacy of animals and women. A vegetarian, Brody was a vociferous opponent of blood sports and angling. She was also staunchly anti-religious and a vocal backer of women's rights.

-Reut10:35 08-08-95



© Sudie Rakusin 1986

LETTERS



ON FEEDING OUR CRITTERS

Hello Wimmin,

We came across a book, *Vegetarian Cats and Dogs* from Harbingers of a NewAge, 717 E. Missoula Ave, Troy, MT 59935-9609. The book gives information on how to make cats and dogs vegan. Harbingers has recently added more taurine for cats, making the mostly protein kibble healthier. Low pyrex baking pans make a big loaf, which can then be cut in layers to strips, to bits. Cats like cantalope and most melons, beets, carrots, parsley, garlic, avocado, sesame or almond spread, soy drink, lentils, seaweed, mushrooms, etc. When you order the supplements, request recipes and info, the book isn't essential. You may also want to get rid of parasites. Hulda Clark, the author of *The Cure for All Cancers*, has little vegetarian consciousness but she has uncovered a vegan, herbal cure for cancer and offers a program in her book for getting rid of parasites, which come mostly from consuming animal flesh. You can get the book by calling 1-800-231-1776. We choose to feed cats vegan food because we do not want to participate in the death industry of the patriarchy. As vegans, we are committed to being biophilic and this means choosing not to feed slaughtered animals to cats and dogs. Also, we were appalled to read about men in FAR. Men cannot be feminists. These deferences to men insult the connections and work we are doing. We did appreciate the writings about PETA, pornography, and harrasing hunters.

Esther and Mel
Cambridge, Massachusetts

It may be unnatural to some not feed "natural" carnivores meat, but we have to remember there's not much that's "natural" in the world today. Ideally, animals would not have to be kept/protected by us. In the wild, the animals stalked by a cat or dog are certainly not those found in manufactured food and it is important to remember that the meat from factory-farmed animals that we feed our companion animals contain pesticides, hormones and/or carcinogens and it is as unhealthy for them as it is for us. Nature's Recipe, a major dog food manufacturer, has developed a vegetarian dog food readily available at most stores. Evolution (1068 S. Robert St., St. Paul, MN 55118) and WowBow (13-B Lucon Dr., Deer Park, NY 11729) are two companies that market vegetarian dog and cat food. They also send literature with their catalogs

which answers some common questions regarding adequate nutrition. For example, taurine, essential for feline health, is available synthetically in Evolution's foods. Even the meat-based cat food companies use the synthetic. My own suggestion is to add vegetables, beans, rice or other cooked grains to lessen the amount of meat. Cats love greens and they aid in digestion.

Gina Grega
New York, New York

I'm writing because I'm concerned about vegan diets for dogs and cats. I choose to be veggie for ethical reasons (although I'll take any extra health benefits that come with my choice). I've shared my home with dogs and cats—all rescued, all spayed/neutered—since 1966, and have tried vegetarian dog food for a short time with no ill effects on the dogs. I considered trying vegetarian cat food, but didn't. However, I had to rethink the situation and came to the conclusion that I was acting unethically toward the dogs by placing my conscience on their backs. There are currently 2 dogs and 6 cats in my home. Even before I became aware of animal rights, when I was still just an animal "lover," I understood the concept of "animal welfare." I knew that by taking in animals, I was responsible for their well-being for their entire lifespan, and I provided the best conditions possible for each animal, according to their needs.

Eventually I discovered the concept of "animal rights" and became a vegetarian. The turning point was when someone said, "You say you love animals. Why kill to eat?" That simple question picked me up, turned me around, and set me down in a totally new direction. I made a connection that changed my entire view of the world, and haven't looked back since.

However, I have looked around, if not back. And what I've discovered is that the entire concept of "pet ownership" is not in line with the animal rights philosophy. As the caretaker of companion animals I am totally in control of their lives. I decide where s/he will live, where s/he will sleep, if, when & for what s/he will get medical treatment, what other animals and humans s/he will come in contact with, what toys s/he will enjoy, where s/he will be allowed to relieve bowel & bladder, and even how s/he will end life (die of old age, injection of lethal drug, etc). And of course I control the diet of the animal(s) in my care.

Part of my belief in a vegetarian diet for myself is the understanding that I, as a human, am a natural, biological vegetarian. My teeth, digestive tract, and natural abilities at

finding food all point in that direction. But all the indicators point to a carnivorous diet for canines and felines. Their wild cousins are all hunters. They have the physical equipment to be excellent hunters, and the digestive tracts to handle a diet of flesh. The only possible rationalization I could give for changing their diet to one that I find palatable is that I prefer it. If that's how I choose, then out the window goes my animal rights ethic. So I'm caught in a dilemma. How do I reconcile my animal rights philosophy that prevents me from eating animals and yet provide dead flesh for the dogs and cats in my home? Answer: I don't. I accept that the two situations are incompatible. Either I choose not to support any part of the concept of animal ownership, and have no choice to make, or I acknowledge that there are dogs and cats who will die if not cared for. If I choose the latter, I must provide nourishment that is optimal for their needs. So my ultimate solution is to admit that I am not "pure" in my commitment to animal rights, but have a large chunk of "animal welfare" mentality. I live with rescued dogs and cats and oppose the buying and selling of "pets." I have them surgically spayed and neutered because I believe the alternative (surplus pups and kittens) is even more horrible, but am fully aware that this is an awesome affront to their rights. I purchase slaughtered animal bodies in cans and bags to feed the dogs and cats in my care, again with full awareness of the incredible hypocrisy of my act. I accept all blame. I assert that the choice to live with dogs and cats is an animal welfare choice, and as long as they are in my care, I cannot in good conscience force them to accept my primate diet, but what their bodies require.

This is one of the hardest dilemmas for many animal advocates to face. Some try to substitute grains, additives, for the flesh in most "pet food." The act of "ownership" is already so antithetical to the true meaning of "animal rights" that the attempt to feed them vegetarian diets becomes almost meaningless.

Whether it is "possible" to formulate a totally nutritious veggie diet for dogs and cats is not nearly as important to me as the basic question of "ownership." If every dog and cat in the world were to become vegetarian and healthy, the question would remain, "Do we humans have the right to own them?" I don't think we do, but I do it anyway. Every time I open a can or a bag to feed them, I am fully conscious of what I am doing. I don't take it lightly, and I don't dwell on it for long. It doesn't feel right, it causes lots of guilt, and I know that eventually I will choose to not add any more dogs or cats to my life. I

(continued on page 16)

BOOK REVIEWS

ALWAYS, RACHEL: The Letters of Rachel Carson and Dorothy Freeman, 1952-1964. An Intimate Portrait of a Remarkable Friendship. Ed. Martha Freeman. Boston, Beacon Press, 1995.

THE HOUSE OF LIFE: Rachel Carson at Work. By Paul Brooks. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989.

Reviewed by Rebecca Taksel

It was a perfect June afternoon. I was sitting on the wide front porch of one of the mansions on the beautiful campus of Chatham College in Pittsburgh. It was easy to imagine the young Rachel Carson here: she graduated summa cum laude in 1928, when Chatham was the Pennsylvania College for Women. Now a fountain bears her name, as does a scholarly Institute.

She began college as an English major, switched to biology, went on to a career as a marine biologist for the Federal Government, then combined her talents for writing and science to become the best-selling author of three books about the sea: *Under the Sea-Wind* (1941), *The Sea Around Us* (1951), and *The Edge of the Sea* (1955). Her unique sensibility infused her scientific subjects with poetry. She wrote to her editor, Paul Brooks, "...my real preoccupation is not with 'pure' or abstract science....I am the sort who wants above all to get out and enjoy the beauty and wonder of the natural world, and who resorts only secondarily to the laboratory and the library for explanations."

It was her anger and grief at the despoliation of the natural world that impelled her to write the book for which she is best remembered, *Silent Spring* (1962). About that book, Brooks wrote, "Though her immediate subject was the poisoning of our environment with lethal pesticides, the implications of what she was saying are boundless. What she did in *Silent Spring*, what so infuriated and frightened her detractors, was to question the basic irresponsibility of an industrial, technological society toward the natural world. That was her heresy. That is why her work endures."

In 1962 the term "environment" did not have the connotations it has today, Brooks reminds us. And the word "ecology," from the Greek "habitation," was practically unknown, as was the concept

it stood for. Yet Rachel Carson's thought, and, to a large extent, her life, embodied that very concept.

A letter from a friend telling her of the horrible death by DDT of the birds on her property, gave Rachel Carson the final impetus to take on the chemical and agribusiness industries and begin the project that would become *Silent Spring*. She never separated her intellectual work from her emotional responses, just as she never viewed the human being as separate from the natural world. She was unquestionably a passionate person. But she was a quiet, modest and private person as well. Until now, her personal life has been largely unknown and uncommented upon. *Always, Rachel* gives us, in letters written to her friend and Maine neighbor, Dorothy Freeman, the record of the most important friendship of the last twelve years of Carson's life—indeed, of her entire adult life—before her untimely death from cancer at age fifty-six. It was the sort of deeply emotional relationship that has been characterized as "romantic friendship." Rachel Carson and Dorothy Freeman spent time together mostly in the brief Maine summers, where they met when Carson built a cottage next to the Freemans' at Southport. With Dorothy, Rachel could talk about writing and music, about birds and the tidal life of the Maine coast, about their adored cats. To Dorothy she confided, uncomplainingly, about the strains and stress of caring for her ailing mother, for a sister and niece who both died young, for the niece's son Roger, whom Rachel adopted. And to Dorothy she wrote, just as uncomplainingly, about the many severe health problems that would have prevented a lesser person from ever completing *Silent Spring*. One example, among many of the sort of confidences Rachel shared with her friend: "Of course I loved your sudden, almost ununderstood impulse to

go tide pooling, and most of all the heart-stopping sight of the flight of wild fowl just above the spruces. Don't ever dream I wondered at your tears. I've had the same response too often—perhaps always when alone...The experience I relate in *Under the Sea-Wind* about the young mullet pouring through that tide race to the sea is one that comes to mind. Of course, I didn't tell it as a personal experience, but it was—I stood knee-deep in that racing water and at times could scarcely see those darting, silver bits of life for my tears. So I do know, of course you knew I would" (p. 281).

Always, Rachel is an important book, and a timely one. Although Rachel Carson is generally acknowledged as one of the founding figures of the environmental movement, a great author and a great activist, her battle against irresponsible environmental policies is far from won. Nor is that battle well-enough remembered among today's activists, I suspect. Women involved in the fight against the exploiters of the earth and its non-human inhabitants would do well to study the history of the publication of *Silent Spring*. Paul Brooks cites one review from the popular press which conclude, "Many scientists sympathize with Miss Carson's love of wildlife, and even with her mystical attachment to the balance of nature. But they fear that her emotional and inaccurate outburst in *Silent Spring* may do harm by alarming the nontechnical public, while doing no good for the things that she loves." That kind of sniping is certainly familiar to every woman who has stood up for the animals! What is especially maddening about the review just quoted is that Rachel Carson never allowed her emotions to overwhelm her passion for accuracy. David Brower, another great founding figure of the modern environmental movement, summed up Rachel Carson's effectiveness in one sentence: "She did her homework, she minded her English, and she cared."

Rachel Carson was honored with the Schweitzer medal of the Animal Welfare Institute, which is still one of the most important animal rights/welfare organizations. The following year the medal was presented to Ann Cottrell Free, whom I had the pleasure of meeting several times. (Ann Free is still

(continued on page 7)

Reviewed by Carol Grunewald

This is a rich and highly recommended collection of thirteen essays by ecofeminist theorists and academics who explore both new and old terrain in their quest to draw theoretical connections between the oppression of women and the exploitation of animals. Above all, it is a call to feminists to stop betraying the deepest commitments of feminism by participating in the patriarchal oppression of the least powerful—the animals. The discussions are wide-ranging and, for the most part, highly readable.

Maria Comninou exposes the patriarchal biases of recent court decisions in which hunters (mostly men) are protected from harassment, but not women; similarly, proponents of the First Amendment support the speech of pornographers (mostly male), but not animal rights activists (mostly female). Gary Francione seeks to reassure pro-choice feminists that they can support animal rights without supporting rights for fetuses and embryos by arguing that the two are not comparable. Linda Birke suggests that if feminists, especially female scientists, reject biological determinism as the basis for their own behavior, they should also question this construct for interpreting the behavior of other species.

In Karen Davis's excellent essay discussing the lives of domesticated chickens, the author explores the idea that farm animals are feminized and thus trivialized by our culture; wild animals and nature, on the other hand, are seen as masculine, and therefore worthy of the attentions of environmentalists. Joan Dunayer argues that speciesism underlies much linguistic sexism. Marion Scholtmeijer studies works of fiction for examples of women using the power of their "otherness" and the "otherness" of animals to subvert the dominant culture. Reginald Abbot provides a fascinating historical analysis of an essay written by Virginia Woolf in 1920 on the Plumage Bill in which Woolf expresses her tacit support for the protection of birds but also delivers her first feminist polemic—a defense against attacks on women by proponents of the bill. Other distinguished contributors include Carol Adams, Diane Antonio, Susanne Kappeler, Marti Kheel, Brian Luke and

Linda Vance.

Among the best essays, to my mind, were those by Kheel, Luke, Davis, Comninou, Birke and Francione. Not only are they clearly written and well argued, but they have a practical purpose beyond intellectual stimulation; their insights and arguments easily can be used by activists to advance the struggle for animals' and women's rights. Unfortunately, for lack of space, I can only expound on two of them here. In her essay "License to Kill," Marti Kheel delivers an airtight ecofeminist critique of the environmental movement's endorsement of hunting, the "sport" (with the possible exception of football) perhaps most associated with traditional masculinity.

Kheel traces the recent renewed interest in hunting among environmental writers back to the violent philosophical roots of the conservation/environmental movement and its male founders; then she moves beyond—to the hunt for masculine self-identity. Most well-meaning supporters of the environmental movement believe that the goal of their cause is "to curb or eliminate society's destructive relation to the natural world." If they only knew the history of the movement and were aware of its still-pervasive hold on contemporary environmentalism, however, they would have little reason to be so deluded. The beginnings of conservationism were hardly altruistic; hunters of the mid-to-late 19th century wanted laws passed to ban over-hunting to ensure that there would be enough "game" for them to kill. Aldo Leopold, the "founding father" of the modern environmental movement, was a hunter all his life. "The instinct that finds delight in the sight and pursuit of game is bred into the very fiber of the human race," he wrote. According to Leopold, not only is hunting an instinctive urge, but it is an "inalienable right." Although he admonished people to "think like a mountain" and preserve biotic systems through his "land ethic," Leopold cared not a wit for the individual creatures actually living on "the mountain" or on "the land." He merely wanted to preserve "the environment" for human benefit.

This legacy has carried through to the present. In recent years, yearning for more

personal, experiential contacts with nature, (mostly male) environmentalists, and especially deep ecologists, have turned increasingly to hunting to provide the element of rawness, animality or primitive aliveness they find missing from their daily lives. With the new romanticism have come new justifications and rationalizations to portray hunting as not only morally admissible but morally praiseworthy. Kheel denotes and deconstructs the ethical codes developed and used by hunters to enable guilt-free and censure-free killing since the beginning of the conservation movement in the mid-19th century when hunting stopped being a utilitarian activity (procuring meat for human survival) and became a recreational activity (killing animals for "sport"—but "fairly" with restraint [rules], thereby providing a "character-building" experience for men). Later, hunting became a moral responsibility to "protect and preserve" the environment through wildlife "management."

Most recently, among deep ecologists, hunting has become a religious experience—a way of "communing spiritually" with wild animals who are not murdered but rather who "give" their lives to the hunters. In all cases, the "happy," the "holist," and the "holy" hunters, as Kheel refers to the subscribers of these three ethical codes, all view hunting as "an instinctive sexually-charged activity, that transports the hunter back to a primeval, animal-like state." But no matter how the bullets and arrows are discharged—whether in the name of recreation, moral obligation, or religion—violence remains an integral part of the three ethical codes, albeit restrained, renamed, or denied. Kheel ends her essay by examining the psycho-sexual roots of hunting which is based on object relations theory, specifically, that the task of boyhood is to create identity by differentiating from the mother and by denying and opposing all that is female (emotions, empathy, etc.) within himself. Dorothy Dinnerstein has extended this analysis to include men's interactions not only with women, but also with all of the natural world. Women and nature become "the other," although it is the men who are really the alienated ones. "Having established a second and alienated nature, it appears that men then face a lifelong

(continued on next page)

(Taksel, continued from page 5)

speaking out for animals, boldly and eloquently, but carefully, asking well-placed, tough questions in a way I'm confident Rachel Carson would approve.) Free wrote about Carson, "During the last tragic but triumphant days of her life, another dimension opened up for Rachel Carson. Had she lived, not only would she have continued as nature's most articulate spokesman {sic} and the person to make 'ecology' a household word, she would have done a great deal more for animals. She had always been humane. She would pick up the stray cat, rescue the injured dog, return sea specimens to the sea after examination under the microscope. She did not look at the efforts of the humanitarian groups as unrelated to those of naturalists. Rachel Carson knew that exerting her strength to end other abuses would not only exhaust her, but lay her open to attacks by her detractors as a 'do-gooder.' But she did the best she could in the time allowed" (quoted by Brooks, 326-317). Free goes on to relate that Rachel Carson did send a message to a congressional committee urging humane standards for animals in laboratories, wrote a forward to Ruth Harrison's book attacking factory farming, and was incensed at the federal "predator control" program. She did not live long enough to become active in the fight against these and other abuses. Free Quotes her as saying, "It is my belief that man {sic} will never be at peace with his own kind until he has recognized the Schweitzerian ethic that embraced decent consideration for all creatures—a true reverence for life."

Rachel Carson had particularly sharp words for the hunting fraternity. Brooks tells us that "...when she detected in the writings of others what she considered a 'glorification of cruelty,' she was moved to cold anger," and he quotes her: "There can be no double standard....By every act that glorifies or even tolerates such moronic delight in killing, we set back the progress of humanity."

I find myself wondering about Rachel Carson in the atmosphere of today's animal advocacy activism. In an era fueled by media sensationalism, would she have tolerated the stunts and the shouting? Would today's young zealots tolerate her? She was not vegetarian, an inconsistency that makes a few passages of "Always, Rachel" and her other works disturbing to those of us who view vegetari-

anism as a cornerstone of our philosophy and action. (She can board a fishing vessel and comment on the "catch," but is repelled when the fishermen shoot sharks for "sport.") Still, my belief is that we need Rachel Carson more than ever. We need her scientific approach and her poetic nature. We need her wry, level-headed critiques and her steady courage as examples to keep before us. My recommendation to all ecofeminists and animal rights/welfare activists is to buy Paul Brooks' book, which includes biographical material alternating with long passages from all Carson's major works. Then, if her life and work fascinate you as they did me, go on to deepen your acquaintance with her in "Always, Rachel."

Rebecca Taksel is living in "gray Pittsburgh," as Carson called it after she had moved away. She is teaching English and working on various writing projects including a humorous book about vegetarians.

(Grunewald, continued from page 6)

urge to return to the original state of oneness that they left behind," Kheel says. "The return to an undifferentiated state, however, is precisely what must be avoided, since such a return would constitute an annihilation of the masculine self. The conflict between these two drives may shed light on the hunter's urge to kill. The pursuit of the animal expresses the hunter's yearning to repossess his lost female and animal nature. The death of the animal ensures that this oneness with nature will not be attained. Violence becomes the only way in which the hunter can experience this sense of oneness while asserting his masculine status as an autonomous human being. By killing the animal, the hunter ritually enacts the death of his longing for a return to a primordial female/animal world, a world to which he cannot return."

In his challenging and provocative essay, "Taming Ourselves or Going Feral," Brian Luke asserts that contrary to the assumptions of prevailing animal rights theory, which he views as patriarchal, people are naturally empathetic toward animals. Animal liberation, he ar-

gues, is less a matter of "taming ourselves" by constraining our violent tendencies, and more about "going feral"—breaking free from institutionalized constraints on our compassion. Luke sees most animal rights philosophy—as put forth by Peter Singer (utilitarian theory) and Tom Regan (rights-based theory)—as dominated by a sexist metaethic of social control and a tacit acceptance of cold reason over emotion. "A central patriarchal ideology is the elevation of the 'rational/cultural' male over the 'emotional/biological' female," he notes. "Women's rage (labeled 'sentiment,' 'hysteria,' etc.) is thus divested of political significance by interpreting any female reaction against the established order not as a moral challenge to that order, but as a biosexual phenomenon to be ignored or subdued." Luke believes that as long as we insist that people lack a natural tendency to empathize with animals, we will be drawn to authoritarian structures that promise to tame our natural anti-social impulses. But Luke believes that people are not innately anti-social and that, "In fact, institutionalized animal exploitation does not so much result from a lack of human sympathies for animals, as it continues in opposition to and despite these sympathies." The proof lies in the fact that institutions (such as factory farms and animal laboratories) go to a great deal of trouble to disguise the animal exploitation they engage in and to persuade employees and consumers to act against their natural sympathies for animals. Luke enumerates some of the many ways in which this subversion is accomplished including myth-making, blame-shifting to deny personal responsibility for harming animals, denying the harm done, and denying the subjectivity of animals. If people did not have a strong innate connection with and sympathy for animals, Luke reasons, such disassociate efforts would not be necessary. In the end, Luke believes animal liberation is not served by the imposition of patriarchal social controls, but rather by breaking through the controls ("going feral") to reclaim and express our natural compassion (emotions) for animals—a truly radical and feminist idea.

Carol Grunewald is an animal rights advocate and writer in Washington, D.C.

(Weil, continued from page 1)

actively care for animals who are already suffering. No one who walks over or by the dog actually violates the dog's rights. They do, however, fail by the feminist standard of care. *Beyond Animal Rights* offers a challenging perspective to rights theory in that it articulates a philosophy which maintains that we have a duty to the dog lying on the sidewalk, and our sympathy for the dog is a valid and important basis for developing a theory of animal advocacy. Several contributors to the book assert that rights theory can be, and frequently is, attacked by those who oppose animal protection, using the same tools as the rights/liberation theorists themselves: rationality. Since several of the authors in *Beyond Animal Rights* discuss the impossibility of proving nonhuman animals' equality with humans, they criticize rights theory as incomplete.

Almost all of the authors discuss the important and influential work of Carol Gilligan which describes the differences in moral reasoning between boys and girls. Gilligan's work is echoed over and over in *Beyond Animal Rights*, because it provides a framework for understanding the difficulties that many feminists find in a strict rights ideology which neglects circumstance, love, compassion and care as significant and acceptable for describing theory to protect animals. In her article, "The Liberation of Nature: A Circular Affair," Marti Kheel examines the problem faced by holists and animal rightsists. While the former promote the protection of the whole biotic community, possibly at the expense of individual animals, the latter promote the protection of individual animals possibly at the expense of the whole community. Kheel writes that "both schools of thought are trapped within the dualistic mindset. Neither can see that moral worth can exist both in the individual parts of nature and in the whole of which they are a part." Such dualistic and competitive thinking are antithetical to a feminist ethic of care, which would, one gathers from the book, attempt to balance and protect the individuals and the whole through a careful, situation-based practice.

Kheel also explores the difficulties in relying on rational thought to the exclu-

sion of emotions. She points out that pragmatic arguments about saving nature and protecting animals make little impact on those who don't care about nature and animals. Instead of persuasion by rational argument, Kheel recommends that these individuals be allowed to witness for themselves a slaughterhouse or factory farm, so that they might be moved emotionally, and finally care. Presumably, rational arguments might then be meaningful to them. From my own perspective as a humane educator, I have learned that logic and rational argument are meaningful for some people, but by far the greater impact occurs when listeners discover for themselves the reality of animal suffering, either through a video, a descriptive story or first-hand experience of witnessing animal exploitation and abuse. These personal experiences then often pave the way for accepting rights theory as valid.

Josephine Donovan, in her article "Animal Rights and Feminist Theory," echoes Kheel's critique of either/or dilemmas which arise during discussions of animal rights. Citing as an example the choice between the life of a gnat or a human, Donovan's point is that "in most cases, either/or dilemmas in real life can be turned into both/ands." She sums up her perspective on animals by writing "we should not kill, eat, torture, and exploit animals because they do not want to be so treated, and we know that. If we listen, we can hear them." This perspective contrasts with one that insists that we come to the same conclusion (that we should not kill, eat, torture or exploit animals) by rational thinking. Certainly, one can come to such a conclusion, and can sometimes persuade others using rational arguments alone, but it is also true that many, if not most people "know," based on feelings of sympathy and compassion that we should not exploit and abuse animals, and this knowing ought to be validated, promoted and nurtured.

Deane Curtin, in his article "Toward an Ecological Ethic of Care," concurs with other authors when he writes that feminist approaches to ethics "tend to see moral inquiry as an ongoing process through which persons are defined contextually and relationally." In discussing moral vegetarianism, Curtin raises the

question of context in eating animals. He describes himself as a "contextual moral vegetarian," in contrast to holding an absolute moral rule that prohibits eating meat. According to some interpretations of animal rights theory, eating animals, no matter what the context, is wrong. (It may be understandable, but it is nonetheless immoral.) So, for example, the eating of sea animals by pacific islanders or Eskimos, dependent upon these animals for their survival, is wrong according to animal rights philosophy, but not according to Curtin's "contextual moral vegetarianism."

One of the most compelling and powerful articles in the book is "Justice, Caring and Animal Liberation" by Brian Luke. Luke suggests that while animal liberation is often framed as an issue of justice, it may be more appropriately understood in terms of caring. Since he believes that arguments "that humans and other animals are relevantly similar, cannot be established by reason alone," other approaches must be available to advance animal liberation. Luke points out that the focus on comparing the treatment of humans and nonhumans is not relevant to most people. For example, his own opposition to animal exploitation stems not from a comparison between human and nonhuman treatment, but from "a consideration of the abuse of animals in and of itself." His condemnation does not arise from reasoned theories of justice, but from his sympathy for the animals, "independent of the question of whether humans are protected from such abuse." Providing examples of people's reasons for concern about animals and support for animal liberation, Luke reveals that fixation on consistency or comparison to human treatment is not the primary motivation for action or concern; rather it is care, compassion, empathy and sympathy that are the primary reasons for their commitment to animal advocacy.

Luke does not believe that the goal of presenting the best reasons for accepting the animal rights position, while neglecting to describe animal rights activists themselves, is adequate. Not only does he not find justice-based arguments to be sound, he also believes that if philosophers want to further animal liberation, it

(continued next page)

(Weil, continued from previous page)

is "incumbent upon them to attend to the actual motivations of the activists." In other words, those who write or speak to move others toward an animal liberation perspective "should make presentation consonant with the real processes by which individuals come to reject animal farming, vivisection, and hunting." The question arises: what if people do not generally care about animals—which Regan and Singer both profess? Luke argues that, in fact, "animal exploitation thrives not because people fail to care, but in spite of the fact that they do care." The rest of Luke's article is a fascinating examination of the socially constructed state of affairs that creates and fosters animal exploitation.

Kenneth Shapiro's "The Caring Sleuth" paints a portrait of the animal activist. Using his expertise as a phenomenological psychologist, Shapiro summarizes the experience of being an animal rights activist. What Shapiro discovers is that "animal rights activists have a caring attitude toward nonhuman animals." This may seem obvious, but it is significant to know that caring is a primary motivation for activism, rather than allegiance to theories of justice. Caring is not, however, necessarily sufficient, and Shapiro writes that while caring may immediately become "a habitual style" for some, others require a "recrudescence" later in life, perhaps an intellectual awakening occasioned by reading Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation*.

In addition to describing the motivations of activists, Shapiro's article explores the tensions and conflicts that arise among animal activists who must actively seek out suffering in their effort to expose and then abolish it. Shapiro discusses how activists deal with this depression, doubt and alienation which are a result of their caring.

In her second article, "Attention to Suffering: Sympathy as a Basis for Ethical Treatment of Animals," Josephine Donovan discusses the philosophical arguments that have been advanced through history which reject a sympathy-based ethic, as well as those that support it. This is an important article for planting the feminist ethic of care in a historical and philosophical arena. Referring to Max

Scheler's *The Nature of Sympathy*, Donovan writes that Scheler does not "see sympathy as a whimsical erratic, and irrational response, but rather as a systematic investigatory tool, a form of knowledge." While Scheler wrote his book in 1913, more recently Nel Noddings wrote that "the maintenance and enhancement of caring [should be] the primary aim of education." This contrasts not only with a rights perspective, but also with our whole educational system, that neglects caring, compassion, love and sympathy in favor of regimented, intellectual learning. As Schopenhauer, quoted by Donovan, writes, "boundless compassion for all living things is the firmest and surest guarantee of pure moral conduct." While Donovan is likely correct that "sympathy precedes justice," it by no means replaces justice. Certainly, there are some for whom no plea for sympathy, compassion or caring "works." This is why we need laws, and have developed systems of protection and punishment—in order to insure compliance with compassionate values; in other words, to insure justice. What Donovan's article offers, however, is the idea that compassion, caring and sympathy are the base and the power behind theories of justice. Justice, or rights theory alone neglects the power and importance of feeling as the underpinning of law and rights. Donovan ends by agreeing that political analysis is essential, "particularly for formulating an effective and appropriate ethical response. But the motivation for that response remains the primary experience of sympathy."

Carol Adams, in her article "Caring about Suffering: A Feminist Exploration" explicitly states "that the male ideal of autonomous individual—on which rights theory is based—is fraudulent." Adams explores the implications "that animal suffering occurs within the context of a patriarchal culture," deconstructing rights theory through the lens of what she articulates as the "sex-species system." Adams explores and contrasts different sufferings: men's, women's, animals', and activists', as well as the response to others' suffering, asserting toward the end of her article that "saving animals is not

enough." By incorporating a gender analysis, Adams reveals the connections between all forms of exploitation and compels the reader to abandon privileging one suffering over another. Ultimately, if we attend to suffering, we are made "ethically responsible."

There is one article in *Beyond Animal Rights* which, while interesting, does not seem to fit in the book. Rita Manning's "Caring of Animals" begins with the disclosure: "I freely confess to being a bit tired of debates about animal rights." Yet, in her article, more than any others, discussion about animals' rights would be of value. Manning explores in detail her relationship with and decisions about the horses she has purchased and owns. While she raises some interesting ethical dilemmas, some of the central questions: should horses be raised, broken (so that people may ride them), outfitted with leather saddles and metal bits, and bought and sold are barely explored. In fact, the dilemmas Manning faces regarding her horses are dilemmas which almost presuppose the acceptability of the horse trade, including buying, selling, breaking and raising horses for human entertainment and pleasure. Manning writes "it does seem to me that an ethic of care requires that we actively seek to avoid risk of injury insofar as we can." While this may be admirable, another perspective more sympathetic to animals might be: if we do not exploit to begin with, we can eliminate the need for risk assessment to minimize suffering.

In an otherwise important and fascinating critique of rights theory, Manning's article actually reinforces the importance of justice theory. Offering her ideas about other domestic animals, Manning writes that "there are important differences between animals raised for food and animals that [sic] are primarily companion animals. My hunch is that tending cattle or pigs doesn't provide the same complex relationship and concern for nature that tending companion animals does." Such an assertion is actually a strong argument for justice-based, rights theory which would protect the interests of "farm" animals whether or not people have a complex relationship with, or compassion and sympathy for them. While Manning points out the

(continued on page 13)

(McGuire, continued from page 1)

\$45. My hotel was located in a relaxed rural setting, a pleasant 30-minute bike ride from Huairou.

Although the U.S. press persisted in spotlighting the Chinese government's strong-arm tactic (all too often at the expense of covering our actual work), I personally witnessed few infractions. Most women at the Forum were jubilant to be in a milieu teeming with so much female energy. Yet, overall, I was disappointed by how narrowly focused it was on the political side—UN objectives notwithstanding. As a veteran of womyn's festivals, I have become accustomed to an environment in which the creative, artistic, and spiritual is given equal weight to the political. This more balanced approach is what I found lacking at the Forum, and feel that most of the women had but a glimmer of the transformative possibilities that open up when the nonlinear sides of our consciousness are given full accord. Nonetheless, the politics were hard-hitting with a strong focus on the issue of violence against women, including such workshop topics as the selling of Nepalese girl child, Zambian battered women shelters, and female genital mutilation in the Arab world. The global network of activists opposed to trafficking in women constituted a strong, vocal presence at the conference.

Conspicuously absent were Western proponents of that Paglian dribble that regards prostitution as a viable career "choice" for women and pornography a liberatory expression of female sexual agency. I was astonished by the lack of environmental con-

sciousness on the part of the Forum organizers. Why was this not a "green" conference? Thousands of plastic water bottles were just tossed away with the regular trash, and it didn't seem like any of the vast reams of waste paper were destined for recycling. Was I the only one appalled—rather than awed—when over 20,000 previously trapped doves and hundreds of balloons were released at the opening ceremonies? Aren't the Forum organizers aware that some animals mistake the deflated balloons for food and often choke to death? Also, there were tents galore for special constituencies such as a disabled tent, a peace/antinuclear tent, a youth tent, an indigenous tent, a lesbian tent, etc. Why was there no environmental tent?

The most flagrant act of eco-suppression was the treatment of the thoroughly ecofeminist contingent, "Daughters of the Earth: The Environment and Development Collaborative Web." Known as the Web, this coalition of 78 global organizations presented a remarkable two-day tribunal, the Second World Women's Congress for a Healthy Planet. The Web grew out of the

McGuire with Indian ecofeminist activist/writer Vandana Shiva



First World Women's Congress held in Miami in November, 1991. This important event was spearheaded by the Women's Environmental and Development Or-

ganization (WEDO) under the leadership of Bella Abzug. The Miami Congress marked a watershed in grassroots feminist politics as women from around the world networked, organized, and collectively devised a strategic plan of action. The resulting document, the "Women's Action Agenda 21," is a paragon of ecofeminist politics. Its presentation at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 was a historic step forward in solidifying NGO's and women's influence on United Nations' policy making.

The Web's tribunal in Huairou was followed by six days of intense plenaries focusing on issues critical to women's empowerment: Trade and the Global Economy, Technology and Communications, Health and Healing, Peace and Militarism, Resistance Strategies and Sustainable Alternatives, and Indigenous Perspectives on Biodiversity. Unlike the official NGO Forum English-only program books, the Web's program book was printed in five languages. A *who's who* of predominantly women of color activists such as Wangari Maathai, Dessima Williams, Miliani Trask, and Urvasi Vaid addressed the panels. The Web's agenda represents a model of international multilateral organizing. So why was it apparently sabotaged?

From the beginning, attending the Web's activities was made difficult. The Forum planning committee assigned the Web a space that was almost a half-hour walk from the site proper. To add insult to injury, the



Women protest McDonalds in Beijing

official Forum map misrepresented the Web's location by several blocks. Then, midway through the conference, their space was yanked out from under them. Instead of one convenient locale, the panels were splintered into several sites. Amidst the general barrage of posted announcements, it was serendipitous that I spotted one of their hastily made flyers indicating their new locations. The Web's plenaries should have been a centerpiece of the Forum. The fact that their agenda was undermined by logistic legerdemain borders was scandalous. I was one of the lucky few to gain entrance into the 1,500-seat conference center in Huairou for both Hillary Clinton's talk and the two keynote addresses. In my opinion, Winona LaDuke's keynote was one of the most important speeches of the entire conference. LaDuke, an Anishinabeg from Minnesota and co-chair of the Indigenous Women's Network, named names, and spoke strong, proud, and unequivocal.

LaDuke located the origins of today's problems in the predator/prey relationship industrial society (the predator) has developed with the prey: nature, women, and indigenous peoples. What law, she challenged, gives corporations like Conoco, Shell, Exxon, Diashawa, ITT, Rio Tinto Zinc, and the World Bank the right to decide how land is to be used? "Is that right contained within their wealth, which was historically acquired immorally, unethically, through colonialism, imperialism and paid for with the lives of millions of people, species of plants and entire ecosystems? One of LaDuke's most cogent points is that often there is no difference between the countries of the North and those of the South. Uranium mining in the First World presents the same dire consequences for indigenous peoples and the Earth as clear cutting rainforests does in the Third World. She demanded an end to profligate consumerism and rampant development. "Consumption," she declared, "causes the commodification of the sacred, the natural world, cultures, and the commodification of children and women."

From a Western perspective, LaDuke's speech is classic ecofeminism at its very best and deserves to be read

WHERE ARE ALL THE BIRDS

Beijing is one of the hottest boom towns on the planet, with capitalists from every continent fueling consumer desire. The front-line casualty in this assault is nature. Greater metropolitan Beijing is highly polluted, the distant horizon never more than a vague smoggy blur. Even in the countryside where I was staying an hour and a half drive from Beijing, the air was just as bad. After my morning jog, I felt as if I had smoked a pack of filterless cigarettes. Women with asthma were having a terrible time. In an effort to reduce pollution for the duration of the conference, rumor had it that each day only cars with alternate numbered license plates were allowed to operate. Similarly, I heard that many manufacturing plants were temporarily closed. The Chinese are very tidy, and put their vast labor pool to use cleaning the streets and sidewalks. Litterwise, the country is immaculate. Composting is *derigueur*. Flowers, especially cockscomb, were everywhere. The entire length of every road, both large and small, is tree lined, making for lovely drives.

Unfortunately, these appearances cannot mask the omnipresent smell of pesticides. Each one of those beautiful trees has a three-foot base of white pesticide "paint," and most plants are heavily sprayed. I was told that the country's pesticide usage is one of the highest in the world. Some nutritionists advise against buying Chinese herbs because of their potent pesticide content. North America is certainly no environmental paradise, but I was shocked by the massive deployment of pesticides to which the Chinese are subjected. I used the issue as an opportunity to encourage women to eat low on the food chain, and was grateful vegetarian dishes were always available. One woman commented on how well fed the Chinese are. I responded, yes, but at what cost? There may no longer be food shortages in the urban areas, but the government is poisoning its people. Not to mention the animals. As visi-

tors to China, many women were asking, Where are all the birds? Where are the insects? Their absence was unsettling. I saw only four dogs, two cats and one mouse the entire seventeen days I was in China. Although old men are avid collectors of caged birds, I was told having a "pet" is a luxury in a country with a history of starvation. Three of the dogs I saw obviously were "pets." The day I left, my encounter with a fourth dog was heartbreaking. I was in the center of Beijing walking along an esplanade. There, curled up on the grass, was a full-grown dog about the size of a Labrador, but very scrawny. Our eyes locked for several seconds. He clearly understood I was focusing on him. He became worried and quickly moved away. I followed him, speaking softly. He was very frightened and kept running. Not wanting to stress him further, I stopped following him. I bought some food and left it where I had first found him, hoping he would discover it. Beijing had gone on a rampage before the conference to rid the city of stray dogs, beggars, prostitutes and criminals. The dog I encountered was definitely a renegade stray. He obviously had evaded the euthanasia squads and was struggling to survive. While the plight of all strays and homeless distresses me, this situation was altogether different. This dog's entire "people" had been annihilated. He was living by his wits with no support system or "community" left. Dogs usually run in packs; this poor soul was literally alone. The Chinese are known to eat dogs. Perhaps this knowledge also contributed to the terrified look in his eyes. Horrific things are done to animals the world over. Yet, it was an especially painful experience coming face to face with a terrified survivor of a species extermination campaign. A primary demand at the Beijing Conference was for the human rights of women. I regret to report that—except for the indigenous women—I did not witness a single concern for any nonhuman animal.

(continued on page 13)

ECOFEMINISTS GATHER IN OHIO

by Greta Gaard

On the weekend of March 31 to April 1, 1995, the University of Dayton's annual Philosophy Colloquium focused on "Ecofeminist Perspectives." This two-day conference, organized primarily by FAR supporter and scholar, Brian Luke, brought together over a hundred ecofeminist activists and scholars from the United States, Canada and Australia.

The conference opened with Lisa Finlay's presentation of the FAR slide show, "Animal Liberation Through An Ecofeminist Lens." Of course, several other sessions addressed the centrality of animal advocacy to ecofeminist theory as well: Lori Gruen and Chris Cuomo's presentation, "Personal/Political Revisited: Women and Animal Relations," Brian Luke's "Violent Love: Hunting and the Construction of North American Manhood," and Carol Adams's keynote presentation, "Ecofeminism and Animal Politics."

Lori and Chris' presentation used a dialogue format to convey theory, a refreshing switch from the standard philosophical paper. Brian's presentation offered a feminist critique of hunting and was followed by a spirited discussion—as it turned out, some of the women students in the audience were also hunters. Finally Carol's keynote presentation raised the question of the limits to caring, which has puzzled many of us in FAR: that is, why do some activists care about the suffering of women but not that of animals, and vice versa? I'm looking forward to reading a more detailed version of her talk this coming winter in *Beyond Animal Rights: A Feminist Caring Ethic for the Treatment of Animals*. Overall, there was a strong emphasis on animals at this ecofeminist conference. Not all ecofeminists understand or agree with the necessary connection of women's and animals' liberation, so it continues to be important that FAR members speak, write and organize in ways that make this connection evident to others.



After hours at the conference – from top left to bottom right: Carol Adams, Barbara Noske, Lisa Finlay, Greta Gaard, Janet Bagby, and Deborah Slicer

Other conference sessions addressed the relationship of ecofeminism to spirituality, philosophy, pedagogy, and activism. Conference highlights included an afternoon address by Val Plumwood on "Androcentrism and Anthropocentrism: Parallels and Politics," and another keynote address from Carolyn Merchant on "Ecofeminism and Partnership Ethics." Perhaps the most important message I took away from this conference was the necessity and the difficulty of building coalitions among various activist movements. The environmental justice movement and the ecofeminist movement, deep ecologists and ecofeminists, spiritual feminists and ecofeminists, environmentalists and ecofeminists, animal liberationists and ecofeminists—all these pairings present areas of potential coalition-building which would work to our mutual benefit and strengthen our respective movements. I was particularly impressed by presentations from activists like Gwyn Kirk and Ann Filemyr, both teaching at Antioch College, who stressed the incredible potential for social change inherent in building connections between ecofeminist and environmental justice movements. The conference provided ample time at dinners and later in the evenings to socialize and build community with other ecofeminists. It was a pleasure to meet writers and activists whose work I have read and admired—Val Plumwood, Gwyn Kirk, Chris Cuomo, Vicki Davion, Barbara Noske, Brian Luke—and to renew friendships

with such fine thinkers as Carol Adams, Deborah Slicer, Noel Sturgeon, and Lori Gruen. One of the services academics can provide activists—in addition to building theory with activists, and offering academic media coverage for progressive actions—is to use their institutional power and privilege, their funding and resources, to create opportunities for activists and academics to come together. Such gatherings are often the only site for building ecofeminist community, forming friendships

which help to alleviate the feelings of isolation so many of us—activists and scholars alike—often feel. Brian Luke deserves our heartfelt thanks for making this conference a reality.

Greta Gaard teaches at the University of Minnesota in Duluth and is a FAR advisory board member.

FAR HONORS WOMEN'S STUDIES PROGRAM

We wish to recognize the women who run the women's studies program at Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, Connecticut for caring about the animals. The women's studies conference held on September 30 to October 1, 1995 which they planned and hosted was a paragon of ecofeminist caring and inclusion. Not only was it totally vegetarian but their brochure inviting craftswomen and other exhibitors stated explicitly that no items resulting in cruelty to animals would be allowed: no leather, no fur, no feathers, no bone, no ivory, and there were beautiful things displayed by many talented women who worked in plant-based, mineral-based, and earth-based materials. In addition, Marcia Ann Gillespie, Editor of *Ms* magazine declared, in her brilliant and inspirational keynote address on the Fate of Feminism, that all life on the planet must be respected. We hope other women's studies programs will follow their example.

(Weil, continued from page 9)

problems and inconsistencies with “caring for” animals one eats, her article does allow for the possibility, and perhaps acceptability, of exploiting the animals for whom one cares. *Beyond Animal Rights* offers an exciting collection of new ideas about animal advocacy theory, one that will hopefully serve to foster the growth of a movement which is primarily built upon the sympathies of its adherents. However, while it challenges and expands upon rights and justice theories, it does not replace them. Rita Manning’s article reveals that an ethic of care is sometimes not enough. On the other hand, rights theory, which permits people to walk over a dehydrated dog, is also not enough. While the book critiques Peter Singer’s theories in general, and his disavowal of sympathy as a basis for theory in particular, it is ironic that Singer’s *Animal Liberation* may be the most significant book to influence people to become both caring in their attitudes and behaviors, as well as to become true activists. Even Shapiro mentions that *Animal Liberation* provides the awakening to sympathetic actions among many activists. I know that in my own life, reading *Animal Liberation* was pivotal—in part because of the philosophical theories of justice. Even more influential for me, however, were the many chapters describing in detail the exploitation of animals in laboratories and factory farms. These horrified me, eliciting an emotional response that fueled my move toward activism. As Shapiro would say, while I was intellectually challenged and changed, my reading of *Animal Liberation* was more a moment “of the heart, not of the brain.” While Singer may disavow emotion as pertinent to theory, his book has probably influenced so many people specifically because it does elicit emotion. Singer also relies frequently on the power of description and story. In his recently co-edited book, *The Great Ape Project*, he collects not only philosophical treatises, but also articles, stories and accounts of great apes, which move the reader emotionally. Sympathy may be the basis for care, which in turn is the basis for legal protection,

but since legal protection would not compel someone to care for another, we need to return to sympathy. Hence the title *Beyond Animal Rights*. What is before and beyond animal rights is an ethic of care, which is, as Marti Kheel writes, a circular affair.

Zoe Weil is the director of Animalearn, the Humane Education wing of the American Anti-Vivisection Society. In addition to her humane education work in the schools, she conducts workshops on humane education for teachers and activists and has written two books on animal issues for young people.

(McGuire, continued from page 11)

in full. (To order a copy, send a check for \$5.00 payable to the Seventh Generation Fund, Route 1, P.O. Box 308, Poniard, MN 56575.)

Another primary indicator of the absence of an ecological consciousness on the part of the Forum was with respect to food. I’m sorry to say this was definitely not a vegetarian conference. Long lines queued before too few stands, most offering some variation of processed food, much of it meat-based. Unless one had a bike (a surprising number of people did!) the vast distances made it difficult to zip over to Huairou restaurants for a quick healthy vegan lunch. Worst of all, the Forum organizers saw fit to consign valuable booth space to McDonald’s. I smelled that unmistakable odor of charred flesh and congealing grease before I actually saw the tent bearing those notorious golden arches. Let’s face it: If you’re gonna install a McDonald’s booth at an international gathering of women, and seat a life-size, plastic Ronald McDonald out front on a bench, you’re asking to get zapped!

Two women from Earth Island Institute in San Francisco, Emily Miggins and Sarah Chamberlain, initiated a spontaneous protest. They upturned Ronald, smeared him with ‘blood’ (catsup), and endeavored to educate the gawking customers about the evils of Big Mac consumption. Meanwhile, Vandana Shiva, the renown ecofeminist activist and scientist from

India, at her workshop titled “Globalization, Food Security, Patents and Pesticides,” called for a march to culminate at the McDonald’s tent. Her contingent joined a large crowd of spirited protesters by then already at the scene. Our chants and placards included: “McDonald’s is not an NGO,” “Eat Chinese,” Support the Local Economy,” “Monoculture is Bad Food,” “Stop Poisoning our Bodies! Stop Clearcutting Our Forests! Stop Polluting Our Environment! Stop Concentration Camps for Animals! Stop Cultural Imperialism!” Before an army of cameras, a group of us picked up Ronald McDonald and hurled him into the mud. (A friend in the U.S. saw this fabulous footage on CNN.) The crowd cackled uproariously while we high fived each other in glorious triumph. Eventually, three shaken Chinese McDonald’s employees rescued Ronald, hauling his battered body away never to surface again for the rest of the conference.

McDonald’s was not the only representative of transnational capitalism at the Forum. Apple and Hewlett Packard logged maximum advertising mileage in exchange for providing Forum participants unlimited access to hundreds of computers as well as free Internet training. Esprit’s donation of thousands of tote bags bearing the official NGO logo created uncomfortable PR problems for Irene Santiago, Executive Director of the Forum. Activists involved in campaigns against international sweatshops distributed flyers indicating Esprit’s custom of underpaying and overworking primarily female laborers. In a puff piece in the Forum’s free daily newspaper, *Forum, '95*, Santiago “strongly refuted the [Esprit] allegations,” that the Forum Secretariat “had taken every precaution to ensure that all its sponsors were socially responsible.” Yeah, right, and Ronald McDonald is a card-carrying member of Greenpeace!

Cathleen McGuire lives in New York City and is a writer and radical ecofeminist activist. She went to Beijing as part of the Ms. Foundation for Women’s 125-member delegation.

FILM REVIEW

THE TREATMENT OF WOMEN AND OTHER ANIMALS IN TWO FILMS

Reviewed by Melissa Clifford

A feminist analysis of the suspense thriller films, *Silence of the Lambs* (1991) and *The Collector* (1965) has not escaped notice of some film critics. However, I have seen no reviews the treatment of women and nonhuman animals in both films.

In both Jonathan Demme's Academy Award winner, *Silence*, and William Wyler's highly rated British film, *The Collector*, there is a relentless blurring of the treatment of women and other objectified creatures. Demme's film especially pushes this connection far beyond what may be necessary to reveal the misogyny in our culture. One cannot help feeling both filmmakers sympathize with women and animals.

The Collector features the disturbed social misfit, Freddie ("peaceful ruler"), who captures, kills, and displays beautiful butterflies. He also desires to capture and imprison a woman whom he expects to fall in love with him. Having won a huge sum of money in the football pools, he abandons his office job and society, and acquires a scenic estate in the English countryside. He finds, however, that his life is missing one thing—Miranda ("greatly admired") Grey, a bright, spirited and sophisticated art student. Instead of trying to gain her affection in a more traditional way, he chloroforms her and locks her in his basement. Grey (played by Samantha Eggar) is an unwilling subject, even with, what is in his view, all the necessities she needs and desires.

In one of Freddie's (played by Terrance Stamp) attempts to impress Grey, he shows her his extensive butterfly collection. "How many butterflies have you killed," she asks. "Think of all the living beauty you've ended." With wrists tightly bound, she tries in vain to free his sole living butterfly. "Let it go!" Distraught and overwhelmed, she declares more than asks, "Now you've collected me, haven't

you?"

Later Freddie offers an exorbitant sum for her self portrait. Grey quickly agrees, then rips the drawing in half. "Put it in a drawer with the butterflies." This association of her image that he attempts to commodify, and the butterflies that he keeps displayed behind glass reveals his attitude toward women. He truly does not want to know her. In a discussion of literature and art he refuses to recognize the beauty and messages found in works that are important to her. Enraged he asserts that she is simply echoing the opinions of her "la-de-da" professors. In this scene, his own self-hatred rises to the surface in an almost pitiful display.

Grey, like a songbird imprisoned by a child, soon withers away and dies. From Freddie's perspective, it is her fault for not complying with his wishes. His only mistake is that he "aimed too high." Next time he'll find a more "common woman" whom he can "teach"; one who won't make him feel inadequate.

Silence's protagonist, Clarice Starling, like Miranda Grey, is a similarly strong, intelligent, and unyielding character. Assigned to the case of a serial killer who has skinned a number of women, Starling pursues her first FBI assignment with intense resolve. The case is a perplexing one, for the murderer neither rapes nor robs his victims.

Starling shares her name with the non-indigenous birds known for their tenacity in the face of human attempts of extermination. Starlings are a common nuisance, not unlike Clarice, the orphaned daughter of common, working-class parents of West Virginia. Her insistence on being treated as an equal is a thorn in the side of the men she deals with. Starling's desire to shed the accent of her birthplace along with the accompanying trappings is analogous to *sturnus vulgaris'* ability to mimic the songs of other species to suit their purpose. "Fly back to school, Starling," coons the condescending Hannibal Lecter at one point in this film.

Starling is sent to negotiate with Dr. Lecter, a renowned psychiatrist imprisoned for a series of grisly murders. The FBI believes he has clues to the identity of the killer, the heterosexual transvestite, Buffalo Bill, who has a penchant for skinning his young, white victims, using

their hides to create something more than apparel. Bill shares with Freddie of *The Collector*, a twisted perception of morality. Living alone in a small town, Bill kills time in his cluttered home by collecting rare species of moths and butterflies in his basement. It is here that he keeps his victims until he is ready to kill and skin them. He feels compelled to remind himself that these are not sentient beings. He consciously refers to his victims as "it."

In contrast to Buffalo Bill, Dr. Lecter (a.k.a. *Hannibal the Cannibal*) shows no qualms about ravaging and eating his human victims. In one of Starling's conversations with the brilliant, maniacal Lecter, it surfaces that the impetus for her risking her own life to stop the killings is traced to a traumatic event from her childhood. Waking to the crying of the lambs on her grandparent's farm after her unsuccessful attempt at saving even one from slaughter proved to be more than she could endure emotionally. The silence following their deaths left an indelible mark on her psyche. Following Starling's visit and confession, Lecter sadistically orders a meal of rare lamb.

One of the strengths of this film is its depiction of a confident, courageous female lead. Not your typical psycho killer flick, it removes sex as an interest. This film, while entertaining, has a strong message. Foster's character may or may not escape the trappings of her origins, but she certainly escapes the definitions Hollywood often ascribes to most female leads. Whether in meeting with male colleagues (from whom she demands respect), or in a darkened basement with a killer (refusing to be the object of his gaze), Starling consistently proves her courage and intelligence. Never again will she be a helpless witness to massacre.

Likewise, Stamp's *The Collector* is all the stronger for lack of a truly sexual motive. In this sense, both films deal specifically with domination and objectification of women and nonhuman animals without sex being a central issue. It is gratifying that Demme and Wyler deal with the issues of speciesism and sexism.

Melissa Clifford is a West Coast FAR member, a feminist, and an animal rights activist.



The Reader's Digest (27 million copies in 18 languages bought monthly) carried this item: "People are more violently opposed to fur than to leather because it's safer to harass rich women than motorcycle gangs."

PBS plans the first nationally broadcast vegetarian cooking show in December, with Mollie Katzen, author "Moosewood Cookbook." As recently as a couple of years ago, people at PBS were nervous about the show being vegetarian. They were saying, should we even use the v-word?

Included in Martina Navratilova's computer files are Vegetarian Restaurants around the world; Homeopathic doctors and chiropractors and osteopaths around the world.

Protesting genetic engineering of animals and plants, Molecular biologist John Fagan returned a one and a quarter million dollar grant to the National Institutes of Health (NIH). In doing so, he recognizes potential hazards if they are released into the environment.

A new vegetarian fast-food place is located right smack in the middle of a major shopping mall in Sarasota, Florida, along with McDonalds, Burger King and KFCs. It's called Froggy's and they offer Veg-Italian sausage, the veggie Reuben, the BLT with fakin'-bacon, meatless burritos, and more. Watch for the possibility of it going national.

Dr. Benjamin Spock, noted pediatrician, has come out in favor of a vegetarian diet for children. Dr. Spock, a member of the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, headed by Dr. Neal Barnard, says that "death from coronary arteriosclerosis, from cancers and from stroke keep increasing, and there is no question these diseases are linked to high-fat diets, particularly animal fats from meat, chicken, fish, eggs and dairy products."

-L.A. Times

Heidi Prescott, National Director of The Fund for Animals, sued bowhunter, Ted Nugent over several defamatory sexist and misogynist comments he made about her on a radio show a few years ago. Nugent recently settled, agreeing to pay Heidi \$75,000 (which Heidi is spending on anti-hunting campaigns).

8/1/95 *New York Times* contains a fraction of the document that the "unabomber" has been circulating through the mails over a very long time, with his favored targets including people working in computer and genetics research and airlines. The document contains a brief, derisive mention of animal rights contemptuously lumped with feminism and other "leftist" ideologies: "When we speak of leftists in this article we have in mind mainly socialists, collectivists, 'Politically correct' types, feminists, gay and disability activists, animal-rights activists and the like..."

"Bass'n Gal," the big-time tournament circuit for women, staged the Culprit-US Invitational, the final meet of the season, Aug 17-18 at Lake Tenkiller. The nation's top female anglers competed for a share of \$112,900 in prize money. First prize was a full-rigged Ranger bass boat with Mercury outboard, valued at \$23,000. Second will be worth \$20,000.

A mild, sudsy cleanser, like dishwashing liquid, will free mice trapped on glue traps.
- Lynn Manheim

Karen Davis of United Poultry Concerns reports: "In recent years younger and heavier birds have been bred for fast-food and rotisserie restaurants. The more fragile capillaries of this newer breed makes for a more cruel death as each suffers massive hemorrhage during the initial electric stunning during slaughter. Partly because chickens are excluded from the federal Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, 30 million birds each day in the U.S. endure horrendous pain in being subjected to the technology that is used to fast-track their bodies to consumer's plates. No matter what the poultry industry says, chicken is not a healthy or a happy choice. The birds go to slaughter loaded with pathogens. They are subjected to cruelty from the hatchery to

the slaughterhouse. Their flesh tells a tale that consumers understandably respond to by saying, 'Oh please. Don't tell me about it.'"

-VivaVegi

Field and Stream, (Aug. '95, Midwest Edition), has a three-page article entitled, "Children and the Animal Rights Agenda," by Gail Shaffer Blankenau, stating that AR people and organizations are teaching children anti-hunting, etc., in schools. (Would that it were true!) They claim, "... they need to be aware of the animal rights agenda and its misleading messages," referring to parents and their children. The article also talks about films, such as *Bambi*, *101 Dalmations*, *Seabert the Seal*, *Beethoven*, etc., which, they claim, depict humans as the ultimate enemy against animals. If you wish to respond to this article: Cheers and Jeers, *Field & Stream*, 2 Park Ave., New York, NY 10016, or fax: 212-779-5468.

EAST LANSING, Mich., Aug. 11 (UPI)—Hundreds of wildlife and zoo veterinarians from around the world are stampeding onto the Michigan State University campus Friday. They're gathering to discuss issues from carcass examination to wetlands revival during the six-day, joint conference of the American Association of Zoo Veterinarians, the American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians and the Wildlife Disease Association. MSU wildlife veterinarian and conference organizer Jim Sikarskie said more than 600 people have registered, including some from as far away as Australia and Finland. "We'll cover a range of issues, but will focus on ecosystem health and the environment," Sikarskie said. The gathering also includes the International Wildlife Disease Conference. Workshops will cover wildlife health care issues, including new drugs, preparing for natural disasters and a session entitled "Getting the Most Out of Your Carcass" on post-mortem examinations. Sikarskie will lead a session and present a paper on using the bald eagle as an indicator of the health of the Great Lakes ecosystem. "We'll be talking about the impact of contaminants on the Great Lakes," he said. Part of the presentation will have a bald eagle that was born with a cross bill and another that has club feet — two victims of Great Lakes pollution. The conference won't be all business. Tuesday night, the vets and zookeepers get together for a barbecue of buffalo, elk and venison.

(Letters, continued from p. 4)

can't imagine what that will be like. The pleasure I've shared with my animal companions has been and continues to be a primary aspect of my being. I design my schedule, my furnishings, my socializing, almost everything I do, around their needs and comfort. I am a vegan for now and I feed flesh to my animal family.

Maureen Koplow,
Editor, *ADVANCE*
Deptford, New Jersey

(Editor's note: Feeding cats and dogs a vegetarian diet is a very controversial matter. We think that Gina's suggestion about adding vegetables, beans and grains to their food is the way to go. We would also suggest not buying regular commercial cat and dog food sold in supermarkets since most contain "animal by-products" that include, among other things, tumors from diseased animals. If you don't prepare their food yourself, buy it in a reputable "pet" supply store (one that does not sell live animals, birds or fish, please) where brands such as Pet Guard or Optimum (the only two brands recommended by Anitra Frazier) are available. Also, we suggest you consult "The New Natural Cat" by Anitra Frazier, who is a 30-year vegetarian living with 14 carnivores (cats). This is perhaps the most reliable source for the care and feeding of cats. Anitra, believe that a raw organic meat diet, laced with chopped up fresh vegetables and well-cooked grains is the optimum diet for cats. While none of us want to participate in "the death industry of the patriarchy," so aptly put by Esther and Mel, we do not live in a perfect world. Maureen Koplow best describes the dilemma in which we find ourselves.)

THIS ISSUE IS LATE...

Due to a number of circumstances (including computer breakdown) this issue of the Newsletter is late. We apologize to our readers (many of whom contacted us about missing the issue) and we apologize to some of the authors whose works are not as timely as they were when written.

DIRECT ACTION NEWS



Call the following companies that sell steel-jaw leghold traps and tell them how you feel about trapping animals in these instruments of torture: F.C. Taylor: 800-344-2923, and Northern Fur & Sport: 800-523-4803. Also call the following companies that test on animals and tell them why you are boycotting them: Arm & Hammer: 800-524-1328; Clorox: 800-227-1860; and Schick: 800-323-5379.

Shirley McGreal, Chairwoman of International Primate Protection League thinks it's time for a Dian Fossey stamp and so do we. On the night of December 26-27, 1985, Dian Fossey, passionate protector of the world's mountain gorillas, was brutally murdered in her primitive cabin in the remote Virunga Volcanos of Rwanda. Dian was buried by her cabin alongside many of her beloved gorillas, including Digit, Baby Kveli and Uncle Bert. One has to be dead for ten years before the US Postal Service can issue a commemorative stamp. IPPL has already submitted a documented letter to the Postal Service requesting that consideration be given to issuing a "Dian Fossey Commemorative" in 1996. Please send letters to the Postmaster General to request that a stamp showing Dian with one of her beloved mountain gorillas be issued. This would be a wonderful way to honor this courageous and dedicated woman. Write: Marvin Runyon, Postmaster General, 485 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Washington, DC 20260-0010.

-IPPL News

President Clinton continues to endorse hunting. In his January 24, 1995 State of the Union Address, he again promoted sport hunting. Just weeks after his Arkansas duck hunting trip, the President stated, "...I would never do anything to infringe on the right to keep and bear arms, to hunt and to engage in other appropriate sporting activities. I've done it since I was a boy, and I'm going to keep right on doing it until I can't do it anymore." Write to the President and tell him that the majority of Americans oppose hunting: President Bill Clinton, 1600 Penn-

sylvania Avenue, Washington, DC 20500.
Phone: 202-456-1111
e-mail: president@whitehouse.gov

-The Activator

Debbie and Freida, Clyde Beatty circus elephants, have gone on the rampage again - this time at a Clyde Beatty-Cole Brothers Circus performance in Queens, New York. The media reported this stampede with coverage on all local New York City television news reports and articles in all the major dailies. According to the July 12 *New York Newsday*, "...nine elephants were performing in a rock and roll routine-locked trunk to tail" when the rampage broke out. *Newsday* added "Twelve spectators were slightly injured, not by the elephants, but when the crowd of 800 panicked and ran for the doors, falling over each other." One of the spectators is believed to have suffered a broken knee. Beatty-Cole officials attempted to minimize the impact by stating "She's just 17, a troubled teenager. She is just a young, typical misguided teenager" This anthropomorphism backfired when the media was alerted that Debbie was not in her teens. Reports quoted Pat Derby of the Performing Animal Welfare Society as stating "I've been tracking them for years. They are not teenagers and this is not an isolated incident, and it's only a matter of time before somebody else gets killed." These Beatty-Cole elephants have been involved in other such incidents, and it's only a matter of time before people realize that all elephants won't quietly endure the misery of circus life. Please call your local park commissioners or other appropriate local authorities and let them know that the Beatty Cole circus has had a sorry history of public safety problems involving stressed elephants. Ask them to make sure that these barbaric and dangerous animal acts are banned from your area.

Contact your congressional representative to strongly urge her (him) to vote for HR1619 which would prohibit federally assisted housing from preventing elderly or disabled persons from keeping companion animals.

RESOURCES



The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) publishes the Animal Welfare Information Center Newsletter and it is available free upon request.

EarthHeart: Nurturing a Peaceful Planet, is a newsletter of the EarthHeart Foundation that educates toward healthier food choices for the good of people, animals and our planet. From their mission statement: "We believe that non-violence through vegetarian food choices, compassion toward all living things and kindness in thought and action makes a difference in how people relate to one another in the home, community and throughout the world."

The Humane Society of the United States is making available three very good booklets about cats. *Cat Care Facts: The Care of Your Cat*, *Facts About Cat Law: Laws About Cats*, and *Facts About Cat Fables*. The only thing we would take issue with is their feeding recommen-

dations. We would better go with the wonderful book by Anitra Frazier, "The New Natural Cat: A Complete Guide for Finicky Owners." We are also becoming advocates of homeopathy for animals.

Dr. Pat Bradley is a woman cat homeopathy practitioner in Arkansas. Sheba, Batya's cat, recently had a siege of FUS (Feline Urinary Syndrome) and after trying all kinds of things that did not work, at the recommendation of Anitra Frazier, Batya called Dr. Bradley who prescribed a remedy that worked like magic. Within hours, Sheba improved and the next day she was fine. Dr. Bradley asks lots of questions about the cat in question and then prescribes a remedy. Her fee is \$90 an hour. We spoke for 20 minutes so the bill was \$30, plus the long-distance phone call. This is perhaps less than a visit to an allopathic vet. And there are no side effects from immune-depressing antibiotics. To reach Dr. Bradley for a consultation about your cat, call 501-329-7727.

Animalearn: The Magazine for Kids Who Love Animals, a beautiful new periodical for children ages 8-12 has been launched by

the American Anti-Vivisection Society. Subscriptions: \$10.00 for one year (four issues) or \$18.00 for two years. In Canada, \$13/year, \$21 for two years.

"Spay and Neuter Legislative Bulletin" published by The Fund for Animals is an excellent resource for those interested in spay/neuter laws and to keep people updated as to which communities have recently passed laws addressing dog and cat overpopulation. They also have a 90-page booklet, "Killing the Crisis—Not The Animal," which outlines the steps in passing an ordinance. Other materials addressing dog and cat overpopulation legislation are also available. There have been numerous spay/neuter laws that have passed during the past several years. Copies of those laws are also available from The Fund. There is no charge for the bulletin and the book is \$5.

E-mail: KimSturla@aol.com
Address: FUND FOR ANIMALS
808 Alamo Drive, #306
Vacaville, CA 95688
Phone: 707-451-1306

HOW TO CONTACT ORGANIZATIONS CITED IN THIS ISSUE

The Activator

The American Anti-vivisection Society 801
Old York Road
Jenkintown, PA 19046-1685
1-800-SAY-AAVS

Animalearn

American Anti-Vivisection Society
(see above)

ADVANCE

476 Warwick Road
Deptford, NJ 08096
609-853-1847

Boston Vegetarian Society

P.O. Box 38-1071
Cambridge, MA 02238-1071
607-424-8846

EarthHeart Foundation

3803 W. Cedar Road
Cambridge, WI 53523
608-423-4229

The Fund for Animals

850 Sligo Avenue, Suite 300
Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-585-2591

The Humane Society of the United States

2100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
202-452-1100

IPPL News

International Primate Protection League
P O Box 766
Summerville, SC 29484

Medical Research Modernization Committee

P.O. Box 2751
Grand Central Stn
New York, NY 10163-2751
212-832-3904

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals

P.O. Box 42516
Washington, DC 20015
301-770-7444

Performing Animal Welfare Society

P.O. Box 849
Galt, CA 95632
916-393-PAWS

Physicians Committee for

Responsible Medicine
P.O. Box 6322
Washington, DC 20015
202-686-2210

United Poultry Concerns

P.O. Box 59367
Potomac, MD 20859
301-948-2406

USDA National Agricultural Library

AWIC Newsletter Staff
Beltsville, MD 20705

VivaVege Society

P.O. Box 294
Prince Street Station
New York, NY 10012
212-966-2060

M E R C H A N D I S E

BOOKS

NEW! *Beyond Animal Rights: A Feminist Caring Ethic for the Treatment of Animals* \$22.95 (HB)
Josephine Donovan and Carol J. Adams, Editors

NEW! *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* \$16.95 (PB)
Carol J. Adams, Josephine Donovan and Suzanne Kappler, Editors

Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals \$24.95 (HB)
A collection of essays by Carol Adams

Ecofeminism and the Sacred \$14.95 (PB)
edited by Carol Adams. An anthology

The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory \$14.95 (PB)
by Carol Adams

Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature . . . \$19.95(PB)
edited by Greta Gaard. An anthology

Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions of American Feminism \$14.95 (PB)
by Josephine Donovan. New expanded edition

Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy, special issue on ecological feminism \$12.95 (PB)

Rape of the Wild: Man's Violence Against Animals and the Earth \$8.95 (PB)
by Andrée Collard with Joyce Contrucci. History of the systematic abuses of nature, women, and animals under patriarchy

Green Paradise Lost \$14.95 (PB)
by Elizabeth Dodson Gray. An introduction to ecofeminist thought

Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism \$15.00 (PB)
edited by Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein. An anthology

Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism \$14.95 (PB)
edited by Judith Plant. An anthology

Dreams and Shadows \$15.00 (PB)
by Sudie Rakusin
A personal journal-keeping book

An Unnatural Order: Uncovering the Roots of Our Domination of Nature and Each Other \$20.00 (HB)
by Jim Mason

In Pity and In Anger \$9.95 (PB)
by John Vyvyan. Details early anti-vivisection movement centering on two key women activists

Instead of Chicken, Instead of Turkey: A Poultryless "Poultry" Potpourri \$10.00 (PB)
by Karen Davis
A vegan cookbook

The Perennial Political Palate \$16.95 (PB)
The Bloodroot Collective
A feminist vegetarian cookbook

FAR BIBLIOGRAPHY

A bibliography of books and articles related to feminism and animal liberation. (1993-94 edition) \$7.50

BUMPER STICKER

"Feminists for Animal Rights" \$1.00

BUTTONS \$1.00 each

- 1) FAR Logo
- 2) Practice Nonviolence: Don't Eat Animals
- 3) Nonviolence Begins with the Fork
- 4) Hunters are a Deranged Species
- 5) Vegetarian Feminist
- 6) Veggi Dyke
- 7) Patriarchy/A Threat to All Life on the Planet
- 8) Proud to be Vegetarian and Gay
- 9) Another Gay for Animal Rights
- 10) Another Eco-Feminist Lesbian Vegetarian
- 11) Leather/No Skin Off YOUR Back
- 12) Meat Eating/Hazardous to Your Health and to the Planet
- 13) Feminism and Meat Eating/A Contradiction in Terms!
- 14) Animal Research is a Human Disease in Need of a Cure
- 15) Stop the War Against Women, Animals and Nature
- 16) Lesbians for Animal Liberation
- 17) Subvert the dominant paradigm: Be A Vegan!

T-SHIRTS: 100% cotton (please indicate 1st and 2nd color choice) Colors: grape, white, natural, black. (sizes M, L, XL, XXL) \$16.00
FAR Logo on front with Alice Walker quote on back: "The animals of the world exist for their own reasons. They were not made for humans any more than black people were made for whites or women for men."

TOTE BAGS: 12 oz. Natural Cotton Canvas Tote. Full sides with bottom gusset, 14"x10 1/2"x5" \$10.00
FAR Logo on front with Alice Walker quote on back (see T-Shirt description above)

Back Issues of FAR NEWSLETTER Available for \$3.50 each (Canada and abroad - \$5.00) postage included

Volume IX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1995) "If Women and Nature Were Heard;" "Veganism: A Radical Feminist Choice;" "Companion Animal Rescue Effort Update;" Book Reviews: "An Unnatural Order," "The Perennial Political Palate," "Feminism, Animals and Science;" "A Vegetarian Friendly Refrigerator;" "Game Agencies Target Women;" "An Ecofeminist Invitation for Democracy;" plus Resources, Direct Action and more.

Volume VIII, Nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 1994-95) PETA and a Pornographic Culture: A Feminist Analysis of "I'd rather go naked than wear fur;" "Hunting the Hunters: Women Hunt Saboteurs;" "Mothering, Caring, and Animal Liberation;" "The Politics of Snails;" "Will the GATT Threaten Animals?" plus book review, poetry, direct action, resources, and more.

Volume VIII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1994) "Pharmaceutical Giant Exploits Horses and Menopausal Women;" "Sheltering the Companion Animals of Battered

Women;" "EcoVisions Unites, Ignites Sisterhood of Ecofeminism;" Editorial: "Reform, Abolition, or a New Feminist Analysis?" "An Ecofeminist Statement delivered at the Summit for the Animals;" Book Review: "Cooking, Eating, Thinking: Trans-

Volume VII, Nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter, 1993-94) Special issue on books on ecofeminism: reviews of five books; "Rodeo Women" (Editorial); "Epitaph for a Greyhound;" "Feminist Trafficking in Animals;" "A Feminist Perspective on Cosmetic Testing;" "So, What Do You Eat and What Do You Do (in Bed)?" "Patriarchy Exposed: The Fistulated Cow;" and lots more.

Volume VII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring Summer 1993) "We're Treated Like Animals: Women in the Poultry Industry;" Carol Adams comments on Marilyn French's book: *The War Against Women*; "Ten Years Ago," speech by Sally Gearhart on World Day for Laboratory Animals 1981 in San Francisco; Book Review: *Autobiography*

of a Revolutionary: Essays on Animal and Human Rights, by Roberta Kalechofsky, and lots more.

Volume VI, Nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 1991-92) "AIDS & Animal Research: False Hope, Wasted Lives;" "The Silencing of Women and Animals" (the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas hearings); "Feminists in the Making: Women Activists in the Animal Rights Movement;" "Snake Oppression;" "Women, Food, and the Vegetarian Connection;" and more.

Volume VI, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1991) "Pornography and Hunting;" "Statement of Opposition to the [Gulf] War;" "Abortion Rights and Animal Rights;" "Of Wimps, Wars, and Biocide;" "Shame on the Furriers;" and a lot more.

Volume V, Nos. 1-2 "What's in a Word;" "Finding a Niche for Animals within the Greens;" "Hunting Rabbits, Squirrels, and Little Girls."

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION AND MERCHANDISE ORDER FORM

PLEASE PRINT

DATE: ___/___/___

Name: _____ Address: _____ Apt. # _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____ Phone: (____) _____

MEMBERSHIP

- Regular \$15-25, sliding scale (receive Newsletter)
- Friend \$26-100 (Newsletter and FAR button)
- Matron \$100+ (Newsletter, FAR button, and T-shirt)
- Angel \$1000+ (all of above, plus *FAR Bibliography* of feminism and animal rights)

\$ _____

MERCHANDISE

Item(s)	Description	Quantity	Price	TOTAL PRICE

Please use another sheet of paper if necessary. Please add \$2.00 postage and handling for the first book, or \$3.00 for the first T-shirt, plus \$1.00 for each additional book or T-shirt (Canada and foreign, \$4.50 for first book or T-shirt, plus \$2.00 for each additional book or T-shirt.) Canadian and foreign checks must be in U.S. dollars or drawn on U.S. banks - or send money orders in U.S. dollars.

Make check (drawn on U.S. bank or money order) payable to:
Feminists for Animal Rights
P.O. Box 16425
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Postage/handling: \$ _____

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED: \$ _____



Feminists for Animal Rights seeks to raise the consciousness of the feminist community, the animal rights community, and the general public regarding the connections between the objectification, exploitation, and abuse of both women and animals in patriarchal society. As ecofeminists, we also are concerned about cultural and racial injustice and the devastation and destruction of nature and the earth. We view patriarchy as a system of hierarchical domination, a system that works for the powerful against the powerless. FAR promotes vegetarianism and is vegan in orientation. FAR is dedicated to abolishing all forms of abuse against women and animals.

FEMINISTS FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS



FEMINISTS FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS

P.O. Box 16425
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Forwarding and return postage guaranteed

Address correction requested

If your mailing label has a red "X" on it, it's time to renew your membership.

BULK RATE
U.S. Postage
PAID
Durham, NC
Permit No. 237

Marti Kheel
8425 Bel View Ct.
El Cerrito, CA 94530

