



4-1992

## From Welfare to Liberation: A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Animal Rights Movement

Linda J. Rynbrandt  
*Western Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses)



Part of the Sociology Commons, and the United States History Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Rynbrandt, Linda J., "From Welfare to Liberation: A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Animal Rights Movement" (1992). *Masters Theses*. 848.

[https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses/848](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/848)

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



FROM WELFARE TO LIBERATION: A SOCIO-HISTORICAL  
ANALYSIS OF THE ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

by

Linda J. Rynbrandt

A Thesis  
Submitted to the  
Faculty of The Graduate College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Arts  
Department of Sociology

Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
April 1992

FROM WELFARE TO LIBERATION: A SOCIO-HISTORICAL  
ANALYSIS OF THE ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Linda J. Rynbrandt, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1992

This thesis is a socio-historical analysis of the animal rights social movement in the United States of America at the end of the 19th and 20th centuries. The theoretical model is resource mobilization theory, especially McCarthy and Zald's (1973) entrepreneurial model. The method, which contrasts this social movement at two points in time, is informed by Skocpol's (1984) interpretative historical sociology. In particular, leadership, ideology, organizational structure, and strategy tactics in both eras are examined. Comparing the two manifestations of animal rights protest, the data show that: (a) Leadership and organizational structure, though similar in many respects, are more professionalized in the contemporary era; (b) Ideology has developed from an emphasis on welfare, to a concern with rights and in the 1980s, to a call for liberation of animals; (c) Strategy and tactics are remarkably similar in the two eras, though the use of mass media, and the consideration of civil disobedience is more characteristic of the modern movement. A socio-historical approach not only contextualizes and clarifies the modern movement--from its origins to potential outcomes--but also illuminates broader social movement activity and social change. It is concluded that the earlier and the present manifestation of this protest are best seen as two manifestations of the same movement.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A thesis is a strange project--inherently individualistic, and yet ultimately a collective effort. What I had originally envisioned as a seamless piece of woven fabric, ultimately more closely resembled a patch-work quilt. I wish to acknowledge the many individuals who contributed to the final product.

First, I would like to recognize my colleagues in the Sociology Department of Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo for their concrete, as well as moral support. I especially wish to acknowledge the skills of Karen Rice, which go well beyond the clerical.

I also am pleased to acknowledge the efforts of my thesis committee: Dr. James Petersen, Dr. Stanley Robin, and Dr. Gerald Markle, Chair. Their thoughtful critiques, serious counsel and occasional comic relief added immeasurably to the thesis. Readers who recognize traces of Jerry's trademark elegance and style can only begin to guess his contribution to this project. His reflective guidance and astute insights informed the thesis from beginning to end. The strengths of the thesis are the result of the thoughtful collaboration of my committee and weaknesses that remain are despite their best efforts.

It is not possible to acknowledge the contribution my family made to this project. They endured frustration, preoccupation and far too many carry-out pizzas for dinner. Without the patience of family and friends, this thesis would never have been completed.

Linda J. Rynbrandt

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# U·M·I

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 1347669

**From welfare to liberation: A socio-historical analysis of the  
animal rights movement**

Rynbrandt, Linda Jo, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1992

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106





TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... ii

CHAPTER

I. FUR COATS AND LAB ANIMALS..... 1

    Historical Interpretive Sociology..... 3

    Perspectives on Social Movements..... 8

        Traditional and Contemporary Approaches..... 9

        Strategy and Tactics..... 12

        Entrepreneurial Model..... 13

    From Theory to the Animal Rights Movement..... 16

II. THE TWO SOCIAL MOVEMENTS..... 18

    Historical Overview..... 18

    Leadership..... 23

        19th Century..... 23

            Henry Burgh..... 23

            George Angell..... 25

            Caroline Earle White..... 26

        20th Century..... 26

            Peter Singer..... 27

            Richard Ryder..... 28

            Tom Regan..... 28

            Alex Pacheco..... 29

            Ingrid Newkirk..... 30

            Kim Stallwood..... 31

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER		
	Henry Spira.....	32
	Summary.....	34
	Ideology.....	34
	Summary.....	40
	Organization.....	40
	Early Organization and Funding.....	41
	Modern Organization and Funding.....	48
	Summary.....	57
	Strategy and Tactics.....	57
	19th Century.....	57
	20th Century.....	66
	Summary.....	73
III.	FROM ANIMAL WELFARE TO ANIMAL LIBERATION.....	74
	Connections and Linkages.....	74
	Why Then and Now?.....	74
	Links Between the Early and Modern Movement.....	77
	The British Connection.....	77
	Leadership and Ideology.....	80
	Organization and Funding.....	85
	Strategy/Tactics and Countermovement Response.....	89
	Violence.....	92
	Two Movements or One?.....	94
	Implications.....	96
	Resource Mobilization Theory.....	97

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER		
	Social Movements Theory.....	98
	Social Change.....	99
	Conclusion.....	100
ENDNOTES.....		104
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		107

## CHAPTER I

### FUR COATS AND LAB ANIMALS

To advocate the rights of animals is far more than to plead for compassion or justice toward the victims; it is not only, and not primarily, for the sake of the victims that we plead, but for the sake of mankind itself. (Henry Salt, 1894, p. 88).

Animal liberation is human liberation too. (Peter Singer, 1975, p. vii).

The contemporary animal rights movement has been called "one of the fastest growing causes in America" (Adler, 1988, p. 59). In a 1988 cover story, Newsweek magazine chronicled its rapid growth.

Cowley (1988) stated,

just fifteen years ago, talk of animal rights was pretty well confined to the humane societies. Today there are some 7000 animal-protection groups in the United States, with a combined membership of 10 million and total budgets of some \$50 million. (p. 51)

The animal rights movement has grown from a few individuals considered to be on the fringe of society, into one that finds ever greater acceptance in mainstream American culture. Confrontational tactics and media coverage have elevated the issue of animal rights to public consciousness. Within a relatively short period of time, the fur coat has gone from being a universally luxurious status symbol to an object for some of censure and derision.

The goal and purpose of this new social movement has been stated succinctly by its guru, Peter Singer (1975), in the second quotation which heads this chapter. Before considering the scope and originality

of that claim, we should note the quotation which precedes it, this one written by Henry Salt in 1894. Salt's quotation, so similar in ideology to Singer's, also typified an animal rights movement, but one which is often forgotten or ignored by contemporary analysts. Yet without the first movement, the second might not have happened, certainly not in its present configuration.

It is not possible to understand the contemporary animal rights movement without an appreciation of its history. This thesis examines the animal rights movement as it existed during the latter part of the 19th and 20th centuries. I examine leadership, ideology, organizations, funding, tactics and strategy, and the response of the external environment, particularly the medical profession, the fur industry and the government. I compare and contrast the early and modern segments of the animal rights movement. This enables me to develop an analysis of the connections and linkages between aspects of the animal rights movement in two different eras. This thesis is not only a comparative analysis of the animal rights movement, but also a study of social change. I wish not only to use theories of social change to understand the animal rights movement, but also to use this particular movement to comprehend the more general social phenomenon.

In this chapter I outline a socio-historical approach to sociological research and note the implications for both theory and methods. I then consider current theoretical perspectives on social movements in order to examine the relationship among social problems, social movements and social change.

## Historical Interpretive Sociology

E.J. Hobsbawm (1988) maintained that the value of historical analysis lies in the fact that it not only narrates what, but also why.<sup>1</sup> History not only discovers the past, but explains it and in so doing, provides a link with the present.

This thesis is a socio-historical comparative analysis of the animal rights movement at two points in time. The aim is not theory testing, but an attempt to generate concepts that will allow meaningful interpretations of this social movement within a historical context. Although I do not intend to test theoretical hypotheses, an implicit theoretical framework does guide the work.

According to Robert Goldberg (1991), social movements might serve as a common site for both historical and sociological analysis. To understand social movements and their environment, he contended, it is necessary to draw on insights from both disciplines. Sociologists have constructed conceptual frameworks that have advanced knowledge and insight into social movements, but they tend to neglect the context of time and space. Historians, on the other hand often focus on the specific and isolate events in time, rather than envision them as part of larger patterns. Goldberg recommended, therefore, that social movement research should

moor sociological insights to a historical framework. It offers sociologists the necessary dimensions of time and human involvement while providing historians a theoretical lens through which to look at pieces of the past. (p. xii)

Theda Skocpol (1984) argued that classical sociology was always historically grounded. Only recently, however, has there been a

resurgence of interest in the historical approaches to sociology. Skocpol (1984) maintained that true socio-historical studies exhibit, to a greater or lesser extent, the following qualities: they ask questions about social arrangements in the context of time and space, they consider processes over time and "take temporal sequences seriously in accounting for outcomes" (p. 1), they note the relationship of purposeful action and structure when accounting for both individual and societal outcomes and emphasize the "particular and varying features of specific kinds of social structures and patterns of change" (p. 1). This focus means that historical sociologists are especially concerned with temporal processes and contexts as well as social and cultural differences.

A comparative historical analysis has certain implications for sociological research. Skocpol (1984) contended that "it is a mistake to tie historical sociology down to any one epistemological, theoretical or methodological orientation" (p. 361), rather that let substantive questions guide the research. She warned that there are no mechanical recipes for correct methodology in historical sociology, but suggested three approaches for socio-historical research in order to tie together theoretical concepts and history.

In the first approach, the researcher may apply a single theoretical model to historical events. The danger with this approach is that the researcher may select historical cases to fit the general theory. Second, it is also possible to employ a more inductive approach by analyzing alternative hypotheses to explore regularities in historical cases. Yet this radical empiricism denies a sociological vision which

might guide the historical investigation. The third strategy, interpretive social history, takes a middle ground between inductive and deductive approaches. Proponents of this technique use theoretical concepts as sensitizing devices to illuminate particulars concerning actors or contexts in historical cases. The interpretive approach uses comparisons to contrast and highlight characteristics unique to each point in time. The focus of interpretive historical sociology is to present meaningful social histories in order to produce worthwhile interpretations of historical patterns. Skocpol (1984) maintained that such an approach is meaningful in that it pays close attention to "the culturally embedded intentions of individual or group actors in the given historical settings," and the topic chosen and arguments developed "should be culturally or politically 'significant' in the present" (p. 368).

Since the aim of this thesis is to provide an interpretive comparative analysis of the animal rights movement at two points in time, with regard to specific similarities and differences, the analysis permits illumination of particulars of both the early and modern phases of the movement, and clarification of possible links and connections between them. Skocpol (1984) concluded that the primary challenge of interpretive historical sociology is "finding the most compelling conceptual lenses through which to mediate between meaningful happenings in the past and the concerns of present day audiences" (p. 371).

A comparative socio-historical approach to social research also has methodological implications. For this study, I collect and analyze a wide variety of documentary data: books written by scholars and



advocates, newspaper and magazine articles, administrative materials produced by social movements organizations, literature produced to promote animal rights, etc.

Skocpol (1984) insisted that secondary data analysis is the method of choice for interpretative sociology. She contended that in the case of historical sociology "a dogmatic insistence on redoing primary research for every investigation would be disastrous; it would rule out most comparative-historical research" (p. 382). Glaser and Strauss (1967) also argued that although most sociologists do not consider the library a source of real data, it can be a realistic and inexpensive alternative to field studies. In fact, they insisted that for some research, the library may be a superior source of data. They noted that a researcher can interview documents, go to meetings, question comparative or deviant groups and follow up on information, all from information available in the library. This greatly extends the range of data available to most researchers. However, they also warn that some groups may not leave a trace and material may be fragmentary. Gamson (1975) acknowledged, as well, the strength and weakness of library research as he wrote about using a questionnaire to interview books and documents, rather than individuals. He also noted one group who left no record, terming them the equivalent of the respondent who is never home or slams the door in your face.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) observed that while documentary research may minimize the possibility that the respondent will be unwilling to talk with you, or be less than truthful, it is still necessary to realize that the information may be inaccurate or misleading. Skocpol

(1984) also cautioned of the historiographical problems inherent in the use of secondary sources for comparative historical research. Researchers must choose their sources carefully and be cognizant of historical interpretations. It is crucial to pay attention to historical context, and not allow contemporary interpretations and mores to influence historical comparisons. If warnings such as these are heeded, I believe that secondary sources are an appropriate basis for social research.

Skocpol (1984) also warned of the temptation to disappear forever into the primary evidence of each case, as well as the hazard of attempting to "narrate unbroken sequences of events, or to cover everything about a given time and place" (p. 383). For the purpose of this thesis, I use a topical rather than a chronological format for the purpose of comparison. This format may increase repetition and extract events from the historical context, but it also makes possible more distinct comparisons that "underscore the general patterns and illuminate the specific differences" (Buechler, 1990, p. x).

In his comparative historical analysis of the women's movement, Steven Buechler (1990) assessed the strengths and weaknesses of a topical method. He contended that long-lived social movements, such as the women's movement, offer a unique opportunity to study how "changes in social structure over time are mirrored by transformations in movements that survive those changes" (p. 7). The animal rights movement also offers a rare chance to examine the connections between social change and social movements.

Goldberg (1991, p. 220) maintained that a synthesis of sociology

and history yields a method of analysis that offers the best opportunities to answer questions long posed regarding social movements and social change. Skocpol (1984) also eloquently argued for the promise of historical analyses "for understanding how past patterns and alternative trajectories might be relevant, or irrelevant, for present choices" (p. 5). Excellent historical sociology can actually speak more meaningfully to real-life concerns" she asserts, "than narrowly focused empiricist studies that pride themselves on their policy relevance" (p. 5).

#### Perspectives on Social Movements

The study of collective behavior and social movements has long been of interest in the field of sociology. Alan Scott (1990) argued that for social theorists such as Alain Touraine, "sociology is the study of social movements" (p. 5). This portion of the chapter outlines a theoretical approach to the sociological study of social movements.

A social movement may be defined as "a formally organized group that acts consciously and with some continuity to promote or resist change through collective action" (Goldberg, 1991, p. 2). The placement of the animal rights movement within the framework of social movement theory facilitates a comparative analysis of the parallels and differences between animal rights movements at two points in time. This perspective also aids an assessment of the possible connections between the two manifestations of the movement, as it places this social movement within the broader social and cultural environment.

Within the theoretical literature, I find resource mobilization theory (for reviews, see Jenkins, 1983, and McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1988), and especially the professionalization-entrepreneurial model (McCarthy & Zald, 1973) most helpful.

#### Traditional and Contemporary Approaches

The study and analysis of collective behavior have changed over time. The traditional view of collective action developed in the aftermath of the destruction and chaos of a world at war. From this perspective social movements were seen as "symptoms of social pathology" (Goldberg, 1991, p. 4). Social movements were considered to be just another form of irrational collective behavior, along with panics and crowds. Social strain caused by rapid changes in society were thought to be the cause of collective behavior. The focus was on individual grievances and the psychological motivations of participants.

Traditional approaches to collective action--collective behavior, mass society, and relative deprivation theory--tend to emphasize the psychological state of participants or the strains in society that promoted mass action. Mass behavior was considered to be irrational and deviant, and social movements were thought to be far removed from normal political activity. In a pluralist system, social movements were unnecessary because the political system was considered to be open--at least to a degree--to all through legitimate channels. In sum, the classical view of collective behavior emphasized a micro approach, irrational individual inclinations and social grievances as causal in

the formation of collective action.

The traditional perspective of collective action was dominant until the social protest and movements in the 1960s and 1970s created a paradigmatic crisis within the field. The old theories did not seem to fit the new social movements. Many scholars came to question the old assumption that the political system was neutral and open to all. They also challenged the supposition that movement participants were motivated by psychological flaws, rather than being rational actors with purposeful goals.

William Gamson (1975) insisted that, "The study of social protest has only recently emerged from the straightjacket [sic] of collective behavior" (pp. 130-131). He contended that "the classical perspective is one in which organized groups seek goals, mobilize resources, and employ strategies, but social movements merely express reactions by the victims of social pathology" (pp. 130-131). In this way, he argued, the collective behavior perspective ignored the social conditions that produce behavior. These critiques altered the focus of social movement appraisal from a "microsocial-psychological to a more macropolitical and structural analysis" (McAdam et al., 1988, p. 697).

Traditional social movement theorists might disagree with this characterization of traditional theory. They might point out that there have been structural non-collective behavior approaches and macro, society wide theoretical elements in the theory. (See for example: Heberle, 1951, for a structural approach; Roberts & Kloss, 1974, for an explicitly sociological and anti-collective behavior treatment; and Smelser, 1962, for a traditional, historical discussion of social

movements). Nonetheless, the resource mobilization theorists' critique of traditional theory vivified the development of the alternate perspective and provided a basis for this research.

These questions and critiques also led to a shift in theoretical assumptions that ultimately emerged as resource mobilization theory. Unlike the previous perspective, this new view of social movements "emphasized the continuities between movement and institutionalized actions, the rationality of movement actors, the strategic problems confronted by movements, and the role of movements as agencies for social change" (Jenkins, 1983, p. 528).

Resource mobilization theory stressed the continuity between movement and institutional politics and the notion that movement participants make decisions and plan strategy in much the same way as their counterparts in business and government: on the basis of a rational appraisal of their choices. Gamson (1990) argued that "in the place of the old duality of extremist politics and pluralist politics, there is simply politics" (p. 138).

Rather than attribute movement emergence to discontent or grievances, which remain rather constant in society, resource mobilization theory considers the availability of resources to be the crucial factor. Goldberg (1991) calls the ability to obtain and organize resources, "the keys to the doors to power" (p. 10). Resource mobilization theorists consider grievances as secondary to resources, organization and opportunities in movement formation. Perhaps the most significant contribution of resource mobilization theory has been the emphasis on "outside contributions and the cooptation of institutional

resources by contemporary social movements" (Jenkins, 1983, p. 533). In sum, resource mobilization theory emphasizes the import of opportunities (McAdam et al., 1988, p. 697), the significance of resources and organization among contentious groups, as well as the power of social control over the movements ability to mobilize their resources.

### Strategy and Tactics

William Gamson's now-classic book, The Strategy of Social Protest (1975), written from a resource mobilization perspective, examined how the success or failure of challenging groups is influenced by strategy and organization. Gamson (1975) concluded from his study of 53 groups that a centralized, bureaucratic group that escapes splits is highly likely to be successful, while a decentralized, non-bureaucratic group that splits is doomed (p. 108). However, Gerlach (1983) argued that an informal, segmentary, polycephalous, reticulate "structure is not inefficient, but rather is highly effective" (p. 134). Although there is a popular bias against this segmented organizational structure, Gerlach contended that in reality, it is highly adaptive and perhaps the key to all successful movements of change. Jo Freeman (1983, p. 118) agreed that movement structure contributes greatly to success, but suggested that there may be no ideal type, just options with various costs and rewards.

In an updated version of The Strategy of Social Protest (1990), Gamson modified his contentions regarding social movement organizational tactics only slightly. However, he posited a greater emphasis, now than in the past, on covert activity of the state against movements,

and stressed the central role of the media for the symbolic contest over image fought between social movements and their opponents.

#### Entrepreneurial Model

In contrast to other more static resource mobilization theory approaches, the professionalization-entrepreneurial model of McCarthy and Zald (1973) addressed issues over time as they account for movement emergence and change. Resource mobilization emerged as an alternative explanation for the increase of social movement and socio-political activity in the 1960s and 1970s. McCarthy and Zald challenged the traditional view that social movements emerge from mass grievances and are dependent on their membership to provide resources.

They argued, rather, that structural changes in society have made mobilization of grievances more likely through professional social movement organizations. Roles historically served by members have been taken over by paid functionaries, foundations and the government, in what they call the "bureaucratization of social discontent" (McCarthy & Zald, 1973, p. 3). A professional social movement is likely to exhibit: full-time, professional leaders; external as well as internal resources; a small or nonexistent membership base; and the image of speaking for-- and attempting to influence policy toward--a potential constituency (p. 3).<sup>2</sup>

A massive increase in financial assets for social movements paralleled increased social movement activity, they noted. The growth of foundation, church and government support have greatly expanded career opportunities for professional issue entrepreneurs within social



movements. McCarthy and Zald contended that as outside funding increases, it becomes more and more possible to find a career in movement leadership without financial sacrifice. They predicted that as these positions multiply, the necessity of linking a career to a single social movement will be reduced (p. 16).

As outside funding increases, organizational membership in the classical sense becomes less important. Therefore members become "almost dispensable" and lack control over the leadership (McCarthy & Zald, 1973, p. 18). Issue entrepreneurs are the key to social movement success. They manipulate images of relevance and support through the media and stressed the importance of professional competence over broad citizen action for social change. They suggested that the "definition of grievances will expand to meet the funds and support personnel available," and noted the possibility of "professional social movement organizations that create rather than mobilize grievances" (p. 23).

Since modern movements develop outside of the mass, entrepreneurs can be thought of as representing only themselves. This means they will switch from one organization to another. Narrowly defined organizations may find themselves without an issue, so "growth and stability depend on picking up a new product line for social action" (p. 25). This may partially explain the broad range of purported concerns in the current animal rights movement. As the issues of wearing fur or animal experimentation become resolved, the movement leaders can turn to new issues such as factory farms and zoos.

Several aspects of resource mobilization theory make it an attractive theoretical perspective for understanding the animal rights

movement. The increase in outside funds available for movement activity is an important component of resource mobilization theory. Conscience constituents, who contribute funds to a movement without benefit to themselves, are one segment of this outside funding. The animal rights movement, along with other recent movements, is said to be "staffed and funded exclusively by conscience constituents" (McAdam et al., 1988, p. 702).

The entrepreneurial model may be most relevant for deprived groups and disorganized collectives. Support for the entrepreneurial theory of movement formation has been found in the environmental movement, which shares certain similarities with the animal rights movement. Entrepreneurs usually emerge from splits in previous movements; however, "major movements do not appear to emerge from the de novo manufacture of grievances by entrepreneurs," but rather the successful redefinition of "long-standing grievances in new terms." The renewed interest in the issue of animal rights may simply be a successful redefinition of "long-standing grievances in new terms" (Jenkins, 1983, pp. 530-531).

Resource mobilization theory is not without flaws. It is better at explaining the how rather than the why of social movement activity. A basic charge against resource mobilization theory is that the emphasis on economic changes ignores changes in cultural values (Jenkins, 1983, p. 535). Gamson (1990) noted as well that the neglect of consciousness and emergent norms in resource mobilization theory reflected "a too-sweeping rejection of traditional collective behavior theory and an isolation from European work on 'new social movements' that emphasized such concerns" (p. 148). Scott (1990) argued, as well, that while

resource mobilization theory clarifies "organizational dilemmas facing social movements, it is handicapped by its continued adherence to economic models of human agency, and says little about the content and context of social movement activity" (p. 110).

Perhaps the new social movement approach may address some of the problems of resource mobilization theory. This approach seeks to explain post World War II social movements, such as ecology, peace and animal rights, in the context of the new values of postmodern society. This perspective posited the emergence of new social movements in relation to "popular discontent with the nature of postmodern society" (McAdam et al., 1988, p. 701).

In this view, the shift from an industrial to a post-industrial society, with a concomitant shift in the nature of production from a material base to a knowledge base, led to social movement activity directed against the "technocratic state" (Scott, 1990, p. 66). The anti-technocratic nature of new social movements, the focus on new, broader moral values and the importance of intellectuals--new class--in the definition and redefinition of issues, make this perspective crucial to the examination of the contemporary animal rights movement. Taken together, resource mobilization and new social movements theory may complement each other.

#### From Theory to the Animal Rights Movement

Using the socio-historical comparative approach advocated by Skocpol (1984), I examine the changes and continuities in the animal rights movement over time and place. By utilizing theoretical ideas

as sensitizing devices, I hope to illuminate the role of social movements in post-industrial society and explore the relationship between social problems, social movements and social change.

I employ resource mobilization theory--particularly the entrepreneurial variant of McCarthy and Zald (1973)--to focus on leadership, organizational form; Gamson (1990) provides a guide for my assessment of strategy and tactics. My additional focus on ideology is derived from traditional approaches, as well as the study of new social movements. This theoretical approach provides a coherency to the organization of Chapter II.

These theoretical assertions suggest intriguing areas for comparison in the 19th and 20th century animal rights movement. By using a comparative historical analysis to examine particular social events within the context of time and space, it is possible to identify exceptional conditions as well as common themes. In this way it should be possible to assess meaningful connections between the movement at two points in time not only to address the question of "one movement or two?" (Skocpol, 1984, p. 5), but also to illuminate how past patterns are relevant for present choices.

## CHAPTER II

### THE TWO SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

In this chapter, I describe two animal rights social movements: the first, from the 1860s through the 1920s, peaked during the last two decades of the century; the next began in the 1970s and grew throughout the 1980s. After a brief historical overview of these two movements, I consider, in turn, each movement with respect to (a) leadership, (b) ideology, (c) organization and funding, and (d) tactics and strategy. In the chapter which follows I will assess the connections between these movements and then conduct a comparative analysis.

#### Historical Overview

Although there has long been concern for the well-being of animals, the first social movement which had as its goal the protection of animals was founded in Great Britain. In an era of social reform, the first legislation for animal welfare--Martin's Act--was passed there in 1822, after many years of humanitarian effort (Ryder, 1989, p. 86). In 1824, The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was formed and became "the first permanent organization in the world for the protection of animals" (Coleman, 1924, p. 28). Despite early difficulties with a hostile public and meager funds, the organization grew. By 1840, Queen Victoria had become a patron, and the prefix Royal was added to the name of the now very respectable society. The Royal Society for

the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) continued to press for legislative reform in order to improve the lot of animals in British society.

There was also a group in Victorian England that went well beyond the mere protection of animals from cruelty. A strong anti-vivisection movement arose in reaction to the increasingly common practice of using live animals for scientific research. Frances Power Cobbe, frustrated with the stance of the RSPCA, founded the National Anti-Vivisection Society in 1875. Through the efforts of the anti-vivisection faction of the animal welfare movement, legislation was passed in 1876 that regulated the practice of vivisection and greatly restricted scientific research in 19th century England.<sup>3</sup>

Advocates of animal welfare in the United States, responding to similar social forces, soon followed the British example. A well-educated, wealthy American reformer, Henry Bergh, visited the RSPCA in London, and returned home to found the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) in 1866 (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 11). The first effective American anti-cruelty legislation was passed in New York in 1866. Bergh and the ASPCA immediately began to enforce the law. The American animal welfare movement grew, and within 10 years most large cities in the eastern United States had societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

The anti-vivisection faction was never as powerful in the United States as in Britain. However, for a short period of time anti-vivisection was a controversial issue within the early American animal rights movement. Although Bergh and other leaders of the animal welfare

movement were against vivisection, Caroline Earle White is considered to be the pioneer of American anti-vivisection efforts. With the encouragement of Frances Power Cobbe, White and some other prominent women founded the American Anti-Vivisection Society in 1883 (Coleman, 1924, pp. 204-205). Initially, the medical profession regarded the group as a joke, but later took White's group seriously. Because of physicians' opposition, White was unsuccessful in her efforts for legislation to stop animal research.

After an initial surge of accomplishments and activity in the latter part of the 19th century, the movement for animal welfare appeared content to rest on its past success. The ASPCA--and its British counterpart the RSPCA--maintained their formal organizations, but virtually disappeared from the public eye. Their agendas, once controversial, became rather tame. Advocates continued to promote non-controversial issues such as anti-cruelty education and animal shelters, but little was heard about the movement for nearly a century.

In the 1970s the issue reemerged. Again, the current interest in animals originated in England and then spread to America. An informal group of Oxford philosophers raised the issue anew, and the treatment of animals is once again the focus of broad concern. Peter Singer, Richard Ryder and other important intellectual leaders of the new phase of the animal welfare movement came from this Oxford group.

In the past, humane treatment of animals was the main focus of most American animal welfare groups, but the modern emphasis has changed from protection to the claim of liberation for animals. The use of animals in scientific experiments is once again the focus of much attention.

For the majority in the new animal rights movement, the issue is no longer better cages, but empty cages. The emphasis has shifted from animal welfare to animal rights. The new philosophy in the animal rights movement, and even the modern animal rights movement itself, may be traced to the 1975 book, Animal Liberation, by Australian philosopher Peter Singer. In an echo of British humanitarian, Henry Salt (1894), Singer's provocative book raised the moral and ethical issues involved in the relationship between humans and animals. He argued for equal rights between humans and animals, and called the exploitation of one species by another speciesism. The philosophy in this book became the battle cry for a new social movement in both Europe and the United States.

The contemporary animal rights movement, like any modern social movement, does not speak with a single voice. There is a wide variety of goals and philosophies within the movement, and these are reflected in widely divergent groups all purporting to speak for animals. Their purpose and tactics range from the conventional to those that are labeled by some as extremist and terrorist. There are the old traditional groups, such as the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) and the Humane Society of the United States, which until recently represented a conservative animal welfare perspective. There are also the newer, more radical groups, such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), founded by Alex Pacheco and Ingrid Newkirk in 1980, now with over 300,000 members. There is the even more militant Animal Liberation Front (ALF), an underground group founded in England and organized in the United States in 1979, which damages medical and



research laboratories and rescues animals from labs.

The new emphasis on animal liberation, rather than welfare, has coincided with a growing militancy in the animal rights movement (Bishop, 1988, p. A1). Even the older, more conservative groups have moved increasingly closer to the more radical elements within the movement. This more militant and visible thrust of the animal rights movement, along with increasing public acceptance, has begun to cause concern within affected sectors of society.

Although there is not uniform agreement among those in the animal rights movement, the most powerful, vocal and growing faction within the movement advocated the elimination of all forms of animal exploitation. This included all use of animals for food, clothing, scientific experimentation and entertainment. Animal rights advocates propose to end all of the practices they consider to exploit animals immediately. Yet they understand that a gradual approach is more feasible.

Animal rights activists believe that time is on their side. Singer contended that "Animal liberation is now a worldwide movement, and it will be on the agenda for a long time to come" (Singer, 1990, p. ix). Ryder (1989), linking a theme carried through from the 19th century movement, argued that animal rights is a

matter of fundamental importance for the future of our planet. The struggle against speciesism is not a side-show; it is one of the main arenas of moral and psychological change in the world today. It is part of a new and enlarged vision of peace and happiness. (p. 1)

With stakes of this magnitude, it is not surprising that animal rights has reemerged as a controversial social issue and that the animal rights movement is once again the focus of a great deal of attention.

## Leadership

### 19th Century

#### Henry Burgh

In 1868 Henry Burgh founded the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA). The son of a prosperous shipbuilder, Burgh attended Columbia and married into a wealthy English family. He sold his share of the family business and devoted his life to travel and literary pursuits. While he was a diplomat in Russia, he became interested in the widespread mistreatment of animals. Later in England he met with an official of The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). When he arrived back in the United States he endeavored to establish an organization to protect animals.

Although his first efforts met with derision, Burgh was able to gather a large audience (including the Mayor of New York) for his initial speech. Burgh used statistics and graphic scenes of animal cruelty to present his case. He contended that cruelty to animals was an indication of imperfections in social and government organization (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 148). Burgh argued that animal protection was a moral, rather than a political, issue. He concluded his speech by stating: "This is a matter purely of conscience. It has no perplexing side issues" (quoted in Coleman, 1924, p. 37).

Because the issue was novel, Burgh's speech was publicized widely, and featured in the daily newspapers of many large cities. This crucial publicity enabled Burgh to overcome fierce opposition from the

Legislature, and within two months the ASPCA was incorporated by the State of New York (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 11). Many of the original charter members were the most eminent citizens of New York. Even so, the early ASPCA was a "one-man power" (Coleman, 1924, p. 55). Bergh was the president, acting agent and legal counsel all at once. One writer noted that "Henry Bergh's newsworthiness, his frequent entanglements with powerful commercial interests, and his striking personality and appearance all served to keep the ASPCA and its president in the news" (Carson, 1972, p. 103).

Bergh's entanglements earned him more than publicity. He drew the enmity of sporting clubs, butchers and dog/cock fight promoters, among many others. He received threats against his life but they did not deter him from his single-minded mission to animal welfare and the organization he founded. Bergh saw his task as a "holy one" (Coleman, 1924, p. 47) and so he persisted in enforcing anti-cruelty laws and introducing stronger animal welfare legislation in the face of strong opposition, unfriendly courts and powerful vested interests.

He was among the first to organize a society for the defense of children. Asked to intervene on behalf of an abused child through the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals because there was no similar organization to protect children, Bergh quickly helped form such a group. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was chartered in 1875, and in a reverse of the animal welfare movement, the idea spread to England and a similar society was soon organized there. The child protection and animal protection societies continued to work closely together for many years in both Britain and the United States.

Bergh remained president until his death in 1888. He had become a nationally known figure: although newspapers initially ridiculed him, many of his obituaries were filled with praise and recognition. One former antagonist wrote, "The man who loved his fellow animal is mourned by his fellow man" (quoted in Carson, 1972, p. 105). His principles had become institutionalized. Indeed his vision still sets the tone for the contemporary organization.<sup>4</sup>

#### George Angell

Another pioneer in the early animal rights movement was George Angell. Although he and Bergh were contemporaries, there seems to have been little contact between the two men. An abolitionist lawyer, Angell became rich enough to leave his profession and devote himself to the cause of animal welfare. In 1868 he founded the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Like Bergh, Angell held the office of president until his death, and the board of directors was made up of Boston's foremost citizens.

Although remembered for his work in animal welfare, Angell was involved, as well, in many other humanitarian efforts, such as the abolition of slavery and opposition to war. Even though the cause of animal welfare was not popular at first, by the time of his death the press devoted a great deal of space to his memory, because by then it had become "good form" to be referred to as a humanitarian (Coleman, 1924, p. 117).

### Caroline Earle White

Daughter of a well known Quaker abolitionist, Caroline Earle White was another prominent leader of the early animal rights movement. Passionately fond of animals, she learned of the RSPCA from her husband, a lawyer from Ireland. After talking with Bergh, she helped found the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in 1868. As a woman, she could not be elected to the Board of Managers. In 1869, a "Women's Branch" was instituted with White as president, a position she held until her death in 1916.

She was a missionary type who wished to share the progress for animal protection made by her society with others. White encouraged the formation of new societies and was influential, along with Bergh and Angell, in the formation of The American Humane Association, a national humane organization. Despite her social prominence, however, she was often the target of ridicule and criticism.

Although her interest covered every phase of animal protection, White is remembered primarily for her opposition to vivisection. She started the Journal of Zoophily in 1892. This aggressive humane magazine, published jointly by the ASPCA and the American Anti-Vivisection Society, was intended to extend the influence of White's organization and advance the cause of anti-vivisection (Coleman, 1924, p. 184).<sup>5</sup>

### 20th Century

The contemporary animal rights movement began at Oxford University in the early 1970s, where a "powerful contingent of academic

philosophers" raised the issue, started the discussion and wrote many books on the subject (Ryder, 1989, p. 6). This philosophical, academic, informal "Oxford Group" produced the movement's intellectual leaders, who then based their political campaigns on moral arguments (Ryder, 1989, p. 231). The publications of the members of the "Oxford Group" served another purpose as well. The mere fact that they were mostly male helped destroy stereotypes that the "animal welfare world was peopled entirely by peculiar old ladies in hats" (Ryder, 1989, p. 245).

### Peter Singer

The guru of the movement, Peter Singer, was a graduate student at Oxford during this period. Born in Australia in 1946, Singer received his doctorate from Oxford. Singer's (1975) book, Animal Liberation, outlined a new philosophy for the animal rights movement. This influential book, which came out in a second edition in 1990, was a significant part of an explosion of literature on the topic in recent years.<sup>6</sup>

Since 1977, Singer has been a Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Centre for Human Bioethics at Monash University in Melbourne, Australia. He is a regular contributor to The New York Review of Books, author of numerous books and a major article on ethics in the current edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica (Singer, 1990). Singer has taught at University College, Oxford, New York University, the University of Colorado at Boulder, and the University of California at Irvine. He is also actively involved in the Animal Liberation movement, as President of Animal Liberation (Victoria) and Vice-President of the

Australian and New Zealand Federation of Animal Societies. Singer's philosophy and agenda have become the basis for the contemporary American movement.

#### Richard Ryder

Another significant leader of the contemporary animal rights movement, Richard Ryder, was also a member of the "Oxford Group." Trained as a clinical psychologist, Ryder gave up experimental psychology in part due to animal experiments (Regan & Singer, 1976, p. 249). Currently he is Chair of the Animal Experimentation Advisory Committee of the RSPCA and an active advocate for the animal liberation movement. He is author of Speciesism (1970) (he claims to have coined the term), Victims of Science (1983), and Animal Revolution (1989).

#### Tom Regan

Around the same time the Oxford Group was beginning to articulate the moral, ethical basis of the current animal rights movement in Britain, Tom Regan, a young American philosopher, was also attempting to develop a moral philosophical approach to the issue. In 1976, Regan and Singer were co-editors of Animal Rights and Human Obligations, a book of essays concerning animal welfare. Regan teaches philosophy at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, and is the author of numerous books including: All That Dwell Therein: Essays on Animal Rights and Environmental Ethics (1982), and The Case for Animal Rights (1983). He is president of the Culture and Animals Foundation and continues to be an active advocate for animal rights.

Alex Pacheco

Aside from intellectual leaders such as Singer, Ryder and Regan, most movement leaders are known through their attachment to specific organizations. In 1980, Alex Pacheco founded People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), the largest and most visible of the new animal rights organizations. A political science major at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., and a veteran of other animal rights activities, Pacheco had been influenced by Singer's (1990) book. According to his own account, Pacheco discovered animal rights in 1978 in a slaughterhouse. After this experience, he became directly involved with animal rights activities on both land and sea. He sailed aboard the Fund for Animals' ship, Sea Shepherd, and he took part in the more advanced animal rights movement in England. On his return to the United States in 1980 he helped found PETA because he felt that the young movement needed a grassroots group to encourage "people to use their time and talents to help animals gain liberation" (Pacheco, 1986, p. 135). He is a vegan, which means that he does not eat or use any animal product. This reflects PETA's maxim "Animals are not ours to eat, wear or experiment on" (Reed, 1990, p. 59).

As of 1991, Pacheco still heads PETA, a group that grew from an initial 18 members into a powerhouse that boasts a membership of 300,000 today. He is called an "engaging young activist" and his warm personality is especially effective for fund raising among PETA's female constituency (McCabe, 1990, p. 77). Pacheco is considered "typical of the new breed of animal rights activists, with his flair for direct action and unbounded zeal" (Starr, 1984, p. 30).



### Ingrid Newkirk

Another co-founder, Ingrid Newkirk, is also still with PETA. She emigrated to the United States from England. A former stock broker, she began working with animals in 1970 and eventually they became the central focus of her life. Newkirk acknowledged a philosophical conversion in 1980 after reading Singer's Animal Liberation. It was no longer a question of how animals should be treated, but whether we had a right to use them at all. She described herself as a person who cared deeply about animals, and PETA members as compassionate people who actively fight institutional animal abuse (Newkirk, 1990, p. xv). Newkirk is a vegetarian whose motto is "if it screams and runs when you go after it, don't eat it" (Reed, 1990, p. 62). She contends that a vegetarian diet is not only better for animals, but better for humans as well--a theme of the entire modern animal rights movement.

The media are often less than kind to Newkirk, labelling her aloof and misanthropic, the product of an unhappy childhood. PETA's growth, one report maintains, is due to a "slick public relations machine run by Newkirk" (Behar, 1989, p. 44). Her name is usually seen in conjunction with her infamous quote: "A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy" (McCabe, 1990, p. 76). She is also often quoted making comparisons between animal rights and the holocaust. "Six million Jews died in concentration camps," she lamented, "but six billion chickens will die this year in slaughter-houses" (p. 76). A PETA news release predicted that eventually we will look at those who work in animal labs "with the horror now reserved for the men and women who experimented on Jews in Auschwitz" (McCabe, 1990, p. 76).

Other media reports are more positive. PETA leaders are called bold, media-savvy people (Pins, 1990), or they are noted for their "direct but sophisticated action" (Starr, 1984, p. 32). One article acknowledged that Newkirk's "name has become synonymous with the burgeoning animal-rights movement" (Reed, 1990, p. 59). This article goes on to state that "PETA has proved that its bite can be as strong as its bark" (p. 61). Even Newkirk's life story sounds more pleasant in this account. She is called brave and noted for her sense of humor.

Perhaps the more positive press coverage is a reflection of the movement's accomplishments over the years, or maybe PETA has come of age as indicated by a "glitzy, celebrity-studded gala" to celebrate its tenth anniversary. Even Fortune ("The Year's 25," 1990) magazine recognized that Newkirk and the animal rights movement she represented had arrived when it named her as one of the year's 25 most fascinating business people in 1990. Called "the Mother Teresa of rabbits," Newkirk (1990) is cited for imposing PETA's ethics on large corporations, as the magazine noted that more than one CEO had "respect for Newkirk thrust upon him." Her acknowledged wit is said to "mask both her passion and her obduracy" (p. 70). Not one to mince words, Newkirk revealed the true nature of the issue when she stated, "only a revolution in consciousness will end the war on animals" (Reed, 1990, p. 59).

#### Kim Stallwood

Newkirk and Pacheco brought Kim Stallwood over from England to join PETA in 1986. A charismatic, full-time activist, Stallwood was involved in the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). This clandestine--sometimes

violent--group, founded in England and now active in the United States, is involved in radical, direct action. PETA speaks for the Animal Liberation Front in the United States. While PETA publicly distances itself from the more radical actions of ALF, it does not disavow ALF's direct action tactics on the behalf of animals. Stallwood maintained the policy is to support ALF activists morally, but not physically or financially.

Stallwood, thought to like political power better than animals (Henshaw, 1989, p. 160), argued against sentiment, noting that the movement is up against big business. He insisted that there is a great deal at stake in animal liberation since the goal is to make a "drastic readjustment" in society. He asserted: "we are asking people to rebel basically," noting that animal rights is not only a moral question, but a vital social, political and economic issue (quoted in Windeatt, 1986, pp. 182-183). As of 1990, he is PETA's executive director.

#### Henry Spira

Although not involved with PETA, Henry Spira is also a well-known activist in the current animal rights movement. Born in Belgium, the former New York high school English teacher became interested in animal rights in the early 1970s when he took a class from Peter Singer. Impressed by Singer's rational, rather than sentimental approach, Spira--an outstanding tactician--noted animal rights' pitiful track record and decided to rethink strategies which have resulted in what he calls a century-long record of failure (Spira, 1985, p. 197). Spira contended that strategy was similar for all struggles, one side had the power,

while the other had justice on its side. He argued that justice can mobilize people and eventually bring about fundamental change.

A former union and civil rights activist, Spira took the strategies from movements for human rights and applied them to the issue of animal rights. A common theme of struggle between those in power and the powerless connects animal rights with Spira's previous political commitments (Lauer, 1984, p. 15). Spira argued that animal liberation is an extension of what life is all about, helping the powerless victims of oppression (Spira, 1985, p. 196).

Spira achieved the first successful attempt to halt animal experiments. In 1977 he forced the American Museum of Natural History to end experiments on the sex lives of cats (Singer, 1990, p. 246). Spira also put together coalitions in 1980 which forced many large cosmetic companies to end testing on animals, or at least to phase out many standard animal experiments, such as the Draize Test and the Lethal Dose 50 toxicity test which establish safety levels for consumer products. These are considered to be key victories for the animal rights movement. Ryder (1989) maintained that "if Singer was the guru, Spira was the great street fighter of . . . animal liberation" (p. 301).

However, Spira--a lone-wolf--known as a moderate in an increasingly radical movement, came under attack from some other movement leaders. One claimed that today's new activists do not even know who Spira is, and according to Feder (1989) Newkirk charged that "He is hobnobbing in the halls with our enemy" (p. 60). Others pointed to the success of his pragmatic approach and noted his long-term goals are as revolutionary as those of his more radical counterparts. These tactical squabbles

reflected the split between the more radical and moderate factions of the movement in general.

Spira has targeted a new, even more difficult area in animal rights for his next point of attack. The "factory farming" issue will prove to be even more of a challenge than the earlier campaigns. Spira argued that "animal rights and eating animals don't mesh" (Feder, 1989, p. 72), but acknowledged the great social and economic obstacles to be overcome before this issue will be resolved.

### Summary

Although there are some exceptions in both eras, leaders in the 19th century movement were drawn mainly from the wealthy, upper-class. They dedicated their lives and fortunes to the cause of animal welfare as part of a humanitarian bid to improve society as a whole. In contrast, leaders in the contemporary phase of the movement were not wealthy, but modern issue entrepreneurs and paid professionals. Despite these differences, however, leaders in both eras faced many of the same issues, used similar tactics to meet these challenges and encountered parallel opposition to their goals.

### Ideology

The ideology of the early animal rights movement reflected a humane interest in reform. Henry Salt, writing in England in the late 19th century, articulated the moral principles involved in the early animal rights movement. He founded the Humanitarian League in 1891 in order to advocate humane principles from a rational perspective. Although

humanity to animals was the main focus, the group sought to bring together all aspects of humane thought. Salt believed in an evolutionary progression of humanity toward a state of perfection (Tester, 1991, p. 162).

Animal rights was considered to be a crucial part of social reform. The League argued that "only by recognizing that justice to animals is part of the great democratic movement that we can hope to attain it; and, conversely, the rights of men will never be fully realized until we have due regard to the just claims of all sentient life" (quoted in McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 122).

Although Salt was an "influential thinker and leading campaigner for animal rights" (Ryder, 1989, p. 125) he was not closely involved with most other animal welfare advocates of the time. The philosophy of the Humanitarian League was at odds with much of the prevailing humanitarian thought of the period. Humane writing of the time concentrated on faith rather than rationality and an emotional appeal for kindness toward animals was common. The writings put out by the Humanitarian League, including Salt's book Animals' Rights (1894), were an exception to the traditional humanitarian view.<sup>7</sup>

The League tried to project an intellectual, reasoned protest against all forms of cruelty, and approach humane principles on a rational basis. The goal of the League was to demonstrate that humanitarianism was "not merely a kindly sentiment, a product of the heart rather than of the head, but an integral portion of any intelligible system of ethics or social science" (quoted in McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 117).

Bergh's concern for animals was also based on a "deep sense of the importance to society of the practice of humanity to animals, as well as by justice to creatures committed to our care by the Most High." He argued that "animals have rights which men are bound to respect" (McCrea, 1910/1969, pp. 148-151). Both Bergh and Angell believed they were divinely called to the cause of animal welfare. Not unlike others in the animal welfare movement both past and present, Bergh was accused of being more concerned with animals than humans. However, he believed that "men will be just to men when they are kind to animals" (quoted in Carson, 1972, p. 105).

The current debates in the new animal rights movement are similar to those of a century ago, but convictions are now based in philosophy rather than religion (Ritvo, 1984, p. 626). This new emphasis may, in part, make the animal rights movement unique. Ryder and Singer, among others, argued for an entirely different philosophical approach to the issue of animal rights. No longer is it enough to simply prevent cruelty or promote the welfare of animals, but now non-human animals are to be considered equal with their human counterparts.

The 19th century movement, Singer argued, was based on the assumption that the interests of non-human animals deserve protection only if important human interests are not at stake. The new movement is significant because it challenges this assumption. The crux of the philosophy of the new animal liberation movement is equality (Singer, 1990, p. 4).

Singer (1990) developed the concept of speciesism, the exploitation of one species by another. He compares speciesism to racism and

sexism, and contended that "most human beings are speciesists" in that they sacrifice the interest of other species to satisfy their own (p.

9). Singer (1990) wrote:

This book is about the tyranny of human over nonhuman animals. This tyranny has caused and today is still causing an amount of pain and suffering that can only be compared with that which resulted from the centuries of tyranny by white humans over black humans. The struggle against this tyranny is a struggle as important as any moral and social issues that have been fought over in recent years. (p. i)

Contemporary philosophers are considered to be very influential in the shift of emphasis from animal welfare to animal rights. Singer's book, Animal Liberation, the bible of anti-speciesism, played a crucial role in the alteration of intellectual opinion (Ryder, 1989, p. 247). According to Sperling (1988), Singer's book was important because it gave the emerging movement a "cohesive moral and philosophical perspective" (p. 82) at a time when science was losing support and the perception was growing of the oppressive nature of modern culture. The rapid development of literature surrounding the new ethical and philosophical approach of the animal rights movement in the 1970s coincided with more radical, militant tactics by activists in the movement. This new rhetoric and new tactics signalled an "ideological disjunction" (p. 101) from the reform emphasis of earlier humane groups to a total redefinition of the relationship between humans and animals.

The new movement, especially in the writings of Singer, posited a distinctive ethical stance and a concomitant expansion of moral horizons. Ryder (1989) agreed, "there was less emphasis on moral duties in the modern movement, and more concern for moral rights" (p. 70); less emphasis on humane ideas and love, more on ethics and liberation. Ryder



posited a moral vacuum left by a decline in Christian values and questioned whether the utilitarian philosophical foundation of animal liberation may one day exert an even wider effect on morality and politics (p. 329).

Singer (1990) argued that the moral standards applicable among humans should be extended to other animals. He took an unsentimental approach toward animal rights even further as he noted, not only did he not own any pets, but he was not especially interested in animals. His interest was in the prevention of needless suffering and the arbitrary discrimination and exploitation of animals by humans. The book examined how humans should treat nonhuman animals and "exposes the prejudices that lie behind our present attitudes and behavior" (p. iii).

While all liberation movements entail an expansion of moral horizons, Singer (1990) contended that this is especially problematic for the animal liberation movement. Not only is it impossible for the members of the exploited group to speak for themselves, but the vast majority of the oppressing group benefit directly from that oppression. Singer, a vegetarian, insisted that "anyone who eats meat is an interested party" (p. v). Despite these problems, however, Singer (1990) maintained that the basic principles of animal liberation are very simple--"Animal Liberation is Human Liberation too" (p. vii). Animal Liberation was not a philosophical treatise written for academics or philosophers, but rather a handbook for action (Tester, 1991, pp. 5-9).

Singer (1990) warned that his book is not for pet lovers, but for people concerned with ending oppression and exploitation. Like Salt, his appeal is to reason, not emotion (p. iii). In contrast to Salt's

philosophy, however, the goal is not social reform, but social revolution. Ryder (1989) sums up the revolutionary credo:

A revolution, to be a revolution, does not merely entail a total change of attitude; it must affect aspects of the human condition which are fundamental. Changing all this will have revolutionary consequences, affecting what we wear, what we eat, the price of food, the development of science, the appearance of our environment, the character of industries and the way we spend our leisure. (pp. 4-5)

Ryder (1989) predicted the revolution will occur by degrees as attitudes and laws change. He contended that humans must face the "logic of anti-speciesism by bringing the law into line with philosophy" (p. 332). The law must recognize that nonhumans have legitimate "claims to life, freedom and the pursuit of happiness, just as we do" (p. 332). He concluded that the idea of animal liberation is "easy to ridicule but hard to refute" (p. 332). Singer (1990) also argued that the case for animal liberation is "logically cogent, and cannot be refuted," because "to discriminate against beings solely on account of their species is a form of prejudice, immoral and indefensible in the same way that discrimination on the basis of race is immoral and indefensible" (pp. 243-244).

Pacheco, as well, believed that all animals have the same right as humans: to life and to freedom from being the subject of experiments. He admonished that "the time will come when we will look upon the murder of animals as we now look on the murder of men" (quoted in McCabe, 1990, p. 77). He asserted that "Animal rights must fill the air" (p. 77). This meant that is necessary to take a strong ethical stand and be strategically assertive "fighting for today's reforms while aiming for and advocating abolition" (Pacheco, 1986, p. 147).

### Summary

Even though the issue of animal rights is thought to be a modern conception, it has been around for at least 100 years. However, the idea of what is meant by rights has changed over time. In the early movement, animals were thought to have the right not to suffer. The movement first emphasized animal protection, which later developed into the idea of animal welfare. Now, even though animal rights advocates still argue for humanity for humanity's own sake, the concept of rights has evolved much further. The modern animal rights movement has moved from an ideology that focuses on humane ideas to one that emphasized liberation. The ultimate goal is no longer social reform, but revolution.

### Organization

There are obvious difficulties in comparing the function, structure and funding of early and modern animal rights organizations. Not only is the historical context very different from the early to the modern period, but each era had a variety of diverse organizations within the animal protection movement. However, a general comparison of organizational structure between the early and modern eras, from a purposive sample--chosen on the basis of function and impact--of representative organizations, offers some insight into the anatomy of the animal rights movement at two different points in time. I will not use all of the organizational variables typically utilized in a standard analysis, but will focus on organizational size and funding for the purpose of

this examination of the animal rights movement.

### Early Organization and Funding

Traditional societies, such as the ASPCA or the Humane Society of the United States, are well funded in the modern era. The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is the wealthiest American humane society with assets of \$42 million (Sperling, 1988, p. 83). This was not always the case, however. The early ASPCA was hindered by a lack of funds. The organization received only \$7,400 in support the first year. Bergh worked for the ASPCA for 23 years without pay and donated property to guarantee \$7,000 annual support for the society (Coleman, 1924, pp. 54-57). The first attorney for the ASPCA, Elbridge T. Gerry, worked as a volunteer. Angell also paid his own expenses and spent his own money to found new humane societies. These men were not exceptions--most early leaders drew no wages, paid their own travel expenses and often supported the work of the society with their own funds (Coleman, 1924, p. 103). Even Caroline White's mother personally canvassed homes to raise enough money for an agent's salary in her organization.

Despite sparse initial funding, the new humane organizations began to grow. With the help of legacies, the ASPCA purchased a headquarters building in 1873 for \$100,000, and by 1924 there were over 100 on the payroll. The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals also grew rapidly. The Angell Animal Memorial Hospital, headquarters for the Massachusetts society, was founded in Boston in 1915, and there were 16 paid agents and 51 paid employees on the staff

by 1924.

Although the ASPCA was a state organization, it had a national influence. Within five years of its founding, 19 states and Canada had established similar organizations (Carson, 1972, p. 100). After the establishment of the ASPCA in 1886, the number of humane societies in the United States grew to 334 active organizations by 1908. These societies was quite uniform, based on the English prototype. A majority were private corporations created by special charter. The executive committee governed within each society, and the scope of activities were confined to the state or local level. Some local societies were branches of state organizations, while others were independent. Most local agents were volunteers (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 18).

The American Humane Association was founded in 1874<sup>b</sup> to create an alliance and promote unity of policies and methods among the diverse state and local humane organizations (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 28). The annual reports of AHA conventions served as a source of information on the early humane movement. A study of the humane movement done in 1908, based on figures from AHA annual reports, offers some insight into the organization, management and finances of early humane societies. Although cautioning that the "figures are necessarily inaccurate" (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 15), the study gives an overview of anti-cruelty societies in 1908. Since some of the anti-cruelty societies include children as well as animals as a focus for their activities, it is impossible to determine an exact figure for those societies devoted exclusively to animal welfare.

McCrea (1910/1969) argued, however, that

as an index of the spread of the anti-cruelty crusade in the United States, it is fitting to use figures that include protective work for both children and animals; for organized activity in the prevention of cruelty to children grew out of the similar work for animals and was part of the same rising wave of humane sentiment and activity. (p. 14).

Of the 334 active anti-cruelty societies in 1908, 104 were animal societies, 45 were child protection societies and 185 were humane societies (which include both). The McCrea (1910/1969, p. 15) study lists returns from 285 societies in 1908 and 348 societies reporting in 1909. In 1908 there were 800 paid employees and 4,945 voluntary agents, with contributions of \$299,133.51 from 54,563 members/contributors. Receipts totalled \$947,313.95, while total disbursements amounted to \$903,601.21. By 1909, there were 952 paid employees, 7,199 voluntary agents, and 64,879 members with contributions of \$351,835.19. Total receipts for 1909 rose to \$1,215,290.73, and total disbursements were \$1,069,366.69.

The largest single expense was for wages, while the greatest single source of receipts was membership dues and contributions. The average contribution was more than five dollars per person, which indicates that members were the main means of support for most societies (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 22). Endowments were generally confined to older organizations in larger cities. Since members largely supported the organization, the main effort of most societies was to expand membership. Newspapers were used for publicity purposes, not only to spread knowledge about the work of the society, but also to "increase the number of members and contributors and the volume of bequests" (p. 24).

The social prominence of those often associated with the

organization helped to create access to newspaper publicity. This could be a disadvantage, however, when the notoriety of individuals involved encouraged publicity of incidents and splits within societies better left concealed from the general public. The tactic of flattery was often used to expand membership and increase funds for the organization. McCrea (1910/1969) maintained, "There is an element of truth in the characterization of the annual report of a humane society as 'a few pages of statistics, several half-tone cuts and a copy of the Social Register'" (p. 25). The annual report was not only a record of the yearly activity of the society, but also a valuable tool for financial support. Members were listed according to the amount of their contribution, special bequests were sought and additional funds were recruited by differentiating funds for specific purposes. Some organizations advertised for new members and more funds "by special mention at the bottom of every page of the annual report" (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 27).

A follow-up study of the humane movement from 1910-1922 (Shultz, 1924/1968) found no significant change in organizational structure since the earlier survey, with dues and donations still the most important source of income. Most of the 539 active societies in 1922 called themselves humane societies and were devoted to the prevention of cruelty for both children and animals. One hundred and seventy-five organizations focused on animals, another 57 organizations' purpose was the protection of children, and 307 addressed both concerns (p. 14). The author noted that the divergence between these two aspects of anti-cruelty work was becoming more pronounced and predicted it would

continue into the future.

The survey noted fairly steady growth of the humane movement until the war years when war charities competed with anti-cruelty societies for financial support with the slogan "people before animals" (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 59). All organizations dependent of public support felt the loss of revenue during the war years, but it was especially crucial for large organizations with paid staffs. There were no major policy changes in the anti-cruelty organizations between 1910-1922. Financial policies tended to be conservative, with expenses limited to annual income and bequests left for investments. In fact, in one society, a resolution was adopted to require the president and executive committee to personally pay off any annual deficit acquired by the society (p. 41). SPCAs in large cities grew in size and resources, but less organized groups in small towns and rural areas did not do as well. The author argued: "There can be no question of the benefits of confederation and inter-organization to the anti-cruelty societies" (p. 53).

The study found that the number of active humane societies grew from 434 in 1910 to 539 in 1922, and membership grew from 117,422 to 202,524. Annual dues/contributions rose from \$361,308 to \$845,072, as total income from all sources increased from \$1,348,297 to \$3,329,820 (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 24).

The author maintained that these statistics indicated that the most important single source of income for humane societies, as in the earlier survey, was dues and donations from members (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 87). The most crucial element in the development of anti-cruelty



societies was the growth of their membership because of the financial reliance on the private contributor. Since membership donations were uncertain, societies were encouraged to build up endowments. By 1917, nearly three-quarters of the support for the largest societies came from endowment funds. In 1922, the ASPCA realized \$30,576 out a total net income of \$66,646.74 as income from interest on investments and property (Shultz, 1924/1968 pp. 89-90). While large societies in major cities relied on income from investments and property, small societies were nearly completely dependent on income from members. It was argued that the success of a new anti-cruelty organization could be measured by the expansion of its membership list. Publicity was still crucial to the growth of a society. One leader claimed, "We believe that we can sell charity the same as merchandise and we are doing it everyday" (quoted in Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 88). It was noted that there was often news value in the activity of anti-cruelty societies and by 1917 many large organizations had staff and departments to generate publicity and advertise the activities of the society.

The financial statement for the ASPCA in 1922 listed an income of \$232,368.73 and expenses of \$241,319.46 (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 32). Aside from this large society in New York City, the American Humane Association 1922 report listed 50 humane societies in the state of New York alone. They vary in size and significance and include independent and branch organizations. There was friction between the large ASPCA and at least one smaller state organization, whose annual income for 1921 was \$17,767.17. The ASPCA disapproved of the methods of the

smaller group, which responded with charges of inefficiency on the part of the much larger organization.

During this same period, the Massachusetts SPCA also experienced rapid growth and expansion of its organization. A Women's Auxiliary was formed to help increase funding for the greatly expanded services of the society. They raised funds by means of fairs and social events. The 1922 annual report indicated an income of \$191,332.88, of which \$67,000 was in the form of bequests and \$31,092.42 was from members. Expenses totaled \$164,457.79, of which \$63,328.00 went toward salaries and \$17,224.00 supported Our Dumb Animals (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 37).

By 1922 almost every state had at least one humane society incorporated as a state society with statewide jurisdiction. The focus was shifting from enforcement of anti-cruelty laws to seeking a remedy to animal cruelty. Humane education became an important concentration of anti-cruelty societies and by 1922, 20 states had humane education laws.

In addition to the traditional animal welfare societies, special focus groups were also a feature of early humane organizations. One such organization was the American Anti-Vivisection Society, the first society opposed to animal experimentation in America. Although the initial focus concerned regulation of animal experimentation, soon total abolition was the goal. Other specialized societies devoted to anti-vivisection shortly followed. Even though Bergh and the ASPCA fought for anti-vivisection legislation early on, by 1910 anti-vivisection became a source of contention within the ASPCA, and the decision was made to let specialized anti-vivisection societies handle the

contentious debate. These radical anti-vivisection societies were so successful in raising this controversial issue that "The Society of Friends of Medical Progress," an organization for the defense of animal experimentation, was organized in 1923 (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 160).

#### Modern Organization and Funding

Early anti-cruelty organizations such as the ASPCA and its British counterpart the RSPCA, were considered radical groups in their day. However, as they grew in size and expanded in organizational complexity from their humble beginnings, much of their initial force was lost. Gone were the days of one-man power, voluntary efforts and noblesse oblige. By the time of the current animal rights movement, the older traditional animal welfare organizations had become a respectable part of the establishment (Singer, 1990, p. 218). Many American organizations concerned with animal welfare issues saw changes in leadership as "the original volunteer force of visionaries bowed out to make way for a new generation of professional executives hired to administer growing bureaucracies and bulging funds" (Ryder, 1989, p. 306).

A current look at modern animal rights organizations presents a rather complicated picture. The Encyclopedia of Associations (Burek, 1991) lists 77 animal rights groups, both large and small. Large traditional organizations, such as the ASPCA, share the animal rights movement with large new groups, such as PETA, and many other organizations of various size and ideology.

The main source of income for traditional American animal welfare

organizations, such as the ASPCA and the Humane Society of the United States, is bequests and donations. Other funding is derived from investments, services and membership dues (Sperling, 1988, p. 83). In the most recent ASPCA Annual Report, this organization billed itself as "America's first, and today one of the world's most influential animal protection organizations" (Kullberg, 1989, p. 2). They claimed to have increased their national membership from less than 1,000 to more than 350,000 in the last decade. The organization has a 27 member board of directors, and a staff of 200 including a 33 member executive staff.

The ASPCA is a not-for-profit corporation qualified to receive tax deductible contributions. According to their 1989 annual report, of their total annual income of \$16,232,553, memberships and donations accounted for \$5,715,357, while \$1,333,470 came from special funds and trusts and \$1,151,947 was obtained from bequests. The remainder of their income (\$7,287,046) came from various fees and an animal control contract with New York City. Of their total expenses of \$16,548,150, fundraising and overhead accounted for \$5,629,742 of the entire expense budget.

Although the society accentuates its membership strength, a look at the list of the top benefactors indicated numerous foundations, trusts, corporations and bequests. Even though they do use press conferences and gala events to call attention to their organization and their cause, they now have "a new computer service that provides instant access to all donor records (now some 400,000 strong) by pushing a single button at the national office" (ASPCA, 1989, p. 16). They predicted that this will significantly improve communication between

the national office and its membership.

Compared to other animal rights groups, the ASPCA appeal for members is quite low-key and their magazine, ASPCA Report, lacks the strident call to activism promoted by many other groups. Perhaps in response to the growing rift between the moderate and radical elements in the animal rights movement as a whole, the ASPCA commissioned a survey in 1989 to measure opinions on animal protection issues. This technique has been used in conjunction with membership and fund raising appeals by many other animal rights groups, as well. The 1991 ASPCA Animal Protection Survey asked the reader to: fill out an enclosed survey requesting "your personal opinions on the controversial issues of animal welfare" (Kullberg, n.d., p. 4) and then to back up those opinions by joining the ASPCA with suggested contributions of \$20, \$50, \$100 or more.

This ASPCA appeal for opinions--not to mention membership and funding--may reflect "conflicts within the movement between the long-established well-financed organizations, and the newer, smaller groups whose activities are patterned after the civil rights struggles of the 1960s" (Johnson, 1988, p. 40L). The letter attached to the 1991 ASPCA survey leaves little doubt that the organization considered itself in a battle for leadership within the current animal rights movement. They argued that animal rights (although they always called it animal protection) "has become one of the most complicated issues on our national agenda. It affects our politics, our economy, our laws, our health, and indeed our very 'humanity'" (p. 2). Changes in the field in recent years, such as disagreement, anger and violence are noted. The President of the ASPCA warned, however, that to continue to argue

among ourselves will only harm the animals. He insisted that it is time now to "rally around the one organization that is capable of setting priorities and exerting leadership," as he claimed that the ASPCA "is uniquely qualified to perform this leadership role" (pp. 2-3). ASPCA literature stressed animal protection (rather than rights), love of animals and practical, humane care. The ASPCA will move into a new \$24.3 million facility in 1991 and they predicted that "with your continued help and support, the ASPCA will remain not only America's first humane society, but also one of the most professional and effective humane forces in the world" (ASPCA, 1989, p. 4).

While the traditional animal welfare organizations may be rich in financial resources, the newer grass-roots groups are rich in human resources. These groups are more dependent on membership commitment and activism. Some even leave successful careers to devote themselves to the movement (Sperling, 1988, p. 84). PETA is a good example of this new type of organization in the animal rights movement.

PETA, founded in 1980 by Alex Pacheco and Ingrid Newkirk with \$60 and a few volunteers, "has become the most influential animal rights group in the world" (The Animal Rights Reporter, 1990, p. 3). Another report agreed: "Today, PETA is the largest and most influential animal-rights group in the United States" (Reed, 1990, p. 59). From its unpretentious beginning in Pacheco's basement apartment, (or Newkirk's kitchen, depending on the source) PETA has experienced unprecedented growth. PETA called itself the "fastest growing animal rights organization in the United States" (PETA, n.d.). The rapid growth of PETA paralleled the growth and radicalization of the modern

animal rights movement, itself.

A 1982 Harvard study predicted that "PETA--may pose the greatest grass-roots challenge to the scientific and medical research communities. Its members are young, articulate, and dedicated" (cited in PETA, n.d., p 2). PETA has grown from 23,000 members in 1983, with an all-volunteer staff, into an organization today that boasts 350,000 members and a staff of 120 "dedicated individuals" (PETA, 1990, p. 2). Kim Stallwood, PETA's Executive Director, stated that he does not "want a passive membership--you can't change society that way" (Windeatt, 1986, p. 182).

In contrast to the ASPCA's new multi-million dollar headquarters building, Washington D.C.-based PETA is centered in an unpretentious warehouse in Rockville, Maryland (Pins, 1990). Like their last century counterparts, Pacheco and Newkirk maintained that they draw little or no salaries from the organization. Newkirk reported that she receives no money from PETA and a 1988 financial statement from the organization indicated that she "received \$8,320 for her 60-hour weeks as National Director" (The Animal Rights Reporter, 1990, p. 3). Although critics question how she lives, her ascetic lifestyle is acknowledged. After PETA was founded, she lived out of a sleeping bag in the office for seven years (Behar, 1989, p. 44). According to 1988 PETA's records, Pacheco received \$19,011 as chairman. He is reported to live better than Newkirk and drive a Porsche (The Animal Rights Reporter, 1990, p. 4). Perhaps in an effort to retain their grass-roots image, a professional fund-raiser who worked a short time for PETA contended that leaders in the organization told him not to use his title of Director of

Development when dealing with other groups in order to conceal the fact that PETA was spending money for professional fund-raising (McCabe, 1990, p. 187).

PETA's 1990 Annual Review covers a broad range of animal rights concerns. One report noted that PETA "wages a broad battle against everything from cosmetic testing to carnivorousness" (Reed, 1990, p. 59). Although the ASPCA's Annual Report also reflected a similar range of animal welfare issues, the report itself is staid and conservative, while PETA's is colorful, playful and graphic. It is difficult to imagine Jeffery and Jette, in the sedate, dignified ASPCA annual report. These two pigs featured in a color photo in PETA's Annual Review, purportedly "enjoy each other's company immensely. They spend a good deal of each day nuzzled up as close as the can possibly get to each other, talking softly" (p. 25).

PETA's 1990 Annual Review listed the organization as "a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation funded mainly by the generous contributions of its members" (p. 26). The report documented revenues of \$9,212,263 including: \$8,540,570 in contributions, \$234,170 in merchandise and sales, \$279,233 from special events, \$87,562 from interest and royalties and \$70,728 miscellaneous. Expenditures were listed as \$8,811,252. Research and cruelty investigations accounted for \$2,211,359, public outreach/training cost \$2,047,312, campaigns and educational programs required \$2,303,227, \$1,497,578 was used for membership development and \$751,776 was spent for operational expenses.

PETA used a similar tactic for membership expansion and fundraising to that utilized by the ASPCA. PETA literature requests reader support



in the form of letters to certain companies and politicians, signatures on petitions and even a request to send a dime to Mrs. Bush with the plea for her to urge President Bush to release the "Silver Springs monkeys." In contrast to the ASPCA appeals, however, PETA requests usually include a graphic, heart-breaking picture and often focus on a specific target or topic. The most recent request from PETA included a request to: boycott certain cosmetics products, sign a petition and "double the impact of your convictions by making the most generous donation you can" (Pacheco, n.d., p. 3).

In addition to a graphic picture of a rabbit who "was the victim of one of Gillette's dermal 'death tests,'" and a gory account of an eyewitness to these experiments, was a letter from Pacheco (n.d.). In this letter he reiterated the accomplishments of PETA over the last decade. He quoted a recent New York Times article that credits PETA with the spread of the idea of animal rights since 1981. Pacheco, in what appears to be PETA's attempt to establish leadership of the animal rights movement, claimed that "PETA has become the most effective and hard-hitting organization in America when it comes to exposing and stopping animal cruelty" (Pacheco, n.d., p. 2).

Some have accused PETA of questionable tactics even within the animal rights movement. According to Behar (1989, p. 44), PETA actively attempts to take over competing animal rights organizations from the inside by running their own slate for the rival's board of directors. If successful, this enables PETA's more radical leaders to control policy of the usually more conservative group and gain access to its often well-funded treasury. Kim Stallwood helped radicals infiltrate

established animal welfare organizations in Britain. Many traditional, conservative animal welfare groups have since been taken over by more radical elements in the United States as well.

Most of the financial support for groups like PETA seems to derive from members, newsletters and advertisements soliciting funds. While traditional groups such as the Humane Society collect vast membership dues, and small specialized groups rely on funds collected for a particular project, "the most militant groups, like the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, rely heavily on members to provide time and money" (Bishop, 1989, p. 7). PETA's appeals for funds and solicitation for member action are much more pronounced than that of the ASPCA. This could indicate that individual PETA members may be more important and exert more control over this organization than in the corporate-like ASPCA. However, PETA's appeals for member activism often resemble a referendum on action already taken, rather than an attempt to mobilize their constituency. Regardless, even their critics acknowledged PETA's masterful use of the media to gain publicity for their cause as they attempt to influence public opinion on a national and even international level (The Animal Rights Reporter, 1990, p. 6).

In spite of PETA's attempts to retain its grass-roots image, its rapid growth has inevitably pushed it in the direction of greater professionalism and bureaucracy. Its 1990 Annual Review detailed the growth of its communication department:

Until 1985, PETA volunteers, using a tattered old copy of the Yellow Pages to locate newspapers and radio and television stations, alerted the media to animal rights issues and actions. Today our Media Department answers 250 calls a month from reporters and coordinates and participates in hundreds of interviews and feature stories on radio and television and for print media. In 1990, PETA issued more than 204 news releases

or advisories and was featured on "Good Morning, America," "CBS This Morning," "Today," and ABC "World News Tonight," and on cable networks. (p. 20)

Although PETA's 1990 Annual Review focused on volunteers and "what you can do," to a much greater extent than the ASPCA 1989 Annual Report with its full page listing the Board of Directors, Regional Advisors and Executive Staff, still PETA's rapid growth may prove to be a mixed blessing. As noted earlier, the ASPCA was also considered a radical organization initially. However, growth and eventual acceptance from the establishment did much to alter the focus of the group from one that advocated radical social change into one that played it safe. Only time will tell if PETA escapes this same fate.

In addition to broad focus groups, such as the mainstream ASPCA and the more radical PETA, many other organizations in the current animal rights movement center on specific issues or concentrate on certain professions or interests. Single-issue, anti-vivisection groups, such as the American Anti-Vivisection Society (11,000 members) still advocate abolition of animal experiments and work with other animal rights groups toward that end. Other special interest groups, such as the Animal Legal Defense Fund--"We may be the only lawyers on earth whose clients are all innocent,"--are lawyers who fight for the legal rights of animals. Other special interests, such as farming, fur and animals in entertainment, are represented by various single-interest groups. Different professions, such as scientists, actors, physicians and psychologists also have formed special animal rights groups. This diversity makes it difficult to generalize about organizational structure and funding in the modern animal rights movement.

### Summary

Organizations in the early stage of the 19th century movement were staffed, for the most part by volunteers and mainly funded by their membership. Special emphasis was given to membership recruitment to encourage growth and financial support. The movement consisted of both large broad focus organizations and smaller, special focus groups, but they all had a state or local area of influence. The modern movement is also made up of groups of various sizes and goals; however, the major organizations have a national or international focus. They are staffed by social movement professionals and funded, to a large extent, by outside financial sources. Even so, contemporary organizations still contend for members, with somewhat similar--if more sophisticated--tactics, and struggle for the authority to define the issue.

### Strategy and Tactics

#### 19th Century

Although Bergh founded the ASPCA in an "era of humanitarian progress" (Coleman, 1924, p. 33), leaders in the early American animal rights movement faced public indifference and scorn. In the aftermath of the Civil War, humane leaders were told that the time was not right for sentiment (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 124). Early leaders quickly learned, however, that public sentiment could be shaped by mass action and influenced by notable opinion makers. In addition to the general public and governmental agencies, humane leaders were also forced to contend with those affected by their efforts to protect animals.

Bergh and other ASPCA agents faced great danger when they attempted to stop the prevalent dog and cock fights carried on in the "lowest parts of the city--with little or no interference from the police" (Coleman, 1924, p. 48). Disgruntled fight promoters picketed Bergh's house and office in an attempt to intimidate the society. Bergh persisted, and eventually succeeded in restricting these fights in spite of the threats, intimidation and unsympathetic courts. Bergh also attacked the popular sport of live pigeon shoots. His efforts eventually led to the development of the clay pigeon. Attempts to prosecute pigeon shooting under the general cruelty act led to a vigorous response from shooting clubs and sporting goods manufacturers. These groups succeeded in having legislation passed to make pigeon shoots legal, and humanitarians were not able to repeal the law until 1901 (Coleman, 1924, p. 51).

Despite his reserved personality, Bergh used direct action tactics. He would go out into the streets and arrest violators of the animal protection law, and then represent the ASPCA in court. Almost daily, he would stand in the middle of the railroad tracks during rush hour and stop overloaded horse-drawn omnibuses. Jeered by the crowds, he would not let the omnibuses move until enough passengers got off to reduce the load (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 151). Although he attempted to reason with individuals he found abusing animals, if this failed he did not hesitate to use force (Coleman, 1924, p. 59). On occasion, he would beat purported offenders with his cane.

George Angell's tactics were different. He believed that education was more important than prosecution. He founded the first animal rights magazine, Our Dumb Animals, in 1868. In addition to promoting kindness

to animals, the publication served important organizational goals, becoming "a most essential aid in building up the society's membership and inducing persons to make their wills in favor of the society" (Coleman, 1924, p. 99).

In another effort to increase membership in his newly formed organization, Angell borrowed 17 finely groomed policemen to canvass the city of Boston for members. This move, which he regarded as providential, increased membership from 400 to 1,600 members and expanded the treasury by \$13,000 (Coleman, 1924, p. 98). The Boston police also delivered his magazine without charge.

A warm, enthusiastic man with many friends, Angell capitalized on his personality to keep his name before the public (Coleman, 1924, p. 90). An accomplished orator, he went on speaking tours to promote and expand the cause of animal welfare. He also used newspaper publicity to facilitate supportive legislation.

Bergh, as well, frequently spoke to large groups of people to spread the message of animal welfare. He was also very conscious of the value of newspaper publicity, even though he was often the target of cartoons and satire (Coleman, 1924, p. 41). Since the general public was apathetic toward the issue of animal welfare, Bergh was anxious to find a case that would generate publicity for the cause. When he heard about a boat load of turtles, shipped on their backs from Florida, with their flippers tied together, he was convinced that he had found just such a case. Bergh arrested the captain and crew of the ship and the case went to court. After the judge acquitted them of cruelty, he told Bergh to "go home and mind his own business" (Coleman, 1924, p. 43).

The publicity raised by the case seemed to backfire when newspapers filled with ridicule and abuse set the whole city talking. In the end, however, the publicity gained by the "turtle case" increased membership and support for the ASPCA.

In another sensational case that foreshadowed the "factory farming" issue of today, Bergh and the young ASPCA exposed unsanitary conditions and corruption in the production of New York city's milk supply. The cattle were often ill, kept in deplorable conditions and fed distillery swill. The health department refused to act and the court impeded justice in every possible way because of local corruption. Newspapers had a field day. After a long battle, the ASPCA succeeded due to state intervention brought about by powerful newspaper support of the cause (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 153).

The ASPCA also led the fight to compel butchers to use more humane transportation methods. The treatment of horses used by omnibus companies was another focus of concern for the ASPCA. Strong opposition and unfriendly courts made these efforts to obtain protective legislation difficult even with a generally favorable press and supportive public opinion. Powerful vested interests prevented stronger legislation, so Bergh tested an existing law. The conviction obtained, upheld by the Supreme Court, illustrated his "vigorous application of the statutes for the prevention of cruelty," as well as his persistence in "securing enforcement of the law" (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 151). These cases were sharply contested by the railroad company using the "most eminent counsel," and so this was regarded as a great victory for Bergh and the ASPCA (Coleman, 1924, p. 45).

In spite of ridicule and opposition the ASPCA prosecuted 119 offenders in their first year and "obtained a good proportion of convictions" (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 150). Bergh is noted for his unyielding tactics in legislative campaigns and when courts did not "render what he regarded to be plain justice to his animal clients he did not hesitate to assail their decisions" (Coleman, 1924, pp. 51-52).

Another important campaign was effectively completed in 1873 when the ASPCA finally convinced Congress to pass legislation for the protection of animals during interstate transit. The issue was far from resolved, however, and while cattlemen jeered reformers, "the little band of humane enthusiasts was not viewed with favor by legislators, and every conceivable slander was hurled by the interests to hold up the approaching reforms" (Coleman, 1924, p. 252). A group of horse owners in Washington D.C. formed an Animal Protective Association to resist the increasingly successful efforts of the local humane society (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 97). Yet, early leaders persisted in spite of the opposition.

While leaders such as Bergh and their organizations engendered a wide range of environmental response, perhaps no segment of the humane movement created as much reaction as the anti-vivisection faction of the crusade.<sup>9</sup> Bergh, Angell and White all opposed vivisection. The issue did not become a concern in America until 1871. A group of Philadelphia surgeons attempted in 1871 to obtain dogs for use in experiments from the animal shelter just opened by the Women's Branch of the Pennsylvania SPCA. White's organization would not fulfill their request and this "undoubtedly hastened the founding of the American Antivivisection



Society" in 1883 (Coleman, 1924, p. 204).

Bergh made the first attempt to introduce anti-vivisection legislation in America in 1867. He was successfully opposed by the New York State Medical Society, and the anti-cruelty laws that passed did not cover animal experimentation. Although the next few years were devoted to the organization of the ASPCA, Bergh later reopened the campaign against vivisection and introduced the first American anti-vivisection bill in 1880. Again, medical organizations were able to stop the legislation (Shultz, 1924/1968, pp. 141-142).

Attacks upon animal experimentation ranged from moderate to radical; proposed solutions varied from regulation to total abolition of research. Proponents of animal experimentation argued that some animal suffering was necessary for the benefit of humans. Advocates of experimentation contended that the use of animals is completely justified by the resulting gains to humanity. Anti-vivisectionists countered with two different arguments. First, they raised the ethical question of whether humans had the "moral right to gain health and freedom--at the cost of any suffering to animals" (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 143). The issue was a moral, rather than a scientific concern. Those who opposed animal experimentation also questioned the purported medical benefits of these experiments for humans. Many refuted the germ theory of disease and opposed the use of anti-toxins and serums acquired from animals. They charged that the "whole doctrine of inoculation and vaccination is propagated by commercial organizations interested in producing these serums for financial gain" (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 144). Rather than prevent epidemics by vaccinations, proponents of

anti-vivisection insisted that "the preventing of contagion and the checking of epidemics can be assured only by the application of sanitary principles, and in no other way" (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 126).

In 1907 and 1908 bills to regulate animal experimentation were brought before the New York legislature. Medical associations led a bitter fight against this proposed legislation and newspapers were drawn into the battle. One report noted that the New York Herald supported the anti-vivisection side, while most other papers were opposed (Schultz, 1924/1968, p. 148).

As the anti-vivisection movement grew, so did the opposition from the medical community. At the 1908 annual meeting of the American Medical Association, a committee was appointed to defend freedom of experimentation. Over the next few years, 30 pamphlets were distributed establishing the medical benefits of animal experimentation (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 148). Critics also attacked the controversial methods of anti-vivisection organizations, accused them of exaggeration, unproved allegations and even deliberate distortion. Anti-vivisectionists were condemned for appealing to sentiment rather than reason. According to Shultz (1924/1968), the medical profession clearly stated its position:

Only the moral degenerate is capable to inflicting the torment that the anti-vivisectionists imagine. No one who is acquainted with the leaders in medical research, who are responsible for the work done in the laboratories, can believe for a moment that they are moral degenerates. The medical investigators further maintain that judgment should be based on knowledge, not ignorance. They rightly insist that their critics are ignorant--ignorant of the conditions of medical research and ignorant of the complex relations of the medical sciences to medical and surgical practice, and they contend that these critics in their ignorance are endeavoring to stop that experimental study of physiology and pathology. (p. 150)

The medical profession refused to allow inspection of laboratories, seeing it as a first step toward total prohibition. However, as a gesture of good-will they set up the Committee on Protection of Medical Research of the American Medical Association and formed their own code of laboratory procedure.

The first anti-vivisection exhibit was held in Atlantic City in 1909, and was later repeated in many other major cities. Large stuffed animals were used to depict various types of torture reputed to occur during animal experiments. Steps were taken to oppose the propaganda of anti-vivisection societies.<sup>10</sup> This anti-vivisection booth was excluded from the Women's Industrial Exhibition (1914) in New York after objections from organized medicine, even though these booths had been allowed in prior years.

This opposition only increased the fervor of the anti-vivisection movement, and many in America, as in England, now sought abolition rather than regulation of animal research. According to Shultz (1924/1968, p. 152) when the New York Herald, in 1909, published horror stories concerning animal experimentation from former employees of the Rockefeller Institute, anti-vivisection societies rushed to introduce new protective legislation. Bills to regulate animal experimentation, introduced in New York in 1910, were opposed by the state medical association and defeated. Legislation of this type was reintroduced every year from 1911 to 1923, but never passed.

Anti-vivisectionists kept the issue before the public, however, by charging that Harvard, Wellesley, Vassar, and Barnard, among other colleges, were stealing pets for the laboratories. The New York Herald

gave the matter a great deal of publicity, and many other newspapers and magazines were also sympathetic (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 154). Anti-vivisection advocates also accused doctors of infecting people with the syphilis virus and raised the issue of human vivisection.

The Interstate Conference for the Investigation of Vivisection was founded in 1912 to facilitate a national approach in the anti-vivisection movement. At around the same time, however, a split developed between two important groups over anti-cruelty charges brought by the Pennsylvania anti-vivisection society against prominent surgeons who used animals in research. The unsuccessful trial left a breach between the Pennsylvania society and the American Anti-Vivisection Society. Internecine warfare was prevalent in the anti-vivisection movement and the decision of more traditional animal welfare societies not to unite with the extremists was viewed as opportunistic by the more militant segments of the crusade.

The anti-vivisection movement won some small legislative victories over the next years, but significant change eluded them. In 1914, for example, forces for anti-vivisection prevented the organization of a research facility in New Jersey. The next year this decision was overturned despite the objection of anti-vivisectionists. Another bill was passed in California in 1915 to prohibit experimentation in schools, but it did not survive the governor's veto. National legislation introduced in 1916 and again in 1920 also died in committee (Shultz, 1924/1968, pp. 157-158).

Opposition to anti-vivisection continued to grow and organizations in support of animal experimentation were formed. The Society of

Friends of Medical Progress was founded in 1923 to oppose the efforts of anti-vivisection societies (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 160). Early advocates of anti-vivisection raised the controversial, ethical issue of animal experimentation. The debate was marked by bitterness and intemperance. While they raised the issue and convinced a number of people of their cause, they achieved few of their goals. Both medical organizations and non-professional organizations combined to combat anti-vivisection endeavors. Private life-insurance companies contributed money to defeat anti-vivisection legislation and it was argued that groups like the Society of Friends of Medical Progress epitomized "a growing disapproval, if not of the aims, then of the methods of anti-vivisectionism" (p. 161).

#### 20th Century

The ultimate goal of most contemporary activists is the eventual elimination of all forms of exploitation of animals. Nevertheless, they have based their current strategy on pragmatic grounds and focused on two issues: the use of animals for fur and for cosmetic and medical research. The fur issue was chosen because animal rights leaders felt it would be a fairly easy target. It would not be difficult, they thought, to highlight the vanity of wearing fur and change the image of the fur coat from a status symbol into a sadist symbol (Beck, 1988, p. 52).

Newsweek called the anti-fur movement "the most visible arm of the animal rights crusade" (Beck, 1988, p. 52). Through the use of celebrities denouncing fur, media appeals, demonstrations, and direct confrontations with individuals wearing fur, animal rights activists

hope to achieve the same success as their more vocal and combative counterparts in Europe, where the sale of furs has dropped dramatically in recent years. The use of animals to test cosmetics could also be made into a vanity issue. Though cosmetic testing accounts for only a small percentage of animals used in research it has become a "favorite target for animal rights activists" (Smith, 1990, p. 12).

The medical research laboratory, while not considered such an easy target, "aroused the greatest passion among movement adherents" (McCabe, 1990, p. 76). In line with this goal, Pacheco--who realized the value of the direct action tactics he had encountered in England--looked for a likely target at home. He infiltrated the Institute of Behavioral Research in Silver Spring, Maryland, by posing as a volunteer. He spent four months documenting conditions in the lab where scientists were studying nerve regeneration on surgically crippled primates. Pacheco took his findings to the police and accomplished the first raid of a research facility in the United States. He achieved some notoriety in this so-called "Silver Springs Monkey" case, where he exposed abuse of laboratory animals. This incident "put animal rights into the popular lexicon and established PETA. . .as the lead organization in the new animal-rights movement" (McCabe, 1990, p. 185).

In spite of the fact that the opposition to the use of animals in medical research is the most controversial issue in the modern animal rights movement, the research laboratory is thought to be a crucial target because 1,653,288 animals were used in research in 1988 according to figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Smith, 1990, p. 12). Although rodents are used in 80-90% of all animal experimentation, the

animal rights movement chose to focus on projects using cute cats, dogs and chimpanzees, with whom the general public could relate. A few graphic pictures of cats with electrodes implanted in their heads and chimps used in head injury research put public opinion firmly on the side of animal rights and the scientific community on the run.

PETA and the underground group, Animal Liberation Front (ALF), for whom they speak, are leading the fight to end the use of animals for scientific experiments. They, and other groups, have been successful in mobilizing public opinion against animal research. By the late 1980s, more mail was sent to Congress concerning animal research than any other topic, with the letters running 100 to 1 against the use of animals for research (Rosenberger, 1990, p. 30). New legislation regulating animal research was written in 1985 when Congress passed the Improved Standards for Laboratory Animals Act (Dole-Brown), amending the 1966 Laboratory Animal Welfare Act (Stanley, 1988). The U.S. Department of Agriculture is responsible for enforcing the regulations of the legislation. Activists contended that the legislation does not go nearly far enough to protect animals, while the scientific community argued that the regulations would drive up the cost of research to a prohibitive level (McCabe, 1990, p. 193). While the debate continued, many research facilities put their own internal regulations into effect in an effort to anticipate government restrictions. A number of animal rights bills are still pending in Congress, including a separate bill that would mandate jail terms for animal rights activists who attack research laboratories (Price, 1990).

Contemporary animal rights activists used demonstrations and

confrontational tactics to harass researchers and get media attention for their cause. They hoped to raise the cost of research, both financial and emotional, so high that institutions and individuals would be reluctant to undertake animal research. The activists acknowledged that much animal research is still done, but point to some important achievements. Many large cosmetic companies, such as Revlon and Avon, have decided to stop all animal testing on new products (Singer, 1990, p. 247). Also, bowing to public demand, a Cornell University researcher returned her \$530,000 grant from the National Institute of Drug Abuse in 1988, rather than face further demonstrations against her research (Lyall, 1988, p. B1).

Although the opposition in both the fur industry and the scientific community originally badly underestimated the power of the animal rights movement, they have now mobilized and taken action to counteract the gains made on behalf of animal rights. The fur industry, despite a decline in sales, continued to deny the impact of animal rights campaigns. However, faced with flat sales and seeing fur sales fall 80-90% in the Netherlands, they went on the offensive. They formed the Fur Farm Animal Welfare Coalition and began a two million dollar public relations campaign with ads that stress freedom of choice as they stated; "Today fur. Tomorrow leather. Then wool. Then meat" (Reed, 1989, p. 72).

The scientific community also began to counter attack. A spokesperson for the Foundation for Biomedical Research, an umbrella organization of institutions that use animals in research, warned that "the movement is slowly strangling research to death," and began to speak out



on the issue (Adler, 1988, p. 60). After a slow start, the research establishment countered animal rights publicity with accounts of the necessity of scientific research. They staged their own celebrity press conference in 1988 to counter animal rights publicity from "World Laboratory Animal Liberation Day." Celebrities, medical experts and beneficiaries of animal research stressed the importance of animal experimentation.

The medical and scientific establishment stressed the many health benefits for humanity gained from this research. The American Medical Association Council on Scientific Affairs (1989) reported on the many medical advances developed by researchers using animals, weighted the costs involved in favor of humans, and predicted "many of today's most vexing health problems will be solved by research on animals" (p. 3606). Experts and important individuals, such as Health and Human Services Secretary Louis Sullivan and Frederick Goodwin of the National Institute of Mental Health defended the use of animals in research, while they attacked the tactics and goals of the animal rights activists (Holden, 1989, pp. 415-416). Groups, such as the Incurably Ill for Animal Research, also formed to present their side in the animal rights debate (Bishop, 1988, p. 14).

Animal rights activists responded to the government, scientific and industry attacks by noting the huge vested interests each group had in maintaining the status-quo in research facilities and procedures (Siegel, 1989, p. 40). They questioned the scientific value of much animal research, and argued that most clinical research is not only unnecessary, but some is actually dangerous to human health. They contended

that a healthy (vegetarian) lifestyle would prevent disease. One activist insisted in response to questions about the value of animals in research: "Who says they're saving human lives? They don't want to cure diseases. They want to treat them and make a profit. You never see the health industry encouraging people to be healthy. Instead, they kill animals to come up with drugs to make a profit" (Bass, 1984, p. 19). It is also argued that animal research is "immoral even if it's essential" (quoted in McCabe, 1990, p. 193). Speaking for the vocal majority in the current animal rights movement, PETA insisted that the use of animals in research is immoral, ineffective and unnecessary.

The scientific community and the government countered with charges that animal rights activists are ignorant of technology and anti-science (Chui, 1988, p. 1232). Others cited cultural scientific illiteracy and warned that it is "imperative that all physicians work to expose the basic philosophy of animal rights, inviting public understanding of an anti-intellectual movement whose premise is incompatible with the humanistic values of the health professional" (Goodwin, 1990, p. 936). A former director of the National Institutes of Health echoed these sentiments; "I'm very concerned about what's happening to science. The anti-intellectualism, fraud issues, animals in research. . .all of these need to be dealt with" (quoted in Culliton, 1989, p. 414). According to an article in the Capital Times by Mulhorn (1990), the AMA planned to raise fifteen million dollars to campaign against animal rights advocates. The dilemma of animal rights clearly raised strong emotions on both sides.

An animal rights activist noted that "animal-rights groups were

large and small, rich and poor, radical and conservative, and that they argued as much with one another as with their opponents" (Bass, 1984, p. 19). This diversity within the movement leads to divisions over philosophy, goals and tactics. There is a growing tendency in the movement toward a more radical philosophy and, concomitantly, a more militant stance. Tom Regan contended that "the animal rights philosophy is abolitionist rather than reformist" (quoted in Adler, 1988, p. 59). Although influential mainline organizations, such as the Humane Society and the ASPCA, officially endorse the reform approach (the 3 R's-- reduce, refine, replace) to animal experimentation, they are now forced to at least give lip service to the abolitionist view. Critics contended that these organizations send a mixed message, but they must balance a more traditional constituency with the more radical philosophy in ascendance in the movement at the moment.

Even though tactics in the animal rights movement ranged from passing out pamphlets to bombing buildings, critics and friends alike note a trend toward more direct action and greater violence within the movement. During the past decade laboratory raids, mainly by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), have caused over ten million dollars in damage in the United States (McCabe, 1990, p. 75). The growing militancy of the more radical factions within the movement induced the federal government to take action and the F.B.I. put ALF on its list of domestic terrorist organizations (McCabe, 1990, p. 186). According to Price (1990), the White House Office of Science and Technology called for federal legislation against animal activists, making such raids a federal crime.

References to animal rights activists as terrorists are common in the media. Dr. Louis Sullivan, Secretary of Health and Human Services, regarded PETA members as "nothing more than terrorists" (quoted in Reed, 1990, p. 59). However, a contemporary animal rights leader retorted that "fifteen or 20 years ago, the stereotype of animal lovers was a little old do-gooder lady in tennis shoes, which was false. The new stereotype is a fanatical vigilante, which is another false image" (quoted in Bishop, 1988, p. 14).

### Summary

While the goals have changed between the 19th and 20th century manifestations of the animal rights movement, the strategy and tactics chosen to achieve goals and the counter-response from opponents remained remarkably similar. Proponents of animal rights were maligned in both eras as their goals and tactics were met with derision and denunciations. At both times, special interest groups formed to counter the movement.

Threats and violence were a feature of both time periods, and the media were used to further the goals of both advocates and opponents of the movement. The modern era is unprecedented, however, in the level of violence directed against animal rights opponents and in the importance of media to the cause. There may be a connection between these two significant factors of the contemporary movement, although it is impossible to draw a direct causal link.

## CHAPTER III

### FROM ANIMAL WELFARE TO ANIMAL LIBERATION

In Chapter II, I analyzed in some detail the animal rights movements of the late 19th and 20th centuries. In this chapter, I begin by examining the question: Why did the animal rights movement emerge at particular moments in history? I then examine the social and cultural connections and linkages between the two movements and assess their similarities and differences with respect to leadership, ideology, organization and tactics/strategies. I address the question: Are these really two separate and independent social movements, or one (more or less) continuous historical phenomenon? Finally, I discuss what this comparative case study of the animal rights social movement suggests about social change and the new social movements of postmodern society.

#### Connections and Linkages

##### Why Then and Now?

In 1980, most people had not even heard about animal rights. By 1990 there was a "growing preoccupation with the moral status of animals. Scholars say more has been written on the subject in the past 12 years than in the previous 3,000" (Cowley, 1988, p. 51). Moreover, the rapidly growing animal rights movement has had an impact on the political and cultural life of the United States. One report noted, "Using an aggressive and sometimes confrontational approach,

animal-rights groups are prodding more and more individuals and companies into action" (Smith, 1990, p. 12). Another agreed: "the debate over animal rights is forcing basic changes in the way universities, corporations and government agencies do business" (Cowley, 1988, p. 51).

My attempt to understand the animal rights movement is to contextualize it--for the movement has a long and controversial history. There are two views that posit somewhat parallel explanations for the emergence of the early American animal rights movement in the 1860s and the modern movement about a century later. The first views as key the abolition of slavery and the civil rights movement. The second suggests that both the early and current animal rights movements occurred in reaction to advances in science and technology.

It was not a coincidence says Coleman (1924, p. 33), that the humane movement in both England and America followed so closely upon the abolition of human slavery. He argued that once the rights of the defenseless were established, the conscience of the nation led to an era of humanitarian progress. In his view, the movement could not have occurred 10 years earlier, but once the stage was set, only a leader was needed to ensure success.

Writers both for and against the animal rights movement linked the emergence of the modern phase of the movement with the equal rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Singer (1990) and Ryder (1989) contended that the animal rights movement was a logical extension of the liberation movements against racism and sexism. A critic of the movement (Vaughan, 1988) also noted that "for some people, animals seemed

the next logical group in need of 'liberation' from the 'oppression' of others" (p. 11).

In the second view, animal rights arose as a reaction against science and technology. Sperling (1988) and Dewsbury (1990) argued that there are great similarities regarding an aversion to science and technology in both the early and modern movements, especially in the area of anti-vivisection. Victorian England was shaken by the emergence of science and its concomitant religious implications. The historical interest in the Victorian animal rights movement was not so much cruelty to animals, but the tensions surrounding the roles of science and medicine in society (French, 1975, p. 408).

Ritvo (1984) contended that anti-vivisection forces opposed not only scientific research, but the moral implication on which it was based. She insisted that anti-vivisectionists "preferred preventing-- the scientific prying into God's creation to saving lives" (p. 630). Although the anti-vivisection movement had been nearly silent since the early part of this century, Ritvo postulated that it reemerged as an issue because individuals are again becoming ambivalent about science and technology.

Dewsbury (1990) asserted that both the early and modern movements "saw excessive manipulation by scientists and physicians as upsetting the balance of nature and called for a return to all that was more natural" (p. 325). Scientists recognized this attitude, and one charged that the animal rights movement "is not only an anti-science movement but an anti-rational and anti-intellectual movement" (quoted in Holden, 1989, p. 19). French (1975, p. 412) believed that the Victorian

anti-vivisectionists linked the issue of animal rights with the future of society. They foresaw the cold, alienation of a future dominated by technology. He argued that it was not so much the experiments on animals that they were protesting, but the shape of the century to come. The same could easily be said today.

Both interpretations suggest plausible explanations for the emergence of interest in animal well-being in each time period. It is logical to assume that an interest in social reform and expanded human liberation could extend to animals, as well. However, this argument is less incontrovertible for the spread of ideas of liberation from human rights to animal rights than the parallel contention that one form of human liberation leads to another. The other view, that the movement in both eras was a reaction against the scientific intrusion into private life, is especially compelling for the anti-vivisection focus in each period. Set in the larger context of fin de siecle society, it is not difficult to speculate that the animal rights movement in both periods was, at least in part, a reaction to discontent with modern society and fear of the world to come.

#### Links Between the Early and Modern Movement

In this section, I discuss historical linkages--primarily the British connection--between the two movements, followed by an analysis organized to mirror the outline of the previous chapter.

The British Connection. The most obvious linkage between the early and modern animal rights movements in America is their British connection. Both movements were inspired by British intellectual thought and



based their organizations on the English model. Leaders in both movements were influenced directly or indirectly by intellectual and organizational leaders in the British movements of the time. The organizations formed by American animal rights advocates in both eras borrowed heavily from existing British groups. The early ASPCA and the American Anti-Vivisection Society were based on their British counterparts. The most powerful new American organization, PETA, also owes much to British intellectual and organizational influence.

The early movement was directly patterned after the British animal welfare movement; the later one was inspired by scholars writing in Britain, and many of its organizations were influenced by social movement professionals from Britain. Indeed, there appears to be no other social movement which owes so much, both then and now, to trans-Atlantic sources. Ryder (1989) noted that while "Europe followed the U.S.A. in its Women's Liberation and Civil Rights movements, it is America which followed Britain in the animal revolution" (p. 4).

The ideological and intellectual connections between the two movements are less clear than the organizational links, but are no less authentic and crucial--and no less influenced by the British connection. It was British intellectual Henry Salt, writing in the late 19th Century, who delineated the philosophical and moral basis of the early animal rights movement.

George Bernard Shaw is said to have described his friend Salt as "the mildest-mannered man that ever defied society" (quoted in Tester, 1991, p. 150). Born in India in 1851, the son of an austere British military colonel, Salt took a Classics degree at Cambridge and became a

master at Eton. A vegetarian and a socialist, he left Eton in 1884 and retired to the country to write and live in harmony with nature. Salt, with his wife, feminist Kate Joynes, gave up conventional upper-class life and formed an intellectual circle that influenced the development of modern social thought. According to Ryder, (1989) Salt's work influenced Gandhi, among others, even though the prolific author never had a widely successful book during his life (pp. 126-127).

Salt's book Animals' Rights (1894), with all its intellectual power, had little apparent impact on the social world of the day. It remained to be rediscovered during the current phase of the animal rights movement where, in retrospect, it is seen to envision many of the modern philosophical arguments, anticipate the contemporary debate, and set the stage for the modern phase of the movement.

Singer (1990) agreed: "It had all been said before, but to no avail" (p. viii). Even so, Tester (1991) argued that Singer could have not have written Animal Liberation without Salt (p. 165).

Salt "invented" animal rights, Tester (1991, p. 194) contended. Singer wrote in the tradition created by Salt, but added the political agenda of liberation. Salt proved that animals have rights, but Singer went further to insist that they must be liberated. For Salt it was a moral principle, while for Singer it was also a practical affair. Salt saw animal rights as part of a moral way of life. Singer also connected it with lifestyle and tied the moral status of animals with a political agenda (Tester, 1991, p. 168).

Tester (1991) linked Salt and Singer because they both advocated a "historical process of moral enfranchisement" as "Salt made animal

rights seen inevitable by talking about evolutionary progress; Singer made it inevitable through revolutionary slogans" (pp. 166-167). Animal rights is not about animals, but is a fetish in which "Animals, themselves, have no place in this conflict; it may be waged in their name, but it rages over their heads" (p. 183).

Even though Salt's philosophical convictions had minimal effect on the social world of his day, his prescient views indirectly influenced the modern intellectual climate in the animal rights movement.

The early and modern phases of the animal rights movement are linked not only by their intellectual and organizational connection to Britain, but also by their emphasis, especially in the modern movement, on philosophical ethics. While not prominent at the time, the ideals espoused by Salt in the early movement eventually found their realization in the modern era.

#### Leadership and Ideology

Beyond these direct and indirect connections and linkages, there are numerous other similarities between the early and contemporary animal rights movements. In both movements, leaders were initially seen as cranks and oddballs, and widely stigmatized by the public and press. Singer was not alone in his contention that a movement which 10 years ago was seen as crackpot has moved from the fringe to the mainstream. However, current leaders and activists alike are still called zealots, trouble-makers or even terrorists by government officials, medical and scientific administrators and business leaders.

Sometimes, the success or failure of a movement was dependent on the personal characteristics of a given leader. Bergh was acknowledged as the driving force behind the early movement. "The cause became known as Bergh's war." The ASPCA was the "Bergh Society" (Carson, 1972, p. 97). There was concern that the movement would not outlive the man. It was typical for sons to succeed fathers as presidents of local societies, and Bergh's namesake and nephew, Henry Bergh became his successor (Coleman, 1924, p. 62). Today, Newkirk and Pacheco are intricately linked with their organization, PETA, as well. One report recognized that Newkirk's "name has become synonymous with the burgeoning animal-rights movement" (Reed, 1990, p. 59). Perhaps today's issue entrepreneurs (McCarthy & Zald, 1973) may merely differ in degree rather than in kind with their nineteenth century predecessor.

Nineteenth century leaders also faced abuse from unhappy opponents and powerful vested interests. Early "reformers worked in spite of the jeers of cattle-men who referred to them as long-haired come-outers and various other terms of opprobrium" (Coleman, 1924, p. 253). Leaders in both movements were not only jeered and ridiculed, but were faced with intimidation and threats against their lives. Partly because of their upper social class, leaders of the older movement achieved some sympathy and respect; it is too soon to assess the fate of the current leadership.

Leaders in both movements had ties to other social movements, such as civil rights (abolitionist), peace and feminist movements. Singer argued that the historical overlap of leaders between various social movements is so extensive as to confirm "the parallel between racism,

sexism and speciesism" (Singer, 1990, p. 221). Tom Regan, (quoted in Ecenbarger, 1985) stated,

my interest in the antiwar movement led me to Gandhi, who convinced me of the moral basis for vegetarianism. Then I found connections between the exploitation of humans--blacks and women, for instance--and nonhumans. Our whole society is built on the back of the exploited--within our species and beyond our species. (p. 66)

Critics in the contemporary animal rights movement continued to charge that animal rights advocates, like their early counterparts, were misanthropic and cared more about animals than humans. They warned that "animal worship" presents a danger to the health and welfare of American society (Bleiberg, 1989, p. 11). The human vs. animal debate is to central to the issue of animal experimentation. Extreme efforts to save animals, such as the whales caught in the ice in Alaska, are contrasted with a lack of similar concern for grave human suffering.

Bergh countered this stock argument of animal rights opponents with the contention that if animals had to wait until all human problems were solved, "they would still be waiting at the Second Coming" (Carson, 1972, p. 105). He insisted that one movement did not preclude the other. Singer (1990) agreed: "The idea that 'humans come first' is more often used as an excuse for not doing anything about either human or nonhuman animals than as a genuine choice between incompatible alternatives" (p. 220). Yet the older movement was unable to sustain its universalistic claim--that animal welfare and human welfare were bound together--and it went into eclipse. Success or failure of the current movement will hinge, in part, on the ability to maintain this ideological linkage.

There are also significant differences in leadership and ideology between the old and new animal rights movements. Although America lacked an aristocracy like that which led the movement in England, all the early American animal protection leaders, except Angell, were wealthy. As Anglophiles, they followed the British example and made animal welfare an upper-class, fashionable cause in order to give the movement credibility (Ryder, 1989, pp. 72-73). Early leaders like Bergh and Angell drew no wages, paid their own travel expenses, and often supported the work of the society with their own funds (Coleman, 1924, p. 103). The first attorney for the ASPCA volunteered his services, and Caroline White's mother personally canvassed homes to raise enough money for an agent's salary in her organization.

Leadership in the modern animal rights movement in American also reflected the contemporary British movement. Like their early counterparts, Pacheco and Newkirk maintained that they draw no, or very modest, salaries from the organization (The Animal Rights Reporter, 1990). However, current leaders in the American movement have different social class backgrounds from their predecessors. It would appear that the contemporary intellectual leadership--drawn mainly from academe--are members of the so-called new class, a phenomenon noted in the leadership of other modern social movements (McCrea & Markle, 1989).<sup>11</sup>

Early leaders were wealthy enough to leave careers and dedicate their lives to the cause of animal welfare. Modern leaders, on the other hand, seem to fit McCarthy and Zald's (1973) category of social movement professionals. They are not typically wealthy, and some have left careers in fields such as law or education and found new careers in

the animal rights movement. Henry Spira, who left a career in education, is now funded in part by the Humane Society of the United States and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Feder, 1989, p. 34). Spira came to the animal rights movement from leadership positions in both the civil rights and union movements. While early leaders volunteered their time, most modern leaders are paid social movement professionals in the animal rights movement. Professional leadership is complicated however, when both staff and members may be seen as conscience constituents. In this case, for some staff at least, "monetary rewards that professional staff receive are probable secondary to ideological concern as their low salary levels suggest" (Jenkins, 1983, p. 539).

Most modern leaders are strict vegetarians, or even vegans, while early leaders, except Salt, did not advocate that lifestyle. Nineteenth century leaders, with the exception of Bergh, were more likely to acknowledge a fondness for animals. Leaders in the contemporary movement preferred to deny or downplay any emotional feelings toward animals.

The ideology of the new animal rights movement is based on philosophical ethics rather than the religious convictions of the 19th century movement. Organized religion and clergy supported the earlier animal welfare movement. Ryder (1989) called this a "battle between the old and the new elites, between. . .the aristocracy and the church, as the old leaders of society, and. . .the upstarts of science" (p. 117). Possibly because of the sophisticated philosophical arguments of the current leaders in the animal rights movement, Christians are

advised that they should focus on animal "welfare" rather than animal "rights" advocated by the new movement (Boyce, 1985, p. 38).

Perhaps because of class differences, there are other ideological differences between the two movements. The older emphasized sympathy and sentiment; the newer, reason and rationality. The older stressed welfare and reform; the newer, liberation and revolution. What was once considered strictly a moral issue has now become predominately a political issue. Regan (quoted in Ecenbarger, 1985) summed up the views of many in the new animal rights movement:

The rights view is not antibusiness, not anti-freedom of the individual, not antihuman. It is simply projustice, insisting only that the scope of justice be seen to include respect for the rights of animals. The animal rights movement is not for the faint of heart. Success requires nothing less than a revolution in our culture's thought and action. (p. 66)

Whether the dramatic claims of the new movement will help to mobilize resources, or whether they will be judged beyond the pale of middle class politics, remains to be seen.

#### Organization and Funding

Early animal welfare organizations, based on the prototype of the ASPCA, were private corporations with public police powers which allowed them to enforce animal welfare regulations. These humane groups focused on a wide range of animal concerns and their activities were located primarily at the state or local level. The primary goals were the establishment of protective legislation for animals, enforcement of those laws and public education against cruelty. Initially, these goals were pursued mainly by volunteers, leaders and members alike.

Some organizations established by early animal rights proponents,



such as the ASPCA and the American Anti-vivisection Society, still exist in the current movement. The ASPCA continues to be an important organization, but groups like the American Anti-Vivisection Society have found their functions and goals usurped by newer, more radical additions to the animal rights scene.

Contemporary animal rights movement organizations are much more varied both in size and focus. However, the largest, most important groups display similar characteristics. They are broad focus organizations with a national and even international area of interest. Organized as non-profit corporations, they are barred from actions of an overt political nature in order to insure their tax deductible status.

The largest, most powerful groups are centralized in their organizational structure. Although made up of less formal local organizations, they articulate animal rights concerns from a central headquarters in order to combat an increasingly centralized state at both the national and international level. This centralized bureaucracy assures a more efficient and uniform focus for the animal rights movement. It also insures governmental recognition in the form of tax breaks, but--as McCarthy and Zald (1973) remind us--this in turn imposes intrinsic social control in the effort to keep their tax exempt status.

Fostering legislation to benefit animals and public education are still significant goals, but enforcement of existing laws is now of less importance. Groups such as PETA and the ASPCA still investigate reports of animal abuse, but the prime focus is now on promoting legislation and influencing public opinion to their cause. The emphasis of this legislation is no longer merely the prevention of cruelty toward animals.

Now the focus is on animal rights, as in the proposed Animal Bill of Rights, by which the Animal Legal Defense Fund (Tischler, n.d., p. 3) would promote animal's legal rights in the courts and in Congress.

Although the principal groups still rely on voluntary members to work toward their goals, the leadership and staff are professional. Both the early and the current animal rights organizations used their annual reports extensively to promote membership and funding. Early on, animal welfare societies recognized the importance of a staff to generate publicity for their cause. This trend has increased greatly and is crucial to organizations today. Nineteenth century humane societies depended mainly on their membership for funding. Contemporary animal welfare organizations, especially the large, traditional groups, rely to a considerable extent on endowments and foundations for their financial requirements. The increasing tendency toward professionalization in the animal rights movement, with paid leadership, professional staff supplanting voluntary members, and outside funding, illustrates the "bureaucratization of social discontent" (McCarthy & Zald, 1973, p. 3).

Since animals are its beneficiaries, the animal rights movement is unique: all of its members may be considered to be conscience constituents. This was also true of the earlier, as well as the contemporary, movement. Thus it is difficult to argue that conscience constituents are a particular feature of professionalized social movements as posited by McCarthy and Zald (1973). However, it may be that the increase in outside funding sources, as well as an expansion in the middle classes, allowed a wider range of people to participate in the contemporary

movement in contrast to the preponderance of elites in the earlier movement.

It is difficult to assess contemporary movement membership because of its diversity. Ryder (1989) observed that, for the first time in history, members of the contemporary animal rights movement came from all socio-economic classes. They also tended to be well-educated with groups located near university towns (p. 186). This lends some credence to the assertion of the importance that academe, intellectual leadership and the new class hold for modern social movements.

By 1890, in both the United States and Britain, the membership in the animal welfare movement was prominently female (Ryder, 1989, p. 174). A contemporary survey of animal rights activists in the United States indicated that most are educated, white and middle class. The majority are women and the average age is thirty. Although women predominate in the movement, men are overrepresented in leadership positions (Sperling, 1988, pp. 85-86).<sup>12</sup>

Splits within groups and charges and countercharges between large and small groups occurred in the early movement. Internecine warfare is still common in the current phase of the movement. New groups develop as leaders split from one group and form another. Kim Stallwood may be a prime example of a modern issue entrepreneur as he split from one established group in Britain and formed a new, more radical group. He then was invited to come to America and share his radical tactics with PETA. Even so, this also happened in the early movement. Caroline Earle White, while maintaining her position in more conventional groups, also founded a much more radical anti-vivisection society.

In both eras radicals accused moderates of inadequate or slow action, powerful groups contended for power within the movement, and small groups blamed large groups for bureaucratic inefficiency and waste. These features are exemplified in the current movement as Newkirk criticizes Spira's tactics, PETA and the ASPCA vie for power and influence within the movement, and diverse groups of all sizes and orientations compete for the opportunity to define the issue and speak for animals. This diversity could prove to be a mixed blessing for the animal rights movement; a variety of groups could strengthen the movement if each provided a complementary function. Decentralized, grassroots groups could provide increased mobilization at the local level, and centralized groups could act quickly and efficiently to respond to animal rights issues on a national, even international basis. However, a movement fragmented with so many disparate groups may easily splinter, or devote needed resources to fighting each other rather than the real adversary. Since the amount of divergence is much greater today, both the potential advantages and drawbacks of this diversity are magnified for the modern animal rights movement.

#### Strategy/Tactics and Countermovement Response

Nineteenth century leaders used direct action, speaking tours and media publicity to influence legislation and promote humane education. Not contented to rely completely on public media, they started their own magazines and used organizational reports to spread their message. It is noted that Angell kept his name and his cause in the news "with the acumen of a modern advertising specialist" (Coleman, 1924, p. 90).

Salt, like his later tactical counterpart, Spira, picked his targets carefully, and realized that he would not achieve his goals all at once (Turner, 1965, p. 238).

Contemporary leaders in the animal rights movement continued to use many of these same methods to advance their cause. However, the greater professionalization of protest and the growing influence of media have transformed social movement activity. It is argued that "as activists have adopted tactical means that gained greater public acceptance, they have also conceived innovative ways to graft new technologies onto traditional tasks" (Goldberg, 1991, p. 223). Media and social movements are much more intertwined today than in the past, and leaders have learned to exploit the media's need for news toward their own ends to a far greater extent than in the past.

The influence of the media on social movements can scarcely be exaggerated. Both the rewards and risks are very great. The media can confer legitimacy and credibility on the cause. It can mobilize members and resources. It can also harm a movement with negative publicity and cause internal tensions by making leaders into "instant media stars" (Goldberg, 1991, p. 226). Although early animal rights leaders valued and utilized the media as they contended with many of the same issues, the extensive electronic media coverage of today is perhaps the most significant tactical difference between the two movements. Because of its crucial impact on a social movement's ability to create images, it is predicted that "efforts to manipulate the media will continue to consume much time and effort" (Goldberg, 1991, p. 226).

McCarthy and Zald (1973) stressed the importance of the mass media as a resource: to build membership commitment, to achieve support for movement goals and to influence decision makers. They noted the power of the media to manipulate images of social problems and create the appearance of seething discontent. They warned that public perception may reflect media coverage rather than actual membership strength or intensity of grievances (pp. 18-19). The leaders of the current animal rights movement have used the media extensively to further their cause and sway public opinion. Animal rights must be considered good copy by the media because boycotts, demonstrations and controversies have been extensively covered by both television and the print media.

In fact, one report charged that "at the heart of the animal rights movement lies something we've all seen plenty of already: a feeding frenzy by an issue-starved, headline hungry media." The movement was called all "sound and fury" and it was suggested that rather than the estimated 10 million members, the "angry, attention-getting fringe boils down to fewer than 100 troublemakers" (Behar, 1989, p. 43).

Both early and current animal rights leaders faced public apathy and derision. Then and now, powerful vested interests fought back against any gains achieved by the movement. The strident contemporary debate over animal experimentation echoes many of the same themes from the nineteenth century anti-vivisection controversy. The scientific establishment argued that medical research was necessary and the benefits to humans outweigh the costs to animals. Animal rights activists, in both movements, alleged that scientific experimentation was clinically useless, or even dangerous. Leaders in both movements

maintained that even if it were useful, it was morally wrong.

Then and now, whistle-blowers within the scientific community would tell tales of horror and the medical community would retaliate with charges that animal rights advocates distort the truth. Science and medicine, in both the early and modern debate, asserted that scientific discretion and academic freedom were at stake. In each time period, the medical establishment attempted to form its own code of ethics to forestall government intervention. Animal rights activists countered with the indictment that powerful vested interests were at stake and contended for public opinion and the opportunity to define the issue to fit their image.

Both then and now, proponents of science and medicine expended a great deal of effort in an attempt to discredit animal rights advocates as they endeavored to counter the protests and publicity generated by the cause. Despite the years, there is very little difference between the contrasting window displays in the nineteenth century which asked "Which will you save--your child or a guinea pig?" and a contemporary article entitled, "Is a Lab Rat's Fate More Poignant Than a Child's?" (McCabe, 1988, p. 55). Advocates of the cause, in both eras, were labeled as misguided or dangerous cranks and their actions and tactics were denounced.

### Violence

The most significant difference between the contending factions in the early and modern animal rights debate is the growing level of violence. Although both early and current animal rights activists faced

threats against their lives, never before have opponents to animal rights been faced with such threats and intimidation. Researchers and merchants fear for their property and even their lives, and women wearing furs face harassment and confrontation. Despite the fact that the violence has so far been limited to property damage, the fear of violence is real and has resulted in various reactions from the scientific community, the public and the government.

Violence presents an ethical predicament for the contemporary animal rights movement. Just as it seemed ironic for Bergh to preach humanity and practice the use of physical force to achieve that end, modern activists are also faced with this seemingly paradoxical dilemma. Intellectual leaders, such as Singer and Ryder, acknowledged the frustration of radical activists over the pace of reform and admitted that a more militant movement appeared to be more successful. However, they cautioned that militancy may not only be politically ineffective, but betray the moral purpose of the movement.

The issue of violence is widely debated in the modern animal rights movement. Gamson (1975) contended that social protest in America is "liberally speckled with violence" (p. 72). Even though violence is thought to self-defeating, Gamson found that social movement organizations have a higher than average success rate if they use violence. He noted, however, that those who use such tactics must be clever enough to use it in situations in which public sentiment neutralizes the normal deviance of the action (p. 88).

Animal rights activists breaking into research laboratories, destroying equipment and liberating animals without public censure, may be



a prime example of this type of strategy. Violence as a strategy is a contentious topic in the animal rights movement at the present time. Some leaders argue that violence is never acceptable, others fear a public backlash. Some radical movement leaders warned that illegal acts, and perhaps even violence, will be necessary if reforms do not occur quickly. By contrast, Singer (1990) recommended the example of Gandhi and Martin Luther King. He insisted that "violence can only breed more violence" (p. xiii). So, despite the frustration and the apparent success of militancy, Singer argued against violence. He contended that "the strength of the case for Animal Liberation is its ethical commitment; we occupy the high moral ground and to abandon it is to play into the hands of those who oppose us." He continued, "It is in the rightness of our cause, and not the fear of our bombs, that our prospects of victory lie" (p. xiii).

The early anti-vivisection movement was successful in raising a controversial issue and converting some to their cause. However, few tangible goals were actually achieved. Singer (1990) acknowledged, as well, that while the contemporary animal rights movement is now a political and social reality, little actual impact has been made on animal exploitation (p. ix). It is too soon to predict whether the current animal rights movement will be more successful than its predecessor in the fulfillment of its ultimate goals in the face of similar, perhaps even more formidable, obstacles.

#### Two Movements or One?

Although modern movement leaders differ from their predecessors

in social class and level of professionalization, there are also exceptional similarities between them. Leaders in both movements faced comparable challenges in parallel ways. The charges leveled against them, the obstacles to their goals and the tactics they chose to combat their opponents are remarkably similar in both eras.

Apparent ideological differences, as well, mask enduring values from the early movement to the modern time. Although an underlying concern for animal well-being has undergone a progression from animal protection to welfare to rights, the basic concern remained constant. This regard for animals, whether in the early framework of humanity or the modern context of liberation, compelled leaders in both eras to a wider involvement in other social movements.

Animal rights organizations are more professionalized today and tactics are decidedly more sophisticated. As Gamson (1990) predicted, both the power of the media and the emphasis on violence are magnified in the modern movement. Again, however, basic similarities persist. The diversity of today's various groups reflects the variance of the early movement; inter-group, as well as inter-personal, rivalry is certainly not relegated to the past. Indeed, some of the original organizations still provide leadership for the contemporary animal rights movement. Even though the claims may be framed in a more political rhetoric in the contemporary animal rights movement, the values espoused, the goals sought and the opposition encountered are all remarkably analogous to those of the late 19th century movement.

Because of these similarities, and despite these differences, the new movement is linked to its predecessor. The contemporary animal

rights movement is neither new, nor entirely original. Its claims and ideology--as well as its basic organizational structure--have a history of at least one century.

Although it is commonly believed that the contemporary animal rights movement is a new social movement, similar to the environmental movement and unique to postmodern society, a socio-historical analysis casts doubt on that assumption. It makes sense--both historically and sociologically--to conceptualize the old and new manifestations of the animal rights movement as part of one continuous social movement. Steven Zawistowski, an official of the modern A.S.P.C.A., agrees: Even though the current animal rights is often thought to have emerged from the contemporary environmental movement; clearly due to its long history, it precedes many modern social movements (personal communication, February 10, 1991). He lamented the fact that the history of the animal rights movement is largely unknown by proponents and critics alike, and argued that it is an important, if uncelebrated, legacy for the movement. Contemporary animal rights activists focus on the present and envision the future. However, not only advocates, but opponents of the movement as well, might do well to look to the past for insight into the present and even future of the movement.

#### Implications

The most important point to be made from this study is that history matters, and that social movements cannot be appreciated or understood without taking an historical perspective. Having said this, it must be pointed out that this study was historically limited. While it examined

in detail the history of the animal rights movement, it did not systematically examine the temporal environment within which each movement existed. Such an analysis, far more ambitious than the one presented here, would be necessary for a better understanding of this case study.

This socio-historical analysis, though limited in scope and depth, did provide "conceptual lenses" through which to illuminate concerns of today with "meaningful happenings in the past" (Skocpol, 1984, p. 371). However, many questions remain. One of the objectives of this study was to shed light on the more general issues, particularly regarding social movements and social change. Thus, I now briefly consider the implications of my comparative-historical analysis for (a) resource mobilization theory, (b) social movements theory in general, and (c) our general conceptions of social change.

#### Resource Mobilization Theory

This theory, particularly its entrepreneurial variation, was the formative intellectual framework for this study. The findings herein are generally consistent with that perspective. There was a clear trend toward professionalization in leadership and organization as predicted by McCarthy and Zald (1973); issue entrepreneurs were found to be of crucial importance in articulating claims, and organizational structure seems to have been determinative in success or failure. Yet, my historical analysis uncovered contradictions in both eras. Some early groups show a strong tendency toward the professionalization model, and important modern organizations and leaders are exceptions to the entrepreneurial thesis. Moreover, issue entrepreneurs, dependent on

organizational status, might not have been as important as charismatic leaders, particularly in the early era. Empirical exceptions alert us to be attentive to the mixture of charismatic and entrepreneurial leadership in social movement, development and maintenance.

What is considered to be distinctive about modern social movements may actually mirror long-standing concerns, organizational structures, tactics and goals. Bureaucratic organizations, issue entrepreneurs and conscience constituents are not limited to social movements in modern society. The distinctive parallels--despite the expanse of years--between the animal rights movement in the last quarter of the 19th century and its counterpart today illustrate commonalities in both action and structure experienced by a social movement in different eras.

#### Social Movements Theory

This research does shed some light on certain unresolved issues concerning social movements, such as how social movements change over time, the impact of violence and how modern activists differ organizationally, tactically and demographically from their predecessors. Striking similarities between the two eras suggest that the animal rights movement of yesterday differs merely in degree with its 20th century counterpart. Unless the animal rights movement is somehow unique from other social movements, this implies that many so-called new social movements may not be so new after all. They may fade as intermediate goals are reached, mobilized resources are exhausted, and prominent leadership is co-opted, but they rise again as unresolved

claims resonate in similar social environments.

The emphasis on broader values and anti-technological focus of the current animal rights movement places it well within tradition of structural functional approaches; and the core of values espoused by animal rights activists seems similar to many of the so-called new social movements. The facts that these values and anti-technocratic views were also the focus of the earlier movement cast some doubt on the perception that they are somehow unique to modern new social movements. What may be different today--if not the extension of moral values and ambivalence concerning technology--is the concern with self-actualization and personal lifestyle change. While early animal rights activists advocated similar values, today these values are more often linked with a complete lifestyle.

#### Social Change

In an era of strong, centralized government and multinational corporate structures, it is assumed that new policy--social change--is promulgated almost exclusively within the political economy. Yet this study, and indeed all social movements research, shows that social change is more complex in its origins. For, outside of formal government, or outside of formal business structure, social movement organizations attempt to--and sometimes succeed in--effecting change. Of course, such movement organizations are influenced, perhaps strongly, by the political economy. Funding such advocacy, for example, is often dependent on capitalistic structures. Nonetheless, this study and those like it show that in order to understand social change in general, one must appreciate social movements--their leadership, their

ideology and their structure. To ignore this sector is to misunderstand social change in contemporary society.

### Conclusion

"All social movements," said Bertrand Russell "go too far" (quoted in Tavris, 1989, p. 273). The animal rights movement, both past and present, is no exception. Following Skocpol (1984), I have attempted not only to evaluate action and structure within its social and cultural context, but also to "take temporal sequences seriously in accounting for outcomes" (p. 1). Using Gamson's (1975, 1990) criteria for success or failure, the early movement was successful to a certain extent. While all of the goals for reform were not met, many new standards for animal welfare were initiated. However, the momentum of the early animal rights movement faded as the major organizations in the movement became part of the establishment when initial, moderate goals were met and visionary, charismatic leaders gave way to their less radical successors. This co-optation (to use Gamson's term) of the movement's goals makes the outcome ambiguous.

The fate of the early movement sheds light on the future of the current movement. The trend toward respectability and bureaucratization in the radical new organization, PETA, suggests that the current movement may share the same problems as its predecessor. Yet, outcomes need not be zero sum: various intermediate stages of success or failure are achieved by social movements organizations. Causes are often advanced, not only with the actual achievement of some tangible goals, but also because ideas that were once considered to be novel or exotic are now

considered normal. In this way, gains made by the earlier movement set the stage for future progress. What was once considered to be a radical proposal is no longer thought to be fanatical. Animal protection leads to animal welfare, which in turn progresses to animal rights.

One report suggested that the vehemence of charges and counter-charges regarding the vivisection question gave the controversy an appearance of greater importance in the early movement that was deserved (Shultz, 1924/1968, p. 161). This sounds similar to the "all sound and fury" charges made concerning the contemporary movement. The implication was also made that the early movement was unable to accomplish their goals, in part, because of their intemperate words and actions. Activists in the modern movement have acquired the reputation of fanatics, as well. This may not be all bad, however, because it is argued that zealots are necessary in social movements, not only to bring an unpopular cause before the public, but also to make the moderate view appear more reasonable (Greenfield, 1989, p. 78).

Tactical dilemmas vexed leaders during both periods. Tactics, such as publicity and confrontation, that were effective in the past are likely to be used to an even greater extent in the future. As in the past, however, this strategy is likely to be countered with an even more sophisticated response from their adversaries. The limited success of the earlier phase of the movement suggests that the modern movement will also face formidable obstacles as it attempts to reach even more revolutionary goals.

Just as they did in the past, internal divisions are apt to create friction within the movement and weaken its offensive. In the movement



at the present time, there is a great deal of talk regarding unity; however, in reality there are wide divisions between groups and feuds between rival intellectual and organizational leaders of the movement. There is vast disagreement over goals, tactics and ideology among individual leaders and between rival organizations. Even though at one level all share a basic concern for animals, there often appears to be no other commonality in the movement. Calls for unity in order to be the "voice of the voiceless" seem to fall on deaf ears as groups and individuals vie for the opportunity to define the issue and create the image of the animal rights movement in the 20th and 21st centuries. I consider this internal division to be a greater potential obstacle to the success of the movement than any external opposition from the public, interest groups and even the government.

Despite both internal and external obstacles, however, the animal rights movement has made great strides in recent years toward the goal of animal rights. Public opinion has shifted toward a much more positive view of the rights of animals, and the results of the movement have been felt in many segments of society. From vegetarian restaurants, to retail stores and research laboratories, the impact of the animal rights movement is evident.

Animal rights activists are convinced that, in spite of internal dissension and external deterrents, the animal rights movement will not only survive, but thrive. They are convinced that the time has come for the liberation of animals from human domination. Advocates believe that the movement will not only end exploitation of animals, but set a completely new moral tone for the next generation. With a

vision this bold, it is not surprising that animal rights activists vow to continue the struggle for however long it takes, and firmly believe that time is on their side.

In a speech at Hope College, Regan (1991) argued that there is a growing realization, among a new generation of activists, of a world beyond the human world that needs protection. This new generation--the "thee" generation, rather than the "me" generation of the eighties--blends the struggle for self-actualization with the struggle to protect, rather than exploit the world. Regan called this new generation good ambassadors for cultural change, and predicted that we are on the edge of significant moral and spiritual cultural change. Many animal rights advocates share Regan's optimistic view that the 1990s will be the decade of animal rights, and that animals can and will be liberated as the cornerstone of an enlarged moral vision of social justice.

It often seems as though animal rights activists and their opponents cannot communicate with one another. At issue is not just the rights of animals, but rather a whole world view on each side. Animal rights advocates--both past and present--envisioned a more natural world and believed our use of animals was but an expression of greed and waste in our throw-away, overly technological, capitalistic society. Opponents of animal rights saw the movement as an attack on the entire way of life in modern American society. The past suggests that the animal rights movement--indeed all social movements--faces formidable odds in its endeavor to liberate animals.

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Hobsbawm also warned that "most sociologists make bad historians" (1988, p. 22).

<sup>2</sup>McCarthy and Zald (1973) hasten to add, however, that while the overwhelming trend toward the professionalization of social movements is new, and presents a sharp break with the past, there have always been movement entrepreneurs and "some earlier movements closely resemble the professional movement" (p. 20).

<sup>3</sup>See Sperling (1988) for a comparative study of the Victorian and contemporary anti-vivisection movements.

<sup>4</sup>One writer noted that Bergh will be remembered for his humane work rather than for his literary accomplishments, since only one of his plays, Hard Sex, was produced in America, and then, privately! (Coleman, 1924, p. 61).

<sup>5</sup>It is not surprising that the foremost proponent of the anti-vivisection movement in America, as in Britain, was a woman. Women were predominant in the Victorian anti-vivisection movement and links were often made between the treatment of animals and the treatment of women (Sperling, 1988, p. 42).

<sup>6</sup>Ryder (1989, p. 299) contended that it was fortunate Singer published this book while on a temporary teaching assignment in New York since most earlier British works on the subject were not published in the United States. He traced the new concern for animal rights in America directly to the 1975 publication of Singer's book.

<sup>7</sup>One reason for the limited appeal of the book was the fact that Salt's condemnation of keeping pets was not in conformity with the prevailing sentiments of the time (Lansbury, 1985, p. 170).

<sup>8</sup>According to Coleman (1924, p. 118), the date is 1877.

<sup>9</sup>There was a world-wide movement against vivisection. Every country in which animals were used in medical research had an organized opposition that sought to restrict or abolish this practice through legislation. Even though some restrictive legislation was passed, no organization realized its goals in any country (McCrea, 1910/1969, p. 123). Anti-vivisection efforts were more productive in England than elsewhere. The 1876 act to amend the law relating to cruelty to animals was the only legislation in the world restricting the experimental use of animals in research (Lansbury, 1985, p. 9). Anti-vivisection legislation may have achieved more success in England because the movement was backed by the Queen, the Church and aristocracy (Ryder, 1989, p. 169).

<sup>10</sup>In England, where the Anti-Vivisection Council set up a display in one shop window depicting the horrors of animal experimentation, the Research Defense Society countered with pictures of Pasteur and a smiling mother and child in the next window. A caption under the photograph asks, "Which will you save--your child or a guinea pig?" (Lansbury, 1985, p. 24).

<sup>11</sup>Alvin Gouldner (1979) drew a distinction within the new class between intellectuals and intelligentsia. The former, trained in the humanistic tradition, are principally located within the university; the latter, trained in the scientific tradition, are typically employed in

the private sector. In the animal rights movement, as Gouldner would have predicted, it is the intellectuals, not the intelligentsia, who are in leadership positions.

<sup>12</sup>The Victorian anti-vivisection movement was an exception, because unlike traditional societies, women held leadership positions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, J. (1988, May 23). Emptying the cages. Newsweek, pp. 59-60.
- American Medical Association Council on Scientific Affairs. (1989). Animals in research. Journal of the American Medical Association, 261(24), 3602-3606.
- American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. (1989). Annual Report. (Available from ASPCA National Headquarters, 441 East 92nd Street, New York, NY 10128).
- The Animal Rights Reporter. (1990). Group profile: People for the ethical treatment of animals, Part II. 2(4), 3-4. Washington, DC: Perceptions Press.
- Bass, P. (1984, October 28). A rallying point for animal rights XXIII. New York Times, p. 1.
- Beck, M. (1988, December 26). The growing furor over fur: A brutal status symbol? Newsweek, pp. 52-53.
- Behar, R. (1989, March 20). Meet the meatless. Forbes, p. 44.
- Bishop, K. (1988, January 19). Growing militancy for animal rights is seen. New York Times, pp. 1, 14.
- Bishop, K. (1989, January 14). From shop to lab to farm, animal rights battle is felt. New York Times, pp. 1, 7.
- Bleiberg, R. (1989, November 13). Animal worship II: The threat to U.S. health and welfare mounts. Barron's, p. 9.
- Boyce, J. (1985, September 6). How much pain is a cure worth? Christianity Today, pp. 35-38.
- Buechler, S. (1990). Women's movements in the United States: Woman suffrage, equal rights, and beyond. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Burek, D. (Ed.). (1991). Encyclopedia of Associations (25th ed.). Detroit, MI: Gale Research.
- Carson, G. (1972). Men, beasts, and gods. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Chui, G. (1988, March). Activists beset U.C., Stanford labs. Science, pp. 1229-1232.

- Coleman, S. H. (1924). Humane society leaders in America. Albany, NY: The American Humane Association.
- Cowley, G. (1988, December 26). Of pain and progress. Newsweek, pp. 50-59.
- Culliton, B. (1989, April). Wyngaarden to leave NIH. Science, p. 414.
- Dewsbury, D. (1990). Early interactions between animal psychologists and animal activists and the founding of the APA committee on precautions in animal experimentation. American Psychologist, 45(3), 315-327.
- Ecenbarger, W. (1985, February). The guru of animal rights. Esquire, p. 66.
- Feder, B. J. (1989, November 26). Pressuring Perdue. New York Times, pp. VI 32, 35, 60, 72-73.
- Freeman, J. (Ed.). (1983). The social movements of the 1960's and 1970's. New York: Longmans.
- French, R. (1975). Anti-vivisection and medical science in Victorian society. Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press.
- Gamson, W. (1975). The strategy of social protest (1st ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gamson, W. (1990). The strategy of social protest (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gerlach, L. (1983). Movements of revolutionary change: Some structural characteristics. In J. Freeman (Ed.) The social movements of the 1960's and 1970's (pp. 133-147). New York: Longmans.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Goldberg, R. (1991). Grassroots resistance: Social movements in twentieth century America. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Goodwin, F. (1990). From the alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health administration. Journal of the American Medical Association, 263(7), 936.
- Greenfield, M. (1989, April 17). In defense of the animals. Newsweek, p. 78.
- Heberle, R. (1951). Social movements: An introduction to political sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

- Henshaw, D. (1989). Animal warfare: The story of the animal Liberation front. London: Fontana/Collins.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1988). History from below: Some reflections. In F. Krantz (Ed.), History from below (p. 22). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Holden, C. (1989, April). A preemptive strike for animal research. Science, pp. 415-416.
- Jenkins, C. (1983). Mobilization theory and the study of social movements. American Review of Sociology, 3(9), 527-553.
- Johnson, K. (1988, November 13). Arrest points of split in animal-rights movement. New York Times, pp. 1-4.
- Kullberg, J. (n.d.). 1991 ASPCA Animal Protection Survey. New York: The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.
- Kullberg, J. (1989). The ASPCA Annual Report. New York: The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.
- Lansbury, C. (1985). The old brown dog: Women, workers, and vivisection in Edwardian England. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lauer, M. (1984, April). A champion of animal rights. The Progressive, pp. 14-15.
- Lyall, S. (1988, November 22). Pressed on animal rights, research gives up grant II. New York Times, pp. 2-5.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1988). Social movements. In N. Smelser (Ed.), The handbook of sociology (pp. 695-737). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McCabe, J. (1988, December 26). Is a lab rat's fate more poignant than a child's? Newsweek, p. 55.
- McCabe, K. (1990, February). Beyond cruelty. The Washingtonian, pp. 72-77, 185-195.
- McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1973). The trend of social movements in America: Professionalization and resource mobilization. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- McCrea, F., & Markle, G. (1989). Minutes to midnight: Nuclear weapons protest in America. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McCrea, R. (1969). The humane movement. New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1910)



- Mulhorn, B. (1990, April 16). AMA targets radical animal rights activists. (Madison, Wisconsin). Capital Times, [Newsbank, Inc., Microfiche SCI 19:A1]
- Newkirk, I. (1990). Save the animals: 101 easy things you can do. New York: Warner Books.
- Pacheco, A. (1986). The Silver Springs monkeys. In P. Singer (Ed.), In defense of animals (pp. 135-147). New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Pacheco, A. [PETA Chairperson]. (n.d.). [Letter accompanying "Petition to stop the cruelty."] Washington, DC: People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals.
- People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. (1990). PETA Annual Review. (Available from PETA, PO Box 42516, Washington, DC 20015).
- People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. (n.d.). PETA Factsheet Miscellaneous #2. PETA history: Compassion in action. (Available from PETA, PO Box 42516, Washington, DC 20015).
- Pins, K. (1990, July 15). Animal rights group puts issue on front burner. Des Moines (Iowa) Register. [Newsbank, Inc. Microfiche ENV 65:A2]
- Price, J. (1990, March 1). Crimes by animal activists prompt call for federal law. The Washington (D.C.) Times. [Newsbank, Inc. Microfiche SCI 10:A11]
- Reed, J. (1989, December 18). The furor over wearing furs. Time, p. 72.
- Reed, S. (1990, October 22). Activist Ingrid Newkirk fights passionately for the rights of animals: Some critics say humans may suffer. People Weekly, pp. 59, 61-62.
- Regan, T. (1982). All that dwell therein: Essays on animal rights and environmental ethics. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Regan, T. (1983). The case for animal rights. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Regan, T. (1991, October). Animal rights in the 'we' generation. Paper presented at Hope College, Holland, MI.
- Regan, T., & Singer, P. (Ed.). (1976). Animal rights and human obligations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ritvo, H. (1984). Plus can change: Anti-vivisection then and now. Bioscience, 34(10), 626-634.

- Roberts, R., & Kloss, R. (1974). Social movements: Between the balcony and the barricade. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Rosenberger, J. (1990, January 15). Whose life is it anyway? New York, p. 72.
- Ryder, R. (1970). Speciesism. Oxford: Ryder.
- Ryder, R. (1983). Victims of science: The use of animals in research. London: Davis-Poynter
- Ryder, R. (1989). Animal revolution: Changing attitudes toward speciesism. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Salt, H. (1894). Animals' rights considered in relation to social progress. New York: Macmillan.
- Scott, A. (1990). Ideology and the new social movements. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Shultz, W. (1968). The humane movement in the United States, 1910-1922. New York: AMS Press. (Original work published 1924)
- Siegel, S. (1989, November/December). Grassroots opposition to animal exploitation. The Hastings Center Report, 19, 37-40.
- Singer, P. (1975). Animal liberation: A new ethics for our treatment of animals (1st ed.). New York: Random House.
- Singer, P. (Ed.). (1986). In defense of animals. New York: Harper & Row.
- Singer, P. (1990). Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- Skocpol, T. (Ed.) (1984). Vision and method in historical sociology. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Smelser, N. (1962). Theory of collective behavior. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, D. (1990, October 15). Animal testing feels the heat. The Christian Science Monitor, p. 12.
- Sperling, S. (1988). Animal liberators: Research and morality. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Spira, H. (1985). Fighting to win. In P. Singer (Ed.), In defense of animals (pp. 194-208). New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Stafford, T. (1990, June 18). Animal lib. Christianity Today, pp. 18-20.

- Stanley, D. (1988, February 15). Animal rights might grow. Sacramento (California) Bee, [Newsbank, Inc. Microfiche ENV19:E11].
- Starr, D. (1984). Equal rights. Audubon, 86(6), 30, 32-35.
- Tavris, C. (1989). Anger: The misunderstood emotion. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Tester, K. (1991). Animals and society: The humanity of animal rights. London: Routledge.
- Tischler, J. [Executive Director]. (n.d.). [Letter accompanying "Animal Bill of Rights: A petition to the 102nd United States Congress."] Washington, DC: Animal Legal Defense Fund.
- Turner, E. S. (1965). All heaven in a rage. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Vaughan, C. (1988). Animal research: Ten years under siege. Bioscience, 38(1), 10-13.
- The year's 25 most fascinating business people. (1990, January). Fortune, p. 70.
- Windeatt, P. (1986). They clearly now see the link: Militant voices. In P. Singer (Ed.), In defense of animals (pp. 179-193). New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Zawistowski, S. (February, 1991). Personal communication.