



FEMINISTS FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS

\$3.50

Semiannual Publication • Volume VIII • Nos. 3-4 • Fall-Winter 1994-95

PETA and a Pornographic Culture

A Feminist Analysis of "I'd rather go naked than wear fur"

by Cathleen and Colleen McGuire

While we greatly respect PETA's formidable work on behalf of animals, the "I'd rather go naked than wear fur" ad campaign strikes us as disturbing and problematic, as does PETA's acceptance of money generated from soft-core pornography. Joining the ranks now of Kim Basinger, Christy Turlington, and other top models who have posed nude for the PETA billboards is Patti Davis, daughter of Ronald Reagan. Davis has chosen to pose with Hugh Hefner's dog no less, and also has agreed to donate half her fee from a recent *Playboy* spread to PETA.

In a letter of support for PETA's actions, Ingrid Newkirk makes the classic assumption that activists who counter oppressive images of women in the media believe "all depictions of female nudity are

categorically wrong." This is the so-called "neo-Victorian feminist" charge constantly hurled at us. We do *not* have a "blanket condemnation of female nudity." What we do have is a developed understanding of when certain portrayals of nudity perpetuate the objectification and debasement of women. We want to see more images like ancient goddess ones of strong women with upraised arms, standing tall. We do not need another tired cheesecake shot of a naked woman flat on her back with a lobotomized "come hither" look.

Newkirk understands the problems presented by *Cosmopolitan* covers, yet is convinced that the PETA campaign does not fall in this category. Frankly, we could barely tell the difference between a recent *Fur Age Weekly* ad and PETA's ad. Both

(continued on page 9)

by Carol Adams

Many of us in *Feminists for Animal Rights* have strong feelings about the PETA ad campaign, and I want to share some of the concerns that arise from someone like me, positioned squarely both in the feminist movement and the animal defense movement.

1. A connection exists between the treatment of women and the treatment of animals. This connection is basically an epistemological process in which a subject knows her or himself through objectifying others. Philosophically speaking, epistemology refers to how we know what we know and how we gain knowledge. A patriarchal epistemology responds to difference (such as race, sex, species) by labelling those who are different as "other," and then objectifying those who are "others," so that they may be used instrumentally. Ecofeminists call this a "value hierarchy," in which power is inscribed over

(continued on page 8)

INSIDE THIS ISSUE . . .

- Blaming the Victims
- Hunting the Hunters, Women Hunt Saboteurs
- Mothering, Caring, and Animal Liberation
- The Politics of Snails
- Poetry
- Will the GATT Threaten Animals?

Plus News, Resources, and more



Photo by Vito Torelli

FAR contingent in the 1993 New York City Fur-Free Friday march

EDITORIAL COMMENT

PETA Tarnishes Its Own Good Name

The *FAR Newsletter* represents a plurality of opinions. The articles do not necessarily reflect an official position of the publication or of FAR.

Submissions of manuscripts and graphics by women are welcomed. Manuscripts should be typed and double spaced. FAR reserves the right to edit manuscripts received for length, clarity, and grammar.

Semiannual Publication Volume VIII • Nos. 3-4 Fall - Winter 1994-95

Batya Bauman, FAR President
Lisa Finlay, FAR Director

Editorial Committee

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

Production

Lisa Finlay

FAR Steering Committee

Batya Bauman
Virginia Kallianes
Marilyne Mason
Sheila Richardson

FAR Regional Coordinators

Atlanta, GA
Denise Messina
(404) 943-4210
Austin, TX
Delora Wisemoun
(512) 477-6002
Decatur, IL
Margaret Ford
(217) 428-1214
Durham, NC
Lisa Robinson Bailey
(919) 361-5991
Ithaca, NY
Laurel Hodkin
(607) 272-4873
Seattle, WA
Claudine Erlandson
(206) 363-4987
Winter Park, FL
Barbara Oshel
(407) 657-1772

Advisory Board

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

We cannot condone or ignore PETA's mistaken notion that their "I'd rather go naked than wear fur" campaign is an appropriate action, especially in a movement which is comprised of some 75 percent women. Having a woman pose naked as what Cathleen and Colleen McGuire call "an impossibly perfect object" in order to sell an idea (or a product) is not what we consider a responsible or appropriate tactic, regardless of our shared goal to forever stop the murder of animals for their fur.

We should have seen the handwriting on the wall when this tactic was first employed a couple of years ago as a relatively harmless—even amusing—little stunt. Then, both men and women of all sizes and shapes, on a very cold Fur-Free Friday November day in New York City, wrapped only in towels, proclaimed, "I'd rather go naked than wear fur." But PETA has now escalated the tactic into pornography and got themselves into bed with Hugh Hefner and *Playboy* magazine. In PETA's latest ad, Patti Davis poses naked with Mr. Hefner's dog, and PETA uses this image in collusion with *Playboy* in their anti-fur campaign. Both Carol Adams and Cathleen and Colleen McGuire write eloquently in this issue about just what is wrong with this image.

FAR has worked long and hard to try to inculcate in the animal advocacy movement, as well as in the feminist movement, an understanding of the connections in patriarchal society between the objectification—leading to the exploitation and abuse—of both women and animals; the source of this abuse is the same for both. We speak out in both places: when women are objectified and exploited in the animal advocacy movement, and when the objectification and exploitation of animals is glorified in the feminist movement. (We spoke out vehemently when *Ms.* magazine published an article glorifying rodeo women, thus legitimating the cruelty of rodeos. It is to the credit of the women at *Ms.* that they understood our concerns immediately and vowed to be more sensitive to the issues of animal exploitation. That sensitivity and awareness has subsequently been reflected in the pages of *Ms.*.) PETA's

working in cahoots with the likes of *Playboy* magazine is insulting to us as a feminist organization and as an animal advocacy organization, and it grossly undermines the work we have been doing in both movements.

We already have evidence of harmful fallout from the PETA "naked" campaign—see my column, "Blaming the Victims." In addition, PETA has provided grist to the fur fashion industry that is exploiting the "naked" campaign in order to sell fur to gay men and project fur as an important gay fashion statement. In the Summer 1994 issue of *MetroSource*, a widely-read gay men's magazine, timed to appear in conjunction with the largest gay and lesbian rights celebration ever, when hundreds of thousands (some estimate over a million) of gay men and lesbians converged on New York City, an ad appeared which parodied the PETA campaign: "I'D RATHER BE NAKED ON A FUR!" The ad shows a naked (presumably) gay man lying on what appears to be a very large fur rug or bedspread. The ad also directs the reader to another page where a full-page color ad appears with a (presumably) gay man wearing a "Wild type Mink-lined Classic American Denim Jacket," courtesy of Gus Goodman Fine Furs.

I would say the "naked" campaign is backfiring and negating a lot of the work many of us in the animal advocacy movement—including PETA—have been doing over the years to stop the killing of animals for their fur. One thing is certain, this campaign does not help FAR in our work with other feminists.

We have long respected and supported PETA. In fact, many FAR members also belong to PETA. There is no doubt that PETA has been in the forefront when it comes to publicly exposing the myriad atrocities perpetrated against animals, and there is no doubt, in our minds anyway, of PETA's total commitment to eradicating animal abuse and suffering. We derive no joy from the outpouring of communications we have been receiving condemning PETA for their current action. But as dedicated as we are to stopping the abuse of animals—and in this case, to putting an end

(continued on page 3)

BLAMING THE VICTIMS

We find WHISPER'S (Women Hurt in Systems of Prostitution Engaged in Revolt) response to PETA's "naked" ad campaign disturbing and distressing. (See accompanying reproduction of a flyer circulated by them.) WHISPER is a St. Paul, Minnesota-based anti-pornography group of feminists whose work promotes alternatives to prostitution for women who are unskilled and untrained—certainly an admirable effort. Women from WHISPER have been distributing leaflets which criticize PETA, and also blame the animals. We find it odd and inconsistent that a group with such an advanced consciousness would deem it necessary to blame the victims, in this case, the animals who are murdered so that their skins can be draped over the backs of humans. The flyer reads: "We won't bare our ass to save their skin."

It is not the animals' fault that PETA has displayed such gross disregard for women in the "naked" campaign. The animals are innocent victims. It is unfortunate that our efforts to make clear the connections between patriarchal oppression of both women and animals were not reflected by WHISPER, and upsetting that they seem not to get it. For their benefit, here it is again: *The oppression of women and of animals comes from the same source—patriarchal, hierarchical domination and control.* We suggest they read some of the books which we list (p.18), and some of the hundreds of entries in the *FAR Bibliography*, most overwhelmingly steeped in radical feminist and ecofeminist theory.

It simply is not a question of either or: either we advocate for women or we advocate for animals. This is the wrong analysis. We advocate for both—and at one and the same time—and we insist that the connections be made. As radical ecofeminists, we refuse to be hierarchical about it, perceiving humans as more important than other animals, or visa versa.

Many people in the animal advocacy movement—among them highly-visible men—have come to understand and to accept our analysis and, as a result, are very sensitive to women's issues. Some of these men joined with FAR this past July in a speakout against PETA's "naked" ad campaign at The National Alliance for Animals Conference, the largest animal advocacy

gathering of the year. Lisa Finlay, national director of FAR, and Gary Francione, long-time animal rights activist and spokesperson, let the gathering know, in no uncertain terms, that the PETA campaign is wrong and that it is harmful to women. Many other animal advocates participated at the speakout against the ad. Others, notably Ken Shapiro, Director of Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, spoke out in plenary sessions—as addenda to their scheduled speeches—to some 700 attendees at the NAA Conference. PETA's objectionable ad campaign simply is not supported by the majority in the animal rights movement.

BOYCOTT PETA



We won't BARE our ass
to save their SKIN!!

Send this message to: Ingrid Newkirk
PeTA, P.O. Box 42516
Washington, D.C. 20015

Hopefully, we can enter into a dialogue with our sisters at WHISPER and make clear our position that, by advocating for animals, we are not advocating against women. We have to stress to them that blaming the victim is wrong, whether it be a woman forced into prostitution for economic survival by a system that creates this situation while it reviles her; a woman who is raped and/or battered; a child who is the victim of sexual abuse; or an animal who has been murdered for human conspicuous consumption. PETA should be held accountable, not the animals, and the slogan, "We won't BARE our ass to save their SKIN!!" coming from a feminist group is entirely inappropriate and misdirected.

BB

(continued from previous page)

to the wearing of fur by both women and men—we cannot condone a method that objectifies women in this way.

We continue to support those PETA campaigns we find good and useful. But not only do we not support the "I'd rather go naked than wear fur" campaign, we also must distance ourselves from it and speak out against it. This we will do at every opportunity until PETA understands how they have severely overstepped the boundaries of respect toward women, and until they publicly admit their error and rescind the ad.

Batya Bauman

Jolene Marion
1941 - 1994

We are saddened by her death
and empowered by her life.

FUR-FREE FRIDAY

The Traditional "Fur-Free Friday" celebration will take place again this year in New York City and in other places throughout the country. In New York City, we, along with many other groups, will gather for a demonstration outside the offices of the Council of Fashion Designers of America, which is located in the heart of New York City's fashion district at 1412 Broadway between 39th and 40th Streets, on Friday, November 25th, 1994, at 10:30 a.m. We will then march to a rally at Central Park West and 59th Street (Columbus Circle). Please join us behind the FAR banner, and, remember, FAR participates not to insult women who wear fur, but to condemn—and hopefully put out of business—the fur industry that tries to dictate to women how they should look and what they should wear, and that is ultimately responsible for the agonizing lives and deaths of millions of animals. We hope to see you there. Call us for further information: 212-866-6422.

LETTERS



HUMANE LEGISLATION NOT HUMANE

I am glad you raised the question of what our relationship should be to matters of reform and humane legislation. As animal rights advocates and people with a care ethic, Feminists for Animal Rights are, of course, committed to individual animals caught in industries of animal abuse. We do care about lessening the suffering of these animals. The concern is that in the process of trying to help animals whom we cannot fully or immediately liberate, we not reinforce industries of animal abuse.

In an article in *Animals' Agenda*, Gary Francione pointed out that such humane legislation as stun guns and more comfortable cages would actually benefit industries of animal abuse by making them less wasteful and more profitable. In order that our efforts do not inadvertently bolster the industries of abuse, any legislation we seek must constitute a prohibition on some form of abuse, not just a change in the way an abuse is carried out. Legislation must detract from the notion that animals are property and firmly support the notion of animal rights.

In my own terms, we must be sure that what we are supporting is the idea that animals in human societies have rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of their own kinds of happiness. Or, we might ask in each case, Does a particular piece of legislation help us clarify how we should be in relationship to other animals, or does it further obscure what that relationship should be? In this context, we may wonder whether Farm Sanctuary's efforts on behalf of "downed animals" does or does not ultimately support the "food animal" industry. Personally, I am not sure, but I think it would be an interesting case for debate.

My other concern is that humane legislation may bolster industries of animal abuse by salving the public conscience. I can imagine people supposing that if a cow is rendered unconscious before its throat is slit, there is no moral problem with killing her. Instead of focusing on stun guns, etc., I think we would do better to stay focused on our goal, which is not to lessen suffering but to restore full dignity to all animals whose lives are caught up with our own in the societies we have created.

Furthermore, it is not true that humane legislation will at least lessen animal suffering in the immediate future because humane legislation is never achieved quickly. Thus, it may require no greater expenditure of time to educate people and change public opinion regarding our overall relationship to animals. Of course, changing our conceptions of animals is more intellectually and morally challenging

than simply trying to effect humane legislation, but, it is women, after all, who have believed in the power of words and education to change the heart by informing the head and vice versa.

Finally, women must be careful. Our much acclaimed ability to compromise and "see the other side" can work against animal liberation. In certain cases, we must be willing to say plainly that there is nothing of merit to see the other side. Our opponents may simply be liars (as when animal abusers claim to care about animal welfare), and we must be willing to expose them. Regarding compromise, Aristotle perhaps put it best when he said that even the Golden Mean (the middle way between two extremes) had its limits. There was, he said, no right time or right place or right way to commit an unjust killing (and we might add, torture!), and nothing Feminists for Animal Rights does should encourage the public to suppose there is. Not only are animals' lives and dignity at stake, but women's care ethic must not be made a mockery of by being put in the service of the status quo. It is, after all, no advance for civilization if a cannibal uses a fork!

Mary Crane
Los Angeles, CA

VEGETARIAN, YES; PREMARIN, NO!

Enclosed is my membership renewal check. The article on Premarin was very good—and upsetting. I hope as women learn about the cruelty of this drug they will refuse to use it. I particularly like the letter from Karen Davis on the true meaning of vegetarianism. Too often I give in and eat a little brownie or cake my mom has made, but she's right, it's {eggs and dairy} really just as bad as eating the actual flesh of the animal and I don't intend to let it happen again. Thanks for putting women and animals together—our struggles are one.

Mary McMahon
St. Louis, Missouri

SHELTERS IN NEW MEXICO

I was so pleased to see the article in your Spring-Summer 1994 issue on establishing shelter for the companion animals of battered women. I had never thought about the need for such a service, despite the fact that I have been involved in animal rights work for about 10 years. Once I read the article, I decided that our organization should definitely add this to the list of services that we provide in the New Mexico community. Therefore, please send us your "Guidelines for Starting a Program for Animals in Danger of Battering."

Please know how grateful we are that you

have not only publicized this need, but also made these guidelines available. You are doing tremendous work. Thank you so much. I look forward to receiving your information and getting this program off the ground in New Mexico. I expect that we will start in Albuquerque and Santa Fe, and then perhaps expand to other communities. Once again, thank you for all you do.

Elisabeth Jennings
Executive Director
Sangre de Cristo Animal
Protection, Inc
Albuquerque, NM

(ED: Copies of "Guidelines for Starting a Program for Animals in Danger of Battering" are available for \$1.00 from FAR, P.O. Box 16425, Chapel Hill, NC 27516. Telephone: 919-286-7333.)

SUPPORT FOR FAR

I run a non-profit large animal refuge in Maryland. Since July, 1993, I have taken in horses, sheep, goats and potbellied pigs. I recently met Jim Brewer from PIGS Sanctuary and we have been working together ever since. Jim told me about your organization and I was *thrilled* to hear of your existence. I read "The Sexual Politics of Meat" and have been thinking about the correlation between society's treatment of animals and women ever since. The analogy seems so obvious; yet, I realize it is quite complex and politically charged. I just want to lend my support and to tell you that I truly believe in your position, and to say that I would like to help in any way that I can. I agree with Jim that your position is "the future of animal rights" and, I would add, the sanest and most reasonable approach to the problem I have yet heard. I enclose a check for membership in FAR.

Cathy Gaynor
Heron Run Refuge, Inc.
Elkridge, MD

We received your newsletter, which in our opinion is very good and interesting. We are involved in two collectives: one for animal rights and the other one is a women's group. So we have many things in common with you. We would also ask your permission to translate and publish some articles. We hope that we can stay in contact and exchange materials and ideas. We wish you love and liberation.

Susan Mulibu
Naturanimal
Apartado 40
2801 Alameda Codes, Portugal

HUNTING THE HUNTERS: Women Hunt Saboteurs

by Heidi Prescott

In his 1974 book, *Man Kind?* Cleveland Amory, founder and president of The Fund for Animals, satirically proposed the creation of a "Hunt-The-Hunters" hunt club. Little did he realize that 20 years later "hunting hunters" would be one of the Fund's most publicized tactics in its campaign to abolish sport hunting.

When it comes to fighting hunting, I find direct intervention at the killing site to be the most personally empowering tactic. Direct action against hunting, sometimes known as field protests, hunt sabotages, hunt disruptions, hunter educational experiences, or "huntus interruptus," can be any activity at the hunting grounds that interferes with a hunter's ability to kill wild animals. Hunting is easily hindered by non-violent tactics such as casual chitchat, sniffing, coughing, or any type of motion. Even just smelling like a human overrides the deer-urine "perfume" hunters often wear to mask their own odor. The latter makes sense because every hunting magazine is full of advertisements for products which disguise hunters' presence.

We really don't need to do much to keep some species of wild animals away—from hunters. Depending on the target species, activists may employ a variety of different tactics. In the case of duck hunting, for example, activists can walk around creating motion so that ducks will not land on ponds where hunters have set up their duck blinds. Any type of motion will suffice, boating, swimming, or even flying kites. During deer-hunting season, activists may directly accompany a hunter, rustling leaves and twigs with their feet (inadvertently, of course) and talking to him (or her, although 92 percent of hunters are male). The woods are one place where our peaceful presence is more powerful than guns, bullets, or bows and arrows.

Some people wonder why we want to do something as perverse as stopping them from hunting when hunters so beneficently protect us from animal overpopulation while creating unusual art by hanging heads on their walls. In reality, hunters and wildlife managers continually manipulate animal populations to make sure there will always be plenty of live targets for "sport" hunters to shoot. For example, state wild-

life agencies continually persecute predators; after all, every deer or rabbit eaten by a coyote or cougar is potentially one less hunting license sold.

I actually believed many of the justifications for hunting until I took a workshop describing how our wildlife is owned and managed by and for hunters. After my rude awakening, I took my first step toward acting on my beliefs by organizing Maryland's first hunt disruption on the open-

ing day of deer bowhunting season in 1989. Bowhunting is a quiet activity during which hunters must sit still for long periods of time waiting for deer to come close enough to shoot them. On this particular day we turned many hunters away, and, best of all, not one animal was killed in the area we protected. I was immediately hooked on the tactic and followed The Fund for Animals on field protests from Kentucky to Connecticut. I began training grassroots activ-

(continued on page 12)



Every forest holds magic; wolf, raven, bear

© Sudie Rakusin 1984

BOOK REVIEW

Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals. By Carol Adams. New York: Continuum, 1994, 256 pp. \$24.95 (cloth).

Reviewed by Linda Vance

Since the publication of *The Sexual Politics of Meat*, in 1990, Carol Adams has been recognized as one of the leading theorists in both the animal defense and feminist movements. But anyone wanting to follow the evolution of her thought has been hard-pressed to do so: like most academic explorations of animal rights, Adams's work has been scattered among a wide array of journals and anthologies. This collection of ten essays, most of which were originally published in the past five years, will make it possible for her fans and critics to explore the best of her work in a single volume.

Adams has been an activist in anti-racist, domestic violence and animal defense movements for over twenty years. This experience grounds her philosophy and theology, and, in fact, forms the basis for her core idea: that patriarchal ideologies of domination and control lead to multiple and interlocking oppressions of women, people of color and animals. The essays in Part 1 of the book, "Examining the Arrogant Eye," develop this core idea in detail. Covering meat eating, animal experimentation, abortion rights and the links between racism and speciesism, the four essays demonstrate that there is nothing "natural" about human exploitation of animals, but that it is, rather, a purely cultural practice, and one which promotes oppressive dualisms of Self and Other, male and female, reason and emotion, mind and body.

Feminists in general have accepted the idea of interlocking oppressions, but have been a little slow to recognize the oppression of animals as one of them. While arguing that race and gender are culturally constructed, and not natural divisions, they have chosen to regard species as a given. Meat eating, many of them say, is no more than a matter of individual choice. In Part 2, "'We are One Lesson': Transforming Feminist Theory," Adams makes explicit connections between patriarchal domination of woman and of animals, and argues

forcefully and convincingly that apparently personal choices are, in fact, deeply political ones. Readers who have wrangled with non-vegetarian friends over these issues will especially appreciate both "Ecofeminism and the Eating of Animals" and "The Feminist Traffic in Animals." The first is a lucid and persuasive presentation of the case for feminists being vegetarians. The second calls for feminist conferences to embrace vegetarian-only meal plans, a suggestion which has, historically, thrown meat-eating feminists into an apoplectic rage, as though opportunities to consume dead flesh were the hallmark of personal freedom. In the end, says Adams, "the issue is not whether a community can forbid an action, but who is to be protected from being consumed." (122)

Adams's formal academic training is in theology, which is the focus of the essays in Part 3, "From Misery to Grace." Again drawing on her experience in anti-racist and domestic violence struggles, she urges us to expand our notion of "peace politics" to the home and to fight for an end to institutionalized violence of all kinds, including violence against animals. God isn't some old white man in the sky, beaming down on his creation; whatever God might be is something that unfolds in relationships, and until we eliminate practices which sever relationships—like the eating of animals—God, or the sacred, will remain elusive.

For me, the most useful essay in the collection was "Abortion Rights and Animal Rights." Feminist animal defenders are all-too-frequently called upon to explain how we can be sympathetic to a chicken, veal calf, fish, etc, but "indifferent" to a human fetus. Or, put another, cruder way—as it usually is—if we are willing to kill fetuses as a matter of "choice," why can't we kill animals? Adams brings these questions into perspective. First, she says, "pregnancy is unreproducible as a moral issue—there is no analogous rights situation to that of a woman who is carrying a fetus within her." (57) But in fact, she continues, there *are* parallels between abortion rights and animal rights, the most significant of which is a focus on the individual. The eating of animals is sustained by collapsing indi-

vidual animals with thoughts, feelings, desires, and social networks into the mass term, "meat." The context of the animal's life is thus obliterated; by bringing it back, by insisting that we focus on individual animals and their experience, we put the emphasis where it belongs. The same is true of pregnant women. Anti-abortion forces relegate the woman and her individual thoughts, desires, feelings, and social networks, to the background: by focusing only on the fetus, they obliterate her. Like the individual animal, Adams argues, the individual woman is the proper focus of attention.

I agree with virtually all the positions Adams takes in these essays, but I do have to say that, as a whole, it's a difficult and often frustrating book to read. Non-academics will be utterly befuddled by much of the writing, which is unnecessarily riddled with jargon. For instance, she describes how many of us come to vegetarianism as a result of a relationship with a particular animal ("If I couldn't eat Fluffy, how can I eat a calf?") in the following words: "{M}any animal defenders. . . become committed to animal defense based on a relational epistemology that enables a metaphysical shift that repudiates somatophobia." (155) Is this necessary? And the general level of abstraction often soars to dazzling heights. Granted, I read most of the essays while hiking in the Rockies and the Appalachians, and so may have been excessively earth-bound myself, but I thought I'd toss the whole book off a cliff if I had to endure one more discussion of "ontology vs. epistemology"—and I'm an academic, someone who trucks in those terms. Most frustrating, however, was the lack of completion which marks many of the essays. I want to be fair about this: Adams is quite brilliant, and I respect her work enormously. But I want to see her ideas more fully developed. In the essay, "Reflections on a Stripping Chimpanzee," she raises a number of questions: Are animals to humans as women are to men? What role does reason and rationality play in determining where women and animals are situated in Western thought? What's the place of emotion and feeling in morality? What's knowledge and how do we gain it? Are "rights"

(continued next page)

(Vance, previous page)

right? And she does, indeed, explore the questions to a certain degree in other essays—but *only* to a certain degree. She's better at raising questions than at pursuing them, although I am quite sure she could do some terrific work if she would just focus. I'd also like it if she'd really reflect on the questions her own arguments leave unanswered: for example, by foregrounding pregnant women in the abortion debate, do we relegate the fetus to permanent obscurity? Is there a point at which it can make moral claims? If the argument that one's culture (Native American, African American) is organized historically around meat consumption can be defeated by the response that present practices don't really replicate the historical ones, what would we say if those historic practices were resurrected? I recognize that Adams can't be expected to carry the burden of developing a feminist theory of animal defense all by herself, but on the other hand, she's the one who has elected to cover so many fronts at once.

Neither Man Nor Beast isn't a book for everyone, which is too bad, because Adams's ideas should have a wider audience. Still, it ought to be read by as many people as possible. Buy this book for yourself, because there are a lot of gems in it. Buy a bunch of copies and start a study group: take on the questions Adams tosses out. Get copies for your academic friends. Use it in advanced seminars on Feminist Theory. The important thing is to discuss it, to work with the ideas, to plug away at the task of developing a feminist theory of animal defense. Adams may be long on questions and short on answers, but questions, after all, are what keep us going.

Linda Vance is an associate professor in the Adult Degree Program of Vermont College in Montpelier, Vermont. Her primary interests are feminist theory and environmental ethics.

Editor: See Pages 18-19 for ordering copies of *Neither Man Nor Beast*.



Mothering, Caring, and Animal Liberation¹

by Greta Gaard

It is widely known that, historically, the animal liberation movement has been characterized by the ideas and theories of several male philosophers, but the composition of activists has been predominantly female.² Wondering about this gender division, I watched as a woman cared for her companion animal at an outdoor cafe. My thoughts were interrupted by overhearing the conversation of two men sitting across from me, when one chuckled and nodded to the woman, remarking to the other, "Misplaced mothering instincts, eh?" Incensed by the comment, I took a moment to think it through.

Marti Kheel has noted at least one male animal rights advocate exulting that "we're no longer a movement of little old ladies in tennis shoes,"³ as if women's caring for animals were somehow less important than men's caring. Perhaps it is the fact that the widespread (though hardly universal) phenomenon of women's caring for animals makes it somehow commonplace; conversely, the often lamented scarcity of men's caring for animals makes that caring unique, and hence more valued (as scarcity of any commodity tends to do in Western culture). But the denigration of women's passion and compassion for other animal species as "misplaced mothering instincts" reveals a number of patriarchal beliefs:

- that women's caring for animals should properly be directed to the biologically-produced offspring of our own species, fathered by men;
- that women can be "cured" from caring about other species through childbearing; and
- that women's caring for animals is a variety of instinct or feeling, and hence of a lower value than men's loftier, rational choice to care about animals.

Once these patriarchal beliefs are exposed, they are easily dismissed. For centuries, women's caring has been visible and respected only as a form of "mothering," simply because the mother-child relationship is the primary source of women's valuation in a patriarchal culture. Beyond "mothering," the relationship of women's caring to animal rights and animal advocacy remains.

I can speak to this relationship most forcefully on a personal level. At the age of 25, married, a feminist and an animal rights activist, I was faced with an unplanned pregnancy. By popular estimates, given these circumstances, I "should" have carried and raised the child. But in a few rushed weeks of research on fetal development, couples counselling, and soul-searching, I made the decision to terminate the pregnancy. It was an ethical decision based on feeling and on reason.⁴ In that decision, I believed that I was faced with a choice of having the time and energy to care for and act in defense of many animals over the course of the next twenty years, or caring for one central animal, and caring for the others as time allowed. As the example of so many feminist animal activists shows, it is entirely possible to care for children and care for animals at the same time (Carol Adams comes immediately to mind). But those wonderful women were not foremost in my thoughts during the decisionmaking period.

My feminism notwithstanding, the only model, the only image that I had of a successful motherhood was the patriarchal model, in which the woman subordinated (or gave up entirely) her life's work to the care of her child—whether through income-generating work needed to support the family, care-giving work in the home, or, in most cases, a combination of the two. What I decided very clearly was that, given the current situation for animals, I felt it was more urgent to direct the caring energy of my life toward all animal species rather than my own offspring.⁵ In my mind, the ethical decision was in one way similar to the description given by the men on the cafe patio: it was a "mothering" decision. That was where our agreement ended. From my perspective, mothering wasn't an "instinct"—it was a choice, and it was mine, to "place" (not "misplace") wherever I chose.

Of course, from this personal narrative, I do not mean to imply that women's caring for animals assumes or constitutes non-human animals as inferior, subordinate, or childlike. What I do mean to assert is that nonhuman animals are desperately in need of being cared for and cared about,

(continued on page 9)

others who hold less power and are therefore seen as having less value. One feminist coined the term "somatophobia" to refer to hostility to the body. In our culture the body has less value than the mind or the soul; anyone equated with the body will also thus be unvalued or undervalued. This concept helps us recognize the relationship between different forms of oppression: those equated with bodies (like people of color, animals, and women) rather than minds or souls (like white people, humans, and men) are oppressed in our culture because of this equation with the body and with each other.

2. The problem is that this epistemological process, if successful, becomes invisible, and we think we are debating ontology. In other words, the debate is kept at the level of who we are (ontology) rather than how we *come to the knowledge* of who we are. Let me give an example specific to the animal advocacy movement: Some people truly see animals as "meat": "why else do they exist?" they think, "they exist to be our meat." As we know, there is nothing intrinsic to an animal's beingness that makes her or him "meat;" it is the knowledge stance of some humans that views them thusly. An ecofeminist way to put this is that those who are "up" in the value hierarchy, in this case humans, view those who are "down," in this case animals, as useable and from this view come to the conclusion that this is why animals exist: to be of use.

3. It is also the same epistemological process that views women's bodies pornographically. Pornography has been historically a way men institute their status as subjects by having others who have the status of objects. As Susanne Kappeler says in *THE PORNOGRAPHY OF REPRESENTATION*, the dominant subjectivity in patriarchal culture is constructed through objectifying others. Here is an example of this sort of analysis, a classic analysis by Laura Mulvey of what is called *the male gaze*: "In a world ordered by sexual imbalance, pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female. The determining (human) male gaze projects its phantasy onto the (human) female figure which is styled accordingly. In their traditional exhibitionist role, women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appear-

ance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote "to-be-looked-at-ness." Pornography, like much of culture, enacts this "to-be-looked-at-ness." Indeed, because pornography is so much a part of our patriarchal culture, it is hard to perceive its specific harm, that is, to stand outside of it sufficiently to perceive the value hierarchy of man over woman and mind and soul over body that it enacts, the somatophobia that it expresses. This difficulty in perceiving harm explains the attraction of a "naked" campaign, because it will get media attention since the media is a primary source of encouraging women's "to-be-looked-at-ness." This difficulty in perceiving how the dominant subjectivity relies on this "to-be-looked-at-ness" also explains the problems inherent to debating the "naked" campaign—some people see it one way, and others see it another way. In other words, because the epistemological remains invisible we end up debating the ontological.

4. Given this analysis, the "I'd rather go naked than wear fur" campaign is intrinsically problematic, provoking a means/end debate among us. But the added twist that occurs with the Patti Davis ad is not only in its alliance with *Playboy*, which has made harm to women through pornography a man's entertainment (because it furthers women's objectification, and reproduces sexualized domination), but the specific concern of bestiality and Hugh Hefner's association with this form of pornography. On this, see Linda Lovelace, *ORDEAL*, specifically p. 194: "Then Hefner said that while he liked *DEEP THROAT*, he was more interested by the movie I'd made with a dog. (forced sex by her batterer husband described on pages 105-113).

"Oh, you saw that one?" Chuck (her batterer husband) said. "Oh that was terrific," Hefner said, "You know, we've tried that several times, tried to get a girl and a dog together, but it has never worked out." "Yeah, that can be very tricky," Chuck said, "the chick's got to know what she's doing." "That's something I'd like to see," Hefner said, "I think I've seen every animal flick (sic) ever made but—" Then Chuck offers Linda as a "willing" participant.

And so we return to my first premise,

that there is a connection between the treatment of women and the treatment of animals. In this case, the point of intersection is the pornographic use of bestiality, which those of us active in the movement against violence against women know is often an occasion for batterers/marital rapists to force sex between an animal and their female partner. They seek to reproduce the pornography they consume.

Our complaint is not solely #4, i.e., that this ad campaign—to anyone's knowledge of Linda Lovelace's testimony—hints of Hefner's association with bestiality, but more comprehensively the theoretical one found in my first premise: that #4 is inevitable because of the epistemological stance of objectification. Let me make this clear. The problem is not that PETA fails to recognize the interconnection of treatment of animals and treatment of women. The problem is that unless they understand male sexual violence and how it is that subjectification takes place under patriarchy, they won't truly understand violence against animals.

For a project I am working on about pornography and animals, I have been talking to feminists who campaign against pornography around the country. What I have found fascinating is that while I cannot assume that a feminist, just because she is a feminist, has read *THE SEXUAL POLITICS OF MEAT*, I am safe to assume that anti-pornography feminists have. As recognition of my work happened over and over when I called feminists I didn't know to ask them about what they think is going on with pornography that features animals, it made me realize that this group of feminists do "get" it, do understand the process of objectification as it affects animals, that we animal rights activists try to educate people about it. I discovered an affinity between their analysis and our analysis. This is one reason why the "naked" campaign is so disturbing: a group of allies, all of whom are very familiar with Linda Lovelace's experience, are now presented with a campaign that announces that animal rights doesn't "get" it about the objectification of women in general, and specifically about the the source of patriarchy in oppressing animals. This, to me, is very sad.



(McGuire, continued from page 1)

depict nude women with negligible difference in their demeanor or expressions. Remove the text in the PETA ad and what remains is remarkably similar imagery. For some communities, such as illiterate people, non-English speakers, or young children, the soft-core pornographic image is the *only* message.

What is the point of the nudity? The ad could have portrayed models shivering in less-than-warm clothing saying "I'd rather freeze than wear fur." Such a campaign would still preserve the message to stop wearing fur. The answer is obvious. Sex sells. Women's bodies sell. And not just any woman's body. Beautiful, young, thin, cosmeticized, shaven bodies of women sell. Newkirk herself agrees she does not meet this criterion, but then conveniently ignores the primary issue: that PETA is replicating the dominant culture's usage of a *particular* depiction of women's bodies to convey their point. However unintended, PETA's unfortunate subliminal message is that women are sexual objects for the male gaze.

Newkirk also adds that she as well as men have participated in "naked stunts" similar to the ad. The impact of street theater, however, pales compared to the power of mass-mediated messages disseminated to millions of viewers. More importantly, the participants in the "naked stunts" are presumably displaying their true animal bodies—not the false, technological makeovers constantly marketed to the public as natural women.

Newkirk feels that the ad is okay because none of the models were coerced or exploited to do the ads. While we think it is a coup that PETA has recruited models as allies for animal rights, we do not believe it is necessary that PETA capitulate to the fashion industry's traditionally sexist mores in which women's bodies are continually represented as impossibly perfect objects. Sexy does not have to mean sexism! We are opposed to this sophisticated form of propaganda "educating" women on how to look (and be) based on values dictated by patriarchal standards. Who benefits from these stereotypes? Who is harmed? We believe such imagery causes downwind damage to all women.

We support eroticism and nudity (e.g., going barebreasted and breastfeeding in public), but we are tired of women's sexu-

ality being used commercially and inappropriately. Who created this ad anyway?

In sum, this is a classic case of championing the rights of one group (nonhuman animals) at the expense of another group (female human animals). We want PETA to continue to be a strong force in the liberation of animals, but find their current ad campaign insidiously damaging to women. PETA is short for People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. Where is PETA's concern for the ethical treatment of women?

Cathleen and Colleen MacGuire are twins, living together in New York City and are radical ecofeminist activists.

Reprinted with permission from the authors and *Media Watch* (P.O.B. 618, Santa Cruz, CA 95061). *Media Watch* is a feminist group that educates for and promotes positive images of women in the media, and protests pornographic and disrespectful images of women.

(Gaard, continued from page 7)

by women and by men, and that this caring can and must take the form not merely of petting or feeding but of active advocacy (sheltering, protesting, authoring and supporting legislation, boycotting, writing and speaking, etc.).

It is not unusual for Western culture to understand when a woman adopts a child and chooses to "mother" it, to care for it. Though the practice has not gained universal acceptance in a racist culture, it is still within the scope of popular understanding if the color of that child is different from the color of the mother. What is not yet understood, however, is when the species of the "child" (i.e., whoever or whatever receives women's caring) differs from the species of the "mother." Calling that caring a "misplaced mothering instinct" is an illustration of the way that the patriarchal institution of motherhood exerts its control over naming, and appropriates women's caring.

But a woman's caring for other animal species is not necessarily "mothering"; rather, as Adrienne Rich has so eloquently argued in *Of Woman Born*, the institution of mothering has served to imprison, confine, and limit women's caring and women's passions. This institutionalized distortion of motherhood relies on compulsory heterosexuality, compulsory moth-

erhood, and a confinement of women's energies, sexuality, creativity, economic production, and caring to be expressed exclusively within the "traditional" patriarchal family. Certainly, feminists have used this definition of motherhood in subversive ways. For example, describing their social work as a form of mothering (or "social housekeeping"), white middle-class women in the nineteenth century were able to gain some approval and permission (however reluctant) for their actions in the public sphere. Even today, many feminist activists describe their work in terms of mothering (most notably Sara Ruddick.) Where this rhetorical strategy once served to gain freedom for women, the historical moment seems to have changed, and the conceptual framework of mothering may carry more associated baggage than we want or need. As Rich has argued, breaking free from the patriarchal institution of motherhood allows women to direct their caring in many ways, singly or in combination, instead of a limited "focus on the family": one way may surely involve human children; another may involve animals.

From this perspective, women's caring about animals can be seen as an act of defiance against patriarchy, a step outside the institutions that would imprison our passions and our concern. Women's caring about animals is, fundamentally, a feminist act of resistance.

By the time I'd thought through all of this, of course, the men had left. So had the woman and the animal she cared for.

¹ For Minki, my companion feline of ten years, who I found at the age of 9 months, pregnant, on a freeway.

² For a history of women's involvement in the animal liberation movement, see Josephine Donovan, "Animal Rights and Feminist Theory," 167-194 in Greta Gaard, ed., *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993). Available from FAR - see Page 18.

³ Certainly, the woman in question may have been a carnivore who cared for her companion animal only as a "pet" without seeing the connections to her meals, her clothing, her household products, her medical care, and the rest of her political life. Nonetheless, she inspired me to think about women who see a clear connection between care about the animals who live with them, and caring about the animals they are fighting for through their

(continued on page 13)

POETRY



UNIQUE by Greta Gaard

Carol in Montana walks her piglet on
Sundays
Marianne in Manitoba keeps her ferret by
the couch
and at the streetcorner in Minneapolis
Roger stops his bicycle, a parrot on his
shoulder,
Speaking to David with the snakes
around his ankles.
And it is widely known that
You're only as exotic
as the animals you capture.

*Greta Gaard is a member of the FAR Advisor
Board and Editor of the collection
Ecofeminism: Women, Animals Nature
(Temple University Press, 1993 - available
from FAR)*

ON STRAYS by Patty Adjamine

If everyone says, "There are so many
why bother to save one?"
Then ultimately
All of the many will perish

But if everyone says, "There are so many
I can help but one."
Then ultimately
All of the many
will thrive.

ON DAVEY by Patty Adjamine

I gazed into his hard, cold eyes
and saw arrogance tinged with fear.
He stood his ground and I reached out to
help him
But he spat out a warning and tried to
flee.
Against his will, I did persist
And eventually brought him home with
me
To discover
Layers of feeling, passion and expression
Dimensions of need
I had never seen before
And so I learned
That sometimes the most desperate lives
are lived in a bravado
Of toughness, independence and flight
And that he who needs the most so often
asks for
and cries the least.

*Patty Adjamine is a New York City-based ani-
mal rescuer and a co-founder of NYCA (New
Yorkers for Companion Animals, 1324 Lexing-
ton Ave., NY, NY 10128).*

ALL FLESH by Heather D. Yakin

what if i told you
i know
what their screams mean
what if i told you
someone held my head back
to stick a knife
in my throat
what if i told you
i know every tremor
running through
that maddened dog
the same fist
has beaten us both
locked us in
the same filthy cage
what if i told you
that fox and i
had the same boot
in our backs
and we both tried
to chew off our paws
to get out
of these leghold traps
what if i told you
i felt the fork
felt you chew
and spit out the gristle
what if i told you
your breath smells like death
and kissing you
was kissing the slaughterhouse

Heather Yakin writes poetry in Woodstock, NY.



THE POLITICS OF SNAILS

by Irena Klepfisz

The Instructions: Crush them with your heels or between two rocks. If that's not appealing, use the powder—it doesn't kill—just keeps them away (this *has* to be a lie—anyone indifferent to mashing them beneath their shoes is not about to go humane). I'm half asleep when I hear these options. Barely take them in—though clearly they register because my first morning alone I will recall the calm voice.

But now it's dusk. The back garden: red and pink roses firmly rooted and pink and red geraniums in steel boxes hanging against the prefab fence. Everything vies for turf. What's new? Under my negligence by summer's end red geraniums will flourish in the ground, challenging the supremacy of the rose. Unfamiliar blue flowers will threaten the geraniums. A garden in which I can do the impossible: sleep and dream in peace while around me: war.

A pretty house . . . with mixed messages. The surrounding condominiums: mortar and cement. Each garden the same: less foliage, more hexagonal bricks supporting the iron-wrought furniture and methodically boxed soil. "You'll need to weed it," I'm told during training. Translation: maintain control—which, after all, is all this life is ever about.

The first morning alone: I slide open the door and step out. Dampness, fog, dew. I spot my first one on the stem of a rose. It looks snug between two thorns. I'm taken aback. It's enormous. An inch-high shell. Nothing fancy. But the body! Sleek gray flesh spills out and around the plain brown wrapper. Entirely exposed—the back tapers into a delicate tail. And the front? I catch my breath! The sumptuous bosom arches high into the finely shaped head. Ah! The wonder of the horns! And are those eyes that plot its course, that reflect its soul?

I look around. I see others—on the fence, on a red brick, on a dark wet leaf. They're different sizes—some the shells mere specks, the bodies barely

visible; others slim and solid like the first.

Surely no one can expect me to murder *these*?

There's only one choice: I harvest them. They hardly struggle. But then it's not exactly an even match. To my fingertips their resistance registers only as a hesitation, a moment's confusion, before they curl inward and vanish. I search under leaves, on the damp soil, the fence. It's a challenge. They're masters in the art of passing—as pebbles, wooden chips, broken dried



stems. But I catch on and in minutes—more than two dozen are in the bag. Occasionally I peek and see them fully present climbing up the sides—horns and eyes exposed. They used each other as step ladders, as free rides—whatever. They're determined to get to the top—and out.

And then it's over. The flowers saved, the snails safe—and there I am holding the bag asking the ultimate question which unreflective altruism never answers: speaking practically, what am I to do with them next? A friend who's lived here for years is sympathetic, though she has a native's perspective. "If the garden meant food, you might feel different," she tells me serenely. Still, she's kind. I'm new. So she drives me to a special spot to view the ocean. It's a perfect refuge for the snails.

Two days later: The same question. I can't hustle them off to safety every morning. I don't have a car. Besides, I have a job. I have to report for work. Besides again—how did all this come to be? I ask another friend, a historian who contextualizes the current crisis: a nineteenth-century Frenchman wanting to make native a delicacy of *escargot*, a desire he fulfilled, but in the process, life triumphed over appetite and death and now we're

stuck with the present situation and impossible solutions—grind them down with your heel or crush them with stones.

A week later: I'm still harvesting, amazed at their numbers. My urge to rescue is transformed into repressed rage. How and when did they become *my* responsibility? Why, I ask myself, must *I* find an escape for them?

There's no one to turn to. I'm angry—at them, at myself for my failing commitment, for losing face. I comfort myself: You can only do what you can do. But I know—in the meantime, the world—or more precisely—the garden—withers.

So, determined not to be defeated, I collect weary paper bags and fill them with endangered snails. Determined, I appraise the terrain, establish escape routes, safety zones. On my way to work I release them at bus stops, on unkempt weedy highway shoulders and hope they'll sense the right direction—away from death. But life's crowded and I'm conscious I've never brought them to the ocean again. In my mortar garden I sleep and dream of that first day's liberation—the openness of sky, the ocean somber in the sunlight, salt in my mouth, the snails among the tall grass. I wake and wonder who it is I'm trying to save.

(First published in *American Voice*, December, 1991)

Irena Klepfisz has been an activist in the lesbian/feminist and Jewish communities for 20 years. She was a co-founder of Conditions magazine, co-editor of The Tribe of Dina: A Jewish Women's Anthology, co-founder of The Jewish Women's Committee to End the Occupation of the West Bank and Gaza and, from 1990-1992, she served as Executive Director of New Jewish Agenda. In 1990 Eighth Mountain Press published two companion volumes of her writing: A Few Words in the Mother Tongue: Poems Selected and New and Dreams of an Insomniac: Jewish Feminist Essays, Speeches, and Diatribes. Permission to reprint this article was granted by the author. © Irena Klepfisz.

(Prescott, continued from page 5)

ists around the country to help them organize more field protests when I started working for The Fund.

The results of our protests are not always heartening, however. In 1990, we organized a rescue and field protest on the opening day of duck hunting season in Maryland. During a typical hunt, as dawn approaches and ducks fly to feeding areas, hunters take great precautions to hide in the marshes, in reeds and behind duck blinds surrounding the swamps and cover themselves with camouflage. They often float little wooden duckies in front of them to attract the real ducks, and quack away on duck calls. Because ducks have very keen eyesight, many will not land or fly within range of the hunters' guns if there is even the slightest movement. On that morning, at 6:00 a.m., teams of antihunting activists began jogging around the swamps.

One small duck did fly over the area, and as she flew toward us, it began to sound like a war zone. At least a dozen big, brave hunters fired at this one duck as she came close to the area where my group was. Five hunters shot at her again as she spiraled down. Sharon Lawson, Robin Walker, and I dived into the water and managed to beat both a hunter and his dog to the duck.

Before we could attempt to stabilize or treat the bird, several Maryland Department of Natural Resources officers surrounded us and demanded that we turn the duck over to one of the hunters. The officers claimed that the hunter was the sole owner of the duck because he had shot her. Since the duck was now in our care, turning her over to them was something none of us could ethically do. We were immediately arrested for disobeying an officer and for committing the crime of hunter harassment. We were held in custody while they tried to force us to relinquish the duck. Ultimately they decided to allow a local wildlife rehabilitator to humanely euthanize her. What happened to this one duck happens to millions of ducks just like her. According to some studies, the wounding and crippling rate associated with waterfowl hunting is well over 50 percent of those shot.

Absurd as it may sound, in most states activities such as quietly following hunters onto public, taxpayer-funded land, carrying protest signs, or even just wearing strong perfume during a hunt are against the law.

Because hunters outfitted with high-tech weaponry are desperate for protection from nonviolent activists armed only with their mouths, Forty-seven states have enacted laws making it a crime to speak to hunters on public lands or to interfere with their hunts in any way. These laws have been used and abused against activists in Idaho, Montana, Connecticut, Michigan, Kentucky, and Maryland. The Fund for Animals believes, however, that so-called "hunter-harassment" laws violate our First Amendment rights of free speech and assembly, and that if hunters have a right to be in the woods pursuing their recreational goal of killing animals, then we have just as much, if not more, of a right to be in the woods pursuing our goal of protecting animals. It is important to note that a similar law was included in President Clinton's crime bill, recently passed, which prohibits animal advocates from protesting on federal public lands (a national forest or wildlife refuge, for example).

Despite these laws, it is empowering to go into the woods and directly save an animal's life from a bullet or arrow. Even though 8 percent of hunters in the U.S. are women, in all my years of disrupting hunts, I have never encountered a woman hunter. There are currently 14 million hunters in the United States (a mere 7 percent of the population), and that number is dwindling each year. Because hunters are beginning to realize that fewer people are interested in hunting and that their "sport" may become extinct in the next few decades, they have mounted extensive—and expensive—pub-

lic relations campaigns to recruit women and children. Nearly every state wildlife agency is sponsoring youth hunts for children ranging in age from six to sixteen, and the national hunting conventions are featuring workshops such as "A Woman's Place is in a Duck Blind." Women are suddenly being wooed into a hobby from which we traditionally have been excluded. We are being used as tactical pawns in their proactive plan to ensure the future of hunting. As one speaker at a recent hunting conference stated, "Women will be the ones who vote hunting in our out."

Sport hunters kill over 200 million animals each year—legally. Squirrels, rabbits, deers, doves, bears, pheasants, elks, quails, moose, geese, turkeys, and many other animals are all fair game for the hunter. We can try to even the odds by empowering ourselves, taking action, and speaking out on behalf of the animals. It is time for us to take back the woods.

For more information on how you can help hunters go home empty-handed during hunting season, contact The Fund for Animals for their "Hunt Disruption Pack," in addition to hunting fact sheets.

Heidi Prescott is national director of The Fund for Animals. She has been arrested for violating hunter harassment laws numerous times including spending two weeks in a Maryland jail for rustling leaves and speaking to hunters. Heidi was the sole protester bearing witness to President Clinton's infamous duck hunt.



Heidi Prescott (center) and two other women accompanying two hunters and performing the gentle art of hunt sabbing.

Will GATT Threaten Animal and Wildlife Protection?

by Anna E. Charleton, Esq.

There is increasing and serious concern within the animal rights and animal protection communities that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) may limit the ability of the United States to protect animals through the use of trade measures.

What is the GATT?

The GATT was adopted in 1947 as a contractual agreement between countries to reduce protectionist trade measures that act as barriers to trade. It is not a treaty, and has not been approved by the requisite 3/4 of the Senate. GATT is a series of international contracts, negotiated in "rounds" approximately every ten years. The most recent round, the "Uruguay round," will be signed by over 100 countries. The early GATT agreements were aimed at reducing tariff rates on trade. Over the years, however, as these rates were reduced, GATT focused on eliminating non-tariff trade barriers. These barriers are of great importance to the future protection of animals.

Non-tariff trade barriers can protect animals

Non-tariff trade barriers are generally laws or regulations that restrict the access of foreign producers to a domestic market. Examples of such barriers are the Federal Humane Slaughter Act, which requires that all domestic- and foreign- produced meat purchased by the government be slaughtered according to "humane" standards. The prohibition against the importation of foreign meat that is not slaughtered in this way is considered a non-tariff trade barrier.

Similarly, the Marine Mammal Protection Act's concern for the killing of dolphins and the prohibition of the importation of tuna caught with the pursine nets that kill dolphins is considered a non-tariff trade barrier. Many other animal protection laws will be considered "production or process standard" ("PPM") regulations that violate GATT.

GATT restricts or prohibits measures protecting animals

Many laws aimed at protecting animals or conserving species are effective because they impose a production or process standard. Such standards consider the means by which imported goods are produced

(whether tuna was captured in nets that snare dolphins) rather than the qualities of the product itself (whether the fish is considered wholesome).

In a decision that caused grave concern for animal protectionists, a GATT panel held in 1991 that the United States could not bar the importation of Mexican tuna on the grounds that the fish were caught in dolphin-snaring nets. GATT considers the end product of tuna caught in dolphin-friendly nets and tuna caught in dolphin-snaring nets to be "like" products. Discriminating on their treatment concerning importation violates GATT.

In 1993, Norway threatened GATT action if the United States imposed an embargo on Norwegian products when Norway resumed commercial whaling in violation of the global ban on such practices. The President currently has this power, under the Pelly amendment, to impose sanctions if a country has "diminished the effectiveness of an international conservation program." Under threat of GATT action, the President did not impose sanctions. Thus, an important means of regulating the treatment of animals is seriously threatened by GATT.

The World Trade Organization

In 1995, the World Trade Organization (WTO) will begin operation. The WTO will take the operation of GATT to another level, because it will have a status independent of the countries who are parties to the GATT agreements, and will essentially police the international economic relationships of the member states. As the WTO will have the power to review domestic laws of member states to ensure conformity with GATT, there is concern that a more efficient trading system will come at the price of significant erosion of U.S. sovereignty and the ability to establish and enforce laws that reflect national concerns about health and safety, animal protection and the environment.

Anna Charleton is Assistant Clinical Professor of Law and co-Director of the Animal Rights Law Center of the Rutgers School of Law, Newark, New Jersey.

WHAT YOU CAN DO:

Write to your senators and representatives and tell them that they should oppose GATT until the Clinton administration negotiates a moratorium on challenges to environmental - and animal - protection laws.

FAR Women Participate in Ecofeminist Writers' Residency

Carol Adams, Batya Bauman and Greta Gaard participated in a week-long writers' residency at Hopscotch House near Louisville, Kentucky in July, 1994. Cathleen McGuire participated in the program during the summer of 1993. The program is sponsored by the Kentucky Foundation for Women and residencies are awarded to women ecofeminist writers who qualify. Those interested in applying for residencies during the summer of 1995 should write to: Wren Smith, Hopscotch House, 8221 Wolf Pen Branch Road, Prospect, KY 40059.

(Gaard, continued from page 9)

activism.

⁴ Cited in n. 2 on p. 262 of Marti Kheel, "From Heroic to Holistic Ethics: The Ecofeminist Challenge," 243-271, in *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*.

⁵ In retrospect, having access to Carol Adams' essay on "Abortion Rights and Animal Rights" would have been tremendously useful to me then. Fortunately, the essay is more widely available to readers as an article in the Spring-Summer 1991 issue of the *FAR Newsletter* and as a chapter in her book, *Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the defense of Animals*, available from FAR and reviewed in this issue.

⁶ Ecofeminism was not a clearly articulated concept for me at the time: I was primarily a feminist, an environmentalist, and an animal rights activist, without seeing the connections. Certainly, my theories of who and what need caring for have expanded considerably since then.

GLEANINGS



Americans for Medical Progress (AMP) continues to distort the aims of animal advocacy persons. For example: ". . . {animal rights} efforts at every legislative level are designed to hamper science curricula and to erect regulatory barriers to hinder and ultimately abolish biomedical research" (in a letter to its members). AMP and other groups, such as "**Putting People First**" try real hard to convince the public that we are anti-science, anti-people, and anti-progress when we protest sordid and unnecessary experiments on animals.

On August 29th, **Kim Trimiew** was released from the Spokane (Washington) County Jail after serving 193 days on a contempt charge for refusing to testify before a federal grand jury. The judge finally acknowledged her argument that further incarceration would not coerce her to testify. The grand jury has been impeached to investigate the 1991 raid on Washington State University, claimed by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). The **Activist Support Network** thanks all those who supported Kim with letters and contributions.

We don't think they'd mind our "outing" as vegetarians two of our favorite tennis champs: **Billie Jean King** and **Martina Navratilova**.

The **National Restaurant Association** is advising its member restaurants to offer more vegetarian items and feature them prominently on their menus.

EarthSave

"One night, at about 2 A.M., high-ranking cadets trapped a raccoon in the barracks and began to stab it with a knife. . . .Accounts of the episode vary. In a widely circulated version (which was referred to in a faculty member's testimony), the cadets chanted, 'Kill the bitch! Kill the bitch!.' as they tortured the raccoon to death." This is an account reported by Susan Faludi in the Sept. 5, 1994 issue of *The New Yorker* magazine in an article called "The Naked Citadel: A visit behind the walls of the military academy called The Citadel reveals an isolated, relentless, and sometimes brutal male culture, and yields an unexpected explanation of why the cadets, and their administrative mentors, so fear the presence of one female student."

University of Illinois occupational and environmental professor **Samuel Epstein**, is urging the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to revoke approval of BST (also known as rBGH). Epstein is concerned that milk from BST-treated cows will increase the risk of breast cancer in women because BST increases insulin growth factors (IGF-1) in milk. IGF-1 is not destroyed by pasturization. {ED: We suggest you stop ingesting all dairy products for your own health and welfare as well as that of our cow sisters.}

Sanctuary News, Farm Sanctuary

It turns out that, in addition to allegedly using ingredients tested on animals even after they told PETA they were no long testing on animals themselves, **L'Oreal** has an unwholesome past regarding Nazi collaboration. Jacques Correze, a convicted Nazi collaborator, was hired by L'Oreal in 1950 after his release from prison and was assigned to the United States in 1954 and appointed Chairman of Cosmair in the late 1960s. He died in 1991, shortly after his past as the No. 2 man in the Nazis' French terrorist squad, The Cagoule, was exposed. Correze was also alleged to have belonged to several pro-Nazi groups during the war, including the Mouvement Social Revolutionnaire (MSR). But L'Oreal's Nazi ties go deeper still: the company's founder, Eugene Schueller, is reported to have helped finance the MSR and later joined the pro-Nazi Rassemblement National Populaire.

Response

In an open letter to the press, **Brigitte Bardot** chastised **Sophia Loren** for accepting a million-dollar offer to appear in ads for Italian furrier, Annabella: "It is degrading, repugnant, deplorable and unworthy," said Bardot, "to accept money that comes from the corpses of animals. . . ."

Maneka Gandhi, daughter-in-law of Indira Gandhi, has succeeded in halting the killing of stray dogs in New Delhi, Bombay, Madras, Calcutta and Bangalore, India and got a program of sterilization started. Dog control efforts in Indian cities consisted largely of breaking legs of strays and throwing them into dumpsters to die or await execution. The current practice of electrocuting or bludgeoning to death unwanted animals is being stopped, according to the January 16, 1994 issue of the *Indian Express Bombay*. Maneka Gandhi was an environment minister, and she is a respected name in "animal care and ecology."

In an unprecedented move, President Clinton announced in April that limited trade sanctions will be imposed in Taiwan in response to the country's undermining of international efforts to stop rhino and tiger poaching.

PAWS,
Lynwood, Washington

Last December, four men accepted a \$15,000 challenge from British activists to live for a week like a battery-caged hen. The men quit after 18 hours, emerging from their 3-ft. square, 6 ft. high cage sore, hungry and cold, unable to endure for even one day what hens endure for their shortened two-year life span.

PAWS
Lynnwood, Washington



SPRING COLLOQUIUM ON ECOFEMINISM

CALL FOR PAPERS on Ecofeminist Perspectives for a colloquium at the University of Dayton, March 31 - April 1, 1995, with guest speakers Carolyn Merchant and Carol Adams. For this interdisciplinary colloquium we welcome all papers written from an ecofeminist perspective on topics such as environmentalism, feminism, animal liberation, race relations, economics and social justice, ethics, philosophy, religion, literature, history, the arts, politics, law, medicine, and the sciences. Papers should not exceed 30 minutes reading time. Please send two copies of your paper and a one-page abstract to: Brian Luke, Department of Philosophy, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH 45469-1546, or, to Pamela Thimmes, Department of Religious Studies, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH 45469-1530. Papers due January 1, 1995, and selected papers announced January 31, 1995.

DIRECT ACTION NEWS



Each year thousands of mammals and birds are strangled when they become entangled in **plastic six-pack rings**. A Seattle company seems to have developed a solution to this problem. **The ALPAC Corporation** has developed a six-pack carrier called *The Clean-Top* that snaps over the entire top of each can. In addition to being safe for wildlife, the *Clean-top* is recyclable and photodegradable. Write to (or call) the following soft drink companies and ask them to start using the new carriers: The Coca-Cola Company, P.O. Box 1734, Atlanta, GA 30301 (800-638-3286); PepsiCo, Inc., Anderson Hill Rd., Purchase, NY 10577, (914-253-2000); Cadbury Schweppes, Inc., 6 High Ridge Park, P.O. Box 3800, Stamford, CT 06905, (203-329-0911).

The AV Magazine

Recently, **Farm Sanctuary's** New York shelter received a rescue alert call—an entire crate of **baby turkeys** had fallen off a transportation truck. Many of the birds had been crushed to death, and the survivors were left lying helplessly along the highway. An emergency vehicle was sent from Farm Sanctuary and returned with 126 baby turkeys. Currently Farm Sanctuary has housing only for half of the turkeys. Safe, loving adoptive homes are urgently needed to provide lifelong care for over 60 turkeys.

All of the turkeys up for adoption are "factory farm" turkeys and have been "detoed" (a common production mutilation). Despite all they have been through, the turkeys love human companionship and are very affectionate. **Turkey adopters will be welcoming very special animals into their homes and hearts.** Contact Farm Sanctuary.



Lynn Manheim, animal rights activist and innovator of a letter-writing service—*Letters for Animals*, has started a syndicated newspaper column—also to be called *Letters for Animals*—in newspapers across the country. You can help Lynn and the animals by sending a copy of the column to the editor of your local daily and/or weekly papers. For a copy of the first column (and possibly others), send a stamped, self-addressed envelope to *Letters for Animals*, P.O. Box 7, La Plume, PA 18440.

Lev L'Chai, a small group of animal rescuers in Israel, has found a way to sell used/cancelled stamps to raise money to help rescue, **spay/neuter** and find homes for unwanted cats and dogs. Remove all the stamps on the envelopes you receive, save them up in an envelope, and when you have an appreciable amount, send them to Doreen Bliss, c/o Simon & Wiesel, El Al Bldg., 10th Fl., 32 Ben Yehuda St., Tel Aviv, Israel 63805.

Pro-Animal, Israel

Encourage your regular supermarkets (and other grocery stores as well as restaurants) to carry terrific tasting, no fat, frozen **Boca Burgers**. These are the very same burgers that **Hillary Rodham Clinton** ordered to be stocked by the case in the White House (yea, Hillary!). (It is reported that over 3,800 Boca Burgers were consumed at the White House in just a couple of months.) Be sure to ask for and get only the "original flavor" **Boca Burgers** because these are the only ones that are completely vegan. They make two other kinds which contain cheese-flavored dairy products. At any rate, always read ingredient listings on packages.

Write to your Congressperson and your Senator to sign on as sponsors of **H.R. 3526** and **S.1343** respectively to prohibit the use of the **steel-jaw leghold trap** in the United States. The bill, introduced by **Congresswoman Nita Lowey** (D-NY), has been introduced as a companion bill into the Senate and has over 80 cosponsors. Tell your representatives in Washington that you think the steel-jaw trap, which clamps shut over an animal's leg, is cruel.

The Animals' Advocate

Spay Day USA, February 28, 1995 has been scheduled by the **Doris Day Animal League** and will focus on spaying and neutering companion animals at a time just before the spring "kitten season." The goal is to get as many veterinarians across the country to participate by designating that day (during their 'slow' season) to alter cats and dogs. **FAR is an endorsing organization of this event**, and we strongly encourage our members and other readers to contact the DDAL to find out how you can participate.

Doris Day Animal League

VISA USA is airing a lengthy television ad promoting the **Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus**. Animal rights activists are protesting VISA's support of animal cruelty, but VISA continues to defend the circus. If you use a VISA card, let your issuing bank know that you believe circuses are cruel and demand that it does not participate in VISA USA's promotion of the Cruellest Show On Earth. Tell them you're switching to Mastercard if they continue to support the circus or any other "entertainment" that exploits and abuses animals. Write VISA USA, Inc., P.O. Box 8999, San Francisco, CA 94128-8999, or call 800-VISA-911.

More than 50,000 **baby harp seals** were slaughtered this past spring for their penises which are believed by the Chinese to have aphrodisiac properties. To protest the continued slaughter of these seals: Brian Tobin, Minister of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Room 807, Confederation Building, House of Commons, Ottawa, K1A 0A6 Canada.

More than **one million cattle** are **painfully branded on the face** before being imported into the United States from Mexico. Terrorized cattle are held between bars and the head is immobilized with steel pincers clamped onto the nostrils as the red hot iron is pressed into the animal's face. This procedure is used under the pretext of tracking cases of tuberculosis among imported cattle, although a U.S. Department of Agriculture veterinarian has admitted that tracking M-branded cattle is "almost impossible. **Ask the USDA to stop importation of cattle who have been face-branded.** Write: Mike Espy, Secretary, USDA, Room 200A, 12th and Jefferson Dr., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

And don't forget to **boycott Ayerst Organics**, which manufactures Premarin, an estrogen replacement product obtained from the urine of pregnant mares. (See "**Pharmaceutical Giant Exploits Horses and Menopausal Women**" in our last issue — Vol. VII Nos. 1-2, Spring-Summer 1994 for details. Send \$1.00 and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to FAR for a reprint of the article or \$3.50 for a copy of that Newsletter issue). Please spread the word amongst your friends, especially women entering menopause, and urge them to read up on the many problems connected with estrogen replacement and to opt for the natural alternatives, if necessary.

RESOURCES



BUNNY HUGGERS GAZETTE is one of our most important resources giving information on all boycotts and letter-writing campaigns, highlighting issues, and including information on all the animal advocacy groups. The annual February issue publishes a listing of all animal advocacy groups, including many local groups, with addresses and phone numbers. The editor, **J.D. Jackson** (a woman), is a feminist and very supportive of FAR. We urge you to subscribe to this indispensable publication. Six issues a year—\$14.00.

Both **Friends of Animals** and **The Fund for Animals** have low-cost spay/neuter programs. You can purchase inexpensive certificates and also receive a list of participating veterinarians from either group. In addition, **Spay/USA** (1-800-248-SPAY) is a clearing house of information on affordable spay/neuter services nationwide. Material promoting spay/neuter is available from them in the form of billboards, school kits, radio and TV PSAs and posters. Information is also provided re the nearest clinic or information on how to start up a low-cost clinic.

PIGS Sanctuary is a haven for grown-up and unwanted Vietnamese potbellied pigs, which were such a fad in recent years. As usual, people who objectify and see animals as 'things' to fill their own needs to own 'exotic' animals, often tire of them, or can no longer 'manage' them when they grow out of their 'cute' stage. **Dale Riffle** and **Jim Brewer**—two pro-feminist gay men and good friends and supporters of FAR—have come to the rescue and started the PIGS Sanctuary in West Virginia. The public is invited to visit them, and, of course, to support PIGS, in whatever ways possible.

By subscribing to **The Animals' Voice Magazine** you can keep current on the many issues of animal abuse and how you can help. Editor, **Laura Moretti**, exhibits a good feminist consciousness in much of the contents and also in her own writing. Support them! Annual sub is \$23 a year (\$28 in Canada and \$32 for other countries).

Send for a great catalog of cruelty free and earth friendly items: cosmetics, animal rights buttons and t-shirts, books, and much more (for instance, a humane mouse trap, items for children, etc.) from **The WARM Store**, 12 Tannery Brook Road, Woodstock, NY 12498. **WARM** stands for **Woodstock Animal Rights Movement** and the store is operated by activist **Andy Glick**, a friend and supporter of FAR. Be sure to drop in when you are in Woodstock, NY.

The Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting (C.A.S.H.) ". . . We hope to alter whatever belief still exists that sport hunters are conservationists and champions of the environment to a realization that they are destroyers of wildlife and ecosystems in the narrow and broad sense. . . ." (from their own mission statement). They publish a very informative, intelligent and analytic quarterly newsletter. The Summer 1994 issue is particularly helpful in acquiring a substantive understanding of hunting and trapping and the mentality behind these activities. We urge your support of C.A.S.H.

The GrassRoots & Public Policy: A Report On The Activities Of The Foundation On Economic Trends And The Greenhouse Crisis Foundation published by the people who bring us **The Pure Food Campaign** and **Beyond Beef** (challenging the beef industry and the genetic altering and radiation of food) and edited by **FAR member, Carol Grunewald**. This quarterly publication supplies detailed information

about the manipulation of our food and is indispensable for those who want to understand what the beef and dairy industries, along with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, try to foist on the public.

SATYA: A Newspaper for Environmentalism, Animal Advocacy, and Vegetarianism is a brand new publication and is available free for the asking in New York City and an annual charge of \$5.00 outside of NYC. Write to P.O. Box 1771, New York, NY 10159 or call 212-545-7569.

The **HUMANE EDUCATION COMMITTEE** has available a new 66-page teaching unit designed for grades 3 to 6 entitled "Towards A Healthy Diet and Lifestyle," which includes, among other things, suggestions to help children build healthy lifestyles and good eating habits. The packet is designed, in part, to help introduce vegetarian and vegan concepts to elementary school students. The complete packet is \$15 from the HEC.

THE LOWFAT JEWISH VEGETARIAN COOKBOOK, by Debra Wasserman is available for \$15 per copy from **Vegetarian Resource Group**. Also available through them for \$16 per copy is the **EUROPEAN VEGETARIAN TRAVEL GUIDE**, including nearly 2000 restaurants and hotels in 18 countries.

Now available for you sporty vegans: a nonleather baseball glove. The size is 11 1/2 and the cost is \$36.95 plus \$3.45 for shipping. This company also stocks a large selection of nonleather shoes. For a catalog and ordering or information, contact **Heartland Products, Ltd., Box 218, Dakota City, IA 50529, (515) 332-3087**.

We encourage bookstores to sell this newsletter. Generous discounts. Contact us for information.

THE ANIMALS' AGENDA

The Animals' Agenda

is a bimonthly magazine dedicated to informing people about animal rights and cruelty-free living for the purpose of inspiring action for animals.

An indispensable tool for all animal advocates!

- In-depth news analysis of topical issues
- News updates and briefings
- Feature articles on key animal rights issues
- Reviews, letters, activities, writing to Congress
- "Your Agenda" — Practical action you can take!

Just \$22 for 6 issues.

The Animals' Agenda

Department 594F2X
P.O. Box 6809, Syracuse, NY 13217

Subscribe!

BECOME A NEWSLETTER SPONSOR!

If we are to continue publishing this newsletter, we are going to need financial help to do so. Won't you please help us? It costs between \$2,000 and \$3,000 to print and mail the newsletter and it is becoming more and more difficult for us to meet this financial obligation. At present, we do not have enough money to publish the next issue. Please help to keep this important newsletter in print by becoming a Sponsor.

Contributions of \$1,000 or more will earn you life membership in FAR, a FAR t-shirt, the FAR Bibliography, and a copy of one of Carol Adams' books (see listing on page 18). Contributions of \$500 to \$999 will earn you a FAR t-shirt, the FAR Bibliography and one of Carol Adams' books. Your name will also appear in the next issue as a sponsor of that issue.

Yes, I will be a sponsor of the next issue of the *FAR Newsletter* and enclose the following amount:

\$2,000 _____ \$1,000 _____ \$500 _____ other \$ _____

Name _____ Telephone _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

You have permission to publish my name as a sponsor.

Title of Carol Adams book: _____

T-shirt size and color (please list first and second choices): _____

HOW TO CONTACT ORGANIZATIONS CITED IN THIS ISSUE

Activist Support Network
POB 9286
Missoula, MT 59807

The Animals' Advocate
The Animal Legal Defense Fund
1363 Lincoln Avenue
San Rafael, CA 94901

The Animals' Voice Magazine
6433 Topanga Cyn. Blvd. #405
Canoga Park, CA 91303
800-82-VOICE

The AV Magazine
The Journal of the American
Anti-Vivisection Society
801 Old York Road #204
Jenkintown, PA 19046-1685
215-887-0816

Bunny Huggers Gazette
P.O. Box 601
Temple, TX 76503-0601

The Committee to Abolish Sports
Hunting (C.A.S.H.)
P.O. Box 44
Tomkins Cove, NY 10986
914-429-8733

Doris Day Animal League
227 Massachusetts Ave #100
Washington, DC 20002
202-546-1761

Farm Sanctuary
P.O. Box 150
Watkins Glen, NY 14891-0150
607-583-2225

P.O. Box 1065
Orland, CA 95963
916-865-4617

Friends of Animals
777 Post Road #205
Darien, CT 06820
203-656-1522

The Fund for Animals
850 Sligo Ave #300
Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-585-2591

The Grass Roots & Public Policy
1130 17th Street, NW Suite 630
Washington, DC 20036
202-466-2823

Humane Education Committee
P.O. Box 445
New York, NY 10028
212-410-3095

People for the Ethical
Treatment of Animals (PETA)
P.O. Box 42516
Washington, DC 20015
301-770-PETA

Physicians Committee for Responsible
Medicine
5100 Wisconsin Ave, Suite 404
Washington, DC 20016
202-686-2210

PIGS Sanctuary
P.O. Box 629
Charles Town, WV 25414

Pro-Animal
P.O.B. 2039
Rehovot 76120 Israel

Pure Food Campaign
1130 17th St., NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
202-775-1132

Response
Simon Weisenthal Foundation
9760 W Pico Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90048
310-553-9036

SPAY/USA
14 Vanderverter Ave
Port Washington, NY 11050
800-248-SPAY

The Vegetarian Resource Group
P.O. Box 1463
Baltimore, MD 21203
410-366-VEGE

WHISPER
Box 65796
St. Paul, MN 55165
612-644-6301

MERCHANDISE

BOOKS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Green Paradise Lost \$12.95 (PB)
by Elizabeth Dodson Gray. An introduction to ecofeminist thought.

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

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

With a Fly's Eye, Whale's Wit, and Woman's Heart \$9.95 (PB)
And a Deer's Ear, Eagle's Song, and Bear's Grace \$9.95 (PB)
both edited by Theresa Corrigan and Stephanie Hoppe. Two anthologies celebrating the relationships between animals and women.

Free the Animals! The Untold Story of the Animal Liberation Front and Its Founder, "Valerie" . . \$13.95 (PB)
by Ingrid Newkirk. The title says it all!

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

The Cookbook for People Who Love Animals \$9.95 (PB)
A vegan cookbook with simple recipes by Gentle World.

Diet for a New America: How Your Food Choices Affect Your Health, Happiness, and the Future of Life on Earth \$13.95 (PB)
by John Robbins.

The Compassionate Cook, or "Please Don't Eat the Animals!" \$9.00 (PB)
by Ingrid Newkirk and the people at PETA. A vegan cookbook.

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

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

FAR BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

BUMPER STICKER

"Feminists for Animal Rights" \$1.00

BUTTONS \$1.00 each

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

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

Back Issues of FAR NEWSLETTER Available for \$3.50 each (Canada and other countries - \$5.00)

Articles in the *FAR Newsletter* do not, for the most part, become outdated. Those few that do become outdated because of new information can serve as important historical information. Following are issues of the *Newsletter* that are available. Each is \$3.50 unless otherwise indicated. (Postage is included within the United States. For Canada add \$1.00, for foreign delivery add \$2.00 for each issue requested.)

Volume VIII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1994) "Pharmaceutical Giant Exploits Horses and Menopausal Women;" "Sheltering the Companion Animals of Battered Women;" "EcoVisions Unites, Ignites Sisterhood of Ecofeminism;" Editorial: "Reform, Abolition, or a New Feminist Analysis?" "An Ecofeminist Statement delivered at the Summit for the Animals;" Book Review: "Cooking, Eating, Thinking: Transformative Philosophies of Food;" "A New Life for Tara;" and more.

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

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

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

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

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

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION AND MERCHANDISE ORDER FORM

PLEASE PRINT

DATE: ___/___/___

Name: _____ Address: _____ Apt. # _____

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

MEMBERSHIP

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

\$ _____

MERCHANDISE

Item(s)	Description	Quantity	Price	TOTAL PRICE

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

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

Postage/handling: \$ _____

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED: \$ _____

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

Address correction requested

Forwarding and return postage guaranteed

P.O. Box 16425
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

FEMINISTS FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS



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

FEMINISTS FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS

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

