

# **ANIMAL ISSUES**

*philosophical and ethical issues related to human/animal interactions*

**VOLUME 4 NO. 2 2000**

**SYDNEY AUSTRALIA**

# ANIMAL ISSUES

The aim of this journal is to investigate philosophical and ethical issues related to human/animal interactions. Papers are invited on any topics within this general area.

**Founding Editor:** Dr. D. Russell, Department of General Philosophy,  
University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia  
e-mail: Denise.Russell@philosophy.usyd.edu.au

**Co-Editors:** L. Birke, Institute for Women's Studies, Lancaster  
University, UK.

B. Forsman, Centre for Research Ethics,  
Goteborg University, Sweden.  
b.forsman@cre.gu.se

P. Hallen, Institute of Science and Technology  
Policy, Murdoch University, Western Australia.

F. Mathews, School of Philosophy,  
La Trobe University, Victoria, Australia.

V. Plumwood, Research Scholar, Research Institute  
for the Humanities and Social Sciences,  
University of Sydney.

Word length should be 4,000 - 10,000 words and papers should preferably be sent on a Mac disc or by e-mail to the editor, or if this is not possible, a hard copy should be sent to the editor. Style guide available on request.

**Subscriptions (2000 rates):**

*Australia and New Zealand:* A\$12 per issue (postage included)  
Back copies: A\$5.00

*Other countries:* A\$20 per issue (postage included)  
Back copies: A\$8.00

Please see back page for payment details

# ANIMAL ISSUES

Vol. 4, No. 2

2000

## CONTENTS

<b>Lisa Galmark</b> Women antivivisectionists – the story of Lizzy Lind af Hageby and Leisa Schartau	1
<b>Simone Poirier-Bures</b> Zaran	33
<b>Alphonso Lingis</b> Quadrille	37
<b>Laura J. Ragan, Lori A. Scinto and Jennifer A. Szymanski</b> Howling about Wolf Control in Minnesota	59
<b>Simone Poirier-Bures</b> The Chicken Tree	79
<b>Review essays:</b>	
<i>Animal models of human psychology: critique of science, ethics and policy,</i> by Kenneth Joel Shapiro reviewed by Alison Turtle	83
<i>The Universal Declaration of Animal Rights: Comments and Intentions</i> edited by Georges Chapouthier and Jean-Claude Nouët reviewed by Denise Russell	88
<i>Preserving Nature: an International Perspective</i> edited by Mark A. Michael reviewed by Suzanne Fraser	93
<b>Book Review:</b>	
<i>The Lives of Animals</i> by J.M. Coetzee reviewed by Denise Russell	97
<b>Index</b>	99



## Women antivivisectionists - the story of Lizzy Lind af Hageby and Leisa Schartau

Lisa Gålmark

Two young women meet for the first time at a dinner party; they find they have much in common and decide to travel together to London where they begin to study physiology; out of interest but also because of the vivisections being performed before students. They are both sceptical towards this method of learning but want to look further into the matter and find out if their critical arguments hold.

Their studies result in a book, *Shambles of Science. Extracts from the diary of two students of physiology*. *Shambles of science* becomes an instant hit and receives two hundred reviews in the British papers during the following months. The debut is the beginning of a public commitment to the question of vivisection. The women also advocate social reforms, gender equality, preventive healthcare and vegetarianism (they are vegans). Their efforts among people in the street have been called the first mass campaign in the history of the movement.

The two women stage and participate in public debates with physiologists and doctors; they found an organization and a journal. The campaigns end in court and receive much attention from the press – not as much for the points of prosecution as for the person representing the campaigning side: a woman who defends herself for the duration of 32 hours. *The Nation* comments:

The long trial revealed the most brilliant piece of advocacy that the Bar has known since the day of Russell, though it was entirely conducted by a woman. Women, it appears, may sway courts and judges, but they may not even elect to the High Court of Parliament.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Nation*, 26.4.13.

As you may have guessed, it was not today nor yesterday that the Swedish women Lizzy Lind af Hageby (1878-1963) and Leisa Schartau (1876-1962) performed their test of investigative journalism and activism.

The book *Shambles of Science* was printed 1903, in a time when women did not have the right to vote;<sup>2</sup> were not allowed to study to become lawyers, and when prominent medical scientists insisted that a woman who educated herself took the risk of damaging her uterus (and so could not have children).<sup>3</sup>

Lind af Hageby and Schartau went out into the streets, talked from speaker tribunes, arranged open air rallies at a time when women of their social class were expected to wait at home for their husband, placidly embroidering something moderately useful.

The present day American animal rights movement has been described by sociologists James M. Jasper and Dorothy Nelkin, as well as by anthropologist Susan Sperling.<sup>4</sup> They have found that sympathizers of the movement come from all social classes and that women are highly represented. Their studies cover the animal rights movement, not particularly the anti-vivisection part – though antivivisection can be said to be included in the animal rights movement. The high representation of women in the American animal rights movement is in line with the Swedish figures. In Animal Rights Sweden (the former Swedish Society against Painful Experiments on Animals) 80% of the members are women.<sup>5</sup> Among the members of the largest British antivivisection organization, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV), 73% are women.<sup>6</sup>

The majority of people involved in animal issues are women, today as well as a hundred years ago. Why did the remarkable women Lizzy Lind af Hageby and Leisa Schartau commit themselves to the issue of antivivisection? What did their work

---

<sup>2</sup> Votes for women: in Britain, 1918; in Sweden 1921.

<sup>3</sup> This was assured by the chairman of the British Medical Association at the end of the nineteenth century. See Elaine Showalter, *Sexual anarchy: Gender and culture at the fin de siècle* (Virago Press, London, 1992). p.40.

<sup>4</sup> James, Jasper & Dorothy Nelkin, *The animal rights crusade* (The Free Press, New York, 1992) and Susan Sperling, *Animal liberators: Research and Morality* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1988).

<sup>5</sup> Anders Mathlein, 'Djurens befrielsearmé', *Dagens Nyheter*, 12.2.95.

<sup>6</sup> BUAV Supporter analysis, Internal document, 22.1.96, p.3.

express? And how does their commitment correspond to the explanations and theories of earlier historical research?

## Animal – human and other, place in society

In the Christian view of the world Man was God's face on earth with a given dominion over animals and nature. In science the male was closer to God the Father than the female - and woman was a defective man, innately sick. Such was the perception during the Victorian age, according to historian Cynthia Russett. Due to Charles Darwin's theory of evolution it was no longer possible to say that man was an entirely separate creation from animals. This contributed to the turbulence of new ideas. Russett states that the period was so full of change materially, religiously and socially that a hierarchy among humans was needed more than ever. Science had become a tool to underrate women together with children and 'lower' races, as well as 'lower' social classes, and 'lower' species. Women were seen as delicate and sensitive but at the same time as having a low sensitivity for pain, like primitive people; a residue from the lower animals' capacity to restore a lost organ.<sup>7</sup>

Women at the turn of the century were generally seen as morally superior and at the same time more emotional and sentimental; associated with body and nature. Women were supposed to be passive and loving bound to the sphere of home and its reproductive character. Men were in general seen as rational, conquering and active; associated with intellect and culture with a place in the public, the productive sphere.<sup>8</sup>

A third of the total British working force were women at the base of the social ladder and they struggled to survive by hard physical labour. Middle and upper class women had few possibilities to get jobs and access to spheres other than home.

At the absolute summit of the social ladder were men alone; doctors and lawyers for instance were exclusively male. Even socially life for women in the upper classes was severely

---

<sup>7</sup> Cynthia E. Russett, *Sexual science* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1989), *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> Ulla Wikander, *Der evigt kvinnliga* (Tiden, Stockholm, 1994), p.13.; Karin Johannisson, *Den mörka kontinenten* (Norstedt, Stockholm, 1994), p.26. and Richard D. French, *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1975).

restricted.<sup>9</sup> If human beings in the form of man were at the top in an ideological hierarchy and held most of the power, animals were at the bottom of the scale. The theory of Charles Darwin showed, however, that man was related to other animals, and that this relation implied a probability that many other species could in fact feel and experience in similar ways to human beings.<sup>10</sup>

Animals had many functions in this Edwardian age; they were slaughtered and eaten as food; they were used as labour in mines and factories; in agriculture, in the cities as draught-animals; as entertainment and for sport (fox hunting, dog fights, horse racing etc). Some species functioned as family members, the phenomenon of companion animals had existed before but became more frequent in all social classes during the Victorian era. The historian Richard D. French has suggested that the phenomenon was a last link to life in the country – something the urbanized person had an urge to maintain. Industrialization and urbanization had in relation to earlier conditions marginalized animals as a labour force in industrial production.<sup>11</sup>

At the same time, animals as a resource in science gained significance. The number of animals vivisected and killed per year increased largely in the period when vivisection was questioned the most. In the year 1880, 311 animals were vivisected in England. During 1900-1913/14, when Lind af Hageby and Schartau were active, the number of vivisections increased from about 10,000 per year to about 95,000.<sup>12</sup>

The status and treatment of animals in the hierarchy of human society seem in practice to have varied depending on species, on intentions of the owner - whether they were intended as companions, as slaughter animals, as vivisectional objects or if they were not owned at all.

---

<sup>9</sup> Paul Thompson, *The Edwardians* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1975), p.16 and p.91.

<sup>10</sup> Keith Thomas, *Människan och naturen* (Ordfront, Stockholm, 1988), p.158.

<sup>11</sup> French, *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society*, p.373 ff. and Thomas, *Människan och naturen*, p.205.

<sup>12</sup> French, *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society*, p.394, figure 17.



## Women in the antivivisection movement

There is not a lot of data on the participation of women in antivivisection organizations. According to French, the number is 40-60% in leading positions until the end of the nineteenth century. According to other writers in the nineteenth century, the antivivisection movement had the highest female participation next to movements with women's rights goals.<sup>13</sup> Female participation increased from the start of the debate to the latter half of the nineteenth century and onwards.<sup>14</sup> Lind af Hageby and Schartau confirm the picture: in their organization twelve out of 33 chairpersons were women and on the executive board there were seventeen women and six men in 1911. Among the permanent members 59 out of 72 were women in 1912.<sup>15</sup>

## Moral utopia finds its role

Let us follow some of the events involving Lind af Hageby and Schartau from the publication of the above mentioned book in 1903 to the trial in 1913.

*Shambles of Science* received many comments in the press. In spite of its 200 pages it was seen as a 'very little book indeed' – this may be connected to the way one-volume titles were regarded at the time. Three-volume works were the norm; a symbol of the Victorian family: father, mother, children. One-volume works symbolized the new single-life, a possibility for more and more people (the celibate, the bachelor, the 'odd woman').<sup>16</sup> *Shambles of Science*, like the single woman, may have reminded the public opinion about the new independence that women were demanding and the place in the public sphere that they were craving.

The philosophical thesis of *Shambles of Science* states that vivisection manifests materialism. This materialism is opposed to a spiritualism that comprises ethical development where the

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p.239. In Sweden the antivivisection movements were made up of 45% women. 1,829 were women out of a total of 4,087 members in the 'Swedish society, to fight scientific cruelty against animals'. (Yearbook, 1901).

<sup>14</sup> Mary Ann Elston, 'Women and antivivisection' in N.Rupke (ed), *Vivisection in historical perspective* (Routledge, London, 1987), p.267.

<sup>15</sup> Animal Defence and Antivivisection Society Report (1916).

<sup>16</sup> Elaine Showalter, *Sexual Anarchy* (Virago Press, London, 1992), p.16.

goal is love and compassion towards all living creatures. Vivisection is in contrast to a sort of 'neovitalism': 'Our life is not the mere outcome of chemical and mechanical forces.'<sup>17</sup> With the method of vivisection physiology takes several steps backwards to René Descartes and his view of animals as soulless machines, despite the fact that we now know that animals have both consciousness and emotions.

Lind af Hageby and Schartau were interested in spiritual thinking and they were advocates of 'moral utopism' – criticism of prevailing social conditions in society in combination with a faith in human nature being able to form itself towards a new morality which is not egotistical, a quite common outlook at the turn of the century.<sup>18</sup> Diseases were not only material, they had psychological dimensions. When medicine presumed a solely material starting-point even though it only was as regulative principle and not as metaphysics it provoked Lind af Hageby and Schartau metaphysically and methodologically: how was anyone to get anywhere scientifically without understanding that the material was a manifestation of the spiritual? In moral terms the battle of Lind af Hageby and Schartau centers around duty ethics. According to them nobody – no animals, no humans – should ever be used as means to better conditions for others.

They had met the author Henry S. Salt (1851-1939) in the summer of 1901, and they sympathized with his philosophy about animal rights; what he called 'humanitarianism' – humans and animals were fellow beings who had the right not to be exploited. Salt's society, the Humanitarian League worked to expand the vote, to get land reform, to abolish punishment in schools; supporting antivivisection, vegetarianism and feminism.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Louise Lind af Hageby & Liesa Schartau, *The Shambles of Science*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition (The Animal Defence and Anti-Vivisection Society, London, 1903), p.xxii.

<sup>18</sup> Historian Inga Sanner has coined this concept. See Inga Sanner, *Att älska sin nästa såsom sig själv* (Carlssons, Stockholm, 1995), p.395 and p.399.

<sup>19</sup> Henry Salt, *Djurens rättigheter* (G. Walfrid Wilhelmssons, Stockholm, 1903), translated into Swedish by Julie Blomqvist. Original title: *Animal Rights*, (1894). Salt was a pacifist and socialist. About Salt, see Colin Spencer. *The Heretic's Feast. A history of vegetarianism* (Fourth Estate, London, 1993), p. 287.; Thomas, *Människan och naturen*, p. 208 and Richard D. Ryder, *Animal revolution* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1989), p. 125 ff.

## Philanthropy

Lind af Hageby and Schartau were philanthropists; they were aristocrats (Lind af Hageby) and upper class; they were women who were denied access to education and working opportunities which men in their class were offered, and Lind af Hageby involved herself in other social issues. They took part in associations and activities where women according to society's rules were permitted to be active, even though the purpose of the enterprise was to change society.

This is only the surface however; their commitment displays an entrance into spheres outside the conventional philanthropic ones. The book *Shambles of Science* meant publicity and battle before the general public – a space women rarely occupied. The public conflict in the vivisection issue contains moral and scientific dimensions; and it contains conflicts with the medical profession and its formation. It entails a fight against values about women's place, as well as about animal's place in society.

The battle against society's established values concerning what is to be seen as female versus male qualities and which sex is allowed to do what, it is not a conflict that these two women expressed. It is society that responds with this view of the matter. The reactions in the press to *Shambles of Science*, revealed these values openly: women with their presumed character and lower position in society may not testify in challenge to a profession formed by and for men. Women, including the authors, lack ability to make sound judgements. Their witness is 'hysterical'.<sup>20</sup>

From Lind af Hageby and Schartau's point of view the controversy revolves around the fact that those who defend vivisection cannot place themselves in the position of the powerless.<sup>21</sup> Lind af Hageby and Schartau seem to have been conscious of the socially challenging implications of the antivivisection argument. They were to experience more of it.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Leader of Daily Express* 18.11.03, *Morning Leader* 18.11.03, *The Star* 19.11.03, *Daily News* 19.11.03.

<sup>21</sup> *Star* 9.12.03, *Daily News* 11.12.03.

## Ideology of the time, socialism

In the beginning the antivivisection movement gathered people with little in common besides being middle or upper class.<sup>22</sup> At the turn of the century, animal issues gained support from a wider spectrum of political positions. The time was turbulent in many respects, even within the antivivisection movement. People from different social classes and political views mingled in the opposition to vivisection. Women's rights had been debated for a long time but it was now taking on a more militant form. Socialist parties had been founded, as well as generally progressive and reformist clubs where people met and discussed.<sup>23</sup>

At an antivivisection meeting at Caxton Hall in 1908 where Lind af Hageby was introductory speaker, the other speakers were both conservatives and socialists.<sup>24</sup>

Charlotte Despard who was mentioned as a feminist leader in literature about this period, was involved in Lind af Hageby's and Schartau's association, the Animal Defence Society and arranged rallies. She was a vegetarian and socialist fighting for the unemployed in Battersea, London.<sup>25</sup>

The influence of the socialists was clearly shown in the antivivisection issue, and in the events around the The Brown Dog Memorial Statue in Battersea. The statue honored the dog whose vivisection is described in *Shambles of Science*. The socialist Cunningham Graham, speaker at the antivivisection meeting in 1908, suggested that animals were used for vivisection because they were cheap, helpless and could not make their voices heard and had no right to vote. In the same way one could regard the poor and they were also vivisected. Many operations at hospitals were cruel and unnecessary, according to Cunningham.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> French, *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society*, p.263.

<sup>23</sup> Thompson, *The Edwardians*, p.5 and p.347. There was 'deep self questioning at all levels of society'.

<sup>24</sup> Protocol (1908). Miss Lind-af-Hageby's Anti-Vivisection Council. A demonstration. Caxton Hall, Westminster, Tuesday May 12th, 1908.

<sup>25</sup> Coral Lansbury, *The Old Brown Dog: Women, workers and vivisection in Edwardian England* (University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1985), p.14 and p.26.

<sup>26</sup> Protocol, (1908), p.19-20.

A priest, Noël, believed that health in Battersea should be attained through improving the way of living, not through cruelty. Equal distribution between poor and rich people would bring the disappearance of undernourishment and associated diseases, as well as diseases associated to luxury living.<sup>27</sup>

Battersea's socialist mayor did not believe in the threats from doctors who claimed they would be forced to experiment on the working class if they were not allowed to use animals. He believed instead that experiments performed in secrecy led to doctors subjecting poor people to experiments at hospitals.<sup>28</sup> If animal welfare in the nineteenth century was an upper class issue – something happened at the turn of the century. Lind af Hageby and Schartau were familiar with the view of vivisection as the elite method of medicine, a method that implied eliminating the social causes of diseases. They had contributed to a worker's journal in Sweden called *Lucifer ljusbringaren* and they connected the two struggles.<sup>29</sup>

## Ideology of the time, the threat of feminism

The turbulent era of feminism and class struggle give the two women opportunities to launch the issue of vivisection in public. Vivisection had come to interest a new social group and it became more permissible for women to enter speaker's tribunes, to take place in the public sphere. Lind af Hageby and Schartau were moving towards the 'male' sphere in different areas; as physiology students, as speakers, as leaders. They used this rapprochement; they cultivated and took up opportunities to use their rationality. In the case of Lind af Hageby this meant being unusual as a woman; and because of her brilliance, also to become sought after as a debater, speaker and writer.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Manchester Dispatch* 17.9.06.

<sup>28</sup> *Morning Leader* 17.9.06. The concept of vivisection entailed both humans and nonhumans. Lederer claims that in the US the antivivisectionists were alone in protesting against vivisections/experiments on humans. See Susan Lederer, *Subjected to science: Human experimentation in America before the second world war* (Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1995).

<sup>29</sup> The *Lucifer ljusbringaren* program: 'Knowledge for freedom and social happiness to the people. Knowledge about humanitarian movements and their leaders. Knowledge of justice and goodness towards humans and animals.'

However they are still in the female bourgeoisie sphere because of the ideological connection between women and sentimentality and the connection to domesticated animals such as cats and dogs. When they start to debate boundaries, especially since they do not do this as admiring students at the 'London School of Medicine for Women'; they violate the unwritten rules as public critics with the ability to gain support and admiration from the public.

At their antivivisection meetings, there are students who play fools' games, shout demeaning calls at the women and attempt sabotage with stinkbombs. As a rule the students do not have to fear these women and their ambitions.

The students may feel secure being part of the university establishment and the power and high social status attached to the whole setting of medicine. Provoking the protesters of vivisection could therefore easily be combined with the usual student pranks but there is a bit of fear, though arrogant in its manifestation. The mobilizing of the students suggests this: 200 students had come to the antivivisection meeting on the 2nd November, 1907 and over 1,000 signed a petition against the Brown Dog Statue.<sup>30</sup>

The students' reaction was also aimed at the mixed opposition against vivisection formed in Battersea. Antivivisectionism had been established in Battersea for some time. The Anti-Vivisection Hospital was situated here, the socialists had been in majority in Battersea Borough Council for many years and the statue as well as Battersea Dogs Home were also to be found there.<sup>31</sup>

Most certainly, the people of Battersea had much fun when supported by antivivisection organizers, they got the opportunity – as lower class against upper class – to beat up the students. For the working people, the drama contained both seriousness and entertainment.

Lind af Hageby experiences laughter as well as appreciation - the audience is shouting and stamping their feet. In fact the situation

---

<sup>30</sup> Ford, E K., *The Brown dog and His Memorial* (Stanley & Paul Co, London, 1908), p.14. See *Daily Graphic* 15.1.08.

<sup>31</sup> Lansbury, *The Old Brown Dog*, p.7. The local trade unions collected money for the hospital. (p.19.) Battersea Dogs' Home was a dog's shelter. In 1907 it was suggested by Professor Starling, one of Lind af Hageby's and Schartau's teachers during 1902-03, that the home should provide dogs for experiments. (p 7, and p.173.)

is similar to the one described in *Shambles of Science* where the students are laughing and clapping while the animals are vivisected. In the book she and Schartau were sitting among the students, now it is Lind af Hageby who is the object of ridicule. On her side there are now many men amongst others the workers from Battersea who assist in throwing out the students.<sup>32</sup> These men seem to have sympathized with antivivisection. But what about the women of Battersea? Did they send their men or was their workload so heavy that there was no time to go to meetings? What was their opinion?

The majority of male workers were probably not particularly interested in feminism, and the men from the trade union who supported Lind af Hageby when she talked about vivisection saw women's rights as a threat to their job opportunities. It could mean competition from cheap labor.<sup>33</sup>

Still they defended the statue in the form of a 'drinking-fountain'. It may be that there was more than symbolic meaning and identification with animals in this: many families did not have fresh water. A fountain meant drinking water. The fountains were used by both animals and humans.<sup>34</sup> Working to improve living conditions for people was also an argument used among antivivisectionists – with fresh drinking water diseases could be avoided. Social reform was the foremost medical method, not vivisection.

## Consolidation of the role

### Lind af Hageby vs Halliburton<sup>35</sup>

Let us now listen to Lind af Hageby and one of her opponents in a debate of 1907: approximately a thousand people had come to the Portman Rooms at Baker Street in London the 16th May 1907 when Lind af Hageby was to debate with Halliburton. In her opening speech, Lind af Hageby stressed the fact that vivisection was nothing new. The method had been practised both on humans, especially criminals, and animals during previous

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p.18.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p.22.

<sup>34</sup> Concerning the function of the fountains, see Thompson, *The Edwardians*, text to picture on page 11.

<sup>35</sup> Debate (1907), pp.4-10. Verbatim report.

decades and it had periodically emerged again without resulting in any great discoveries. Experiments of today are less cruel, and the causing of pain is more considered than in the 1860s and 70's, she says, but the excuses are now wholly different than they were 50 to 60 years ago. Today it is said that vivisections are done in the interests of humanity and that they are necessary to medicine. This is not true, Lind af Hageby claims. With the support of quotations she emphasizes the variations between the physiology of different species and their varied reactions to different drugs. The results are not transferable to humans. Her second objection to vivisection from a scientific angle is that the method used to cause disease and unnatural conditions signifies that results will be unreliable. When the science of physiology begins to study the wholeness of the organisms and their 'unicity', it will become exact. To isolate parts without recognizing their interrelation hinders physiology from making progress. The method of vivisection will be abandoned during the twentieth century, Lind af Hageby says to the audience - who shout either 'Yes!' or 'No!' and applaud.

Preventive medicine through hygiene and sanitary measures will become important, as well as rational cures: more sophisticated methods like radiation energy. Food habits will become a way to cure illness, Lind af Hageby believes. She ends her speech saying that the question at stake really is a moral one: Aristotle taught that slaves were only domesticated animals with intelligence; we have come far since then. Every century has widened our sphere so that we may embrace 'the brotherhood of man'<sup>36</sup> and also recognize our responsibility towards the animals. The results of vivisection may seem necessary, but only in the short term. If we abandon the method we will get more and better results - both physically and socially.

### Halliburton vs Lind af Hageby<sup>37</sup>

During the speeches, the audience interrupts. The students yell and laugh; ladies in the front row clap and cheer. Both camps shout 'Shame!' and 'No!' etc.. The chairperson, an aristocrat and member of the Parliament, exclaims 'Order, order!'. Halliburton says that he feels that he is at a disadvantage, he is second speaker and he thinks that there are people in the audience who have

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p.9.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., pp.10-17.



negative feelings towards him, or fear those he represents; and he has 'nothing sensational to put before you'.<sup>38</sup> There are people who will believe anything, and what can you say to them? he wonders. 'Truth', the audience yells, and 'Science'.<sup>39</sup>

Does Lind af Hageby know that those who first protested against cruelty in vivisections were doctors? Medical journals during the 1860's and 70's condemned vivisections sharply, as sharply as the associations which represent this futile struggle today?

Halliburton wants to show that vivisection is not cruel, and as a rule not painful. There has been a law for thirty years, anaesthesia is being used, still people are suspicious as if our profession was inherently cruel. The distrust is not compatible with the fact that these men are 'honourable English gentlemen'.<sup>40</sup> To observe the pulse and the heart is sufficient to see if an animal is rendered insensible, even with the use of curare. Vivisections are allowed because they are necessary to fight the suffering in the world. Doctors and veterinarians see so much suffering that they want to do something about it. When you yourself get sick you will accept the help from the 'cruel' doctor who has performed vivisections.

If you despise the act then ponder the high motives that lie behind it, the highest you can have. Will you let your children die for the sake of a rabbit? Halliburton goes on to say that knowledge about diet, hygiene and bacteriology all originated from vivisections. The same was true about anaesthetic measures and antiseptics. Nobody cares about other usages of animals. He had been at a meeting where Lind af Hageby spoke and never saw such a display of ospreys in his life. Lind af Hageby herself is a vegetarian. How many here are vegetarians?

Halliburton had recently read a book called *The Expensive Miss Du Cane*<sup>41</sup> about a lady who took twelve lessons in just about everything. She reminded him of Miss Lind af Hageby. She has probably had no more than twelve lessons in physiology but on the strength of those she advises physiologists and doctors how to do their work. In medicine all parts are necessary: vivisections, chemical and microscopical investigation, observing by the

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., p.11.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p.10.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p.12.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p.16.

bedside, post-mortem examination. All this is necessary to make physiological discoveries.

The anti-vivisection movement has started stories about vivisections that are not true, says Halliburton and he uses different papers as examples. The people attacked as cruel vivisectioners are honourable and friendly, more honourable than the whole audience. Still you call them torturers, he says.

There are medical men, extremely few in number, who stand out by being anti-vivisectionists. When a doctor poses as an antivivisectionist 'he is at variance with the vast majority of his fellows, and against all that is best and wisest in the great profession of mercy we call the medical profession.'<sup>42</sup> Such people are 'imposters',<sup>43</sup> since they know that the instruments and cures of today originate from vivisection on animals. To use anaesthetics is to use something that has come out of vivisections.

However the antivivisectionists have recently become rather more sensible. The struggle against vivisection is hopeless; it is like the story about Mrs Partington who tried to keep back the Atlantic with her mop. 'Well you may wave your little mops; you may publish your little pamphlets, but it will have no effect in staying the great onrush of knowledge and consequent alleviation of human suffering which that knowledge will bring with it', says Halliburton and the students in the audience sing: 'For he is a jolly good fellow.'<sup>44</sup>

## Sex as a disadvantage

The fact that women were involved in the antivivisection movement and that many leaders were women as well as the fact that the rhetorics were said to be emotional, must have given the opponents an advantage. People with a subordinate sex (women) worked for a group whose status in society were even lower on the scale (vivisectioned animals). This might have been a reason why Halliburton on the 16th May chose not to respond to the

---

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p.27.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p.28. The debate was reviewed extensively in the *Daily News*, *Tribune*, *Morning Leader*, *Star* and *Morning Post* 17.5.07.

arguments from Lind af Hageby. The conditions of power were already settled, why bother?

The pro-vivisectionists may have had an interest in antivivisection being associated with women and the prevailing construction of femininity. Antivivisection could then be perceived as weak, unprofitable and without career possibilities other than for those who already had an income or were provided for. The pro-vivisection organisation Research Defence Society (RDS) was formed when women's voices were starting to be heard and the suffragette movement was gaining ground. Perhaps it was not seen as proper anymore just to ignore or dismiss?

### Lind af Hageby and Halliburton as symbols

When Lind af Hageby meets Halliburton two individuals with different premises confront each other. They are different sexes and have different social positions in society. They represent different sides of the vivisection controversy but because of this they play an active role in the conflict about subordination and power for men and women in society. Halliburton represents a profession with an increasingly consolidated position of power. Lind af Hageby represents a movement in opposition to this profession.<sup>45</sup>

As an individual Lind af Hageby is more independent than Halliburton. She has no economic interest in the issue of vivisection, no pressure from colleagues. From this point of view she has an advantage. While she could concentrate on the argumentation per se, Halliburton was trying to defend his professional code of honour. 'We are not bad people, trust us, we are gentlemen.' He may have underestimated the audience when he did not answer the arguments of Lind af Hageby or it may have been a conscious strategy in line with the formulation of the problem saying that vivisection was too complicated a question for the 'ordinary man' to comment on.

The debate must have been an entertaining piece of theatre whichever side the people in the audience were on. The dichotomy for or against made the question appealing. It had the character of the old gladiator games with two opposing parties and

---

<sup>45</sup> See French, *Antivivisection and the medical science in Victorian society*, p.338 for more on the consolidated profession.

it presented a man, a professional person on one side and a woman, a foreign aristocrat on the other.

Lind af Hageby wanted to meet pro-vivisectionists in intellectual battle. The papers report bragging about not standing on a platform without opposition.<sup>46</sup> Through the antivivisection question she has encountered a gap in the strategy of social exclusion but it closes again when, after a few successful debates, nobody wants to take her on. From a gender perspective one can say that she has entered the wrong area – and with critical opinions. The arguments in the debates as well as in the commenting papers, fall into oblivion. Lind af Hageby's sex and personality are stigmatized as in Halliburton's demeaning comments about the expensive 'Miss Du Cane' and Mrs Partington's failure to stem the Atlantic with her mop.

### Lind af Hageby as a lawyer in 1913

In June 1911 Lind af Hageby and Schartau start campaigning from 170 Piccadilly Street, London aiming at people passing by the window. The message is abolitionist: the law concerning vivisection means that animals are tortured; experiments on animals should be stopped.<sup>47</sup> In 1913 Lind af Hageby sues the paper *Pall Mall Gazette* for libel. In the *Pall Mall Gazette* 7th May and 10th May, 1912 there were articles by a Dr C. W. Saleeby saying that the campaign frightened women and children and that the message contained factual errors.<sup>48</sup> The exhibition showed a 'panopticon picture': a model of a man leaning over a table where a dog is fastened on its back.<sup>49</sup>

The trial of 1913, *Lind af Hageby v Astor and others*, gains attention mostly because Lind af Hageby acts as her own lawyer although women still cannot become lawyers in the UK; but also because of the many hours and words she spends as well as the

---

<sup>46</sup> Lind af Hageby emphasizes this often. For example: 'All inquiry, all controversy, all discussion of a subject...tend to further the final triumph of truth and justice'. (*Anti-vivisection Review*, II, (1910-11), p.31.)

<sup>47</sup> Notes of court proceedings in the High Courts of Justice, King's Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, 3rd - 23rd April, 1913 before Mr. Justice Bucknill and a special jury. *Lind-af-Hageby - v - Astor & others*. Third day, p.3.

<sup>48</sup> *Daily Telegraph* 14.4.13.

<sup>49</sup> Photograph: 'Two years shop campaign in Piccadilly. The Anti-Vivisection window' and exhibition 'Dog on operation-board'. (*Animal Defence and Anti-Vivisection Society Report* (1913), p 17.)

way she acts. According to the papers it is a record with a total of 32 hours or 330,000 words.<sup>50</sup> 'But by far the most striking feature of the case was the high standard of intellectual ability displayed by Miss Lind-af-Hageby, and the astonishing physical task of which she acquitted herself', the *Daily Telegraph* wrote.<sup>51</sup> In spite of it being words from a 'highly-strung woman, [she] did not depart from womanliness.' and 'Who says now that women should not be admitted to the Bar?' were other typical comments.<sup>52</sup> However the Jury do not see that the *Pall Mall Gazette* articles were aimed especially at Lind af Hageby personally and therefore she loses the trial.

The public success gives Lind af Hageby opportunities to state her opinions on different matters. In a lecture series on feminism in 1914 she sees the revolt of women as one of the most important questions of the time. The battle is inevitable: 'It is necessary from the point of view of social evolution that two opposing parties should feel strongly and passionately in order to achieve movement'<sup>53</sup> and 'the very essence of social life is change'.<sup>54</sup> According to Lind af Hageby, the *Times* editorial said that women had poorer brains than men and Otto Weininger, the author claimed that they did not have any at all! 'Let us grant that the average woman is more ignorant, politically and socially, industrially, from the business point of view, than the average man. If she wants to remedy that defect, if she wants to find knowledge, to educate herself, to widen out her sphere, then she is told she is no longer "pleasant"' says Lind af Hageby.<sup>55</sup> But what are the appropriate spheres for women and men? We don't know woman yet: 'We only know a creature whose human qualities have been stifled at the expense of her sexual qualities...The whole idea of what woman can do and cannot do is entirely one of geography, of circumstances, of environment, of convention.'<sup>56</sup> She thinks that 'the social evolution' will create a bridge between man and woman and lead to greater understanding, 'an exchange

---

<sup>50</sup> *Daily Chronicle* 4.4.13, *Daily Telegraph* 24.4.13, *Daily Mirror* 24.4.13. The introductory speech was nine hours long.

<sup>51</sup> *Daily Telegraph* 24.4.13.

<sup>52</sup> *Daily Chronicle* 24.4.13; *Liverpool Evening Express* 24.4.13.

<sup>53</sup> Lecture (1914), no. 1, p.2.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

of qualities, a spiritual bisexuality, which will by and by create the perfect humanity which we are seeking.<sup>157</sup>

The magazine *The Antivivisection Review* produced by Lind af Hageby and Schartau from 1909-11 has a significant cover: 'Humanity' and 'Science' stretching towards the sky in the shape of two women holding torches, 'Humanity' has a child and 'Science' a dog at her feet. However Lind af Hageby does not explicitly bring forward the feminist perspective in her antivivisection statements.

Lind af Hageby's personality and actions bridged masculinity and femininity. The construction of gender roles did not suit her and brought bad results in medicine. She defied conventions but was not entirely excluded since she uses conventions about women and men as tools; the triumph of this strategy is the unanimous press tributes in 1913. The series of lectures on feminism 1914 testifies to her consciousness concerning the structural conditions under which she and Schartau worked.

### Lind af Hageby's antivivisection becomes women's rights

In the trial of 1913 Lind af Hageby saw a possibility to spread her message on antivivisection and she must have wanted to use her unusual capability to entertain an audience. By fighting for antivivisection she had in fact attained knowledge that society did not allow her to practice as a profession because of her sex. The legal profession was still closed to women in the UK. During this period Lind af Hageby achieved the role of public opinion moulder, and in that sense a certain political influence in spite of the vote being years in the future. In the High Court in 1913 she exercised both legal skills and knowledge about vivisection.

It is not surprising that the panopticon picture in the window of 170 Piccadilly did upset the opponents. Although it was undramatic in itself, it was life sized and had a theme – the scientist bending over the dog with a callous expression – which can be said to hint at pictures of the male scientist/doctor bending over the study object/woman that were abundant during the

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p.21.

Victorian age.<sup>58</sup> Perhaps the model symbolized more than it was meant to; not only a critique against vivisectors and the practice of the vivisection law but also against the conditions for women in a society where men had the power in the home as well as in the rest of society. The impression of the trial was foremost not about antivivisection. The reaction of the press to Lind af Hageby as lawyer overshadowed this. The fact that she was a woman was emphasized in every paper.

## The new woman

Lind af Hageby polished those parts of her personality which could be tolerated and appealing to conventional society. The reactions of the newspapers showed this clearly. Her social competence was upper class and the courtroom was indeed an upper class setting. People at the time were alarmed by feminism. The suffragettes were on hunger strike in prisons causing a big headache for the established society. Will women attaining power turn into men? Or will they remain women, a lesser type of man, an emotional and hysterical animal who frees itself from its cage?

In the eyes of the press Lind af Hageby resembled the male lawyer as much as was possible without losing her femininity. Earlier in her diary, she had testified to detesting the uncomfortable clothes for women and the discomfort she feels in some female milieus.<sup>59</sup> She complained of feeling like half a person. It was a strain affirming rationality to the extent that her position invited.<sup>60</sup>

-----

---

<sup>58</sup> Ludmilla Jordanova has made this connection between vivisection and woman as object of study. Jordanova is discussed in Showalter, *Sexual Anarchy*, p 145. In Johannisson, *Den mörka kontineten*, pp.42-43 and p.108 there are several pictures with this theme of the male scientist bending over his woman object of study lying on a table. It is tempting to remember a similar theme in another, but relevant situation: the suffragette being forced in 1912. The suffragette is being held, a man bends over to force her to open her mouth. Photograph in Johannisson, p 23.

<sup>59</sup> Articles positive to 'dress-reform' appeared in the *Antivivisection Review*, eg. I (1909-10), p. 265 ff.

<sup>60</sup> Diary 21.3.06.

## Women and antivivisection – Lizzy Lind af Hageby and Leisa Schartau

### Symbols and surrogates?

We have followed two women during an eventful period in their struggle against vivisection at the turn of the last century. We have heard their – especially Lind af Hageby's – own opinions and the opinions of their opponents and the media. Why so many women became involved in antivivisection is a question few historians have investigated. I will use my findings to discuss some of the earlier explanations and also try to give an alternative viewpoint where the opinions of Lind af Hageby and Schartau are taken seriously.

The question about why women were engaged in the antivivisection movement is of course a question about antivivisection as a whole. Historian Richard D. French states that the abstract animal rights philosophy used by the antivivisection movement only makes sense if that philosophy is seen as an extension of attitudes towards companion animals. The most important sign of these underlying forces was the anthropomorphizing of the animals. French discusses a period before the turn of the century but the explanation could also be relevant in a later period.<sup>61</sup>

The anthropologist Susan Sperling has a different standpoint. The stereotype of 'eccentric spinster ladies' devoted to their surrogate children in the form of companion animals is misleading. The antivivisection movement was very sophisticated, well organized and quite powerful. The movement's arguments were mainly the same as those of the animal rights movement today.<sup>62</sup>

Lind af Hageby and Schartau were only two of the women committed to antivivisection but they were leaders and Lind af Hageby in particular can be said to have had a prominent position. If one looks at Lind af Hageby's and Schartau's involvement, Sperling's thesis seems more fitting than French's. The two women were intellectually well formed. They were vegetarians in the strict sense. Among the animals mentioned in their book *Shambles of Science* there were animals such as frogs,

<sup>61</sup> French, *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society*, pp.372-75.

<sup>62</sup> Sperling, *Animal Liberators*, p.26.



not solely companion animals. The view of animals taken by Lind af Hageby was aimed at animals directly, not animals as a surrogate for something else. Animals as well as humans should be embraced with compassion not because they were companion animals (if they were) but because they could feel pain and because it was 'wrong to exploit them for our supposed service and for our use'.<sup>63</sup> The coherence in Lind af Hageby's and Schartau's theory and practice means that the animals cannot have been just symbols for something else. Exactly how common their outlook was among other antivivisectionists nobody knows due partly to the fact that the philosophical and ideological differences have not gained attention from historians. Rather, the battle between Lind af Hageby and Schartau versus their opponents seems to have revolved around whose perception is the true one: which perspective is the appropriate one for judging and expressing opinions about the situation of animals? In this sense, on this level, the animals become symbols, tools in a battle for power: who has the right qualifications to perceive what is happening to an animal? Who has the power to assert their own perception? From this perspective the whole antivivisection issue becomes a symbol for conditions of power. One can extend this perspective further: if the methods of science were the battleground, animals were the weapons used. 'It was not experiments on animals they were protesting against, it was the shape of the century to come', French writes about the first wave of antivivisection.<sup>64</sup> The Swedish historian Sverker Sörlin has in a similar manner described the antivivisectionists in Sweden as 'conservative cultural pessimists' who were more interested in the moral fate of humanity than in the suffering of the animals.<sup>65</sup>

It may be that one must see antivivisection as an issue that can harbour and interest different forces in society at different times in history. Lind af Hageby and Schartau express a rather utopian view as early as 1901 and throughout the period there is an optimism and almost religious faith in what they call the social evolution towards a better world. The privileged were constantly

---

<sup>63</sup> *Evidence* by Miss Lind-af-Hageby before the Royal Commission given on 1st May and 5th June, 1907, London: Miss Lind-af-Hageby's Antivivisection Council, p.99.

<sup>64</sup> French, *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society*, p. 412.

<sup>65</sup> Sverker Sörlin, *Naturkontraktet. Om naturumgängets idéhistoria*, (Carlssons, Stockholm, 1991), p.166.

relinquishing their power to those that did not have any.<sup>66</sup> It is important to emphasize the difference between the periods before and after the turn of the century. As we have seen antivivisection seems to have become an issue appealing to different social groups.

It is hard to find any evidence confirming the thesis that antivivisectionists were not sincerely touched by the fate of the animals. The logic in the philosophy of Lind af Hageby and Schartau as well as the indignation in *Shambles of Science* rather seem to be proof of the contrary. The two women clearly advocate an animal rights philosophy, against the view that sees animals as slaves of human society. To regard animals as slaves is an injustice, since animals have rights not to be negatively used by humans.

Another historian, James Turner, has stated regarding the British animal welfare movement in the nineteenth century, that a newly formed middle class which was worried by the consequences of the industrialization felt guilty when they saw the poverty among workers and made animals surrogates for their compassion.<sup>67</sup> Turner's explanation can be applied to the issue of women and antivivisection at the turn of the century, since mostly middle and upper class women seem to have been concerned. The thesis can be true, at least subconsciously, for the actual period. But like French's argumentation, it seems to presuppose that antivivisection in itself was a (psychologically) absurd standpoint which calls for excuses rather than discussion and explanation. In the case of Lind af Hageby there already was a commitment to social issues; she had experience of and was active in supportive associations for poor women (prostitution).<sup>68</sup> Both women contributed to a Swedish Labour journal, and Lind af Hageby recruited socialists to the organization. For their part the surrogate-for-compassion-with-the-poor thesis seems more of a type of explanation which make excuses than tries to make the

---

<sup>66</sup> Lind af Hageby refers to Benjamin Kidd's book *Social evolution*, (Föredrag, 1914), p.20.

<sup>67</sup> James Turner, *Reckoning with the beast: Animals, pain and humanity in the Victorian mind* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1980).

<sup>68</sup> Lind af Hageby was used to being criticized for defending animals. 'Is it proper to care about animals when people are suffering? I have found that people asking this question generally do not do anything to prevent either of these problems'. (*Daily News and Leader*, 26.3.14.)

phenomenon intelligible. How much relevance it has for women antivivisectionists in general is however uncertain.

Similar explanations of the phenomenon of animal welfare are presented by the historian Keith Thomas. He states that historians who regard the movements against the slavery system during the latter half of the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth as methods to redirect the radical energy from the misery in the British working class, could say the same about the struggle against cruelty to animals.<sup>69</sup>

Antivivisection had, as we have seen, other starting points than animal welfare. The antivivisection movement had begun as an opposition against animal welfare and its lack of radicalism. Although the contents of the politics, the radical abolitionist standpoint, was an important reason for this, there were other factors as well.

Animal welfare, represented by the RSPCA, had aimed at cruelties within the working class, not those performed in the middle or upper class. The campaigns were about working class sports like cock fighting, cat-throwing, bear-baiting etc while the fox hunting of the upper class was left uncriticized.

There was no place for radical animal rights ideology advocated by Henry Salt, Lind af Hageby and Schartau among others which meant that the principle against cruelty to animals counted irrespective of social class. Many of the leaders of the antivivisection movement were committed to other causes like feminism and antivaccination. These causes were on the side of poor women and children and they criticized elite groups of society, scientists and doctors.

## Women leaders

Traditional animal welfare had been conservative and followed the prevailing exclusion politics regarding women and power. For instance it was not permissible for women to enter the Board of the RSPCA until 1896.

---

<sup>69</sup> Thomas, *Människan och naturen*, p.210. Women's struggle has been criticized in the same manner. Marxists for example suggest that equality between the sexes would come without effort once class society is dissolved.

In the new antivivisection associations there were possibilities for women to excel and they did get many women members. There were also many women models like Frances Power Cobbes whose pioneering efforts must have appealed to women as well as the fact that she acted in the area of women's rights. The two doctor pioneers Elizabeth Blackwell and Anna Kingsford, were antivivisectionists who played important roles. The movement explicitly encouraged women to become doctors.<sup>70</sup>

Middle and upper class women's opportunities to free themselves from the allotted sphere and to make their voices heard were principally to be found in private political organizations. But why antivivisection? Historian May Ann Elston has warned that one may think that antivivisection was something that all feminists and women sympathized with. Within organizations with aims to further women's rights, antivivisection was a controversial issue. If women wanted to compete with men on equal terms, they had to accept the existing conditions in professional and scientific life.<sup>71</sup> That meant accepting vivisections in for example education to become doctors.

## Women, nature, animals

Antivivisection was described by its agitators as a moral question and morality was part of the construction of 'femininity'. Most of the animals represented species that also appeared in homes, so-called companion animals. They belonged in that way to the home sphere. At least in the propaganda of Lind af Hageby and Schartau they were pictured as helpless victims, something which might have struck women who identified themselves with a gender role that was supposed to be the conscience of society.

The domestication of animals - in the double sense of taming them and affecting their traits through breeding, as well as their place in culture - in association with middle and upper class women's expected traits and sphere - could mean that women identified themselves with animals in this way too.

---

<sup>70</sup> Another alternative was to stop going to doctors, according to Blackwell cited in French, *Antivivisection and the medical science in Victorian society*, p.240.

<sup>71</sup> Elston, 'Women and antivivisection', p.286. According to French, *Antivivisection and the medical science in Victorian society*, feminism was important in attracting women to antivivisection, p.246.

Historians Carolyn Merchant and Cynthia Russett emphasize the connection between women and nature within science. Male scientists during the nineteenth century describe their activities as a conquest of nature, and nature as a woman. Francis Bacon in the seventeenth century used rape as his central metaphor describing the process whereby the scientist subdued nature 'and wrested her secrets from her'. Claude Bernard, prominent physiologist in the nineteenth century, talked of nature 'as a woman, who must be forced to unveil herself when attacked by the experimenter and who must be put to the question and subdued'. Both these men were front-line figures in modern science.<sup>72</sup> Lind af Hageby and Schartau react to this metaphor by seeing the scientist as a jealously armed man who attacks to rip secrets from the bosom of nature. The first chapter of *Shambles of Science* starts as follows:

Armed with scalpel, microscope, and test-tube, the modern physiologist attacks the problem of life. He is sure that he will succeed in wrenching the jealously guarded secrets of the vital laws from the bosom of Nature.<sup>73</sup>

Elston has shown that medical science, and medical practice, were often formulated as metaphor for rape in British antivivisection literature after 1880.<sup>74</sup>

Scientific discourse as explicit worldview reflected gender constructions by stating that female and male traits were rooted solely in biology. Prominent scientists sexualized their relation to nature and animals and perceived them as symbols for the female/femininity. It may be that the results from scientists especially when they were used ideologically and politically led to a general suspiciousness from middle and upper class women. For example, scientific 'facts' were used to show that women were inherently unfit to gain access to education.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Hilary Rose, *Love, power and knowledge* (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1994), p.44.

<sup>73</sup> Lind-af-Hageby & Schartau, *Shambles of Science*, p.3.

<sup>74</sup> Elston, 'Women and antivivisection', p.279.

<sup>75</sup> Ann Dally, *Women under the knife* (Hutchinson Radius, London, 1991), p. 93 and Ornella Moscucci, *The science of woman: Gynaecology and gender in England, 1800-1929* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990), p.107.

## Women's experiences

French has found that letters from women to antivivisection magazines expressed an identification with animals. The letter writers felt that when animals were tortured it was as if it happened to them.<sup>76</sup> What experiences of women – especially the social group forming the antivivisection movement – could have affected an identification with animals? And as in the case of Lind af Hageby and Schartau, also lead to sympathy with women from the lower class who visited the hospitals? Elizabeth Blackwell, a doctor at the time, claimed there was a link between the increasing number of operations on women in the end of the nineteenth century and the increase of animal experiments. Furthermore the vivisections of animals could lead to the usage of human patients as clinical material. Blackwell wrote that 'The great increase in ovariectomy, and its extension to the insane is a notable result of this prurigo secandi (itch to cut)'.<sup>77</sup>

According to historian Karin Johannisson, the medical methods had developed to become more experimental and interventionist and gynaecology was characterized by frequent usage of instruments and punishment as therapy.<sup>78</sup> The physician Ann Dally states that poor people were used to attain skill and knowledge in surgery but sick middle class women who could pay for their treatment were also used. These women suffered from the lack of interesting occupation and they were caught in the prevailing myths about what women were and could be. All these women that were operated upon - and this in a time of prudence and fear of bodily expressions - experienced the role of patient in relation to doctors and also experienced being on an operation table.<sup>79</sup> It was not unusual for patients of both sexes to be exhibited undressed before students as illustration and example.

The experience of being at the mercy of male doctors on an operating table may not in itself be a sufficient explanation as to why many women were committed to antivivisection nor can other explanations *in themselves* explain the phenomenon.

---

<sup>76</sup> Susan Lederer, *Subjected to Science* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1995), p.37.

<sup>77</sup> Blackwell in Moscucci, *The science of woman*, p.158.

<sup>78</sup> Johannisson, *Den mörka kontinenten*, p.177, p.204 and p.208.

<sup>79</sup> Many women did not want to undress themselves before a male doctor. There were long queues to the first women doctors. (Dally, *Women under the knife*).

When different circumstances and facts concur a certain pattern of acts become probable. There must have been many middle class women with operated abdomens who did not sympathize with antivivisection as there were women doctors who were pro-vivisectionists. One of them was Elizabeth Garret Anderson (1836-1917), the first registered female British doctor who had studied and attained her degree in England.<sup>80</sup>

Literary historian Coral Lansbury has stated that the reason for the riot concerning the Old Brown Dog Memorial in 1907 was that the vivisected animals reflected feminists' and workers' own situation. The poor of London and especially the poor among women, 'victims' of both gender and class suppression were being used by doctors for medical purposes, at lectures as well as in research.<sup>81</sup> Lansbury has also drawn parallels between pornography, literature and medicine of the time to show that women may have identified with vivisected animals. In pornography women were flogged, tied to tables etc; often they resembled unwilling animals, horses (mares) to be curbed, domesticated and broken.<sup>82</sup> Prostitution was a seasonal job and a rational choice for many poor women given the alternatives.<sup>83</sup> The fact that they frequented the hospitals may have contributed to the issue of antivivisection being relevant to them. When the Royal Commission on Vivisection in 1907 asked Lind af Hageby if it is right to break horses for riding, this was a question loaded with symbolism. Lind af Hageby herself did not come from poor social conditions but she did have experience of prostitution as a phenomenon through her involvement in the regulation issue. Undoubtedly she comprehended the symbolism.

## Professionalization, gender and antivivisection

French has read the periodicals of the antivivisection movement of the 1860-80s. He concludes that women involved in antivivisection were discontent and distrusting of the entire profession of physicians.<sup>84</sup> The distrust was spread amongst other groups as well. G B Shaw, for example, in his book *Doctor's*

---

<sup>80</sup> Elston 'Women and antivivisection', p. 284.

<sup>81</sup> Lansbury, *The Old Brown Dog*, especially p. 58.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid. Also see Carol Lansbury, 'Gynaecology, pornography and the antivivisection movement', *Feminist Studies*, 11 (1985), pp.414-437.

<sup>83</sup> Walkowicz in Sperling, *Animal Liberators*, p 55.

<sup>84</sup> French, *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society*, p.342.

*Dilemma* of 1906, attacks vivisection and criticizes the medical profession for being commercial.

The antivivisectionists attack upon the medical profession did come about late in the transformation of the profession. The body of physicians was already strong as was the experimental method. Most of the physicians were loyal even those who did not perform vivisections.<sup>85</sup> When Halliburton in the debate with Lind af Hageby in 1907 compared the struggle against vivisection with the woman trying to stop the flooding sea with a cleaning mop, this is a satire with some truth in it.

One could say that the social exclusion of women affected the gender system on several levels. Women were not just formally excluded from the profession but also indirectly through lowered motivation: vivisection excluded those who did not want to be hardened; those whose sex was defined as emotional, moral, and caring.

Stephen Paget chairman in the Research Defence Society formed in 1908 expressed how this definition affected men's opinions of women at several times: women doctors were a different type of woman, the rest were 'ladies'.<sup>86</sup> Antivivisection could be used as a counter attack on this exclusion of women by recommending social exclusion of a different kind. Lind af Hageby stated that women antivivisectionists should refuse to socialize with vivisectors.<sup>87</sup>

According to the medical doctrines spreading during the nineteenth century, which continued to dominate, 'woman' was a defective sex. Those doctrines were used to prevent women from studying and, for example, becoming doctors.<sup>88</sup> This pathologizing spread to the issue of antivivisection. Women's interest in antivivisection was pathologized. In the beginning of Lind af Hageby's and Schartau's careers as public antivivisectionists, the press stigmatized them as hysterical.

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., p 294.

<sup>86</sup> Protocol (1908).

<sup>87</sup> The 'ten little rules' can be found in the *Antivivisection Review*, II (1910-11), p. 35.

<sup>88</sup> Dally, *Women under the knife*, p.93 and Moscucci, *The science of women*, p.107.



The turn of the century was the golden age of hysteria as historian Karin Johannisson has shown. This diagnosis was very frequent in medical circles.<sup>89</sup> In the US in 1910 a neurologist claimed that women's sympathy for dogs was an expression of 'zoophilic psychosis'. Women could be divided into two types: one being the motherly type, the other the prostitute, and women caring about dogs did not belong to the first group.<sup>90</sup> Prostitution, animals, and independent women could in this manner be mixed and stigmatized as a punishment for women who tried to free themselves from the limited domestic sphere.

## To search for a different kind of life

From Lind af Hageby's and Schartau's viewpoint, their moral philosophy was the starting point. They were not especially interested in animals and they did not themselves identify with animals more than with other groups. They empathized with the powerless and saw their struggle as a part of many reforms for justice in society. According to their spiritual beliefs, there was a probability of being reborn as an animal or as man. This most likely affected their will to identify with other groups which did not resemble their own. Lind af Hageby did express direct identification though: 'I would certainly prefer to be a wild sheep than a domesticated one.'<sup>91</sup>

Lind af Hageby and Schartau did not want to be domesticated in the sense of having their lives restricted to a home, obeying the 'master of the house'. They did not accept the prevailing role for women and one can say that they showed this in practice by entering platforms, public places, courts and newspaper columns. The antivivisection movement constituted a gap in society's exclusion of women, a practical liberating opportunity for self-realization. The fact that marriage and childbearing meant losing the few political rights that were allotted to women must have influenced their choice to remain unmarried and live with each other instead. In a letter to her brother Ernst, Lind af Hageby expresses her irritation over the fact that he cannot accept her lifestyle.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Johannisson, *Den mörka kontinenten*, p 149.

<sup>90</sup> Lederer, *Subjected to science*, p.36.

<sup>91</sup> Diary 26.6.06; Lind-af-Hageby (1907) Evidence.

<sup>92</sup> 'How in heaven's name you in these enlightened times dare to advise me to get myself a home I do not know!!! Do I not have a "home"???' (Letter to Ernst 16.8.13).

Lind af Hageby and Schartau reflect the time they live in; the values that are still a result of the Victorian age; they are part of it. But they are also dissidents in their criticism of society, both in ideology and in their choice of lifestyle. The experience of being a woman in a society constructed by males and the identity that culture moulds them into have given them special foundations to practice and maintain that part of the human brain which mediates experiences and expressions of empathy.

As women they have a superior position in that empathy developed to sympathy is associated with 'femaleness' and 'femininity'. They have an expertise. But they do not only react. They bring this expertise into a project in the new society which is, little by little, letting go of the tightly defined sphere for women. Lind af Hageby especially takes advantage of this opportunity to use her great capacity for rationality – a trait seen as an expression of 'masculinity'.

When they confronted a whole body of scientists on the vivisection issue they also confronted the formal and social exclusion that this professional body had tried to uphold. Their answer was to define people with power and economic interests as not being able to judge and perceive the issue from the point of view of the powerless and exploited. They did not try to become a part of the profession and its scientific discourse. They criticized it not only in part. They wanted another science, a science characterized by the expertise they possessed: compassion. They believed vivisection to be the wrong way to deal with diseases, diseases were symptoms of unequal distribution of wealth and had social causes.

Certainly vivisection for them represented a society which excluded them as highly competent women; a society which permitted exploitation of women in their homes, at hospitals, in the streets as prostitutes and as cheap labour. Seen in this way, antivivisection meant revolting against the whole of patriarchal society with its social hierarchies and the subduing of women, nature and animals.

It was the disadvantageous position which Lind af Hageby and Schartau perceived in the situation of vivisected animals. They had the expertise and their view was reinforced by the negative

picture of medicine which had become part of women's experiences. But the values surrounding woman as a gender, *either* as a mother tied to the home setting and probably getting ill due to under-stimulation, *or* as a free wild sexualized prostitute beast, must have affected their identification with animals.

These subconscious values probably affected different women in different ways. They might be clues – besides the fact that career possibilities were limited for women in science if they refused to perform vivisections – as to why the feminists of the time considered the issue controversial. And it should have resulted in an ambivalence for women trying to form an identity. In a new era, which was to give women more freedom and opportunities, a new outlook on women was needed. To be associated with animals in any way at all must have been problematic.

Finally one may ask what the experiences of Lind af Hageby and Schartau tell us today. In what ways does the high frequency of women interested in animal questions reflect our society and its still prevailing male order? To what extent are the explanations and motives discussed above relevant today?

## Biography

*Lisa Gålmark has a BA in history and philosophy. She was the cultural editor of the journal Djurens rätt (Animal Rights Sweden) for ten years and has published several books. Djurrätt (Nya Doxa, Nora, 1998) and Vadå Vegan (Rabén & Sjögren, Stockholm, 2000), are the first Swedish books about animal rights and veganism. Currently she is translating into Swedish the novelist J.M. Coetzee's book, The Lives of Animals (Princeton University Press Princeton, 1999). She is also working on a book about female antivivisectionists at the beginning of the twentieth century.*

**Ethologists for the Ethical Treatment of  
Animals (EETA)  
Citizens for Responsible Animal Behavior  
Studies  
(CRABS)  
([www.ethologicaethics.org](http://www.ethologicaethics.org))**

*Mission statement*

Marc Bekoff and Jane Goodall are forming an international and interdisciplinary group called "Ethologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals/Citizens for Responsible Animal Behavior Studies" (EETA/CRABS).

Scientists, non-scientists, teachers, and students are most welcomed. Our purpose is to develop and to maintain the highest of ethical standards in comparative ethological research that is conducted in the field and in the laboratory.

Furthermore, we wish to use the latest developments from research in cognitive ethology and on animal sentience to inform discussion and debate about the practical implications of available data and for the ongoing development of policy.

If you are interested, please contact

Marc Bekoff at <[Marc.Bekoff@Colorado.edu](mailto:Marc.Bekoff@Colorado.edu)>  
or at EPO Biology,  
University of Colorado,  
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0334 USA.

## Zaran

Simone Poirier-Bures

(For Alice Walker)

**W**hen we first moved here there were two of them - beautiful white horses with a kind of smoky look. Arabians, with huge, firm haunches and a deeply masculine mien, like athletes with oiled muscles. Zaran and Zarif: It took me a while to learn their names. Sometimes they stood by the side of the fence and snorted while I passed, friendly snorts, their huge faces leaning over the wire. Sometimes they'd gallop through the field, their heads and tails high and proud, like thunder, like a roaring waterfall, like tap dancers on drums.

Then Zarif died. He caught some disease, or perhaps it was food poisoning. In any case, a few days later, he was dead.

Zaran missed him. You could tell by the way he moped around, as if he no longer knew who he was, as if Zarif's presence had defined him: *I know who I am because of that other, like me.*

Then a young colt arrived. Brown and shiny like a ripe chestnut. Bob, they called him. He was small and frisky, and towered over by the solid, broad-shouldered Zaran. Who became coltish himself in the following months, charging up and down the field with Bob. When they weren't running, they'd stand side by side facing opposite directions, the way horses do, companionable, silent, feeling each other's body heat.

Bob grew up and it was time to have him trained. No one had ever ridden him, and it was thought that one of the girls who lived in the house might want to put a saddle on him. He would have to be sent away for this.

The day the horse-trailer arrived, Zaran pulled his ears back, suspicious. The same horse trailer had carted off Zarif to the vet and he had never returned.

Two men led Bob out of the paddock and put him in the trailer. Zaran watched, pacing back and forth, the muscles in his neck taut with worry. The men went into the house for a few moments. Bob, in the trailer, whinnied. Zaran whinnied back, and soon the air rang with the frantic calls of the two horses.

The men came out and started up the truck. As they drove down the road, Zaran ran the whole length of the field beside them, his eyes huge, his voice an agony of protest and disbelief.

All summer his grief was huge and silent.

But Bob came back. I heard a ruckus horse--sounds--and looked out. The horse-trailer and Bob were coming down the road and Zaran was practically leaping out of his skin, running up and down the fence line in anticipation, the two horses calling to each other. I never saw such happiness. There was thunder in the field again. I thought of a huge sun shining in a blue blue sky.

Last winter, a sudden storm dropped six inches of snow. Bob tripped in a small sink hole and broke his leg in several places. Nothing could be done for him. He lay there in agony, until someone came with a rifle and put him down. They buried him in the same field the two horses had run in.

So Zaran is alone again. Neighbors bring him apples and carrots and talk to him, but none of that removes the deep loneliness from his eyes. He's like an old man with nothing much to look forward to. Does he miss Bob? Zarif? Does he remember them? Or is this just anthropomorphism, the imaginings of an overly sensitive writer?

One night a few weeks ago, I went out for a walk after dark. It was bitter cold, but there was a big moon and a fine dusting of snow, so everything looked bright and magical. I heard a low snuffling sound and looked over to see Zaran standing in the middle of his field. Why was he out there like that, instead of in his shed, where it was warm and sheltered?

A small movement caught my eye. Ten feet or so away from him stood two does, quietly feeding on the stubble sticking up above the snow. They were brown and sleek and small-boned, like

young horses.

I'd like to think that he finds their presence comforting. I'd like to think that something stirs in his memory, something dim that doesn't quite have a shape. He stands there in the moonlight, listening to their snuffling and snorting, feeling the heat from their bodies. And though he knows that there's something different about them, something not quite like me, it's all that he has, and for now, perhaps it's enough.

## Biography

*Simone Poirier-Bures is the author of three books: 'Candyman' (1994), a novel set in her native Nova Scotia; 'That Shining Place' (1995), a memoir of Crete; and 'Nicole' (2000), a collection of short fiction and memoir, also set in Nova Scotia. She has published twenty-two short stories, ten essays and works of creative nonfiction, and several poems. Her work has been included in eight anthologies and more than two dozen journals. She is the recipient of a Virginia Commission for the Arts grant, six prizes for short fiction and memoir and the Evelyn Richardson Award for 'That Shining Place'. Currently she teaches in the English Department at Virginia Tech, in Blacksburg, Virginia, USA.*

## **ANTHROZOOS**

### **A multidisciplinary journal of the interactions of people and animals**

Anthrozoos is a quarterly, peer-reviewed publication whose focus is to report the results of studies, from a wide array of disciplines, on the interactions of people and animals. Academic disciplines represented include: anthropology, archaeozoology, art and literature, education, ethology, history, human medicine, psychology, sociology and veterinary medicine.

Send all manuscripts, books for review and correspondence to

Dr. A.L. Podberscek,  
Editor-in-Chief,  
University of Cambridge,  
Department of Clinical Veterinary Medicine,  
Maddingley Road,  
Cambridge, CB3 0ES, U.K.

email: alp18@cam.ac.uk

fax: +44 (0)1223 33 0886 (delete 0 if  
calling from outside UK.)

For subscription information contact:

Delta Society,  
289 Perimeter Road East,  
Renton, WA 98055-1329, U.S.A.  
email: deltasociety@cis.compuserve.com



## Quadrille

### Alphonso Lingis

The pair of long, highly decorative feathers of the king-of-Saxony bird of paradise are valued as decorations both by bowerbirds and by Papuan people. The selection process by which these feathers evolved was carried out by female birds of paradise, not by humans or bowerbirds - but all three species find them attractive.<sup>1</sup>

## Courtship

### Why does lust demand beauty?

In humans as in other species, the urge to indulge in sexual display with concomitant activities is probably to some degree innate and is certainly influenced by internal and also environmental stimuli and inhibitors. The establishment of feudalism in Europe freed the warrior caste from bondage to agricultural and craft labor, and their military and police obligations became episodic. Their existence became only the more public, a display of signals. In order to be effective, signals have to be reliable; in order to be reliable, signals have to be costly, argue ethologists Amotz and Avishag Zahavi. If the signaler could have given the opposite signal and gained thereby, the signal that he did give at a loss is credible.<sup>2</sup> Their display behavior became more and more elaborate.

The knights began to dress in refined fabrics, dyed and embroidered linens and silks, decorated with ruffles and lace, set off with furs. Unlike the stately and static raiment of the monarch, their apparel was designed to be displayed in movement - in parades, dances, and tournaments - even though both the bulk and the refinement of this apparel handicap movement. They contrasted the sleek clinging of stockings and leggings and bared chests with billowing

---

<sup>1</sup> J. David Ligon, *The Evolution of Avian Breeding Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999), p.223.

<sup>2</sup> Amotz and Avishag Zahavi, *The Handicap Principle* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999), p.xv.

shoulders, flared sleeves, and flowing capes. They grafted upon themselves the glittering plumes of rare birds, the secret inner nacreous splendors of oysters, the springtime gleam of fox fur. At their crotches they sported brocaded and jeweled codpieces. They wore helmets of gleaming metal adorned with filmy plumes; their boots were embossed leather with buckles of silver. They wore jewelry of precious metals and precious stones and perfumes made of musks. They remained professional warriors and bore arms, but their swords were forged of rare metals and the hilts adorned with jewels. The fantastically arrayed body was set apart, remote from all laborious concerns, ostentatious and alluring.

The knights evolved a specific beauty which is ostentatious, spectacular, monstrous - glamorous. It is not the beauty of ideal bodies celebrated in classical sculpture, the splendor of harmony, proportion, and inner timelessness, that is, without internal factors of disequilibrium or change. It is not the functional beauty of workman's garb, Mongolian herdsman's longcoat, boots, and fur hat, aviators' jackets and helmets. The apparel of the knights monstrously enlarges and distorts the proportions of body parts, the head, the arms, the genitals. Intense and showy colors and intricate embroidery and beadwork are displayed. The body is used as a frame for the display of the gossamer texture or heavy folds of fabrics. While colors, textures, and designs are harmonized, they are so in contrasting intensity.

Knights cultivate gallant and ceremonious ways of gesturing and moving, marked with statuesque postures and poses. They carry on their wrists hooded falcons with gorgeously designed and colored plumage. They parade mounted on sleek horses with embossed and studded saddles.

Natural cries, shouts, outbursts, murmurs give place to vocalizations all of which are to be some measure mimicry: whenever he speaks, the male came to speak as a knight, a prince, a priest, a peasant, a foreigner, a servant, or a supplicant. The knights developed special vocalizations - declamations, epic chants, and romantic songs.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> A red-eyed vireo in eastern North America sang 22,197 songs in a single day. L. de Kiriline, 'The Voluble Singers of the Tree-tops', *Aububon Magazine*, 56, pp.109-11.

The display behavior of these males is elaborated in intersexual selection. Whereas mutual selection leads to the most enduring pair bonds but also the greatest similarity, intersexual selection consistently promotes the most striking contrasts between the sexes in appearance and behavior. Human males are on average twenty percent greater in size than females, but there is no reason to think that it is natural for them to use their greater size and musculature to forcibly subdue females for sexual pleasure. Rape is not the norm in nature. Elaborate and fantastic courtship behaviors have been much documented among jewelfish, whitefish, sticklebacks, cichlids, and guppies, among fruit flies, fireflies, cockroaches and spiders, among crabs, among mountain sheep, antelopes, elk, lions, and sea lions, and among emperor penguins, ostriches, pheasants, and hummingbirds. Females are drawn to the most imposing and most glamorous males; females select their sexual partners. The epigamic characters for which knights are selected by females signal their superior genetic endowment. They also function as stimuli for sexual arousal of the females.<sup>4</sup> At the present time, we do not know how much a mode of display behavior has been incorporated within the central nervous system, ready to be called into play by the action of sex hormones which are liberated during the maturation of the gonads.<sup>5</sup>

To multiply one's own genes is the single evolutionary imperative. In natural selection, success means success in reproduction. Ordinary natural selection and sexual selection seem to pull in opposite directions. Ordinary natural selection tends to make individuals inconspicuous, conservative of energy, and streamlined for more effective

---

<sup>4</sup> Pair-formation having taken place with or without a certain amount of display, the posturing of the paired birds has the effect of establishing in-phase correlation between them. Chapman says of Gould's manakin, 'Whatever be the sexual condition of the female she apparently must be courted before she will receive the male.' Similarly Bristow, writing of certain spiders, thinks that without prior courtship display it is impossible for the female to copulate. Selous reached the conclusion that greyhens come to the lek for the definite purpose of being aroused sexually, and if the stimulation is not sufficient they depart without coition having taken place. Without sex play the reproductive cycle of certain frogs, toads, newts, lizards and fish apparently cannot be completed. Edward A. Armstrong, *Bird Display and Behaviour* (Dover, New York, 1965), p.34.

<sup>5</sup> A.J. Marshall, *Bower-Birds* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964), p.166.

action. Sexual selection frequently promotes brilliant raiment, extravagant adornments, noisy and conspicuous behavior, all of which consume a great deal of energy and make individual males vulnerable. R. A. Fisher<sup>6</sup> described this as a runaway process: the only advantage the ostentatious males have is the fact that females consider them attractive. Since such males pass on the show-off character to their offspring, those offspring will show off and will be attractive to females too. Thus females lose by having offspring who waste resources on showing off.

But the same costly characteristics that attract mates also deter rivals of the same sex. Male rivals remain intimidated by the same exorbitant display that attracts females. They must see in the extravagance of the signal the high costs to the knight, and thus his superior vitality.

Armed, bold, ostentatiously exhibiting virile postures and vigor, warriors exhibiting a touchy susceptibility and sense of honor before other males, the male display counts as a display of genetic vigor which promises fit offspring. Females then who become entranced by the most lavishly attired males, or those who display most dashingly or persistently, choose for vigor, perhaps unwittingly. The qualities the knights exhibit, however, are not those of a good spouse: someone who would cooperate with the female in setting up a household, someone with skills in agriculture and craft, someone who would cooperate with the female in rearing the offspring. The choice thus effectively selects racial vigor but not husbandly virtues.

In courtship males and females have conflicting interests. The number of offspring a female may have is limited; a male has an interest in breeding with a large number of high-quality females. In social classes where males provide and commit themselves to parenting, they can commit themselves to but one female at a time - and the female may well have to compromise on quality in order to get a male willing to commit with her. But the knights, susceptible of going off to war at any time, disengaged from agricultural work, are at best intermittent parents. In those circumstances,

---

<sup>6</sup> R.A. Fisher, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection* (New York, Dover, 1958).

a female can be attracted to finding the most superior sperm donor she can, even if she has to share his favors with many other females.<sup>7</sup>

The knightly glamour spread to the clergy. For the princes of the Church no fabric was too refined, no expenditure of jewelry excessive for their vestments. Even plebeian parish priests began dressing in florid ceremonial raiment. Shall one object that this extension to the clergy of the knightly display demonstrates that it was not intrinsically sexual display? That would be to ignore the fact that whenever males enter contests of display of their individual superiority, females are going to be drawn to the most imposing and spectacular ones, and many males will find no sexual partner. And throughout the feudal period clerical celibacy was honored in practice not even by the pope.

The ostentatious splendor of the knights eventually produced permission for their female consorts to adorn themselves with impractical garb of luxurious fabrics and designs. The courtesans were chosen to breed offspring and reproduce the genes of the knights, but they were able to separate themselves from the burdens of parenting, leaving nursing and nurturing to servants.

The display, a courtship of females, is also turned toward other males, those friendly and those hostile. Knights compete with one another in splendor and also in altruism - in rescues, in assistance to the exploited, the weak, in taking risks. Their social services are not cases of reciprocal altruism. Other than recognition of their superior status, they want nothing from those they benefit. Their prestige is the proof they give that they have excess energies and resources to squander. The benefit of their altruism to the group is but a side-effect of their exhibition of power.<sup>8</sup>

Intrasexual selection determines not only ranking of strength and belligerence but also of splendor. Helmets, capes, bouffant sleeves and codpieces which enlarge the bulk of the body are designed to be intimidating. Many poisonous animals have bright coloration that stands out from their

---

<sup>7</sup> Zahavi, *The Handicap Principle*, p.27.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p.149.

surroundings. These bright colors - aposematic coloration - advertize boldness and challenge the enemy.

For a threat to be reliable, the signal must increase the danger to the threatener - must increase the risk that the threatener will be attacked or will be at a disadvantage if attacked.<sup>9</sup> The knights are warriors. But their contests occur in carousels, tournaments, on parade grounds, leks. Their jousts stop short of killing or even serious injury. Most warfare is psychological warfare.

The knights' strenuous intrasexual competition, coupled possibly with polygamy, has resulted in the evolution of the remarkable vigor, aggressive temperament, histrionic raiment and elaborate display specializations of the knights. It is a remarkable fact that the evolution of this astonishingly complex and, to some degree, aesthetic reproductive mechanism has apparently rendered the knighthood neither more nor less numerically successful in reproducing their genes than many other quite undistinguished males of the immediate environment.<sup>10</sup>

This seems to supply an obstacle to the biologist's effort to understand sexual selection in the context of ordinary natural selection - to understand female sexual selection as selection of fitness and reproductive success. But is not something else evolving also in courtship - so widespread in species from fruit flies to hummingbirds and emperor penguins - namely, the evolution of individuality and individual attachment? 'Sexual selection provides our earliest clear examples in the animal kingdom of the selection by one individual or another for personal qualities such as appearance, behavior, and probably other attributes that we fail to recognize', Alexander Skutch observed. 'It is an important step in the emergence of personality from the level of specific uniformity. When mutual, sexual selection leads to lasting individual attachments and, ultimately, to friendship and conjugal fidelity, thus contributing to moral as well as physical beauty.'<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>10</sup> Marshall, *Bower-Birds*, p.27.

<sup>11</sup> Alexander F. Skutch, *Origins of Nature's Beauty* (University of Texas Press, Austin, 1992), p.58.

## Male Performance and Female Selection

It remains true nonetheless that wherever courtship exists in nature, the extravagances of appearance and behavior evolve from female selection of them. However, in the ensuing generations of human courtship in the West, display behavior has become more and more assigned to females. Females then will be selected by males. In addition, the adornment has separated from the performer, to stand apart as artwork. The stimulatory valance is transferred from the courtier to the objects he makes or collects.<sup>12</sup> Males compete for females no longer with their own body modifications and adornment - their own apparel became progressively more drab - but with the attractiveness of their collections of objects. This has provided the selective pressure for the production of art objects with no utilitarian function whatever, and for which vast fortunes can be spent.

Recent developments in the 'art world' have reversed this evolution. Jackson Pollock marks a first date. More exactly, the more than five hundred photographs taken in the summer and early fall of 1950 by Hans Namuth in Pollock's studio, the black and white movie and the color movie made with Paul Falkenberg, of Pollock at work. Jackson Pollock held it essential to maintain 'contact' with the canvas. He danced over canvases laid horizontally on the floor, dripping and pouring paint to create fields of color. The photographs and films showed Pollock as a painter caught in the arena of a ritualized, yet uncontrolled, brutally direct, and explosive creative activity. The vast canvases ceased to be objects contained within frames to become environments. They also ceased to be spaces for equilibrated compositions that displayed carefully selected segments of the world that could be appreciated as *pictures* - representations of independently existing things, that is, illusions.

With Pollock in mind, the influential critic Harold Rosenberg famously declared in 1952 that 'at a certain moment the canvas began to appear to one American painter after another as an arena in which to act - rather than as a

---

<sup>12</sup> Armstrong, *Bird Display and Behaviour*, p.14.

space in which to reproduce, re-design, analyze or 'express' an object, actual or imagined. What was to go on the canvas was not a picture but an event.<sup>13</sup> The separation of the artist from his object was being reversed; the subject of art increasingly became its own making.

As a result of the popularity of Namuth's photographs and films of Pollock, the persona of the artist took on a dimension greater than his works. The generation of artists who worked in the late Sixties and Seventies focused much energy on projecting a persona or self-image that could be as compelling as Pollock's media image. This was to issue in what came to be known as 'performance art', including artists who explored persona and self-image as a significant and appropriate subject.

The emergence of female performance artists around 1970 marks a second date. If Jackson Pollock reinscribes the extravagances of color and design back on the behavior of the performer, nonetheless the canvas remains as an exteriorization now of the performer. While Pollock put himself in the artwork, Orlan set out to inscribe major artworks onto her own face. She created a composite image, via morphing computer software, of her face, combined with features of females in artworks. Leonardo's *Mona Lisa* was chosen 'because she is not beautiful according to present standards of beauty, but because there is some "man" under this woman. We now know it to be the self-portrait of Leonardo hiding under that of *La Gioconda* (which brings us back to an identity problem).<sup>14</sup> Orlan incorporated the forehead and temples of *Mona Lisa* into the composite image. Diana, the goddess of the hunt, was added because she was aggressive and did not submit to males. Orlan used the nose of an anonymous School of Fontainebleau sculpture of Diana. From Gustave Moreau's *Europa* Orlan appropriated the mouth. Europa looked to another continent, permitting herself to be carried away into an unknown future. From Botticelli's *Venus*, goddess of love, fertility, and creativity,

<sup>13</sup> Harold Rosenberg, 'The American Action Painters', in *Tradition of the New* (Horizon Press, New York, 1959), p.25.

<sup>14</sup> Orlan, 'Carnal Art', translated by Tanya Augsburg & Michel A. Moos, in Orlan, *ceci est mon corps...Ceci est mon logiciel / This is my body...This is my software*, ed. Duncan McCorguodale (Black Dog Publishing, London, 1996), pp.88-9.



Orlan took the chin. She appropriated the eyes of François Pascal Simon Gérard's *Psyche*, because of Psyche's need for love and spiritual beauty. She then integrated the composite into her own face via ten operations of plastic surgery. She has called this transformation a 'woman-woman transsexualism.'

Plastic surgery has seemed but a further extension of display existence before males which has been in recent centuries assigned to females. Involving a confession of natural faults in their bodies, it would be done in secret, and ideally completely deniable. Orlan, however, chose the features from classical artworks to be inscribed on her face because, she explains, they corresponded to her inner image of herself. Yet it cannot be said that there is no intersexual selection involved: these art images of ideal females were produced by males, and Orlan says that the *Mona Lisa* contains a self-portrait of Leonardo. But instead of presenting herself for male selection, it is she who selects males. And instead of cosmetic surgery being an operation where a female puts her body under the knife in an act of extreme subjection to male aesthetic expectations, Orlan makes of the surgery 'performance art'. The surgeries are televised to be broadcast in selected public places, galleries in Paris, London, New York, Montréal, Tokyo. It is her performance: she dresses the surgeon and nurses in clothes she has selected designed by top Parisian haut couturiers, she determines the colors in which the operating room is to be painted, and she remains conscious during the whole of a typically six-hour operation during which she recites texts chosen from Baudelaire, Lautréamont, Blanchot, Lacan, and answers telephone calls and faxes. The performance is ostentatious and monstrous. As the surgeon inserts the scalpel and cuts through the thickness of her face, lifting it from the skull, the flesh immediately darkens and swells. For weeks afterward, the face remains discolored and swollen; Orlan exhibits daily photographs of this in galleries, along with vials of the blood shed and fat extracted during the course of the operation. In a recent operation she had two ridges inserted monstrously in her temples.

Unlike the beauty parades where males complacently watch females display for them, these performances shock, repel,

horrify viewers. Surgery remains akin to butchery, such that any surgery is repellent, with the anaesthetized patient spared the witness of the violence being done to his or her body. Surgery on the face is particularly horrible to watch, since all that is most personal and individual in our sense of our identity and will is condensed on our face, which the surgeons cut loose and now have in their hands. By remaining conscious during the entire operation, and speaking, Orlan imposes on viewers a shock in which their complacency and good pleasure is utterly blocked. In this it is quite unlike those performances where the performer is denuded and displays himself in some physically degrading position - and where the viewer does not watch the spectacle without a sadist awakening in him. And Orlan's performance summons a new kind of male, a new knighthood. In order to be effective, signals have to be reliable; in order to be reliable, signals have to be costly, ethologists Amotz and Avishag Zahavi have argued.

The songs [of humpback whales] have musical structure. They are comprised of four to ten themes sung in the same order, and each theme is a unique set of musical note sequences - phrases and subphrases....Of vast significance for understanding musical intelligence is that, when played at high speed, whale songs are indistinguishable from bird songs; at an intermediate speed, they can be mistaken for possible human compositions. Apparently, birds, humans, and whales possess a basic musical intelligence since they can they can listen to, appreciate, create, and sing intricate and beautiful music that is executed by each taxon at a different tempo.<sup>15</sup>

## Glamour

The sage grouse inhabit the vast plains of northwestern United States and southern Canada. The cocks are clad in brown or gray-brown flecked with white, with a black

---

<sup>15</sup> Theodore Xenophon Barber, *The Human Nature of Birds* (St. Martin's Press, New York, 1993), p.132.

foreneck and belly and a white breast. Their eighteen tail feathers taper from broad bases to long pointed ends. The dark undertail coverts are tipped and spotted with white. The females, much smaller in size, are clad in uniformly grayish brown plumage, with fine buff and white mottling.

In late February or early March, the cocks gather on traditional ceremonial arenas, on open plains or gentle slopes covered with short grass surrounded by sparse, low sagebrush.<sup>16</sup> They come there from as far as a hundred miles away. The arena is long and narrow; it may be as large as a half mile long and two hundred yards wide. Up to four hundred cocks come to perform there. The performances are held each day in the late afternoon. The performers position themselves thirty feet apart, and dance over an area of from sixteen to twenty square yards. As the new moon rises higher in the sky at nightfall, more and more cocks remain on the display ground, dancing, and challenging rivals in the middle of the night.

The dancer draws himself upright, erects his tail with the attenuated feathers spread out and widely separated, rather like the plumed sheaths used in the great samba competitions in carnival in Rio de Janeiro. He raises his wings at the base and bends them sharply downward at the wrist, the tips of the longest primaries often touching the ground. He gradually raises his back, so that in the second movement his back is held at a forty-five-degree angle from the ground. The anterior neck feathers then suddenly part, exposing two olive green skin patches. The dance is stately with the strutting postures and movements of flamenco. The third movement begins as the performer opens his mouth to apparently take a breath. But instead he fills his air sac, an expansion of his esophagus, until it swells out hugely with four or five liters of air, spreading the stiff white feathers of his breast until they cover the whole front of his body and hide his head. In the midst of this white expanse appear two egg-shaped patches of yellowish bare skin. He then lifts the pendent esophageal bag and the skin patches disappear; he takes another step forward and quickly draws his folded wings across the stiffened feathers at the side of his neck as it

---

<sup>16</sup> Skutch, *Origins of Nature's Beauty*, pp.62-7.

is jerked upwards, producing a brushing sound. In the fourth movement his mouth is shut, he moves his wings forward again, and lowers his esophageal bag. In the fifth movement he again swells out his neck, exposing the oval skin patches a second time but again not greatly inflated, and makes a second although silent backward stroke of his wings. In the sixth movement he takes a third step forward, he moves his wings forward again, the skin patches are somewhat more fully expanded, and the esophageal bag begins to move upward again. In the seventh movement he extends his neck diagonally as the esophageal bag is strongly raised, nearly hiding his head, and he again rubs his wings against his breast feathers as they make their third backward stroke. In the eighth movement he withdraws his head into his erected neck feathers, the esophageal bag bounces downward, and the inflated bare skin patches form large oval bulges, while he moves his wings forward and back a fourth time. In the ninth movement he quickly withdraws his head into his neck feathers so that it becomes completely concealed, compressing the esophageal bag so greatly that the skin patches bulge strongly outward in the shape of hemispheres, and his wings complete a fifth backward stroke. He now suddenly releases the pressure on the trapped air in his esophagus, and moves his head upwards toward a normal position. The expulsion of the air produces two explosive sounds that can be heard a mile away on a still evening. In the tenth and final movement he returns his head to the original starting position, his white neck feathers close over the bare skin areas, and he returns to the stance assumed at the beginning of the display.<sup>17</sup> The dance is extremely strenuous, and uses up the energy at the typical maximum rate sustainable by homeotherms. This is the classic dance. In the movements both held and abruptly changed and in the explosive vocalizations, it is strikingly reminiscent of Japanese kabuki theater. Individual performers, however, give their own style to it, and vary the steps. There are also different traditions in different arenas. For example, the explosive contraction of the air sacs is done twice in the classical dance; eight times in Gunnison County, Colorado.

---

<sup>17</sup> Paul A. Johnsgard, *Grouse and Quails of North America* (University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1973), pp.169-171.

For several weeks the performers dance before one another, and gradually rank themselves. Top performers accompany their dances with combats, themselves the stylized movements of a martial art. A challenger runs toward another with guttural, menacing cries. Often only a few wing blows are exchanged. If the opponents are more evenly matched, they stand side by side, head to tail, a foot or more apart. With body, wings, and tail quivering with excitement, they rapidly repeat the guttural challenge. Suddenly, one lashes out with a wing at the other, who may dodge or parry the blow and strike back in turn. Rarely, one seizes with his bill the top of the other's head and holds him while thrashing him loudly with a wing, despite his struggles to escape. More often, before the fight escalates to this extreme, one of the contestants slowly backs away after the exchange of a few blows.

The center of the arena is the place of greatest prestige, and eventually the most magnificent performer occupies it. His chief rival will occupy an adjacent square, and three to six other splendid performers will circle these two, their guard.

Hens first appear at the arena two or three weeks later. They come by air, but land to then walk into the arena. As they stroll through the four hundred assembled dancers, they pause near a dancer whose performance impresses them. Over the course of days they gravitate to the master cock, who may thus have fifty to seventy hens watching his performance. What is admired is the performer with the best and also most intense and most frequent dances. Aficionados admire particularly a certain vocalization and a certain pause within it, which accompany a particular movement in the dance. Evidently, only the most accomplished performers can achieve this particular combination within the strenuous choreography of the dance.<sup>18</sup> The hens award their sexual favors to the most admired performers. Of the four hundred performers on one arena that was carefully observed, four master performers won the favor of seventy-four percent of the women. All the other cocks, performing from late February through mid-June, get no one at all.

---

<sup>18</sup> Zahavi, *The Handicap Principle*, p.34.

Once a hen has chosen her lover, and made love with him, she goes off to make a nest, incubate some sixteen eggs, and rear the offspring - all by herself. The cocks do not acknowledge their paternity, and do not assist her in any way. They are full-time professional performers. One can think that the performing artists have the glorious life, quite freed from domestic labor. Indeed. How did it come about that boys so predominate among births? One census-taker counted three hundred sage grouse cocks to eighty hens.<sup>19</sup>

We noted above that the astonishingly complex and aesthetic reproductive mechanism of their courtship behaviors has apparently rendered the knighthood neither more nor less numerically successful in reproducing their genes than many other quite undistinguished males of the immediate environment. The courtship practices of sage grouse, which occupy even far more of their actual lives, results in the vast majority of them not reproducing their genes at all.

Georges Bataille emphasized the excesses built up and released in this kind of art. Erotic beauty is excessive, excessive in flamboyant colors, in monstrous forms.<sup>20</sup> Peculiar adornments are thrust into prominence: crests, wattles, ruffs, collars, tippets, trains, spurs, excrescences on wings and bills, tinted mouths, tails of weird or exquisite form, bladders, highly colored patches of bare skin, elongated plumes, brightly hued feet and legs. Attitudes and movements tend to be odd, exaggerated, or unwonted. The display is nearly always beautiful; it is always striking.<sup>21</sup> Discharge of excessive energies and forms, it is orgasmic. It must be contrasted with the organic beauty, built on functional harmony, which appears as an exterior exhibition of the inner drives of an organism. The excessive beauty of glamor is itself a transgression of norms, and invites transgression. It invites the excesses of orgasmic violence and violation.

---

<sup>19</sup> Another observer found that of 204 hummingbirds of ten species, 166 were males and but 38 females.

<sup>20</sup> Georges Bataille, *Eroticism*, translated by Mary Dalwood (City Lights, San Francisco, 1986), pp.142-6.

<sup>21</sup> Armstrong, *Bird Display and Behaviour*, p.305.

But Bataille's conception of transgression posits a polarization between a beauty that is essentially ethereal, sacred, and the sexual violence that is invited and aroused which Bataille conceives as profanation, and defilement, befoulment. The crest, the tail ending in points, and the silky plumage are impractical, the designs on the raiment completely ignore the segmentation of physiological functions on the body. But this raiment both covers over and suggests the sexual organs. The performance maintains tension between the glamorous external display, held at a distance and apart, and the organs of sexual contact and interpenetration. It is this tension that excites the onlooker and tempts the transgression. There is female repugnance before the crouching position with which she exposes herself to copulation, but also a vertiginous attraction to it. Yielding to the male who is physically larger and stronger, but also chosen for his aggressive splendor 'invites', Marguerite Duras writes, 'strangling, rape, ill-treatment, insults, cries of hatred, unleashing of whole, deadly, passions.'<sup>22</sup> But his beauty which holds back and holds him back invites the vertigo of submission to him. The orgasmic ecstasy ends in a muck of steamy breath, vaginal fluids, semen, and blood.

Bataille's conception of erotic transgression depends too much on the decomposition of the body in orgasm, its release of fluids and energies which leaves the orgasmic bodies depleted and exhausted.<sup>23</sup> Yet there must indeed be something repugnant about copulation, or instant and promiscuous gratification would never have given rise to the excesses of glamour.

Bataille also does not give enough attention to the dangers to which an individual who displays exposes himself. Not for nothing are the hens clad in camouflage colors. Annual mortality of adult sage grouse cocks runs about fifty percent.<sup>24</sup> Is it not the danger and the excitement of exposing oneself to such danger that maintains the tension that invites transgression?

---

<sup>22</sup> Marguerite Duras, *La maladie de la mort* (Ed. de Minuit, Paris, 1982), p.21.

<sup>23</sup> Bataille, *Erotism*, pp.144-45.

<sup>24</sup> Ligon, *The Evolution of Avian Breeding Systems*. p.390.

Bataille's conception is marked with the biases of his time and his gender. Although it is he who explained that glamour in Europe was invented by the knights, he envisions it primarily in women, and assumes it exists for male appreciation. He neglects the intrasexual rivalry in which it develops. He also neglects the autoerotic character of erotic beauty. The great majority of cock sage grouse, assembling at the arena year after year, receive the sexual favors of no one. And the performer who makes himself into a spectacle is somehow - through means that psychology has not to this day elucidated - a spectacle before himself: he knows how glamorous he is. In performing for several weeks before other cocks, he knows that the center of the arena is his - or is not his. His splendor is his pleasure, and his life.

## Performance Art and Installations

In the eastern forests of Australia perform the satin bowerbirds. His black plumage glistens with tints of violet, purple, and blue. The dull green female has dark crescentic marks on her creamy yellow underparts. Both have bright blue eyes. He clears a patch of ground of every tiny twig, stem, leaf, and root. It will be a hundred yards from any other male's chosen site. He then covers the cleared area with a mat of coarse grasses and twigs. At one side of it he builds an avenue of vertical twigs - a passageway about 5 inches wide with a wall of twigs down either side. The avenue is set in a north-south direction. The parallel walls are about 12 inches high and 4 inches thick, arranged to arch over into a bower. On the display stage in front of the northern entrance of the avenue, the performer then places a collection of objets d'art. He travels far and wide to bring back blue parrot feathers, blue flowers, blue berries, blue beetles, fragments of blue glass, pieces of blue crockery, blue buttons. These decorative objects are laid out in the display area; not one blue object can stray inside the bower. Every day he runs a careful check on his collected objects. If any have lost their color during the night, flowers wilted or berries shriveled, they are discarded on a garbage dump, far from the stage.

When Morrison-Scott showed 340 shades of colored objects to satin bowerbirds, he found that their absolute preference was for cornflower-blue and lemon-yellow. One satin bowerbird



had put in his display patio seventeen blue feathers, thirty-four pieces of blue glass, eight blue bags, ten pieces of blue matchboxes, one blue State Express cigarette packet, one blue envelope, one piece of blue string, one blue marble, one car park ticket white with blue printing, four blue chocolate papers, a blue invitation card, eight yellowish wood shavings, two pieces of yellowish green onion peel, eight snail shells, one cocoon, six cicada cases, numbers of blue and yellowish green flowers, and a very large number of yellowish green leaves, mostly the stiff serrated leaves of the banksia.

The satin bowerbird paints the inside walls of his bower. He searches out blue berries, plums, green liverworts, or charcoal. He grinds the material and mixes it with his saliva. He works a small piece of bark into a soft sponge-like wedge that he holds in his bill. He wipes his brush over the surfaces of the inner walls. He will cover them entirely with a thick shiny paint. Any strong rain washes it away and he may have to repaint almost every day.

Satin bowerbirds build their bowers beginning in May; hens begin to visit them but there will be no mating until October and November. When an individual in female plumage visits a bower, the owner often emits a volley of harsh notes and flings his display things around as though he were angry. His bower is his most precious possession; he attends it devotedly, keeping it in good repair, often flying far for items to adorn it; he guards it from intruders who might carry off his treasures or harm it; understandably, he is wary of visitors. So he begins his courtship blustering, while the female, prudently keeping the bower walls between herself and him, waits passively until he calms down, which may take many minutes.

The performance is scheduled for dawn. The first and most extensive part - three quarters of the total performance time - is an extensive concert of vocalizations, performed while the singer is hidden from view behind a small tree. At times he seems to pour harmony from his very soul. But from his concealment he also imitates the calls of the kookaburra (only the first two bars), the butcher bird, the grating cries of the white cockatoo; the screeching of the black cockatoo is done with virtuosity. The cries of the crow-shrike and the

magpie are mimicked perfectly, and the peculiar grunt of the native bear is true to nature. Spotted bower birds imitate the cries or calls of eagles, hawks, butcher birds, magpies and notably the wail of a domestic cat. One spotted bower bird precisely mimicked the sound created by sheep scrambling through a wire fence. The toothbilled catbird achieves a high standard of vocal mimicry reproducing with startling exactness the notes of many birds of the tropics, but his masterpiece of vocal conjuring is the imitating of the whirring of a cicada when held by a bird. Another striking reproduction is the distressed croak of a frog when caught by a snake.<sup>25</sup>

Then the singer suddenly pops into view to begin the performance piece. A female who comes to watch stands inside the bower. He positions himself on his display arena and carefully selects one of his colored objects. Picking it up in his bill he starts to make a strange whirring noise. Then with his blue eyes bulging, he fans his tail feathers and starts to flick his tail and his wings in short sharp movements, his head held low with his neck stretched out. His movements seem threatening and, as he shifts the position of his body, his plumage shimmers and glistens in the dappled sunlight. Although the female occasionally gurgles softly and sometimes gives a small start when his actions are particularly forceful, his actions are not directed towards her. As he leaps and hops stiffly about his display arena, picking up first this and then that object in his bill, he ignores her and concentrates on the colored articles he has collected so painstakingly. And yet if she suddenly departs, he stops displaying immediately and starts calling to her until she returns.

Lauterbach's bowerbird weaves thousands of small pebbles into the walls of his avenues, and also builds transverse walls on each end of his avenue. He collects red and pale grey objects, placing them in separate areas inside his bower. The fawn-breasted bowerbird collects pale green berries and places them directly in front of the bower and also on the inner walls. The great grey bowerbird places a huge pile of white

---

<sup>25</sup> Tom Iredale, *Birds of Paradise and Bower Birds* (Georgian House, Melbourne, 1950).

objects directly in front of the avenue and pale green objects on either side of the white ones.

The display stage of one artist was found to contain over a thousand small white bones, and also white pebbles and stones, and white snail-shells. When he can collect pieces of green glass, these are laid out at the bower entrance and inside the bower. But individual bowerbirds can have very different preferences for colors.<sup>26</sup>

In the gardener bowerbirds, the elaboration of the bower reaches its highest artistic expression. The Queensland gardener, himself but nine and a half inches long, builds twin pyramidal constructions up to nine feet high with a bridge connecting them, and decorates the inner walls with pale moss, lichens, ferns, flowers, and bunches of berries. The flowers are all placed upright. W. S. Day turned one of the bird's orchids upside down. Upon his return, the bird made a great fuss and noise, and replaced the flower in its proper position. Day repeated the operation the next day, and the flower was again placed upright. The Striped Gardener packs twigs with moss about the trunk of a sapling. About this 'maypole', he constructs a dome-shaped pavilion two or three feet in diameter. The pavilion is cemented waterproof, and covered with living orchids. On its floor, covered with a mat made of blackish fibers from the trunks of tree ferns, he arranges bright yellow flowers, many scarlet and bright blue berries, yellowish green leaves, and mauve-colored beetles. The Vogelkop bowerbird builds a dome-shaped pavillon eight feet long, and six feet wide and four and a half feet high. In front of the pavilion there is a garden of moss, upon which flowers and fruits are placed. S. Dillon Ripley dropped on this garden a pinkish begonia, small yellow flowers, and a pretty red orchid. Upon his return the owner promptly threw aside the yellow flowers. 'After some hesitation and a good

---

<sup>26</sup> By use of poker chips, Jared Diamond experimentally confirmed individual variation in their preference of colors of decorative items. Provided with poker chips of a variety of colors, different individuals within a population varied in their selection criteria and in the way they arranged the chips chosen to decorate their bowers. Decorating decisions involved trials and changes of mind. Jared Diamond, 'Evolution of bowerbird's bowers: animal origins of an aesthetic sense', *Nature*, 297, pp.99-102; and 'Animal art: variation in bower decorating style among male bowerbirds, *Amblyornis inornatus*'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, 88, pp.177-204.

many nods and looks and flicks of the tail', the begonia was also cast away. Perplexed by the red orchid blossom, the gardener took it from one of his piles of fruits or flowers to another, trying to find one that it matched. Finally, with many flourishes, he laid it on top of some pink flowers.

Bowerbirds do not become sexually mature until about six years. During their long adolescence, they spend much time watching adults at their bowers. Their own earliest constructions are rudimentary, and only by much practice do they become proficient in building and decorating their bowers.

Birds building bowers regularly spy on one another, but do not fight one another. They do, however, steal objects from one another's collections, and actively wreck the bowers of rivals during their absence.

Female bowerbirds visit all the bowers in the area, and end up selecting the best-constructed and best-decorated bower. They especially prize novel and unusual decorative objects in the collections. They are also partial to singers with superior creative mimicry interwoven in their songs.

After making love with their chosen top performer, a female leaves, does all the work of building a nest, incubating eggs, and feeding the offspring with no attention whatever on the part of the father. The nests are shallow bowls built high in trees. Since she has to do all the feeding, she lays but one or two eggs. The fathers continue to tend to their bowers, embellish them, and vocalize and dance in them for months after. When the young are raised, the males leave their bowers, and collect in gregarious flocks, until the next theater season.

While I have ascribed a utilitarian basis for each of the behavioural phenoma discussed, I see no reason, provisionally, to deny that bowerbirds possess an aesthetic sense, [A.J. Marshall writes] although it must be emphasized, we have as yet no concrete proof that such is the case. Some bower-birds certainly select for their displays objects that are beautiful to *us*. Further, they

discard flowers when they fade, fruit when it decays, and feathers when they become bedraggled and discoloured. But, it must be remembered, however beautiful such articles may be, they are still probably selected compulsively in obedience to the birds' heredity and physiology....The choices, in the species we know best, are mechanical; and so, seemingly, are the other bizarre activities which have excited so much imaginative writing in the past....It would, of course, be unthinkable to suggest that bowerbirds...do not get pleasure from the vocal, architectural, and other activities they perform, but whether such pleasure has much in common with that of Man, engaged in comparable pursuits, has yet to be proved.<sup>27</sup>

With these words, A.J. Marshall posits a finality beyond the pleasure bowerbirds get from their vocal and architectural activities; the imperative to reproduce their genes. Marshall joins all those who seek to reduce Darwin's sexual selection to natural selection. What remains puzzling is that the achievement of this imperative is not reinforced with pleasure: the bowerbirds do not visit the nests the females make and take pleasure in seeing their offspring. But then there is not, in a human, a knight or Jackson Pollock, who unquestionably takes pleasure in mating with a large number of different females if only they are beautiful, a conscious pleasure at anticipating seeing sons and daughters who look like himself when he later drives through Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Kansas City, Boulder, Los Angeles, and Tokyo. Is then aesthetic pleasure a pleasure that is systematically deceived about itself? Indeed, why does lust demand beauty?

---

<sup>27</sup> Marshall, *Bower-Birds*, pp.185-6.

## Biography

*Alphonso Lingis is a professor of philosophy at the Pennsylvania State University. He has published the following books: 'Excesses: Eros and Culture' (1984); 'Libido: The French Existential Theories' (1985); 'Phenomenological Explanations' (1986); 'Deathbound Subjectivity' (1989); 'The Community of Those Who Have Nothing in Common' (1994); 'Abuses' (1994); 'Foreign Bodies' (1994); 'Sensation: Intelligibility in Sensibility' (1995); 'The Imperative' (1998) and 'Dangerous Emotions' (2000).*

## Howling about Wolf Control in Minnesota

Laura J. Ragan, Lori A. Scinto and Jennifer A. Szymanski<sup>28</sup>

### Introduction

At one time gray wolves were near extinction in the lower 48 United States. However, from a single small population in Minnesota they expanded their range into Wisconsin and Michigan. It is estimated that the Minnesota wolf population is now more than 2,400 and the Wisconsin/Michigan population is near 400. In the northern US Rocky Mountains, wolves emigrated from Canada into northwest Montana where there are currently about 75 wolves. The reintroduction of wolves into Yellowstone National Park and central Idaho has led to a population that is increasing faster than expected and numbers about 200 in those areas. Due to these increases in gray wolf numbers and range in the continental United States, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is reviewing potential changes to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) protection for gray wolves.

In the western Great Lakes region, the Service is contemplating removing gray wolves in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan from the endangered species list. With this action, wolves in these states would no longer receive federal protection. The pending delisting of the western Great Lakes gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) by the federal government poses a considerable dilemma throughout the entire Great Lakes region. Future wolf management in the

---

<sup>28</sup> The opinions of the authors do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the agencies for which they work.

state of Minnesota is a central focus in this debate because Minnesota currently has the largest number of wolves in the lower 48 states. In the near future, this state may be faced with the burden of reconciling at least two contradictory historic commitments: 1) to ensure the long-term survival of the gray wolf in Minnesota and 2) to resolve conflicts between wolves and humans.

The horns of this dilemma reach back and forth from the early 1800s to sometime in the year 2000. This rubbery time warp concerning at least two centuries of gray wolf history can be broken into three phases: eradication, protection and recovery, and proposed delisting of the species. Needless to say, we now stand at the beginning of what is surely a unique era for the gray wolf and wildlife managers poised to deal with its reemergence in the twenty-first century.

Between 1838 and 1865, bounties for the gray wolf were instituted in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota. By the turn of the century, wolves were rare in southern and western Minnesota, southern Wisconsin and Michigan, and the rest of the eastern US. In 1914, the US government began a widespread predator control program in which it provided poison and personnel in an attempt to rid the country of its remaining wolves. By 1960, this goal was largely accomplished and wolves were considered extirpated from all of the lower 48 States except in extreme northeastern Minnesota, on Isle Royale, Michigan and in the West, where there were a few non-breeding individuals.

The tide had begun turning in 1956, however, when the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) ended its bounty program. The next year, Wisconsin ended its bounty system and became the first of the three states to protect wolves under state law (this action came too late, however, and wolves were considered extirpated from the state by 1960). In 1965, Michigan was the second of the three states to give the wolf complete protection under state law. It was not until 1974, the year after the wolf was listed as a federally endangered species, that Minnesota finally ended its public harvest of wolves (which included hunting and trapping of wolves on private and state lands) and granted the species full protection.



In 1975, the first documented reproducing pack of wolves in Wisconsin since the 1950s prompted the state to list the gray wolf as a state endangered species. In that same year, the US Fish and Wildlife Service initiated a program to control wolf depredations in Minnesota. In 1978, the Minnesota Legislature enacted a compensation program to pay livestock owners for losses from wolf depredation. In this same year, the Eastern Timber Wolf Recovery Plan was published. In Minnesota, it called for five wolf management zones, reclassification from endangered to threatened (which allowed the United States Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services unit to kill depredating wolves), and the re-establishment of wolves elsewhere in the state. By 1988, Minnesota DNR estimated that there were between 1,500 and 1,750 wolves in the state. The following year, the DNR announced its long-term management goals for the wolf. The plan called for maintaining at least 1,000-2,000 wolves through 1992, expanding public understanding of wolves and assisting other states in establishing wolf populations. By 1992, the original Federal recovery plan was updated, and wolf populations were increasing. At that time, population estimates were 1,500-1,750 wolves in Minnesota, at least 20 in Michigan, and 45 in Wisconsin.<sup>29</sup>

The conditions for delisting were mapped out in the 1992 recovery plan which said that delisting could be considered when at least two viable populations within the lower 48 States satisfy the following conditions: (1) the Minnesota population must be stable or growing and its continued survival be assured—with minimum population numbers of 1,251 to 1,400, and (2) a second population outside of Minnesota and Isle Royale, Michigan must be established, having at least 100 wolves in late winter if located within 100 miles of the Minnesota wolf population, or having at least 200 wolves if located beyond that distance. These population levels must be maintained for five consecutive years before delisting can occur.

Delisting discourse began in 1994 as both Wisconsin's and Michigan's populations reached 57 wolves. Their combined

---

<sup>29</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1992.

estimates of more than 100 wolves outside of Minnesota prompted the five-year countdown to delisting the gray wolf as suggested in the 1992 recovery plan. By 1995, Wisconsin and Michigan estimated their populations at 83 and 80, respectively. Both states then started the three-year countdown towards reclassification from endangered to threatened status as suggested in the 1992 recovery plan. In 1998, Minnesota's wolf population was estimated at 2,455 wolves, Michigan's at 199 (174 in the Upper Peninsula and 25 on Isle Royale), and Wisconsin's at 197-203. With these numbers, the population criteria for recovery were met.

In addition to the population standards, the US Fish and Wildlife Service is requesting that state wolf management plans be developed so that future threats to the wolf may be better evaluated. If the gray wolf is delisted, complete management authority will rest with the States. The overall strategy of the DNR's management plan is causing a great deal of controversy in Minnesota. At the root of the controversy is whether wolf numbers should be controlled, and if so, how this should be accomplished. In keeping with its historical commitments, the DNR held a series of public information meetings in early 1998 to scope the issues. Following these meetings, the DNR appointed a 'Wolf Management Roundtable' to guide the agency in addressing the controversial wolf management issues. The Roundtable included representatives from state agencies, Native American tribes, environmental, agricultural, hunting and trapping groups and wolf advocacy groups. The Roundtable's objective was to develop consensus recommendations for wolf management in Minnesota.

The following sections examine the contentious issues the Roundtable had to consider as well as the positions of various interest groups on these issues.

## Issues in the Wolf Debate

### White-tailed Deer Harvest and Wolf Predation

The goal of the DNR's white-tailed deer management program is to maintain a specified deer density. A number of factors, including both natural and human-induced,

influence white-tailed deer densities. Severe winter weather is a significant factor affecting white-tailed deer populations in Minnesota.<sup>30</sup> Additionally, human harvest through hunting substantially influences deer numbers, therefore enabling DNR to control population levels. Other important factors that affect deer numbers include disease, predation, and automobile collisions. In Minnesota, the primary predators include coyotes, bears, bobcats, fishers and wolves, with more than 100,000 deer taken by natural predators annually.<sup>31</sup>

From 1983 to 1989, the statewide firearm white-tailed deer harvest rates were relatively stable. Harvest levels varied from a high of 139,000 kills (1985 & 1988) to a low of 132,000 kills (1986 & 1989). During the early 1990s, white-tailed deer numbers exploded as a result of two extraordinarily mild winters. In response to this population increase, the DNR allowed greater harvest rates - with a record high of 229,000 kills occurring in 1992. These elevated harvest rates continued over the next few years. In 1996 and 1997, severe winter weather coupled with high harvest rates caused the white-tailed deer population to decline. Consequently, the harvest rates in subsequent years more closely resembled those of the 1980s. Although deer densities and harvest rates were well within the DNR's white-tailed deer management objectives, the lower deer harvests in 1996 and 1997 alarmed some Minnesota residents, many of whom attributed the decline in white-tailed deer densities to the concurrently increasing wolf population. Moreover, some believe that the continued increase in wolf numbers and corresponding decline in white-tailed deer numbers will decimate northern Minnesota's economy. Conversely, other Minnesota residents indicate a preference for limiting human harvest rates rather than wolf numbers to increase deer densities.

---

<sup>30</sup> M.E. Nelson & L.D. Mech, 'Deer populations in the central Superior National Forest, 1967-1985. USDA Forest Service Research Paper NC-271. North Central Forest Experiment Station, St Paul, MN.

<sup>31</sup> W. Berg, 'Does Killing Wolves Save Deer?', *Volunteer*, (Nov-Dec., 1992).

## Wolf Depredation on Livestock in Minnesota

Although natural prey comprise most of their diet, wolves will kill and eat domestic livestock. The domestic prey of wolves includes cattle, sheep, turkeys, horses, geese, goats, chickens, ducks, and pigs. Most depredations occur in summer when livestock are released to graze in open and wooded pastures. Husbandry practices such as calving in forested or brushy pastures and disposal of livestock carcasses in or near pastures contribute to increased incidences of depredation.

To minimize economic loss to ranchers in Minnesota, a program is in place that compensates livestock owners for depredation losses. To initiate the claim process, the producer reports a livestock kill to a conservation officer or county extension agent. The conservation officer is charged with verifying the loss as wolf-caused. This is often done with the assistance of US Department of Agriculture (USDA), Wildlife Services Program. The county extension officer determines the value of the livestock and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture processes the payment. The number of complaints and verifications, as well as funds paid in compensation, has been recorded since the program's inception. The total compensation paid in Minnesota since 1977 has ranged from \$14,444 to \$42,739 annually.

As the wolf population and range expands, so do the number of livestock depredations (from 29 complaints and 15 verifications in 1979 to 201 complaints and 113 verifications in 1998). Although a small fraction of the farms (1% of 8,000 farms) within wolf range are affected by depredation, for some producers the monetary loss is substantial. The recent increase in livestock depredations caused alarm among livestock growers in Minnesota.<sup>32</sup> Some go as far as implicating the increasing wolf population as the primary cause of the loss of many small family-farms in Minnesota.

---

<sup>32</sup> S.R. Kellert, 'The public and the timber wolf in Minnesota. A Report of the International Wolf Center' (Ely, Minnesota, 1999).

Many livestock producers argue that the compensation program is not adequate. First, they assert that the actual number of depredations is much higher than the statistics show. The president of the Minnesota Cattleman's Association believes that more than 90% of the depredations go unreported because of missing carcasses. At present, farmers are reimbursed up to \$750, minus the amount received from insurance, for lost livestock. According to a University of Minnesota study, \$750 is adequate to fully compensate for loss of sheep and turkeys, but loss of cattle is only partially compensated. Some believe that 100% compensation as implemented in Wisconsin is warranted. (Wisconsin ranchers are required to implement various preventive measures before compensation is paid).

The second assertion is that, even if a carcass is available, the verification process is too exacting, as demonstrated by the few verifications relative to the number of complaints. Currently, verification requires a wounded animal or the remains of a dead animal (or, if a carcass is missing, evidence of a kill such as blood and rumen) and evidence of wolf involvement. According to the USDA's Wildlife Services program, the cause of the discrepancy between the number of complaints reported and the number of verified incidences is twofold. In addition to wolf depredation, other species (such as coyote, black bear and domestic dogs) prey on livestock. William Paul the District Supervisor for USDA's Wildlife Services,<sup>33</sup> estimates that at least 20 to 25% of the complaints reported to Wildlife Services are coyote kills. As a result, the severity of the wolf depredation problem issue is often exaggerated. Also, wolves scavenge, and thus ranchers sometimes mistake natural mortality or non-wolf kills as wolf-caused. Of the depredation complaints received in 1998, 58% were verified as wolf kills. While acknowledging that the actual number of depredations is higher than what is verified, Wildlife Services believes that wolf depredation is problematic for less than 5% of Minnesota farms in wolf range.

In addition to the compensation mentioned above, farmers also receive assistance from Wildlife Services to remove

---

<sup>33</sup> personal communication, 1998.

depredating animals. The primary method of control is trapping and removal of problem wolves. Since 1979, the number of wolves trapped has ranged from 15 to 227 annually, and the number of wolves lethally removed has ranged from 6 to 216 annually - up to 10% of the wolf population but far fewer than the farmers believe is necessary. Paul agrees that currently the Wildlife Services program is not adequately addressing wolf depredations in Minnesota but maintains that Wildlife Services could at least keep pace with the increasing trends if the program had more resources.

Some argue that livestock growers need to take some responsibility, such as exploring non-lethal methods for deterring depredation.<sup>34</sup> There are numerous techniques proven effective under various scenarios, particularly when used in combination.<sup>35</sup> However, Paul asserts that many of these techniques have been tried with limited success in Minnesota. For example, net wire and electric fences with anti-predator designs can be effective in smaller areas near the barn but in larger, forested pastures, the costs of acquiring and maintaining such structures are prohibitive. Similarly, flashing lights and sirens are most useful for reducing depredation in small pastures, but without a physical deterrent, their effectiveness wanes even in small areas. Lastly, guard dogs have been used for centuries in Europe and Asia and have proven successful in the western US. In addition to requiring time to bond with the livestock - and thus not providing an immediate solution - their effectiveness in Minnesota is questioned because of the difficulties in protecting livestock in forested pastures. Despite these shortcomings, Paul believes that guard dogs are the most viable option, especially for deterring coyote depredation.

Others have suggested using a trapping and firearms season as a potential control method. Although shooting alone is unlikely to be effective, hunting - in combination with

---

<sup>34</sup> Kellert, 'The public and the timber wolf in Minnesota'.

<sup>35</sup> D.H.Cluff & D.L. Murray, 'History of Wolf Control' in L.N. Carbyn, S.H. Fritts & D.R. Seip (eds), *Ecology and Conservation of Wolves in a Changing World* (Canadian Circumpolar Institute, Edmonton, 1995), pp.491-594.

trapping - could be a viable option. The success of trapping in controlling wolves is well documented but so too is the public's antipathy towards trapping. Anti-trapping campaigns in the 1930s and again in the 1970s were successful in effecting leg-hold trap restrictions in several states. Despite technological advancements in trap design (such as offset jaws, padded jaws, and tranquillizing tabs), public acceptance of trapping remains low. In two distinct studies of attitudes and behaviors toward the gray wolf in Minnesota, a substantial proportion of respondents stated they were ethically opposed to harvesting wolves for their fur or for sport.<sup>36</sup> (Currently, toothed jaws are prohibited in the US but are used for research and removal of depredating wolves). Most feared a legal harvest would result in excessive and unsustainable mortality.

### Human and Pet Safety

Personal safety is a key concern in the conflict between humans and wolves. Wolves appear to be more tolerant of humans and human settlement than they were in the past. This tolerance is likely due to the influx of humans living in greater proximity to wolf habitat. Also, because of the protected status and increased awareness and knowledge about wolves, harassment of the animal has decreased in recent times. Thus, where wolves may once have been wary because of predator control programs and other human disturbance, they are now less threatened by humans.<sup>37</sup> Despite the wolf's increased tolerance of humans, there are no accounts of human attacks in the lower 48 States.<sup>38</sup>

There was a documented wolf attack on an 11-year old child in Algonquin Provincial Park, Canada in 1996. When the wolf approached the boy (who was sleeping out under the stars) it first tugged at the sides of his sleeping bag. The wolf then tried to get another hold on the bag, grabbing the end of it and thus, grabbing the boy's head. The boy's parents

---

<sup>36</sup>S.R. Kellert, 'The public and the timber wolf in Minnesota', *Trans. North Am. Wildl. and Nat. Resour. Conf.*, 51, (1986), pp.193-200 and S.R. Kellert, 'The public and the timber wolf in Minnesota', (1999).

<sup>37</sup> Tim Cook, International Wolf Center, personal communication, 1998.

<sup>38</sup> L. David Mech, wolf biologist with the U.S. Geological Survey, Experimental Forest Station, personal communication, 1998.

managed to scare the wolf away and park officials later removed the wolf. The circumstances surrounding this attack are suspect.<sup>39</sup> The wolf in question had been visiting campsites in the park for some time prior to the incident. There is indication that the wolf had been habituated to people and had prior exposure to human articles. After the wolf was killed, its stomach contents revealed strange items such as string, carrots, and other foreign objects. It is postulated that this could have led to the animal's erratic behavior. Finally, Algonquin Park has a history of wolves displaying bold behavior. This fact has led to speculation that some of the so-called wolves in the park may in fact be wolf-dog hybrids or released captive wolves. Four similar incidents have occurred in the Park since 1987. Minor injuries occurred in each event but there were no mortalities.

In comparison to wolves, domestic dogs may pose more of a threat to humans as evidenced by statistics from the Center for Disease Control, which reported 12.5 deaths/year in the US caused by various breeds of domestic dogs in the years 1979-1994. Further, there are 4.5 million dog bites reported annually in the US and 334,000 victims of dog bites visit the emergency room annually.

Similar to human safety concerns, pet safety is a key consideration in the human conflict with wolves. In 1998, USDA's Wildlife Services program verified 25 instances of domestic dogs being killed by wolves. It is believed that wolf attacks on domestic dogs are under-reported. However, wolf predation on dogs still appears uncommon, considering that only a small percentage of the estimated 68,000 households to have dogs in 1997 were affected.

The main reason wolves attack domestic dogs is usually territorial and rarely predatory. Wolves view dogs as competitors, resulting in interspecific strife between domestic dogs and wolves<sup>40</sup>. While some pet owners react traumatically to wolf attacks, others accept unfortunate incidents as a part of living in wolf country.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Bill Route, International Wolf Center, personal communication, 1998.

<sup>40</sup> Cook, personal communication.

<sup>41</sup> Route, personal communication.



## Spiritual connection

For many American Indians the wolf holds a spiritual and cultural significance. This is especially true for tribes that live in proximity to wolves and where wolves and wolf stories are encountered. The wolf plays a central role in much of Native American cosmology. The animal represents the eastern direction and the season of summer in several tribes.<sup>42</sup> Clans often are distinguished from each other by animals to which their members look for guidance and inspiration. The wolf is often chosen by individuals to represent their clan. Some tribes believe that upon death the spirit returns to the body of their clan animal therefore, ancestors may be embodied in a living wolf.<sup>43</sup> (In Minnesota, many members of the Chippewa band belong to the wolf clan). Individuals may also choose the wolf as their personal totem animal, an animal with which they feel their life to be closely connected. A person is prohibited from killing or harming his or her totem 'lest the animal take offense and abandon the mortal'.<sup>44</sup>

Many American Indians have long recognized the resemblance between their life and history and that of the wolf. The wolf is held in high regard by many tribes because it is a good hunter and provides for its family - skills and attributes required of them to survive. The connection between wolves and Native Americans is felt even more strongly today by those who relate the plight of the wolf to that of themselves and their ancestors. Many feel that, just as they were, the wolf has been pushed to the brink of extinction and is now recovering, only to be faced with more persecution.

## Public Attitudes

Human attitudes toward wolves have formed as a result of historic connections to the animal as well as ideas of its

---

<sup>42</sup> B.H. Lopez, *Of Wolves and Men* (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1978).

<sup>43</sup> P. Steinhart, *The Company of Wolves* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1995).

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

nature. Since European settlement in North America, the wolf has been viewed mainly in negativistic and utilitarian terms. These attitudes stemmed from a pioneering view of the wolf as 'the essence of wildness and cruel predation, the ally of barbaric Indians, a creature of twilight'.<sup>45</sup> The wolf was despised because it represented a perceived threat to personal safety and livestock and an 'impediment in the march of progress and civilization'.<sup>46</sup>

The perceived need to conquer the wolf began to change during the second half of the 20th century. During this time, many began to view the wolf as a symbol of human persecution of animals and nature. It was one of the first species listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Negative attitudes persisted, however, perhaps due to the generally hostile depiction of this animal in literature, children's stories, and various myths.<sup>47</sup>

A diversity of values and attitudes toward the wolf exists in the United States today. In 1985 and 1999, Kellert conducted a study of public attitudes of Minnesota residents towards the wolf. The author of these studies stated that 'The Minnesota public clearly values wolves, viewing this animal as ecologically important, scientifically fascinating, aesthetically attractive, recreationally appealing, and significant for future generations'.<sup>48</sup> In both studies, the majority of respondents favored protection of the wolf, provided that private property rights were not compromised. Most respondents also supported the right to protect livestock and pets but focused on control methods that target only the problem wolf.

Among the respondents that were not farmers, most in the 1985 survey viewed the wolf in favorable and positive terms and expressed an appreciation for the wildness of the animal as well as a desire to see a wolf. Most also believed wolves are

---

<sup>45</sup> L. Boitani, 'Ecological and cultural diversities in the evolution of wolf-human relations' in Carbyn, Fritts & Seip, *Ecology and Conservation of Wolves in a Changing World*, p. 5.

<sup>46</sup> S.R. Kellert, *The public and the timber wolf in Minnesota* (Yale University Press, Connecticut, 1985), p.13.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid and Boitani, 'Ecological and cultural diversities in the evolution of wolf-human relations'.

<sup>48</sup> Kellert, 'The public and the timber wolf in Minnesota', (1999). P. 400.

an important part of Minnesota's environment and saw wolves as a symbol of nature. Although many expressed a moderate degree of fear of this animal, most people disagreed that wolves pose a threat to human lives or that the animal is inherently cruel. These sentiments do not appear to have changed in 1999.

A noticeable difference between the predominant attitude of those from northern counties who live in proximity to wolves and those living outside of wolf range persists. Non-northern Minnesota residents hold a highly protectionist attitude toward the timber wolf and express a strong affection toward the animal. However, these residents have a limited understanding of wolf biology. Northern county residents are more knowledgeable about wolf ecology, and in general held a much more utilitarian and authoritarian view toward them.

## Positions of Interest Groups

### Minnesota Deer Hunters Association

The Minnesota Deer Hunters Association (MDHA) believes that Minnesota wolf population objectives should be considered and set in coordination with the traditions of deer hunting. The MDHA maintains that a reduction in allowable deer harvest by humans will have economic and social implications. Joe Wood (Executive Director of MDHA in 1998) explains that in addition to the revenue generated by license sales and deer hunting paraphernalia, peripheral expenses such as gas, lodging, and food greatly increase the total deer-related economic expenditure. He further asserts that the viability of many local communities depends on this annual income. The MDHA further argues that for ecological integrity, deer populations must be controlled, and that hunting is the most economical and humane method of accomplishing this. The MDHA recognizes the ecological role of wolves and does not support the elimination of the wolf. However, they believe that wolf densities need to be kept within a certain limit and that without control, adverse social and economic impacts will occur. Thus, the MDHA supports

maintaining a wolf population between 1,251 to 1,400 as required by the 1992 recovery plan.

### Minnesota State Cattleman's Association

The Minnesota State Cattleman's Association (MSCA) supports control of the wolf by regions within the state. In particular, MSCA believes that wolves should be managed within the state's wilderness areas and controlled in areas where livestock production is occurring. They also support regulations that allow ranchers to protect their cattle before a kill occurs - specifically, that cattleman have the right to kill wolves that stalk their herds. Further, MSCA believes that Minnesota cattleman have had to endure the senseless killing and maiming of valuable livestock without just compensation. The MSCA also contends that the USDA verification process is problematic because the reporting requirements are difficult to adhere to and often the carcass is not available for verification.

Dick Lecocq, the president-elect of the MSCA, asserts that the depredation problem is far worse than what is perceived.<sup>49</sup> He believes based on the number of cattle missing from his herd and the loss of aborted calves induced by wolf harassment, that 90% of the depredations that occur go unreported. MSCA further contends that minimizing the risk of wolf depredation requires ranchers to employ unsound management practices. Lecocq explains that the practice of confining cattle close to the barn might be feasible with a handful of cattle, but is troublesome for ranchers with large herds because of manure build-up and the consequential disease problem for calves. The best husbandry practice, according to Lecocq, is to confine cows to the cleanest area near the barn, and two to three days following birth, move cows and calves to the pasture (where disease is less likely to infect calves). Lecocq views other preventive methods such as guard dogs as very impractical. He insists that wolves and livestock are not compatible. Thus, the only equitable remedy is to remove wolves from livestock production areas.

---

<sup>49</sup> personal communication, 1998.

### Minnesota Conservation Federation (A Sport Hunting Group)

The Minnesota Conservation Federation supports returning management of the gray wolf in Minnesota to the DNR if US Fish and Wildlife Service removes the wolf from the endangered species list. It is in favor of regulated and monitored public hunting and trapping of wolves, and further, believes that these actions will assure continued public support to maintain the population and range of the wolf in Minnesota. The Minnesota Conservation Federation bases its position on the following beliefs: 1) that the wolf population and range has expanded beyond the goals of the 1992 recovery plan, 2) that the wolf is a significant threat to deer populations and a serious hazard to domestic livestock and pets, and 3) that there is seriously decreased human tolerance of wolves within Minnesota's wolf range.

### Minnesota Trapper's Association

The Minnesota Trapper's Association believes the recovery of the timber wolf is one of the 'greatest success stories of the Endangered Species Act'. They contend that once the wolf is delisted, the State, rather than Mother Nature, will need to manage and control the wolf. They believe that wolf control will be best accomplished by: 1) allowing citizens to protect their family, pets and livestock; 2) providing fair compensation for loss of livestock and pets; and 3) permitting hunting and trapping by qualified or certified personnel who have attended an orientation seminar.

### American Indian Community

Because of the intense connection many Native Americans in Minnesota feel toward the wolf, they would like to see this spiritual animal remain protected by the Endangered Species Act. The main reason Native people do not want the wolf delisted is because they fear the control that state government will then have over the wolf. Also, they feel the reason control is sought is a selfish one because hunters and farmers feel threatened by the wolf. The Native concept is that hunters and farmers threaten the wolves. Wolves are

considered a very sacred animal to Native people - an animal that should not be killed for sport.

### Environmental Organizations: Sierra Club, Help Our Wolves Live (HOWL), and Friends of Animals and their Environment (FATE)

These organizations feel that immediate delisting of the gray wolf is premature - that more scientific research is necessary before any decision can be safely made. They believe that population estimates may not be accurate and that the present increase in population is the result only of the wolf's protected status. Their concern lies in subsequent effects on population numbers if the wolf is removed from protection.

Because of the conflict between wolves and humans, these organizations do not oppose some form of wolf control if the wolves in Minnesota are found to be a stable and growing population. Their specific position on control is as follows:

- Oppose public hunting and trapping of wolves. Arbitrary killing of wolves for sport is not an effective or reasonable method of depredation control nor does it encourage public respect for this species.
- Favor a restricted wolf depredation control program subject to regulations that favor the wolf, and occurring only after scientific verification that the loss was caused by wolves. The target of control should be the depredating wolf, not all wolves in the area or wolves in general. There should be promotion of non-lethal predator control techniques including the use of guard dogs and fencing.
- Oppose preventative control trapping (killing wolves before losses have occurred).

Finally, they stress that the protection and control of the timber wolf is not just a Minnesota issue. The wolf still remains extirpated throughout most of its former range. Decisions made in Minnesota will likely effect the entire species. As stated in their position paper, these organizations believe 'The ESA was not designed to bring back populations so states could propagate species for recreation revenue but

rather to maintain species and enrich the biodiversity of our nation'.<sup>50</sup>

## Minnesota Wolf Management Roundtable Recommendations

In September 1998, after eight meetings of the Minnesota wolf management Roundtable, consensus on a package of wolf management recommendations was reached. Under this consensus, wolves in Minnesota would be allowed to expand statewide with population management measures to be considered no sooner than 5-years post-delisting. The Roundtable further recommends a minimum statewide population of 1,600 wolves.

*Wolf Depredation Management:* Wolf depredation management remains a high priority under the Roundtable recommendations. The Roundtable supports the continuation of a compensation program for wolf depredation on livestock and recommends expanding this program to include dogs and livestock guard animals. Killing of wolves in defense of human life will continue to be allowed and with the new recommendations, livestock owners may kill wolves that pose an immediate threat to their animals on their property. The Roundtable further recommends that the current cap of \$750 paid to farmers with verified wolf kills be increased to better reflect the fair market value of the animal. Compensation for the loss of livestock guard animals and pet dogs is also included in the recommendations.

Strong emphasis is placed on livestock owners using Best Management Practices to deter wolf depredations. The Roundtable urges the Minnesota Legislature to appropriate funds for the research, development and implementation of non-lethal means of wolf control to minimize wolf depredation on livestock.

*Habitat Management:* The DNR will be responsible for identifying current and potential wolf habitat in the state with the objective of managing it to benefit wolves and their

---

<sup>50</sup> HOWL, unpublished document, 1998.

prey. Wolf habitat considerations include human accessibility, disturbance at den and rendezvous sites and availability of suitable corridors and linkages.

*Population Monitoring:* The Roundtable accepts the current monitoring methods used by the DNR to estimate wolf populations in the state but suggests that future monitoring move toward an actual census. This move will require standardized training for data collectors and more continuous tracking and verification of data.

*Other Recommendations:* The Roundtable also made recommendations on education, enforcement, eco-tourism, wolf-dog hybrids/captive wolves and monitoring of the management plan.

After conclusion of the Roundtable process, the DNR drafted a wolf management plan that incorporated the recommendations of the Roundtable. The final draft of Minnesota's wolf management plan was finished in February 1999 and underwent legislative review. The 1999 legislative session closed without adopting a wolf management plan, although, the issue will be examined again in the next legislative session. The lack of an approved Minnesota wolf management plan could affect plans to delist the gray wolf in the western Great Lakes region.

## Conclusion

Biologically, the gray wolf is doing very well in Minnesota and the surrounding area. Since they were protected under the ESA in 1974, their numbers and range have steadily increased. Minnesota's wolves now number more than 2,400 and occupy over half of the state. Some scientists even contend that wolves in Minnesota have saturated the suitable habitat and are now moving into marginal territory.

Socially, this animal still has a lot of obstacles to overcome. Public attitudes toward the wolf seem to be generally positive in areas where there are no wolves but, negative attitudes continue to prevail among people who live in wolf country. The future of wolves and their management in Minnesota has yet to be determined.



Devising a state wolf management plan is not simply a scientific task. Social beliefs and personal values are inherent in making any biological decision. In fact, the three authors of this paper, who all have similar educational training and a related conservation ethic, found it difficult to agree on a single best management strategy. However, we did agree with the DNR's resolution to involve stakeholders in the decision process. This procedure enabled the DNR to create a plan that incorporated the diverse values and beliefs of Minnesotans. Although we do not necessarily agree with all of the Roundtable's recommendations, we believe that the state legislature should have acknowledged the value of this consensus agreement and adopted the recommended plan.

## Biographies

*Laura Ragan has an M.S. degree in Conservation Biology from the University of Minnesota. She is a Fish and Wildlife Biologist with the Division of Endangered Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Recently, she has been spending her time working with the gray wolf, the bald eagle and the piping plover. She lives in Minneapolis, MN with her husband and dog.*

*Contact address: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, MN, USA 55111*

*Lori Scinto has an M.S. degree in Conservation Biology from the University of Minnesota. She is an Environmental Scientist with the Puget Sound Water Quality Action Team. Recently, she has been working on the Action Team's biennial report on the health of Puget Sound. She lives in Seattle, Washington with her dog, Spec.*

*Contact address: Puget Sound Water Quality Action Team, P.O. Box 40900, Olympia, WA, USA 98504*

*Jennifer Szymanski has an M.S. degree in Conservation Biology from the University of Minnesota. She is a Fish and Wildlife Biologist with the Division of Endangered Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Recently, she has been spending her time working with the Mitchell's satyr butterfly, the massasauga rattlesnake and a slew of endangered*

Mississippi River inhabitants. She lives in White Bear Lake, MN with her husband and two dogs.

Contact address: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, MN, USA 55111

## SOCIETY & ANIMALS

### *Journal of Human - Animal Studies*

**EDITORIAL BOARD:**

**EDITOR: KENNETH SHAPIRO (WASHINGTON GROVE, MD, PSYCHOLOGY)**

**ASSOCIATE EDITOR: ARNOLD ARLUKE (NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, SOCIOLOGY)**

**EDITORIAL ASSISTANT: FRANCIS ALBRECHT**

VOLUME 8, (2000)  
(3 ISSUES PER YEAR.)  
ISSN 1063-1119  
INSTITUTIONS EUR 68.- /  
US\$ 84.- / DGL 149.85  
INDIVIDUALS EUR 31.- /  
US\$ 38.- / DGL 68.32

Academic Publishers

 B R I L L

P.O. Box 9000  
2300 PA LEIDEN  
THE NETHERLANDS

TEL +31 (0)71 53 53 566  
FAX +31 (0)71 53 17 532  
E-MAIL [csi@brill.nl](mailto:csi@brill.nl)

*Society & Animals* publishes studies that describe and analyze our experiences of non-human animals from the perspective of various disciplines within both the social sciences and humanities. The journal specifically deals with subjects such as human-animal interactions in various settings, the applied uses of animals, the use of animals in popular culture, attitudes toward animals as affected by different socializations, agencies and strategies, representations of animals in literature, the history of the domestication of animals, the politics of animal welfare, and the constitution of the animal rights movement.

*Society & Animals* is unique in the breadth of subjects covered, methods of papers published, and diversity of scholarly disciplines represented. It is also unique in its encouragement of data based discussion of ethical and policy issues in the current debate over the place of non-human animals in an increasingly human-centered world.

*Society  
Animals*



[www.brill.nl](http://www.brill.nl)

## The Chicken Tree

Simone Poirier-Bures

**T**he house stands on the hinge of the road, where the paved section ends and the gravel part begins. It's an old house, of a style you often see in rural areas, with a porch in front, and another on the side, off the kitchen. Torn blinds hang in the upstairs windows, blinds that never seem to go up or down. The house needs paint, the front steps droop, and the gutters teeter precariously from the roof line. But the grass is always neatly mowed, and every spring the clumps of blood red roses and wild purple phlox bloom sweetly.

On sunny afternoons and mild evenings an elderly couple sits on the front porch, while their middle-aged Down's Syndrome daughter swings slowly across from them, saying, 'Momma? Momma?' over and over. A dog tied out back barks half-heartedly; Banti chickens run free, clucking and scratching in the sideyard. A big, proud rooster herds his hens back from across the road when he sees us, and squawks at us indignantly for his trouble.

Whenever we stay at our river cottage, which we do as much as possible from early spring to late fall, we pass this house on our walks. Always, it's the object of our curiosity, this house hints of old ways, of things forgotten. Last fall, before we closed up our cottage for the winter, we discovered one of its secrets.

It was a beautiful evening for a walk, still warm, fragrant with the scent of fallen leaves, the aroma of things ending. The sun was inching toward the horizon, the crickets rowdy and restless. When we reached the end of the paved road, we looked over at the old house and its yard, as usual.

'Look!' my husband said. 'In the tree!'

He pointed to the wild cherry in the sideyard. Most of its leaves had fallen so its branches were silhouetted clearly against the sky.

'What?' I said, then saw them. Chickens! At least a dozen, perched in the branches. Below, the big rooster cackled and fussed, and sure enough, one of the remaining hens scuttled up a low branch and made her way to a cluster of other chickens.

I stood there with my mouth open, amazed.

'They are birds,' my husband said. 'And Bantis are still partially wild. They must feel safe roosting there.'

'Don't they have a henhouse?' I wondered aloud.

'Oh they probably do,' my husband said. 'But it gets hot in a hen house. They probably prefer to be outside, especially on a night like this.'

While we watched, several of the chickens drew closer together, fluffed themselves up, and settled in. Though the light was fading, we counted twenty dark shapes among the branches. I tried to imagine how it must feel to them, sleeping out under the stars like this, in the fresh air, surrounded by night sounds. Like children in a tree house, I concluded, charmed.

The old house was silent, its windows dark except for a small light in the kitchen. It seemed, now, to be full of secrets, things that it knew, but we didn't. All those times we'd passed and never noticed the chicken tree!

The memory of the roosting chickens stayed with us over the winter, so this spring, when we reopened the cottage, we made a point of walking by the old house at dusk. The trees had not yet completely leafed out, but the ground was warming and everything seemed restless and excited. The chickens were in their tree again, and though we could barely see them in the thickening canopy, we could hear their soft, contented sounds. We paused to listen, and for a moment it seemed as if the tree itself was clucking in happiness.

Once, all chickens roamed free like these. But that was before industrial farming, before chickens were crammed by the thousands into tiny spaces and force fed, chickens destined never to feel the sun on their backs, never to eat a worm, never to climb a tree. Such chickens no longer even know how to fly. The Bantis, I reflected, were relics of a time when the human grip on the earth was looser, when the world was a wilder, more mysterious place.

I looked over at the old house, locked in its silences. It seemed, now, to bear witness to what we have lost. As I listened to the drowsing chickens, I could easily imagine it: a world still partly enchanted, full of small wonders, like chicken trees.

## ISAZ

### *INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR ANTHROZOOLOGY*

ISAZ is a supportive organisation for the scientific and scholarly study of human-animal interactions. The primary aim of ISAZ is to promote the study of all aspects of human-animal relationships by encouraging and publishing research, holding meetings, and disseminating information. Meetings have focussed on a wide variety of topics including: attitudes to animals, companion animal welfare, methodologies in anthrozoological research, medical, social, and psychological aspects of human-animal interactions, ethological and behavioural approaches to the study of human-animal interaction. Membership is open to individuals currently or previously involved in conducting scholarly research within the broad field of human-animal interactions. Corporate membership is open to any charities, organisations, or companies which have an interest in the aims of the Society.

contact: <http://www.soton.ac.uk/~azi/isaz1.htm>

or Dr. Debbie Wells,

Membership Secretary and Treasurer,  
ISAZ,

School of Psychology,

The Queen's University of Belfast,

Belfast BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland, UK.

ph: +44 - (0)1232 - 274386; fax: +44 - (0)1232 -  
664144;

e-mail: [d.wells@qub.ac.uk](mailto:d.wells@qub.ac.uk).

## Review Essays

*Kenneth Joel Shapiro, Animal models of human psychology: critique of science, ethics, and policy, 328pp., Hogrefe & Huber Publishers, Seattle, 1998.*

'I intend the present work as a polite and respectful but strong and objectively founded call to action'. Thus Kenneth Shapiro concludes his Introduction (p.14) to this powerful and pathbreaking treatise. A clinical psychologist himself, and at the time of writing Executive Director of Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Shapiro has been publishing on the topic of his colleagues' utilisation of animal models for a decade and a half. With its comprehensive coverage and careful analysis of facts and issues, this latest book provides a unique combination of consideration of and examination of ethical systems in terms of their implications for the policies regulating animal research, and of a particular area of animal research in terms of its success as a scientific enterprise.

Also in the Introduction, Shapiro outlines his plan to address both sets of major beliefs about animal research - the one that views it as senseless and wrong, and the other that sees it as a necessary basis of science. He ends up censuring the protagonists of both, for partisan support without a solid critical base. A sample of conceptual flavours to come is given in the 'preliminary landmarks' of the respective positions. While both hold that animals in the laboratory are transformed from their actual state of being, on the one hand the critics of animal research regard them as being **reduced** to a lesser status by virtue of becoming just part of the laboratory scene, whereas its proponents construct them as **transcendent** objects serving the cause of the expansion of knowledge. A fine sample of the author's personal style is provided in his pithy policy statement on matters linguistic.

Psychology, Shapiro points out, is for two reasons of particular significance in any consideration of the use of animals in laboratory research. Firstly, courses in the discipline are taken by such huge

numbers of students that it must needs figure largely in the formation of attitudes towards this controversial issue. Secondly, for whatever reason, psychology has been one of the prime targets of the contemporary animal rights movement. The fact that psychologists were caught unprepared by this unwelcome attention certainly highlights the need for an examination of its whys and wherefores such as is here offered.

The treatise is clearly structured, and presented in such a way as to enlighten and instruct both newcomers to and those already acquainted with the discipline and practices of psychology. The first chapter, dealing with current practices and attitudes in psychology's use of animals, is an absolute treasure house of information. Reviewing a range of previous studies on the topic, Shapiro comes to cautious conclusions on matters such as the numbers of animals used annually in United States psychology laboratories (one and a quarter to two and a half million!) and elsewhere, on changing rates of such usage, on relative proportions of species of animals used and in what fields. He identifies his focus as being on that research approach which situates animals as models of particular aspects of the human condition, in contrast to that which studies animals for their own sake, or even that which conceives of psychological processes as being universal across species. Animal model research is distinguished by its targeting disorders and dysfunctions, and attempting their induction in animals in the laboratory. An amazing list of eighty-one conditions for which animals have been used as models is presented on p.29 – 'it is evident that psychologists have attempted to develop an animal model for virtually every known problem in the human condition that has even a remotely psychological cast'. (p.30)

Ensuing chapters discuss how animals have come to be conceptualised in psychological laboratory-based research. Adopting a constructionist perspective on the sociology of knowledge, Shapiro examines the strategy of creating animal models of human disorders via examples from the field of eating disorders. He argues that such models are in point of fact decidedly distanced from actual clinical knowledge and treatment of these disorders. This is because the development of models is heavily constrained by the laboratory situation, 'a place away from the buzzing confusion, the



uncontrollable flow of events of the ordinary world'.(p.63) The so-called lab animal itself is a product of social construction, with its interplay of human and institutional processes and attitudes. In turn, the technologizing of the laboratory means that the behaviours studied are elicited rather than occurring naturally, and are recorded, in mathematical format, rather than observed.

Chapter 3 tackles head-on the all too often evaded theoretical issue of the formal status of the model. A model is an analogy, it is not itself the phenomenon of interest its creator allegedly wishes to illuminate. At best, Shapiro asserts, animal models in psychology may provide weak analogies to human behavioural disorders, heavily embedded as are the latter in exclusively human social structures and influences. But in fact these models fail to function even as heuristic devices, and to generate ideas that are then tested on that which they claim to resemble. In consequence not only of the disparity between the laboratory and the clinical settings, but also of that between the professional worlds of animal experimenters and clinicians, the work has had almost no impact on treatment practices. The latter claim is substantiated by a most impressive array of empirical data, presented in the next chapter.

This central chapter commences with a description of the two primary eating disorders, bulimia nervosa and anorexia nervosa, and the stress induction animal models of them, respectively the over-eating elicited by sham feeding and tail pinching, and the self-starvation consequent on forced hyperactivity. Analysis of these models reveals two primary limitations - the restricted number and simplistic character of those features modelled, and the focus on symptoms at the expense of causation. Shapiro argues that their use is actually counter-productive, beginning from what are for the most part arbitrary starting points, and shaping up a research enterprise that is in-grown in nature, concentrating on the comparison with each other of various laboratory models and variables. Their bias is towards physiological explanation at the expense of culture and personal dynamics; one consequence of this is a preoccupation with technology and procedures for their own sake. The author then reports on a survey he has conducted on thirty clinicians specializing in the treatment of eating disorders. Sixty per cent of the respondents were unaware of the existence of animal models in their field, and

no-one displayed any detailed knowledge or understanding of any such. Eighty-seven per cent denied any influence of such models on their treatment approach. A citation analysis instigated by Shapiro, targeting nine investigators in the field of relevant animal modelling, demonstrated a low overall frequency of citation of this work in the psychological literature. More significantly, in the present context, no citations at all occurred in the journals named as being helpful in their work by the clinicians in the aforesaid survey!

The final two chapters deal with the ethical and policy issues raised by the foregoing material. Current practice in psychology is found woefully lacking in respect of both sets of discourse. It would be hard to find a more comprehensive and balanced review of the literature in either category than is provided here. On the basis of this review the author arrives at his own personal position. He condemns 'official psychology' for its global defence of animal research as such, independent of a consideration of the merits of particular studies, and for its convenient line that the benefits of any one investigation cannot be determined in advance, and may in any case be much delayed. No more than lipservice is paid by it to utilitarianism - 'official psychology exploits certain openings in a utilitarian philosophy to override the provision of any meaningful limitation on animal suffering in research'. (p.280) Shapiro himself decides that the use of Peter Singer's utilitarian ethic is limited, favouring instead a combination of this with Tom Regan's case for individual rights wherein priority is given to rights over a cost-benefit analysis. Thus certain procedures with a severe degree of invasiveness should be banned in principle, regardless of any possible benefits of their use.

Shapiro's hope for the impact of his present contribution is that it will lead to increased public and professional awareness of the state of play regarding the enterprise of animal model research in psychology, and that ending its closed shop status will in turn lead to a demand for the radical curtailment of such research.

Where then will this 'strong and objectively founded call to action' be heard? The animal rights movement will of course find in it an expansion of their artillery with regard to the use of animals in psychology. In Australia, for instance, the line taken by Shapiro ties in very closely with that taken by the Australian Association for

Humane Research, which emphasizes the scientific inappropriateness of using animal models and data for research on humans, though mainly instancing medical practice. It will be intriguing to see the frequency and location of citations of this book itself in the psychological literature over, say, the first decade after its publication. Shapiro is a first class theoretician, and one would hope to find references to specific aspects of his analysis of theoretical issues such as the formal status of the model in journals such as *Theory and Psychology*. I have not mentioned his brief but insightful forays into the historical realm; researchers into the history of behaviourism and the development of laboratory procedures and ideologies for instance may well refer to him. Whether clinicians in the field of eating disorders will take notice of the book is a moot point; after all if, as Shapiro demonstrates, they are already uninterested in animal research purporting to model these disorders, they may or may not make time to peruse a monograph whose views reinforce or elaborate on those they already hold. The book clearly provides ample ammunition for those (regrettably few) psychologists actively concerned with questions of animal rights; it will hopefully also become a source book for courses and committees dealing with laboratory codes of practice. The hundred dollar question remains as to the extent to which the animal researchers themselves will take notice of Shapiro's evaluation of their activities and position. My prediction is that many of them will in fact respond; the quality of argument, extent of coverage of issues and skilful employment of empirical backup, make this critical foray into their field too substantial to be easily ignored. Entrenched positions however are not readily abandoned; the incidence of citations need not correlate with actual changes of viewpoint. Nonetheless, once it is referenced in the literature, this treatise will be accessed by students, that group still in the process of taking up positions on ethical matters and determining career paths; here Shapiro should indeed make a mark.

Alison M. Turtle

Georges Chapouthier and Jean-Claude Nouët, eds. *The Universal Declaration of Animal Rights: Comments and Intentions*, 93pp., *Ligue Française des Droits de l'Animal*, Paris 1998.

*The Universal Declaration of Animal Rights* is an expression of some of the theoretical concerns emanating from France and in particular from the French Animal Rights League (*Ligue Française des Droits de l'Animal*) including criticisms of the two main currents of thought regarding animals in English-speaking countries, ie. the views of Regan and Singer.

The book has seven contributors with the discussion framed by the two editors, Nouët beginning and Chapouthier completing the volume. The authors have a range of backgrounds in philosophy, medicine, law and art history but philosophy dominates.

Nouët, a professor of medicine explains that the Universal Declaration of Animal Rights was proclaimed in Paris in 1978 and presented to the United Nations. The Declaration recognises

the equal rights for all living non-human beings to exist on earth. The intention of the Universal Declaration of Animal Rights is to establish an egalitarian right to life, no matter what the species be and...in the context of and with respect to the balance of nature (p.9).

Nouët cites the following authors as important influences leading to this declaration: Thomas Young, Jeremy Bentham, Henry Salt and André Géraud. Various charters which have been proposed to protect animals from 1950s on, also formed the background to the 1978 Charter. It has subsequently been refined and presented to UNESCO in 1989 by the International League. The text is remarkable for its scope and succinctness and is therefore produced below in full:

## **Universal Declaration of Animal Rights**

### **Preamble**

*-Considering that Life is one, all living beings having common origin and having diversified in the course of the evolution of the species,*

*-Considering that all living beings possess natural rights, and that any animal with a nervous system has specific rights,*

*-Considering that the contempt for, and even the simple ignorance of, these natural rights, cause serious damage to Nature and lead men to commit crimes against animals,*

*-Considering that the coexistence of species implies a recognition by the human species of the right of other animal species to live,*

*-Considering that the respect of animals by humans is inseparable from the respect of men for each other, it is hereby proclaimed*

### **ARTICLE 1**

*All animals have equal rights to exist within the context of biological equilibrium.*

*This equality of rights does not overshadow the diversity of species and of individuals.*

### **ARTICLE 2**

*All animal life has the right to be respected.*

### **ARTICLE 3**

*1. Animals must not be subjected to bad treatments or to cruel acts.*

*2. If it is necessary to kill an animal, it must be instantaneous, painless and cause no apprehension.*

*3. A dead animal must be treated with decency.*

### **ARTICLE 4**

*1. Wild animals have the right to live and to reproduce in freedom in their own natural environment.*

*2. The prolonged deprivation of the freedom of wild animals, hunting and fishing practised as a pastime, as well as any use of wild animals for reasons that are not vital, are contrary to this fundamental right.*

**ARTICLE 5**

1. *Any animal which is dependent on man has the right to proper maintenance and care.*
2. *It must under no circumstances be abandoned or killed unjustifiably.*
3. *All forms of breeding and uses of the animal must respect the physiology and behaviour specific to the species.*
4. *Exhibitions, shows and films involving animals must also respect their dignity and must not include any violence whatsoever.*

**ARTICLE 6**

1. *Experiments on animals entailing physical or psychological suffering violate the rights of animals.*
2. *Replacement methods must be developed and systematically implemented.*

**ARTICLE 7**

*Any act unnecessarily involving the death of an animal, and any decision leading to such an act, constitute a crime against life.*

**ARTICLE 8**

1. *Any act compromising the survival of a wild species and any decision leading to such an act are tantamount to genocide, that is to say, a crime against the species.*
2. *The massacre of wild animals, and the pollution and destruction of biotopes are acts of genocide.*

**ARTICLE 9**

1. *The specific legal status of animals and their rights must be recognised in law.*
2. *The protection and safety of animals must be represented at the level of Governmental organizations.*

**ARTICLE 10**

*Educational and school authorities must ensure that citizens learn from childhood to observe, understand and respect animals.*

*The Universal Declaration of Animal Rights was solemnly proclaimed in Paris on 15 October 1978 at the UNESCO headquarters. The text, revised by the*

*International League of Animal Rights in 1989, was submitted to the UNESCO Director General in 1990 and made public that same year. (pp.80-81)*

Nouët stresses the need to abolish the hierarchy between humans and animals arguing that humans and animals may have different features but these differences do not mean that humans have some special status or privilege.

The position of animals in French law is discussed by Suzanne Antoine, a Judge at the Court of Appeal in Paris. Animal rights are not included in French law. However there is some protection for domestic animals and 'wild animals tamed or kept in captivity' (p. 18). This protection is limited and not consistent between the various legal codes, though animals are usually considered as objects similar to other items of property. French criminal law since 1992 does prohibit physical abuse and acts of cruelty to animals. This includes the abandonment of animals and the use of animals for scientific experiments not complying with official regulations. It is interesting that the latter is brought under the criminal code, rather than a breach of a more loosely defined animal welfare regulation as is common in many countries.

Bull fights and cock fights are exempted from the French anti-cruelty law if there is proof of an uninterrupted local tradition, a feature which Antoine deplors. In a separate chapter Elisabeth Hardouin-Fugier examines Spanish bullfighting in France pointing out the powerful interests supporting this cruel practice and the difficulty that opponents have in even getting heard.

Antoine points out that no protection is given to individual wild animals in French law. However conservation of the species is covered by legislation. Antoine argues that this is a weak law and that the application is made problematic by hunting interests. She regards hunting as a practice which should no longer be tolerated in any civilized country and notes the absurd example of the hunting of migratory birds. Species which are protected in neighbouring countries may be legally shot when they fly over France.

The French legal situation stands in sharp contrast to the Declaration of Animal Rights. However Antoine mentions a promising move from some French lawyers to recognize animals as 'subjects' with a certain number of rights.

The philosopher Florence Burgat draws on Rousseau in an attempt to work out whether there is a basis in natural law to oblige humans not to harm animals. She concludes that it is the capacity of animals to suffer which draws them into the same moral domain as humans and promotes the recognition of animal rights. (Bentham and Singer should be acknowledged here but are not.) Burgat claims that this should lead to different legislation than for instance the anti-cruelty codes which only serve to re-enforce the dominant position of humans who may act charitably to inferior beings.

Goffi, another philosopher, directly engages with Singer's utilitarianism. He presents a novel logical argument against Singer's view and supports the extension of the moral domain beyond sentient beings. In fact Goffi believes that 'the moral community is the same as the community of living organisms' (p.67), while there is a hierarchy of different forms of individual good.

Goffi also evaluates Regan's position, granting that he presents a very strong case in defence of animal rights which questioning Regan's view on inherent value. Curiously, I take the opposite of this stand. Regan's notion of inherent value seems to me to be on the right track even though flawed. (His definition of inherent value draws too heavily on what is of value to humans). Regan's view on rights strikes me as an unnecessary 'add-on'.

Chapouthier discusses animal rights in relation to human rights, ranking them on different levels but arguing that human rights take precedence over animal rights only when the human rights to life and health are under threat. Charpouthier argues perhaps surprisingly that animal rights and human rights usually operate in the same direction.

The articles in this volume engage with debates appearing in English on animal rights but they offer new perspectives both in terms of



critique and positive theory. Hopefully this translation into English will mean that reverse engagement will occur.

Readers interested in obtaining a copy of *The Universal Declaration of Animal Rights: Comments and Intentions* should contact Ligue Française des Droits de l'Animal, 39 Rue Claude Bernard, 75005 Paris, France.

Denise Russell

*Mark A. Michael, editor, Preserving Nature: An International Perspective, 307pp., Humanity Books, New York, 2000.*

Mark Michael's anthology on wildlife preservation offers an enlightening and disturbing introduction to some of the most important questions facing conservationists. According to Michael, the contributors all share the assumption that 'wildlife should be preserved (p.8). Perhaps because of its status as an assumption, this sentiment escapes any significant analysis, leaving poorly explored a range of issues, including the definition of nature, of wildlife and of preservation. The book highlights a startling disjunction between conservation and animal rights perspectives on wild animals, and this too, could have been explored more fully.

The first section contains three articles which debate moral issues around human intervention into the lives of wild animals. A case against assisting injured wild animals is made, and a survey of the impact of the tagging and studying of endangered species is offered. Also included is a rather frustrating criticism of sport hunting by Roger J. H. King, which depends heavily on eco-feminist arguments. Most frustrating about the critique is its failure to question the meaning of 'nature'. The article makes clear that many of those who oppose hunting see humans as distinct from nature; as a danger to its delicate balance and even its survival. However, some proponents of hunting argue that the desire to prey upon other species is itself

natural in humans. As such, hunting is inevitable and perhaps even desirable. Where anti-hunting arguments appeal to unanalysed notions of nature in this way, they must expect to be met with opposing arguments equally invested in the easy authority wielded by the term, 'nature'.

The second section takes a close look at approaches to habitat conservation and the treatment of exotic species that threaten the well-being of endangered native animals. The wisdom of attempting to save individual species through captive breeding programmes is explored, as is the culling of introduced species thought to be a danger to other flora and fauna. It is perhaps in this section that the gulf between animal rights advocates and conservationists emerges most clearly. The US National Parks Service's decision to destroy a population of goats is debated in an exchange that overtly addresses some of the issues behind this gulf, while other articles hint at them. Andrew Cohen's article, 'Weeding the Garden' expresses strong dissatisfaction with a gull culling programme he participated in, and reveals some very disturbing attitudes towards non-native species. Any approach which labels overabundant species 'garbage animals' (as does one ecologist with the Environmental Defense Fund that Cohen quotes) has no chance of meaningfully reversing the negative effects humans have already had on other species or of building a future that safeguards the diversity of animal species and their welfare.

It is at this point that questions raised by the book's inadequately defined title assert themselves. What is wildlife? Why preserve it? Can what is preserved remain 'wild'? Should some animals suffer to preserve human understandings of the wild? For whose benefit is endangered wildlife preserved? Where the preservation of some animals appears to necessitate brutal poisoning regimes for others (the gulls in Cohen's article take up to two days to die (p.85)), it is clear that animal welfare is not at stake. Nor is it at stake in captive breeding programmes involving the release of bred animals and the subsequent death of most of these animals (17 out of 20 in the case of the tamarins in Robert Loftins' 'Captive breeding of endangered species (p.113).). Unless one wishes to argue that animals care whether their species persists, captive breeding projects do not serve individual members of endangered species well.

Perhaps it is possible to argue that these interventions have an animal welfare component because if individual species die out, the ecological system in which they function will be damaged and many other animals will die as a consequence. This is an important consideration. However, another issue that must be confronted is whether in some cases, the animals subjected to intensive breeding programmes in captivity are those whose numbers have become so depleted that their role in their traditional ecosystems is minimal. If such cases occur, the preservation of these species appears to be motivated mainly by the desire to maintain a diverse environment for human benefit. Are captive breeding programmes and culling justified in such cases?

Section three mainly examines the role game hunting and harvesting can play in conservation in developing nations. The history of conservation as bound up with imperialism is highlighted here, and negative perceptions of conservation among Tanzanian pastoralists and Zambian villagers are shown to be the result of inequitable practices around land appropriation and profit-sharing from sport hunting and tourism. The articles in this section make clear that poor rural people often bear the brunt of conservation programmes initiated elsewhere, at the behest of foreigners.

It is unsurprising then, that economic incentives in the form of employment associated with sport hunting and the harvesting of meat, horn and ivory are required to secure the participation of impoverished peoples in conservation. In light of this, it would have been valuable to include an examination of the ways in which Western nations and individuals might be exhorted to systematically bear some of the cost of conservation in poorer countries. After all, it is the West that so strongly demands conservation, and it is the West that is more able to afford it.

The last section takes a similar tack in looking at several ways in which conservation of animals, such as elephants in Graeme Caughley's 'Elephants and Economics', and land in Gordon Grigg's 'Kangaroo Harvesting and the Conservation of Arid and Semi-Arid Rangelands' can be effected through the development of new markets for animal produce. Martha Groom, et al. take a slightly

different approach by examining a tourism market in Peru that revolves around watching animals rather than farming or hunting them, but they indicate that this kind of marketing, if poorly regulated, can also have a negative impact on wild animals. This section contains some valuable discussion of economic issues around conservation. Does classical economic theory warrant application to conservation? Do economic incentives really encourage the protection of endangered species?

*Preserving Wildlife* is an interesting if rather limited look at some of the issues surrounding conservation today. Animal rights advocates may be disturbed by some of the conservation practices documented here. These are particularly difficult to accept because the book fails to offer any detailed or convincing exposition on the foundations of conservation, its specific rationale, and perhaps most importantly, the limits of its legitimacy. This is not to say, of course, that conservation is wrong or pointless. However, important questions need to remain on the agenda. If conservation seeks to protect the natural world, what is nature? What is the status of human behaviour in nature? What is the status of those non-native species that 'naturally' thrive in habitat required for survival by other, native, species? Whose idea of nature is being protected? In short, what is being conserved, how, and at whose cost?

Suzanne Fraser

## Book Review

J.M.Coetzee, *The Lives of Animals*, 125 pp., Profile Books, London, 2000.

A female novelist is invited to give a lecture in a US university and she uses the occasion to attack philosophers views on animals and the supremacy of reason: judging animals by how well they match our criteria of rationality or linguistic competence. This is the subject of the first half of the book entitled 'The Philosophers and the Animals'. In particular there is a fine discussion of the limited nature of Nagel's answer to the question, 'what is it like to be a bat?'. There are some philosophers however who accept her criticisms and it is a pity that they are ignored. See for instance, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* by Val Plumwood,<sup>1</sup> *Beyond Boundaries: Humans and Animals*, by Barbara Noske<sup>2</sup> and *Beyond Animal Rights: A feminist caring ethic for the treatment of animals* edited by Josephine Donovan and Carol Adams.<sup>3</sup>

The lecture also contains a discussion of the evils of confinement of animals and its devastating effects in zoos<sup>4</sup>, laboratories and institutions and the moral wrong in the 'places of slaughter' which surround us. There is a plea to use sympathetic imagination to think our way into the existence of an animal, just like we may do with a character in a novel.

The dinner afterwards is framed by a crisp, ironic discussion of vegetarianism with reflections on what makes animals different from humans. One dinner guest suggests that animals have no

---

<sup>1</sup> (Routledge, London, 1993).

<sup>2</sup> (Black Rose Books, Montreal, 1997).

<sup>3</sup> (Continuum, New York, 1996).

<sup>4</sup> Janet Frame evokes this well in the novel, *Daughter Buffalo* (Flamingo, London, 1993), p.112: 'We walked throught the cat house, stopping at each cage to admire the grace and courage evident in spite of the habitual attitude of imprisonment that replaced brightness in the eyes with bewilderment and a perpetual leaking from the tufts that looked very much like real tears for real reasons, and the sleek coat with dull dry tufts of fur'.

shame. They don't hide their excretions and they perform sex in the open. Another announces that animals are creatures we don't have sex with.

The second half of *The Lives of Animals*, 'The Poets and the Animals', centres on a seminar to the English faculty. Ted Hughes is praised for writing poems which 'ask us to imagine our way into [the jaguar's] way of moving, to inhabit that body'(p.85) in contrast to inhabiting another mind. Such poetry is a 'record of an engagement'with an animal (p.86).

In the ensuing discussion the woman misses some obvious responses eg when accused of trying to impose a western ethic, she fails to point out that concern for animals and vegetarianism has been an important part of major eastern religions such as Buddhism.

This is a challenging book, exposing the immorality of common attitudes towards animals held by 'kind' people. It aptly points out the weakness of much philosophy. The way forward, the poet's way is explored with tantalizing brevity and some might find Hughes an odd choice. I do.

Denise Russell

## INDEX

### Vol. 1 No. 1 1997

#### articles:

Freya Mathews: 'Living with Animals'

Val Plumwood: '*Babe: The Tale of the Speaking Meat Part 1*'

Lynda Birke: 'Science and Animals, or, Why Cyril Won't Win the Nobel Prize'

Emma Munro: 'Speciesism and Sexism'

interview with Peter Singer

#### reviews of

*Feral Children and Clever Animals:*

*Reflections on Human Nature*

*The Frankenstein Syndrome: Ethical and Social Issues in the Genetic Engineering of Animals*

### Vol. 1. No. 2 1997

#### articles:

Andrew Brennan: 'Ethics, Conflict and Animal Research'

Birgitta Forsman: 'Two Different Approaches to Gene Technology in Animals'

Val Plumwood: '*Babe: The Tale of the Speaking Meat Part II*'

Lynda Birke and Mike Michael: 'Hybrids, Rights and Their Proliferation'

interview with Julia Bell

#### reviews of

*Dog Love*

*Taking Animals Seriously: Mental Life and Moral Status*

**Vol. 2. No. 1 1998**

articles:

Annie O'Rourke: 'Caring-About Virtual Pets: An Ethical Interpretation of Tamagotchi'

Glenn Albrecht: 'Thinking like an ecosystem: the ethics of the relocation, rehabilitation and release of wildlife'

Simone Poirer-Bures: 'He's the one'

Denis Mahony: 'Toward a better press for animals'

review essay: Felicity Sutcliffe: *Good natured: the origins of right and wrong in humans and other animals*

review of

*Minds of their Own: Thinking and Awareness in Animas*

**Vol. 2. No. 2 1998**

articles:

Henk Verhoog: 'Morality and the "Naturalness" of Transgenic Animals'

Anne Quain: 'Is there a problem in attributing beliefs and intentionality to animals?'

Frans W.A. Brom and Egbert Schrotten: 'Ethics and Animal Biotechnology'

Gurch Randhawa: 'Xenotransplantation: Do we have an alternative?'

review essay: Andrew Asquith: *Nature Wars: People vs. Pests*

reviews of



*Animal Consciousness and Animal Ethics:  
Perspectives from the Netherlands  
The Intrinsic Value of Nature  
Transgenic Animals. Why*

**Vol. 3 No 1 1999**

articles:

Gisela Kaplan: 'An exercise in the practice of biodiversity and a tool for conservation'  
Nicola Taylor: 'Whither rights? Animal rights and the rise of new welfarism to animals?'  
Simone Poirier-Bures: 'One crow, sorrow'  
Elizabeth Murphy: 'In what respects, if any, should the primates be equal?'

reviews of

*Ethical approaches to animal-based science  
Hearts and Minds  
Not Only Roars and Rituals  
Animals and their Moral Standing*

**Vol. 3 No 2 1999**

articles:

Michael W. Fox: India's Sacred Cow: Her Plight and Future  
Simone Poirier-Bures: Garden  
Will Kort and Medard Hilhorst: The Death Penalty or Lifelong Encagement: Moral dilemmas about animals-without-further-destination

review essay: Paul Redding: *Species of Mind: The Philosophy and Biology of Cognitive Ethology*

reviews of

*Beyond Boundaries: Humans and Animals  
Rain without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement*

**Vol. 4 No 1 2000**

articles:

Barry Kew: 'It's a (Two-) Culture Thing: The Lateral Shift to Liberation'

Val Plumwood: 'A Wombat Wake: In Memoriam Birubi'

Consuelo Rivera-Fuentes: 'Gender and hybridity: the significance of human/animal characters in magic realist fiction'

Simone Poirier-Bures: 'The Face in the Tree'

review essays:

Anne Quain: *Ethics into Action: Henry Spira and the Animal Rights Movement*

Ralph Acampora: *Reading Zoos: Representations of Animals and Captivity*

Suzanne Fraser: *Brute Science: Dilemmas of Animal Experimentation*

Alison M. Turtle: *The Pact for Survival: Humans and their Animal Companions*

review of

*Understanding Dogs: Living and Working with Canine Companions*



**ISSN 1328-8202**