

Henry Spira and the SHAC 7: Comparing Animal Rights Activism in 1976 and 2006

Shauna Woods

Senior Honors Thesis 2010

Faculty Mentor: Laura Kalman

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Laura Kalman, thank you for agreeing to be my mentor and for being so amazing. I plan to put your face on mugs, t-shirts, and keychains. I think there's a demand.

With love, Ms. Marymount

Professor Bernstein, I finished my footnotes. They still probably aren't correct. Thank you for your patience, dedication, and guidance! I don't think I would have finished this without you. Thank you also for your frequent reassurance that I would finish this.

Mack & Cathy, Bill Pullman would be so proud of both of you! I guess I'm proud too.

Thank you to the Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities for funding my project.

To my parents, thank you for your constant support. I'm so grateful for everything you have done for me! Thank you for the constant reminder to "try my hardest and do my best." I'm 85% sure I fulfilled that.

When I first chose to go to UCSB, I was told I'd have little interaction with professors at such a large school. LIES! I'm grateful to the History Department for offering small classes that have allowed me to get to know my professors on a personal level. And more importantly, I'm thankful to the professors that have encouraged me and made me proud to be a history major at this school: Bernstein, Drake, Kalman, Plane, and Talbott.

PRELUDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Philosophy and Becoming an Activist	8
Selecting a Target	12
The Protest	16
Leadership	24
Secondary Targets	28
Media Attention	30
Government Reaction	34
Scientific Community Reaction	39
Legacy	42
Conclusion	50
Bibliography	53

* For more information, refer to POM Wonderful's website, which links to several studies published regarding the benefits of pomegranates.

http://www.pom Wonderful.com/health_benefits/health_research.aspx

* Jessica Garretts, "Activists Target Juice Company," *Los Angeles Times*, September 10, 2006, California Section.

* Ibid.

* Joe Miciello, "Santa Monica and FBI target animal activists," *Los Angeles Times*, November 3, 2006, California Section.

PRELUDE

In 2006, after graduating from high school, I went to work at a bookstore in Los Angeles. While working there, I met Kevin, a vegan and self-described animal rights activist. Although my older sister had been a vegetarian for over a decade, I had never met a vegan before. After asking the obvious questions about nutrition and diet, I began to ask the more difficult questions about the philosophy of animal rights activism.

Kevin responded passionately to my questions, explaining that he participated in protests against circuses and against POM Wonderful, the world's largest distributor of pomegranate juice. In order for POM to make health claims about the benefits of pomegranate juice, it funded animal research on topics such as "cardiovascular disease, prostate cancer, and antioxidant activity."¹ In early September, the protests received coverage in *The Los Angeles Times*. As I read the article, I learned that activists' targets, such as acting UCLA chancellor Norman Abrams, believed animal rights activists were terrorists.² Activists who protested POM, including Kevin, had been served with an injunction by POM to stop demonstrations outside employee homes.³ I could not imagine anyone describing my well-spoken friend Kevin as a terrorist. Two months later in early November, Kevin called to tell me that the Santa Monica police had searched his home as a result of his involvement in the POM campaign.⁴

While Kevin's protests against POM persisted, Congress passed the controversial Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act. The AETA was designed to "enhance the effectiveness

¹ For more information, refer to POM Wonderful's website, which links to seventeen studies published regarding the benefits of pomegranates.

http://www.pom-pills.com/health_benefits/health_research.aspx.

² Jessica Garrison, "Activists Target Juice Company," *Los Angeles Times*, September 10, 2006, California Section.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Joe Mozingo, "Santa Monica and FBI target animal activists," *Los Angeles Times*, November 3, 2006, California Section.

of the U.S. Department of Justice's ability to prosecute animal rights extremists who cross the line and utilize violence and terroristic threats" while still "expressly preserving the First Amendment rights of animal rights activists to peacefully protest and boycott lawfully."⁵ Liberal groups, such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), felt the AETA still violated activists' First Amendment rights. Despite protest, the Senate passed AETA on unanimous consent on September 26, 2006. The House of Representatives also passed the AETA unanimously on November 13, 2006, and the bill was signed into law on November 27, 2006.⁶

I believe that the AETA is a violation of first amendment rights. As the AETA passed, I began to look at the history of the animal rights movement, and what could have possibly led authorities to label activists as terrorists.

It was in this context that I first came to question my own beliefs regarding animal rights activism. While I am fascinated by animal rights activism, I am not an activist. While I entertained the notion of veganism for several weeks, I caved at the sight of a cheeseburger. While I am disturbed by cruelty and violence towards animals, I support some animal testing. Animal rights activists would describe me as an animal welfarist, someone who believes that humans have the right to use animals for research and food, as long as the pain and suffering endured is minimized. Although the subject of animal rights activism is highly controversial and political, my interest is not politically motivated, but rather, driven by the evolution of animal rights activism.

⁵ "House Unanimously Passes Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act," Capitol Hill Press Release, November 13, 2006 (Access My Library), http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-25716825_ITM.

⁶ Ibid.

INTRODUCTION

Prior to 1976, animal rights activism had a broad agenda of “abused workhorses, seal hunts, inhumane slaughter, trapping, hunting, strays, performing animals, feathered hats and fur coats, wildlife extinction, and vivisection.”⁷ Diane Beers, author of *For the Prevention of Cruelty: the History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States*, is one of few experts on the animal rights movement until 1975. In her book, Beers identified early tactics as six-fold: public protest, prosecution, legislation, economic boycotts, organizational networking, and public education.⁸ While Beers argues that the early animal rights advocacy moment had “its limitations and problems,” the early movement “laid the foundation for the more radical activism” by “modestly [improving] exploitative practices and abuses.”⁹ While the early animal rights movement was passionate, it was not marked by the same success as later campaigns.

Between 1976 and 1977, animal rights activists, led by Henry Spira, protested the American Museum of Natural History’s experiments on the sexual behavior of mutilated cats. Protesters were peaceful, but the public outcry against the experiments was nearly unprecedented. Between July and August 1976, the museum received over 2,000 letters of protest, and nearly 350 people cancelled their memberships to the museum.¹⁰ More importantly, Spira’s campaign against the museum was successful: the experiments ended, marking the first time an animal rights activist stopped experimentation. Spira’s campaign also established the focus of animal rights activism. Animal rights activists

⁷ Diane L. Beers, *For the Prevention of Cruelty: the History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006), 11.

⁸ Beers, 12.

⁹ Beers, 16.

¹⁰ Peter Singer, *Ethics into Action: Henry Spira and the Animal Rights Movement* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000), 60.

have “placed a heavy emphasis on antivivisectionism,” or the opposition to animal testing. This was the result of “the rise of the movement in the 1970s and 1980s [that] began with the successful protests against experiments sponsored by the Museum of Natural History in New York.”¹¹

Nearly thirty years later, united by a similar philosophy of animal liberation, protestors targeted Chiron, a biotechnology company. Although Chiron itself did not test products on animals, it sponsored several vivisection experiments at Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS). According to *United States v. Fullmer*, a case that convicted SHAC activists, HLS is:

a research corporation that performs testing for companies seeking to bring their products to market. The testing that Huntingdon provides to its clients is mandated by the laws and regulations of the United States and Europe to ensure the safety and efficacy of pharmaceuticals, agricultural products, veterinary products, and medical implants. Huntingdon has three laboratories, two in the United Kingdom and one in New Jersey. All Huntingdon laboratories use animals as test subjects. Approximately eighty-five percent of the animals used by Huntingdon are rats and mice, and the remaining fifteen percent is composed of other species, including fish, dogs, monkeys, and guinea pigs.¹² The resulting Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) campaign, created in 1999, specifically targeted HLS and all companies with which it conducts business. Chiron was just one company with which HLS worked, and that SHAC has targeted. Liddick, an academic who supports animal testing, writes that during the Chiron campaign, activists subjected [employees] to repeated late-night home visits... waking and scaring the young children of employees. Checking-account information [was] posted on

¹¹ Donald B. Liddick, *Eco-Terrorism: Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2006), 47.

¹² Kevin Jonas, *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*, ed. Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II, (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), 263.

¹¹ Lawrence Finsen and Susan Finsen, *The Animal Rights Movement in America: From Compassion to Respect* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1994), 268.

¹² *United States v. Fullmer*, 584 F.3d 132 (U.S. Court of Appeals 3rd Circuit, 2009).

the Internet, lewd and threatening phone calls and e-mails [were] sent, feces [was] smeared on homes.¹³

The majority of SHAC campaigns have relied on similar tactics of intimidation and threats. Former SHAC president, Kevin Jonas, suggested that during the day, SHAC obstruct the business of HLS through “hordes of emails, phone calls, and sign-wielding demonstrators,” and at night, activists “[break] windows at homes, [sink] private yachts, and [disseminate] personal credit card information.”¹⁴ Jonas observed that these tactics are successful, in that “scores have capitulated to the SHAC bark, and even more to the SHAC bite.”¹⁵

Six members of the SHAC campaign, known as the SHAC 7, were prosecuted and convicted of “terrorism and Internet stalking” in March 2006.¹⁶ The case marked the first time animal rights activists were tried under the Animal Enterprise Protection Act.

Henry Spira’s campaign against the American Museum of Natural History was undoubtedly successful, since within two years the museum stopped all experiments. As I write this, the SHAC campaign has raged on for nearly a decade, grown internationally, and continues to evolve. HLS continues to conduct business. However, SHAC activists have also achieved victories over HLS. Activists have scared off investors, insurers, employees, caterers, and childcare services within the last ten years.

Spira’s campaign, by contrast, concluded within two years. What made his campaign winnable? A comparison between both campaigns shows that they shared

¹³ Donald R. Liddick, *Eco-Terrorism: Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2006), 47.

¹⁴ Kevin Jonas, *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*, ed. Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II, (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), 263.

¹⁵ Jonas, 263.

¹⁶ David Kocieniewski, “Six Animal Rights Advocates are Convicted of Terrorism,” *The New York Times*, March 3, 2006, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/03/nyregion/03animals.html?_r=3 (accessed March 10, 2010).

similar tactics of protesting against secondary targets, or those who could pressure the primary target, such as HLS or the American Museum of Natural History. Both campaigns were relentless and determined, and both groups saw winning their campaign as critical to the survival of animal rights activism.

While Spira's campaign was smaller in scale, HLS represents one of the largest animal testing facilities in the world. While the American Museum of Natural History experimented on 174 cats in 1974, HLS used 896 dogs, 626 primates, and 391 rabbits between 2005 and 2006.¹⁷ Additionally, Spira assumed responsibility for his campaign, while no activist has acknowledged a leadership role in the SHAC campaign. Spira benefited from support from the media, the government, and the scientific community itself. SHAC, though, has received minimal to no support from these groups. Spira was thus more successful in his campaign against the American Museum of Natural History than SHAC activists have been against HLS.

While the differences in leadership and public reaction could be a consequence of the size of the targets, I argue that it is SHAC's lack of recognized leadership as well as its coupling with more violent underground strains of activism, such as the Animal Liberation Front, are more likely to have caused this disparity. SHAC's relationship with violent activism has resulted in alienating the media, the government, and the scientific community, groups that in the 1970s allowed Spira to achieve unprecedented success.

I will analyze how both groups became interested in activism, and then how they chose their targets. From there, I will compare the protest tactics used, focusing on the

¹⁷ Singer, 56; "Annual Report of Huntingdon Life Sciences," reprinted on *PrimateResearch.com*, November 20, 2006 (<http://www.primateresearch.com/HLS06.pdf>).

lack of leadership in the SHAC campaign, as well as SHAC's use of violence. Then, I will discuss the differing response to the campaigns, by discussing the media attention, the government's response, and the scientific community's reaction. After comparing and contrasting Spira and SHAC in this way, I will then focus on the legacy of the campaigns.

SHAC's violent tactics, as well as the lack of formal leadership, have prevented the campaign from achieving the same importance as Spira. Activists in the SHAC campaign have instead been portrayed as terrorists by the media, the government, and the scientific community. In the case of 6 SHAC activists, this has even led to being prosecuted by the government, and convicted of terrorism.

PHILOSOPHY AND BECOMING AN ACTIVIST

By the time he was forty-five, Henry Spira had spent much of his life involved in activism. A former member of the Socialist Workers Party, he wrote for *The Militant*, the party's weekly newspaper.¹⁸ In June of 1956, Spira covered the Montgomery Bus Boycott for *The Militant*.¹⁹ Spira continued to cover the Civil Rights Movement, reporting on the movements to register black voters, as well as movements to integrate the South.²⁰ Spira also wrote a series of twelve articles criticizing the FBI in the 1950s.²¹ In the articles, he questioned why the FBI kept files on Americans not involved in crime, the legitimacy of their informants, and why, when the FBI seemed to have such an endless amount of resources, nothing had been done to stop the violence in the South.²² Spira then focused his efforts on the corrupt National Maritime Union (NMU), editing

¹⁸ Singer, 17.

¹⁹ Singer, 18.

²⁰ Singer, 20-21.

²¹ Singer, 22-23.

²² Singer, 23-26.

and organizing *The Call for Union Democracy*, a paper run to discredit the NMU's president, Joseph Curran.²³ Curran had not increased wages for the average seaman for six years.²⁴ Even though the cost of living had increased, an average seaman could expect to earn only around \$6,000 a year. Meanwhile, Curran allowed himself a rent-free New York apartment, a chauffeured limousine, and \$102,637 a year.²⁵ Spira, with his newspaper, helped encourage reforms within the NMU.

In 1973, when he was forty-five, Spira adopted a cat from a friend who was leaving the country.²⁶ While Spira had never considered himself an animal person, he ended up changing his mind, and loving his cat. That same year, Spira read Peter Singer's review of Godlovitch's *Animals, Men, and Morals* in the *New York Review of Books*.²⁷ Spira was so intrigued by Singer's ideas that he signed up for a course called "Animal Liberation" offered at New York University, taught by Singer.²⁸ Spira was awestruck at Singer's ideas:

His concern for other animals was rational and defensible in public debate. It did not depend on sentimentality, on the cuteness of the animals in question or their popularity as pets. To me he was simply saying that it is wrong to harm others, and as a matter of consistency we don't limit who the others are; if they can tell the difference between pain and pleasure, then they have the fundamental right not to be harmed.²⁹

During Singer's lecture series, Spira became a vegetarian and first came to consider applying his background in social activism towards the animal rights movement.

²³ Singer, 35.

²⁴ Singer, 36.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Singer, 46.

²⁷ Singer, 49.

²⁸ Singer, 50.

²⁹ Ibid.

In 1974, *The Vegetarian Times* began its publication. Then, it was a fledgling magazine with a small readership.³⁰ The magazine "began by distributing 300 copies of a 4-page typewritten free handout at Chicago-area health food stores" and "has steadily grown until today its circulation is about 350,000."³¹ This growth parallels the increase of vegetarianism in the United States.

In a 2008 study sponsored by *The Vegetarian Times*, a non-biased survey group reported that 3.2% of Americans are vegetarians, and 0.5% of those are vegans.³² Additionally, vegetarian groups cite their growing population by referring to vegetarian options in supermarkets. The Vegetarian Resource Group (VRG) claims that Heinz baked beans "used to be the only vegetarian baked beans available, [but] now there are several varieties on the shelf, from Campbell's to store brands."³³ Furthermore, VRG points out the increasing number of vegetarian/vegan garden burgers available in the supermarket. Websites such as GoVeg.com and the VRG help guide new vegetarians through their transition and advise on nutritional issues. This variety of resources was not available when Spira became a vegetarian but has certainly helped shape the experiences of modern activists.

Additionally, animal rights groups have also experienced an unprecedented growth in the last thirty years. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) was founded in 1980 and actively attempts to create a vegetarian community and engage new activists. According to the group's statistics, in 2008, PETA mailed 419,912 free

³⁰ Jewish Vegetarians of North America, "A Brief Recent History of U.S. Vegetarianism," *The Schwartz Collection on Judaism, Vegetarianism, and Animal Rights*.

<http://www.jewishveg.com/schwartz/ushstry.html> (accessed March 12, 2010).

³¹ Ibid.

³² "Vegetarianism in America," *Vegetarian Times*, http://www.vegetariantimes.com/features/archive_of_editorial/667 (accessed March 9, 2010).

³³ Charles Stahler, "How Many Vegetarians Are There," *The Vegetarian Resource Group* (1994): <http://www.vrg.org/nutshell/poll.htm> (accessed March 9, 2010).

copies of its "vegetarian starter kit." Its website was visited by a reported 63 million people and 2.5 million subscribed to its newsletter.³⁴ Famous celebrities, such as Natalie Portman, Alicia Silverstone, Peter Dinklage, Paul McCartney and Pamela Anderson have publicly advocated for a vegetarian lifestyle and lent their fame to the animal rights cause.³⁵ Vegetarianism has also become so common that many people cite health or environmental reasons as their primary factor for becoming vegetarian.³⁶

Leafleting remains common on college campuses, outside supermarkets, and at concerts, thanks to groups such as Vegan Outreach. Vegan Outreach claims to have distributed over 7 million pamphlets since 1990,³⁷ and now organizes more than 700 volunteer leafleters. According to Vegan Outreach, "an average leafleter at a busy spot, such as a concert or packed festival, can pass out 150 to 200 leaflets in an hour. In that same amount of time, a superb leafleter can pass out as many as 500 leaflets—about one leaflet every eight seconds."³⁸ The group also maintains a website that advocates a vegan lifestyle. By promoting a vegan/vegetarian lifestyle through both the internet and leafleting, groups such as Vegan Outreach impact a large number of people.

Through vegan advocacy groups, leaflets or friends, most people have some experience or knowledge of vegetarianism. It is through this exposure that most modern animal rights activists can trace the beginning of their advocacy. For Spira, the influence of Peter Singer, a noted animal rights philosopher, spurred him to change his

³⁴ People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, "2009 Financial Statement," *About Us*, <http://www.peta.org/about/numbers.asp> (accessed March 9, 2010).

³⁵ People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, "Vegetarian Celebrities Speak Out," *Veggie Testimonials*, <http://veggietestimonial.peta.org/> (accessed March 9, 2010).

³⁶ "Vegetarianism in America."

³⁷ Vegan Outreach, "Notes from Vegan Outreach, E-Newsletter December 5, 2007," <http://www.veganoutreach.org/enewsletter/20071205.html> (accessed March 9, 2010).

³⁸ Mark Hawthorne, *Striking at the Roots: A Practical Guide to Animal Activism*, (Washington: O Books, 2008), 24.

lifestyle. However, as vegetarianism becomes a more popular option, and as animal rights groups increase in size, activists have been able to find a greater sense of community and more access to information about dietary options.

SELECTING A TARGET

With new acquaintances from Singer's lecture series at NYU, Spira began to plan his first animal rights protest. Spira wanted to "adapt to the animal movement the traditions of struggle which had proven effective in the civil rights movement, the union movement and the women's movement," but also, he wanted to "focus sharply on a single significant injustice, on one clearly limited goal. Moreover [he wanted] that goal [to] be achievable."³⁹ In the summer of 1975, Spira found his target in a pamphlet published by United Action for Animals.⁴⁰ Five blocks from where Spira lived, the American Museum of Natural History was one of New York's biggest museums.⁴¹ The American Museum of Natural History fit Spira's criteria. The Museum was central to New Yorkers, making protests easier to attend. Moreover, Spira targeted only one of the Museum's experiments, allowing the campaign to be limited, and hopefully more successful.

Museum director, Thomas Nicholson, described the experiments run by Dr. Lester Aronson, one of the museum's staff scientists, as examining "the sexual behavior of mutilated cats."⁴² The experimenters "removed the cats' senses of smell, cauterized parts of their brains and castrated them or surgically separated the nerves in their

³⁹ Singer, 52.

⁴⁰ Singer, 54.

⁴¹ Henry Spira, "Fighting to Win," in Peter Singer, ed., *In Defense of Animals* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), 197.

⁴² John F. Burns, "American Museum Pinched for Funds," *New York Times*, February 16, 1976 as quoted in Peter Singer, *Ethics into Action: Henry Spira and the Animal Rights Movement* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000), 56.

penises.”⁴³ The cats were then tested on their ability to “mount” another cat or if they would instead “mount” a rabbit.⁴⁴ In a 1976 *Newsweek* article, the potential benefits of the experiment were discussed. Aronson claimed that the experiments “have led to a better understanding of deviant human sexual behavior” because human and cat “skull shapes and nervous systems” are similar, enabling scientists to study the amygdala.⁴⁵ The amygdala “has been associated with human hypersexuality,” and Aronson believed by studying the amygdala, he could develop “a therapy for human males who are attracted to children or animals.”⁴⁶ The Museum was Spira’s ideal target as a result of the nature of these experiments.

Spira knew that “it would be easier to arouse members of the public to protest against experiments on animals to which they could easily relate,” and because the experiments focused on sexual behavior, “no claim could be made that the experiments would lead to a cure for some fatal disease.”⁴⁷ Moreover, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, a branch of the National Institute of Health, allocated taxpayer dollars to fund the American Museum of Natural History’s experiments.⁴⁸ Spira could summarize his campaign in one simple question: “do you want your tax monies spent to deliberately mutilate cats in order to observe the sexual performance of crippled felines?”⁴⁹

Spira believed choosing the American Museum of Natural History as a target helped lead his campaign to triumph. Spira described his initial targets as “small

⁴³ Peter Gwynne, “Cat Fight,” *Newsweek*, November 8, 1976.

⁴⁴ Singer, 56.

⁴⁵ Gwynne.

⁴⁶ Gwynne.

⁴⁷ Singer, 54.

⁴⁸ Singer, 54.

⁴⁹ Spira, 198.

enough, at first, for us to have a chance of success despite our very limited resources, but at the same time the first small targets could serve as symbolic victories which would lead on to bigger goals.”⁵⁰

As Spira predicted, his campaign has paved the way for activists to target larger organizations. The campaign against Huntington Life Sciences began in England in early 1989 when activist Sarah Kite obtained a job at HLS and began to work “undercover to provide information to the [British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection] that would expose the day-to-day suffering of animals in laboratories.”⁵¹ Keith Mann, an English animal rights activist, describes HLS as “a big employer and a key player in the world of harmful product testing.”⁵² The Food and Drug Administration “requires that drugs be tested on animals before it will grant approval, and testing laboratories like Huntingdon are hired to carry out those experiments, often injecting test animals with a substance, then killing and dissecting them.”⁵³ HLS claimed they use “the most humane methods possible when testing animals for the food and cosmetics industry.”⁵⁴ Donald Liddick, author of *Eco-Terrorism: Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements*, describes HLS as “one of the largest contract animal-testing laboratories in the world.”⁵⁵ Mann also suggests Kite chose HLS “to prove that if the largest contract-testing laboratory in Europe, promoted as a ‘Centre of Excellence,’ was so readily ignoring the strict regulations, then [animal testing

⁵⁰ Spira, 206.

⁵¹ Mann, 198.

⁵² Mann, 587.

⁵³ David Kocieniewski, “Accused of Aiding Animals,” *The New York Times*, March 1, 2006, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/01/nyregion/01animal.html?pagewanted=2&fta=y> (accessed March 9, 2010).

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Liddick, 45.

regulations were] a sham.”⁵⁶ Even though the FDA regulates that all products must be tested extensively on animals, groups such as HLS target instead those who actually carry out these experiments.

Kite published an exposé in a national newspaper and “further extracts of Sarah Kite’s harrowing diaries were published by [the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection] in her book *Secret Suffering*.”⁵⁷ Kite “painstakingly collected evidence of the suffering and poor conditions endured by the animals, and the uncaring attitudes of the staff.”⁵⁸ After the exposé was printed, protestors created Huntingdon Animal Concern.⁵⁹ Later, a PETA investigator, Michelle Rokke, released five months of footage from inside the HLS laboratory in New Jersey. Although HLS served PETA with an injunction, the courts lifted it, and the footage was released.⁶⁰ HLS also sued PETA for “alleged misrepresentation, breach of employment obligations, invasion of co-workers’ privacy, illegal wiretapping and electronic surveillance, and theft of ‘valuable trade secrets.’”⁶¹ Following extensive legal proceedings, PETA released the footage.

In 1999, following the release of Rokke’s footage, Greg Avery and Heather James created Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC).⁶² Avery and James held their first protest, attracting nearly 500 protestors.⁶³ In the initial stages of protest, “protest camps” in front of the labs “attracted widespread support and national publicity and

⁵⁶ Mann, 198.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, “Secret Suffering: BUAV,” *Investigations*, <http://www.buav.org/investigations/secretsuffering> (accessed March 12, 2010).

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Mann, 587.

⁶¹ “PETA, Procter & Gamble, and the Rokke Horror Picture Show,” *Animal People News*, July/August 1997, <http://www.animalpeoplenews.org/97/6/lab.htm> (accessed March 12, 2010).

⁶² Liddick, 45.

⁶³ Mann, 588.

ultimately cost HLS nothing short of 1 million [pounds] in court eviction costs.”⁶⁴ Mann describes the choice to pursue HLS as “obvious” as a result of “its precarious public image and the availability of a huge wealth of inside information” as well as an “ambitious” choice because of “its status as a key player in the product testing industry.”⁶⁵

Spira chose a small, local target in the American Museum of Natural History. However, the SHAC campaign selected an international target, with extensive testing facilities.

THE PROTEST

After carefully selecting his target, Spira began to research the experiments. Through the National Institute of Health’s listing of research grants, Spira found the name of the experimenter, Dr. Lester Aronson, and then filed a request under the Freedom of Information Act to learn more about Aronson’s study.⁶⁶ Under the Freedom of Information Act, the National Institute of Health is required “to disclose records requested in writing by any person.”⁶⁷ Spira learned that Aronson, with his assistant, Madeline Cooper, had been conducting this experiment for nearly fifteen years, and Aronson’s experiments had only “led to the conclusion that further experiments were needed.”⁶⁸

In June 1976, Spira first wrote to the Museum, asking if he could meet with Museum directors and Dr. Aronson to discuss the experiments. The Museum never

⁶⁴ Mann, 589.

⁶⁵ Mann, 586.

⁶⁶ Singer, 55.

⁶⁷ United States Department of Justice, *Freedom of Information Act*, <http://www.justice.gov/oip/> (accessed March 9, 2010).

⁶⁸ Singer, 56.

replied to Spira's letter, or any of his subsequent phonecalls. Spira went to a lecture Dr. Aronson gave to ask questions, but Aronson refused to answer the questions.⁶⁹ After receiving no response from the Museum, Spira then turned to the media, appearing on a New York radio station in June. He then organized his first protest in July, and published an article in the same month in *Our Town*, a weekly published paper that "serves the East Side of Manhattan."⁷⁰

Spira's article in *Our Town*, entitled "Animals Suffer for Science," focused, in graphic detail, on the experiments, describing how "cats and kittens are deliberately blinded-- both eyes cut out. Their hearing and sense of smell destroyed by slicing in their sex organs. Their sense of touch deadened by cutting nerves in their sex organs."⁷¹ After depicting the nature of the experiments, Spira documented Aronson's refusal to discuss the experiments and non-animal options. Spira then reminded his readers that "we are the species capable of moral choice. It's time we used that option."⁷² By framing his issue as a moral cause and arguing there was no potential medical benefit of the experiment, Spira then introduced more information regarding animal rights:

What crimes and tortures are committed in the name of science! And still the animals continue to suffer. And not just the cats at the Museum, but an estimated 60 to 120 million animals a year, from mice to monkeys, and including 700,000 to 2,500,000 cats and dogs. The Museum experiment is only a speck on the tip of the iceberg of animal suffering.⁷³

Spira used his article in *Our Town* not only to generate publicity for his campaign against the Museum, but also to advocate for the larger campaign of animal rights.

⁶⁹ Singer, 57.

⁷⁰ "Our Town." *Manhattan Media*. Manhattan Media, n.d., <http://www.manhattanmedia.com/ourtown.php> (accessed March 9, 2010).

⁷¹ Henry Spira, "Animals Suffer for Science," *Our Town*, July 23, 1976 reprinted in Animal Rights International, *Strategies for Activists: from the Campaign Files of Henry Spira* (New York: Animal Rights International, 1996), 130.

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ *Ibid.*

In July, Spira also organized his first demonstration with help from the Society for Animal Rights, Animals Need You, Mercy for Animals, and Fund for Animals.⁷⁴

Thomas Nicholson, the Museum director, described Spira's protests in the 1977 annual report for the Museum:

A broad section of the public -- by no means limited to antivivisectionists -- became involved in questioning the research. More than 8,000 letters were received and an uncounted number of telephone calls were taken. While we provided answers and information that were satisfactory to many who inquired, the core of anti-vivisectionists who initiated the campaign in the spring of 1976 kept it alive throughout the year through a well-executed campaign. Advertisements were taken out in the media, attacks were written in humane society publications, letters and telephone calls of harassment some threatening were directed at employees and Trustees, demonstrators picketed the Museum on most weekends, inflammatory handbills were distributed, the granting agencies that supported the research were attacked, political intervention was sought and contributors to the Museum (particularly corporations and private foundations) were pressured in various ways.⁷⁵ The demonstrations outside the Museum continued every weekend. Newsweek

described how activists "have marched in front of the museum, waving placards with such messages as CASTRATE THE SCIENTISTS."⁷⁶

As Nicholson suggested, Spira and other activists contacted the Museum's benefactors, and activists who owned stock in companies that were listed as benefactors were asked "to move a shareholders' resolution to stop further donations until the experiments were ended."⁷⁷ Furthermore, 400 people "[cancelled] their museum memberships, and several [wrote] to say they [would] cut the institution out of their wills."⁷⁸ Activists also contacted their elected officials.⁷⁹ Activists then contacted Robert Goelet, the president of the Museum's Board of Trustees in November. Activists ran photos of Robert Goelet in newspapers along with the caption, "This Man Can Free This

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Spira, 60.

⁷⁶ Gwynne.

⁷⁷ Singer, 59.

⁷⁸ Gwynne.

⁷⁹ Singer, 60.

Doomed Cat.”⁸⁰ Activists distributed flyers to Goelet’s neighbors discussing the experiments on the cats, and even hosted a meeting with Goelet’s neighbors. Activists also held a “Motorcade of Protest,” including cars, bicycles and motorcycles which began at the Museum, then proceeded to Goelet’s home and then to the mayor of New York’s home.

The pressure activists had placed on elected officials finally worked when Ed Koch, then a junior congressman, went to visit the Musuem. During his visit, Koch was allowed to talk to both Dr. Aronson and his assistant, Madeline Cooper. When Koch asked Aronson, “after you have taken a deranged male cat with brain lesions and you place it in a room and you find that it is doing to mount a rabbit instead of a female cat, what have you got?” Aronson and Cooper could not answer this question, but could answer Koch’s question about how much their experiment had cost the government--\$435,000.⁸¹ Koch and others members of Congress wrote letters to the National Institute of Health about the experiment. The National Institute of Health, NIH, began a review of the experiments and its funding.

In October 1976, *Science* magazine published an article written by Nicholas Wade on the experiments at the Museum, and focused on the animal rights activists. The article suggested that Aronson’s research was useless. Fourteen of Aronson’s twenty-one articles, as of 1976, had never been cited within the Science Citation Index. Wade then argued, “if a paper is never cited-- as indeed is the fate of about half the scientific articles published-- it is hard to make the case that it has contributed in any important respect

⁸⁰ Singer, 62.

⁸¹ Spira, 199.

to the advance of knowledge.”⁸² Although the scientific community supported vivisection, it criticized Aronson’s methods. As the scientific community began to question Aronson’s work, so did NIH.

In August 1977, Spira received confirmation that NIH was planning to stop funding the experiments. Before NIH announced its decision, activists mailed a leaflet to residents of Hillsdale, New Jersey, where Dr. Aronson lived. The leaflet began with the words, “Lester R. Aronson is your neighbor! He lives at 47 Cedar Street in your town of Hillsdale. His telephone number is (201) 666-0175.”⁸³ The leaflet then detailed Aronson’s experiments, before asking its readers, “after you have read the enclosed information why don’t you telephone Lester Aronson and tell him what you really think of him and of Madeline Cooper.”⁸⁴ Madeline Cooper’s neighbors received similar mailings. Cooper and Aronson themselves “received hate mail and threats on their lives” while the museum became “the target of bomb scares.”⁸⁵

Spira then forwarded the mailings to the National Society for Medical Research, which published a story about the mailings, achieving Spira’s goal: “thousands of scientists were led to think about the possibility that one day their neighbors too, might one day receive extracts from their grant proposals.”⁸⁶

⁸² Nicholas Wade, “Animal Rights: NIH Cat Sex Study Brings Grief to New York Museum,” *Science*, October 8, 1976. Reprinted in Animal Rights International, *Strategies for Activists: from the Campaign Files of Henry Spira* (New York: Animal Rights International, 1996), 134-137.

⁸³ Flyer reprinted in Peter Singer, *Ethics into Action: Henry Spira and the Animal Rights Movement* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000), 70.

⁸⁴ Flyer reprinted in Peter Singer, *Ethics into Action: Henry Spira and the Animal Rights Movement* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000), 70.

⁸⁵ Gwynne.

⁸⁶ Singer, 71.

Spira was successful—the experiments stopped. He had also established a precedent for tactics within the animal rights movement. When questioned about his success, Spira commented:

I think it was just absolutely necessary to do the full-page ad. It was absolutely necessary to have demonstrations every weekend. It was absolutely necessary to get these companies and legislators to pressurize NIH. It was absolutely necessary to put pressure on city and state legislators and all the benefactors and donors. At one point, the museum just figured, it ain't worth it to continue this. I think the other crucial thing is for them to realize we're not going away... We're staying till it's finished, over, all over, till it's closed down.⁸⁷

Spira's legacy encompasses not only the campaign against the American Museum of Natural History, but also later successful campaigns against cosmetic companies that tested products on animals.⁸⁸ Spira's continued success inspired activists to write extensively on what made Spira's campaign win. Nearly thirty years later, SHAC used some similar tactics in its campaign against HLS.

Although SHAC is an international campaign, tactics remain largely consistent towards each individual target. While Spira began his campaign by trying to negotiate with the American Museum of Natural History, "most animal rights direct action activists assume negotiations will fail, and skip this stage of the campaign."⁸⁹ SHAC uses "marches, phone and Internet blockades, and arson attacks. Office windows were smashed, private homes visited, offices occupied and the business disrupted in many other days."⁹⁰ These tactics were used from the beginning. Activistcash.com, an organization within the Centre for Consumer Freedom, is a conservative website that believes many activist organizations are actually "financial Goliaths that use junk

⁸⁷ Singer, 71-72.

⁸⁸ Spira organized a campaign against Revlon, and in 1980, both Revlon and Avon stopped experimenting on animals. Other cosmetic companies followed suit.

⁸⁹ Freeman Wicklund, *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*, ed. Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II, (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), 245.

⁹⁰ Mann, 595.

science, intimidation tactics, and even threats of violence to push their radical agendas."⁹¹ Activistcash.com includes SHAC in this group, arguing that in SHAC's first two years its:

gangsters have allegedly been responsible for at least 140 acts of vandalism or physical sabotage; malicious threats against at least 85 persons; harassment (by telephone, e-mail, or otherwise) of the employees of more than 30 American companies; and the illegal dissemination of personal information (including credit card and social security numbers) of at least 120 people.⁹² SHAC's tactics, consistent from the campaign's founding, includes a reliance on direct action.

SHAC has coupled its protests with the actions of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). In *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?*, Steven Best analyzed the Animal Liberation Front, a group of people "in a decentralized, anonymous, underground, global network," whom he defines as "human activists who risk their own liberty to rescue and aid animals imprisoned in hellish conditions."⁹³ The ALF, founded in the United Kingdom in the early 1970's, dates its origins in the United States to 1977.⁹⁴ Early ALF efforts focused on removing animals from laboratories; however, the ALF eventually instead began focusing on "property destruction and arson."⁹⁵ Since SHAC began its campaign, "nearly 80 percent of the ALF attacks that have taken place in the US and the UK have been aimed at closing down HLS."⁹⁶ Activists noted that, "never before [had] the ALF been so active towards the same goals as aboveground groups lawfully protesting."⁹⁷ In May 2005, the ALF issued a statement on its website, threatening HLS associates that,

⁹¹ Activistcash.com, "Activistcash.com: Exposing anti-consumer activists and funding," <http://activistcash.com/> (accessed March 12, 2010).

⁹² "SHAC: Funding sources, staff profiles, and political agenda," Activistcash.com, http://activistcash.com/organization_overview.cfm/o/408-shac (accessed March 12, 2010).

⁹³ Steven Best, *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*, ed. Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II, (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), 11.

⁹⁴ Best, 21.

⁹⁵ Best, 23.

⁹⁶ Jonas, 267.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

"if you support or raise funds for any company connected with Huntingdon Life Sciences we will track you down, come for you and destroy your property by fire."⁹⁸ Activists see the joint efforts of SHAC and the ALF as "the intelligent and strategic continuation of such a rounded attack, effectively coupling both legal and illegal tactics."⁹⁹

SHAC focuses its campaign on "direct action including 'intimidation of HLS, its employees, its employees' families, its business partners, their business partners, their insurers, their caterers, and cleaners.'"¹⁰⁰ SHAC also claims that "anyone who delivers service to people who do business with HLS— even the owners of pubs employees visit, or the companies that deliver their milk in the morning—is regarded by SHAC as a legitimate target."¹⁰¹ By broadening its emphasis on secondary targets, SHAC has been able to make conducting business more difficult for HLS. HLS has had difficulties finding catering companies, janitorial staff, and companies to insure their business.

One such insurer, Marsh Inc., became a SHAC target in 2002. SHAC activists initiated a campaign of direct action:

One Marsh executive's home was defaced with graffiti that said 'puppy killer' and 'we'll be back' in red paint. After a Marsh employee in Boston had his home address posted on the Internet, protestors surrounded his home, threatened to burn it down; a communiqué on SHAC's website had referenced the man's wife and two-year-old son.¹⁰²

Members of SHAC received emails with a "list of Marsh offices with phone numbers and home addresses of Marsh employees."¹⁰³ After this information was released, a Marsh executive "received a letter indicating that he had been 'targeted for a terrorist

⁹⁸ Liddick, 47.

⁹⁹ Jonas, 271.

¹⁰⁰ Liddick, 45.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Liddick, 46.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

attack.”¹⁰⁴ In July 2002, the Marsh offices in Seattle were forced to close temporarily after smoke bombs were released.¹⁰⁵ Other Marsh employees were threatened and harassed at home, and in July 2002, the release of smoke bombs at Marsh offices in Seattle forced hundreds of workers into the streets. This violent escalation was successful, and Marsh dropped HLS as a client by the end of 2002. While SHAC did not claim responsibility for the majority of the campaign’s violence, the website included a section where activists could post photos and summaries of protests and demonstrations.

While SHAC’s release of employees’ information mimics Spira’s leafleting in his campaign, activists now focus on targeting individual employees. Mann describes this shift as part of a need “to adapt new tactics” in order to “[keep] one step ahead.”¹⁰⁶ Mann specifically cites the role of the internet, or “electronic civil disobedience” as being effective. Mann lauds SHAC’s ability “to pressurize[sic] HLS and its affiliates (all from the comfort of home)... Huge numbers of emails have poured into systems causing meltdown.”¹⁰⁷ While the internet offers activists new opportunities to pursue HLS and its employees, these tactics do not appear too dissimilar from Spira’s.

LEADERSHIP

Henry Spira carved an active leadership role for his involvement in the campaign against the American Museum of Natural History. Spira himself acknowledged that he was “responsible for getting the file through the Freedom of Information Act,”

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Mann, 596.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

discovering the nature of the experiments.¹⁰⁸ Spira attempted to contact the Museum and Dr. Aronson personally and, when this failed, he took the issue to the media through his articles in *Our Town* and by appearing on radio stations throughout New York to promote the issue. Spira did not focus on establishing a leadership group "but concentrated instead on bringing people together to get things done."¹⁰⁹ An article from 1976 in *Newsweek* calls Spira a "Crusader," and does not mention any other individual activists.¹¹⁰ Spira became the public representative of the campaign against the Museum and, thus, responsible for the campaign's actions.

In contrast with Spira, the leadership role in the SHAC campaign remained a contentious issue. While most argue there was no strong leadership during the SHAC campaign, the prosecution during the SHAC trial argued Kevin Jonas was the group's leader. Liddick, who studied the SHAC campaign, argued in *Eco-Terrorism: Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements* that "animal liberation and radical environmentalism are social movements devoid of organizational structure or formal leadership, [but] organs *within* the broad stream of activism include incorporated organizations and public figures who may be viewed as ideological/motivational leaders."¹¹¹ However, until 2004, Kevin Jonas was SHAC USA's president.¹¹²

During the SHAC 7 trial, the prosecution labeled Jonas SHAC's leader. While Jonas does not attempt to seize a leadership role, and rejects the implication, the

¹⁰⁸ Henry Spira, "Animals Suffer for Science," *Our Town*, July 23, 1976 reprinted in Animal Rights International, *Strategies for Activists: from the Campaign Files of Henry Spira* (New York: Animal Rights International, 1996), 130.

¹⁰⁹ Spira, 207.

¹¹⁰ Gwynne.

¹¹¹ Liddick, 70.

¹¹² Kevin Jonas also goes by the name Kevin Kjonaas. For this paper, he will be referred to as Kevin Jonas for continuity.

prosecution suggested that Jonas is a de facto leader as a result of the SHAC website. In response, Jonas sent written comments to an Animal Rights conference in 2006, while he was under house arrest. Jonas told his audience, "I am not your 'leader.' You are all your own people, and this is but one of the many admirable qualities that you all possess that attracted me to this most noble of compassionate movements."¹¹³

Jonas did not recognize publishing information on the SHAC website as a leadership role, but rather "saw himself as a conduit for information."¹¹⁴ Jonas:

posted the home addresses and telephone numbers of Huntingdon employees on the group's website. Sometimes [Jonas] helped organize protests in front of workers' homes. When he couldn't make it to a demonstration, he posted other people's accounts of the event, even when they included acts of vandalism.¹¹⁵

In the trial against the SHAC 7, prosecutors argued that this use of the internet was not used as a "conduit for information," but rather, "the activists used their Web site as the nerve center of a campaign of violence and intimidation."¹¹⁶

Liddick argues that "the method employed by animal rights/liberation and radical environmental movements... may be best characterized as leaderless resistance, in which small groups and individuals fight entrenched power through independent acts of criminality."¹¹⁷ In his closing statements in the SHAC trial, Assistant United States Attorney Ricardo Solano conceded this point, suggesting Kevin Jonas and other SHAC leaders were "generals in a war... And just like in any war, the generals didn't always

¹¹³ Kevin Jonas, "A Letter from a SHAC Defendant," *Satya Magazine*, September 2006, <http://www.satyamag.com/septo6/jonas.html> (accessed March 10, 2010).

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Chris Maag, "America's #1 Threat," *Mother Jones*, January/February 2006, <http://motherjones.com/politics/2006/01/americas-1-threat> (accessed March 10, 2010).

¹¹⁶ Kocieniewski.

¹¹⁷ Liddick, 69.

know all of the foot soldiers."¹¹⁸ Spira was personally connected to those he worked with during his campaign through his class at NYU and his involvement at every protest against the museum. Jonas was not at every protest, and did not know all SHAC participants.

However, the prosecution claimed that "group members had extensive contact with other animal rights activists who advocated violence and that [group leaders] knew that the information on the Web site was likely to incite violent reprisals against their targets."¹¹⁹ Although the prosecution "produced telephone records indicating that... [Jonas] called a man charged with bombing a California biotech lab shortly after the explosion," they could not link Jonas to other crimes in the SHAC campaign.¹²⁰ If Jonas was only connected to one violent act during the extensive SHAC campaign, then his role as a leader was minimal. The defense then asked: why, then, was he prosecuted as SHAC's leader?

The defense believed "the government [unfairly targeted] the group's leaders, partly because the authorities [were] unable to catch those who carried out the violence."¹²¹ Hal Haverson, one of the lawyers defending the SHAC 7 commented that, "several of the victims cited by the government had been attacked before their personal information appeared on the [SHAC] Web site."¹²² If Jonas had acknowledged his leadership role, he would then become accountable for all illegal action committed during the campaign. Although he did not acknowledge his leadership role, by running

¹¹⁸ Kocieniewski

¹¹⁹ Kocieniewski

¹²⁰ David Kocieniewski, "Six Animal Rights."

¹²¹ Kocieniewski, "Accused of Aiding Animals."

¹²² Kocieniewski, "Accused of Aiding Animals."

the campaign's website, Jonas became liable for the extended group's actions. Furthermore, both Jonas and other activists likely understood the potential implication of assuming a leadership role in the movement, and were discouraged from taking responsibility for the violent campaign.

SECONDARY TARGETS

Both Spira and SHAC relied on secondary targets to further their campaigns.

Secondary targets are defined as those who may have the ability to apply pressure themselves to a campaign's primary target, but who are not researchers or those involved in decision making. For Spira, the museum's shareholders as well as the experimenters' neighbors provided another opportunity to try and stop the Museum's experiments. In the SHAC campaign, any business that associated itself with HLS became a target.

While Spira addressed all of the benefactors of the museums, he specifically addressed the president of the Museum's Board of Trustees, Robert Goelet.¹²³ By protesting Goelet so vigorously, Spira forced Goelet to reconsider his own connection to the American Museum of Natural History, and also made the protests an issue in Goelet's personal life. Spira used similar tactics when he approached Dr. Aronson and Madeline Cooper's neighbors. Activists distributed flyers in Aronson's neighborhood. With these flyers, Spira not only further embarrassed Dr. Aronson and Madeline Cooper, but he also sent the flyers to the National Society for Medical Research, creating a precedent to other experimenters. Spira instilled a sense of fear in the scientific community at the prospect of being targeted by animal rights activists.

¹²³ Robert Goelet should not be confused with Grammy and Tony award winner, Robert Goulet.

SHAC relied on direct action towards not only HLS and its employees but also secondary targets and their employees. SHAC threatened that, "anyone who delivers service to people who do business with HLS— even the owners of pubs employees visit, or the companies that deliver their milk in the morning— is regarded by SHAC as a legitimate target."¹²⁴ Kevin Jonas clarified SHAC's reasoning in their targeting in his essay, "Bricks and Bullhorns:"

The SHAC campaign has widened the circle of targets more than any other animal rights group. Banks, insurance companies, auditors, and private investors have found themselves receiving the same sort of vitriolic attention as those who actually test on animals. SHAC has made it clear that anyone who touches HLS is fair game. This approach has made the idea of sponsoring, investing in, or providing services to the vivisection industry in any way far less palatable; whole new forms of personal accountability have been brought into play. Although focusing on one target, HLS, the reach of SHAC extends far beyond it.¹²⁵ While SHAC's policy towards secondary targets certainly made it increasingly difficult for HLS to carry out day-to-day business functions, it also successfully discouraged companies from associating themselves from HLS. Not only have financial institutions and banks severed ties with HLS, but also "scores of major pharmaceutical, agrochemical, and household product companies have canceled their contracts" and "even the lab's janitors, laundry service, and cafeteria suppliers have come under fire."¹²⁶ By attacking every aspect of HLS's business, SHAC has made HLS a more costly enterprise. Additionally, SHAC has discouraged potential investors and business.

¹²⁴ Liddick, 45.

¹²⁵ Jonas, 267.

¹²⁶ Jonas, 266. Mann elaborates in *From Dusk Til' Dawn*, "In September 2005, HLS shares were meant to be reintroduced on the New York Stock Exchange. However, an hour before the stock was going to be traded, they pulled the stock for fear of what activists might do in response. Brian Cass, HLS CEO, commented, 'Well obviously we were extremely disappointed, distressed, astonished. We were absolutely speechless.'" Mann, 608.

In September 2005, the ALF attacked GlaxoSmithKline, an HLS customer, by bombing the home of Paul Blackburn, the company's corporate controller.¹²⁷ Later, the ALF released a statement, suggesting that the attack would be the first of many:

GSK, we realize that this may not be enough to make you stop using HLS but this is just the beginning, we have identified and tracked down many of your senior executives and also junior staff, as well as those from other HLS customers. Drop HLS or you will face the consequences.¹²⁸
By using secondary targets SHAC not only attacked HLS's associates but also applied pressure to HLS itself, the campaign became temporarily more successful and effective.

MEDIA ATTENTION

Henry Spira's campaign against the American Museum of Natural History was discussed in several media publications, such as *Newsweek*, *Science Magazine*, and the local New York paper, *Our Town*. While Spira did not have any control over the *Newsweek* or *Science* articles, he did control the representation of the campaign in *Our Town*. Spira, by personally submitting the article, was able to guarantee a positive depiction in *Our Town*; however, SHAC had no influence over the media, and its campaign was depicted as violent and militant.

In his *Our Town* article, Spira graphically detailed the experiments in order to create sympathy for animal rights. Spira describes how cats had "their hearing and sense of smell destroyed by slicing in their sex organs," and "their sense of touch deadened by cutting nerves in their sex organs."¹²⁹ By writing the article himself, Spira guaranteed a positive assessment of his campaign, ending his article with the reminder

¹²⁷ GlaxoSmithKline produces prescription drugs, vaccines, and provides consumer healthcare. In accordance with FDA regulation, the company is required to test each of their products on animals. For more information, please refer to their website, <http://www.gsk.com/>.

¹²⁸ Liddick, 47.

¹²⁹ Henry Spira, "Animals Suffer for Science."

that "we are the species capable of moral choice. It's time we used that option."¹³⁰

Spira's argument against animal testing reached a wider audience, and he presented his case against the Museum effectively.

While the *Newsweek* article from 1976 remains generally unbiased, it does describe both the potential benefits of the experiments as well as the attitudes of activists. The *Newsweek* article refers to the "hate mail and threats on [the researchers'] lives," causing Dr. Aronson and his assistant Cooper to feel "genuinely frightened" and "keep well out of the limelight."¹³¹ While this reveals some sympathy for the experimenters, the article described activists as "undeterred" and "cat fanciers."¹³² While activists would reject the term "cat fanciers," it was a term that cat lovers across the country could understand.

Nicholas Wade, a journalist with *Science Magazine*, noted that the campaign was covered in articles titled "'Cats are Tortured in Vicious Experiments at Famous N.Y.C. Museum' (*National Enquirer*), 'Museums Ends Its Silence on Study of Cat Sex Lives' (*New York Times*), and 'Congress Pays for Sex Sadism at Museum' (*Our Town*)."¹³³ In these headlines, it is obvious the media felt sympathetic towards Spira's campaign.

Spira's campaign is also allegedly responsible for the moniker "animal rights activists."¹³⁴ In response to the campaign, "the American press used the term *animal rights activists* rather than *animal lovers* in describing these events."¹³⁵ This shift illustrates a greater understanding of animal rights activists and their philosophy. While those involved in Spira's campaign did see themselves as "animal lovers," the

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Gwynne.

¹³² Gwynne.

¹³³ Wade.

¹³⁴ Finsen, 61.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

American Museum of Natural History represents a shift towards identifying as an activist movement, rather than simply "loving animals." The public adoption of this phrasing also illustrates the positive reception Spira and his fellow activists in 1976.

In the SHAC campaign, activists regularly questioned the importance and reliance on media. The organization's relationship with the ALF was regularly questioned not only by the media but also by fellow activists. Kevin Jonas described it as "a tragic mistake and setback for the animal rights movement to let the media determine our tactical agenda because of a fear of negative coverage."¹³⁶ Jonas suggested that negative coverage is not a result of the involvement of the ALF, but rather "the failure of movement organizations and speakers to reframe the debate away from the tactic to the more substantive issues of animal exploitation."¹³⁷ While not admitting there was a problem, Jonas instead proposed that "if there does exist a problem with media portrayal," then "it is well worth the effort of national groups to invest in becoming more media-savvy organizations."¹³⁸

In 2003, the SHAC campaign targeted Chiron Diagnostics Corporation in Emeryville, California. Chiron, now a branch of Novartis Diagnostics, produced vaccination and medical treatments, specifically focusing on blood transfusions.¹³⁹ Chiron maintained a contract with HLS to test their products. In August 2003, a group of activists, the Revolutionary Cells, emailed reporters from local San Francisco newspapers to inform them that they set "two pipe bombs filled with an ammonium

¹³⁶ Jonas, 270.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Debra J. Saunders, "Intimidation, Inc.," *The San Francisco Gate*, June 13, 2004, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2004/06/13/EDGMB73C1C1.DTL> (accessed March 10, 2010).

nitrate slurry with redundant timers" in Chiron's office building.¹⁴⁰ The bombs exploded early in that morning. Luckily, "no one was hurt."¹⁴¹

The media coverage of the bombings included interviews with Kevin Jonas and other members of the SHAC campaign. Although Jonas told reporters "that he [had] never heard of Revolutionary Cells," he also commented that he "[sympathized] with their cause and [applauded] their passion."¹⁴² However, Jonas added one caveat to his support: "[SHAC] only [takes] nonviolent action."¹⁴³ The bombings "made the front page of the *San Francisco Chronicle* on three different days" and was featured "in over 100 papers nationally and internationally."¹⁴⁴ Although "the press made it clear that the FBI was treating the incident as domestic terrorism," the newspapers "included quotes from ALF or SHAC spokespersons saying that though they supported economic sabotage, violence against humans or members of other species is unacceptable."¹⁴⁵ SHAC never denounced the bombing. Even though SHAC activists rejected any connection to the bombings, by not condemning the attack, the group supported the violence, and even applauded it. When Brian Cass, the managing director of HLS "was wounded outside his home by three men wielding ax handles in February 2001," Kevin Jonas commented, "I don't shed any tears for Brian Cass."¹⁴⁶ Jonas, as SHAC's de facto leader, represented the entire organization when he commented on the bombings and the attack on Brian Cass. By supporting the attacks, Jonas was openly unsympathetic,

¹⁴⁰ Stacey Finz and Bernadette Tansey, "Animal Rights Groups Tied to Bombs," *The San Francisco Gate*, August 30, 2004, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/08/30/CHIRON.TMP> (accessed March 10, 2010).

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Karen Dawn, *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*, ed. Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II, (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), 223.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Liddick, 45.

and alienated those that would expect an apology from the official organization.

Instead, no activists apologized for the attacks.

In the *San Francisco Chronicle* headlines during the Chiron campaign, the *Chronicle* suggested activists are violent. Headlines included, "Intimidation, Inc.," and "Militants say they placed Shaklee Bomb." *The Boston Globe* documented the SHAC trial with headlines such as, "Animal Extremism," "Animal Rights and Wrongs," and "Animal Activists Charged with Stalking." *The Washington Post* titled one article, "Animal Rights Group Aims at Enemy's Allies." In SHAC's most recent campaign, *The Wall Street Journal* titled articles, "Animal Activists Expand Corporate Attacks," and "Drug Giant is Targeted by Attacks." As newspaper writers shifted towards using words such as "intimidation," "attacks," and "militants," the media portrayed those being targeted as the victims, and activists as violent.

Some activists maintain, that if bombing continued to be a tactic, "somebody eventually will get hurt."¹⁴⁷ If that person was an experimenter, "there is little doubt that the press coverage would be entirely unfavorable; we could lose much public sympathy."¹⁴⁸ Some activists rejected violence as a campaign tactic not because it causes people harm, but because of the potential effect on media attention.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Spira turned to the government for help within his campaign. Activists wrote to their elected officials, and called them regarding their concerns with the American Museum of Natural History. Eventually this pressure led Ed Koch to visit the Museum and inspect the experiments. Congress encouraged the National Institute of Health to

¹⁴⁷ Dawn, 223-224.

¹⁴⁸ Dawn, 224.

halt their funding of the experiments.¹⁴⁹ This pressure proved effective, as the National Institute of Health stopped supporting Aronson. The government intervention in the SHAC campaign represents the most drastic shift when analyzing Spira's campaign against the American Museum of Natural History.

During the SHAC campaign, both the FBI and the police followed and tracked activists. This eventually led the government to prosecute the alleged leaders of the campaign, known as the SHAC 7. Josh Harper, a member of the SHAC 7, was followed by the government. After he began campaigning against HLS, his "home was raided by the Seattle Joint Terrorism Task Force," meanwhile, the FBI "simultaneously raided the SHAC USA offices."¹⁵⁰ Harper also "found out that people, including one of my roommates, were offered money to spy on me."¹⁵¹ Soon, Harper moved and "began to suspect that [his] home was being entered while [he] was away, and one day had the suspicion confirmed when I found files rifled through, closet doors opened, and vegan outreach materials thrown around."¹⁵² The FBI, in discussing its efforts to combat domestic terrorism, commented that "extremist groups," like SHAC:

are difficult to track. They are loosely organized, without firm structure or organization... Their membership is multi-national, but their activities are local, often involving only a few members of the group, without direction from above. And it often is difficult to distinguish the acts of one group or movement from another, unless a particular party claims responsibility.¹⁵³ Thus, the FBI worked "to put together a better picture to help us prevent acts of

terrorism before they occur. And we will continue to work together on this threat to law-

¹⁴⁹ Spira, 199.

¹⁵⁰ Josh Harper, *Igniting a Revolution*, ed. Steven Best, (Oakland: AK Press, 2006), 238.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ John E. Lewis, 4th Annual International Conference on Public Safety: Technology and Counterterrorism, *Counterterrorism Initiatives and Partnerships*, March 14, 2005. <http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/speeches/lewis031405.htm> (accessed March 13, 2010).

abiding citizens and their legitimate business pursuits.”¹⁵⁴ While the FBI did not specify how it accomplished this, it presumably included the tactics Harper identified. By labeling SHAC as “terrorists,” the FBI’s pursuit of the organization was also covered by Title I: Enhancing Domestic Security Against Terrorism under the Patriot Act.¹⁵⁵

Kevin Jonas experienced similar treatment.¹⁵⁶ In 2003, Jonas and his roommates noticed “two men wearing suits [sitting] in a parked car three doors down from their house.”¹⁵⁷ The roommates quickly discovered that their garbageman had been bribed “to set [their] trash aside,” while their “mailman said the FBI ordered him to photocopy [their] mail.”¹⁵⁸ Meanwhile, “the FBI had also obtained warrants to tap his phone and monitor his email use,” which ended up totaling “890 hours of videotape to watch, 600 taped phone calls to listen to, and thousands of pages of documents to review.”¹⁵⁹ For two years the FBI followed the members of the SHAC 7 in order to build a concrete case against them for the prosecution.

During the trial, on charges of conspiracy to violate the Animal Enterprise Protection Act, stalking, conspiracy to commit interstate stalking, and conspiracy, it became clear there was little evidence directly tying the defendants to violence in the SHAC campaign.¹⁶⁰ The defense “acknowledged that a Web site run by Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty posted home addresses and other personal information

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ The 107th Congress of the United States, *The Patriot Act*, October 24, 2001

<http://epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.pdf> (accessed March 13, 2010).

¹⁵⁶ Kevin Jonas also lived with fellow SHAC activist and member of the SHAC 7, Lauren Gazzola.

¹⁵⁷ Maag.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ The Animal Enterprise Protection Act (AEPA) was passed in 1992 and makes “animal enterprise terrorism” illegal for anyone who travels in “interstate or foreign commerce” (like crossing state lines or using the mail) and “intentionally damages or causes the loss of any property (including animals or records) used by the animal enterprise, or conspires to do so.” For more information, please see <http://www.greenisthenewred.com/blog/aepe/>.

about animal researchers and others;" however, "the activists said they were simply trying to shame their targets into dissociating themselves from [HLS] and they disavowed any involvement with the vandalism, death threats, computer hacking and pipe bombs against those on the Web site."¹⁶¹ The prosecution "[insisted] that the pattern of violence was no coincidence" and that the SHAC 7 were "guilty of conspiracy and stalking" despite the fact that "there was no evidence that any of the defendants committed any of the violence."¹⁶² *The New York Times* reported that Assistant United States Attorney Charles B. McKenna "said that group members had extensive contact with other animal rights activists who advocated violence and that they knew that the information on the Web site was likely to incite violent reprisals against their targets."¹⁶³ Defense lawyers [responded] that "the government is unfairly targeting the group's leaders, partly because the authorities have been unable to catch those who carried out the violence."¹⁶⁴

Animal rights activists saw this trend towards prosecuting groups and their leaders as a sign their campaigns were successful. In *From Compassion to Respect*, Lawrence Finsen argued that "the success of a campaign or movement for social reform can be measured in terms of the strength of the resistance it faces," and thus, "the animal rights movement has been successful."¹⁶⁵ In his analysis, Finsen identified what he saw as the government's goals in prosecuting activists:

It is important to point out that these various organizations and law-enforcement bodies have two related yet distinct goals. Obviously, law-enforcement agencies seek to capture and convict those who have broken laws, and laboratories and factory farms wish to avoid being raided. There is also the much broader interest

¹⁶¹ Kocieniewski, "Six Animal Rights Activists"

¹⁶² Kocieniewski, "Accused of Aiding Animals"

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Finsen, 162.

that the state, the corporate structure, and many segments of society have in preventing the animal rights movement from achieving its goals, whether or not its tactics are legal. As with other campaigns waged by the FBI and other organizations, the objective is often stated in terms of law enforcement, while in fact a broader goal of protecting vested interests in the status quo is actively pursued.¹⁶⁶ Finsen then suggests enemies of activists portrayed animal rights activists, particularly the ALF, as "terrorists." The FBI's actions, under the Patriot Act, support Finsen's view. Rather than support these "terrorists," the majority of the public interested in animal rights would "[shift] the demand for animal rights and an end to exploitative institutions to the call for 'animal welfare' and 'protection,'" which Finsen believes is "a much less threatening prospect to those who wish to continue to use animals as they are used today."¹⁶⁷ This shift to moderation in the general public has weakened more radical strains of animal rights activism, such as SHAC.

However, not all government intervention in the SHAC campaign was negative. Immediately following the release of undercover footage, the United States Department of Agriculture investigated the claims against HLS. Eventually, as a result of the investigation, HLS:

[was] later charged with five offences under the Welfare of Animals Act¹⁶⁸, including 'Failure to give animals painkillers and anaesthesia during painful and distressing procedures' and 'Failure to provide primates with psychological enrichment to keep them from self destructive behaviours.'¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ "The Animal Welfare Act was signed into law in 1966. It is the only Federal law in the United States that regulates the treatment of animals in research, exhibition, transport, and by dealers. Other laws, policies, and guidelines may include additional species coverage or specifications for animal care and use, but all refer to the Animal Welfare Act as the minimum acceptable standard. The Act was amended six times (1970, 1976, 1985, 1990, 2002, 2007)." United States Department of Agriculture, *Animal Welfare Act*, December 22, 2009, http://awic.nal.usda.gov/nal_display/index.php?info_center=3&tax_level=3&tax_subject=182&topic_id=1118&level3_id=6735 (accessed March 10, 2010).

¹⁶⁹ Mann, 588.

However, HLS made an agreement with the Department of Agriculture allowing it "to [instead] spend \$20,000 on new primate caging and [a promise] to invest \$20,000 in non-animal testing methods."¹⁷⁰ The government's initial reaction to correct violations within the HLS laboratories illustrates some willingness to work with activists to correct problems.

However, the subsequent shift to tracking and then prosecuting activists demonstrates a remarkable change between Spira's campaign and the SHAC campaign. This difference could be attributed to the violence and SHAC's relationship with the ALF, or a difference in the campaign's targets. Even though the government was unable to link the SHAC 7 to violence during their prosecution, six SHAC members were convicted and now serve prison time.¹⁷¹

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY REACTION

As Spira began his campaign, he looked towards the scientific community for support. Spira spoke "to several respected scientists who called the tests scientifically worthless."¹⁷² Spira admitted that he then "amplified suggestions from the scientific community itself" in order to "create a loop of scientific superstars who agreed that it was time to reassess traditional practices."¹⁷³ However, Spira understood that it would be a mistake to "claim that research scientists get their jollies from torturing animals" because "the public [would not] believe this, and it is no way to get support from anyone

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Jake Conroy was sentenced to four years. Darius Fulmer was sentenced to one year and a day. Lauren Gazzola was sentenced to four years and four months. Josh Harper was sentenced to three years. Kevin Jonas was sentenced to six years. Andy Stepanian was sentenced to three years.

¹⁷² Erik Marcus, "Tackling the titans: the successful strategy of animal-rights activist Henry Spira," *Vegetarian Times*, issue 193, September 1993.

¹⁷³ Joan Zacharias, "Making a Difference: Part Two, An Interview with Henry Spira" *Satya Magazine*, August 1995, 10.

in the scientific community."¹⁷⁴ Spira's strategy was successful, and he received support from the scientific community.

Henry Spira's campaign was covered in a four page feature in the October 1976 issue of *Science* magazine by Nicholas Wade. Wade suggested that Aronson's research was useless as it had not been referenced in the Science Citation Index. As of October 1976, fourteen of Aronson's twenty-one articles had never been again been cited. The support of the scientific campaign proved critical to Spira's campaign. As the scientific community suggested there was no actual worth to Aronson's experiments, it proved they were not worthwhile, both in terms of government support.

In their book, *Targeted: the Anatomy of an Animal Rights Attack*, Margaret Sheffield Simon and Lorenz Otto Lutherer, two professors at Texas Tech University, analyzed the methods of recent animal rights activists in order to help potential targets and research facilities prepare for a campaign. The authors suggest:

when an individual is attacked on the basis of presumed cruelty, people can easily become indignant without thinking that the attack represents any threat to their current or future health. This process is made easier if people can be convinced that the research done by this investigator is worthless and is done for ulterior motives. Further, by attacking a single individual, an activist group ensures that other members of the scientific community, and even institutions and organizations employing or supporting the individual concerned, will be less likely to take an active stance in the defense.¹⁷⁵

SHAC did not receive the support Spira did from the scientific community. Instead, scientists instead focused on creating support groups for each other. Or, in the case of Lutherer and Simon, helped each other to prepare for a potential attack.

The scientific community also reveled in the prosecution of the SHAC 7. On her blog in 2006, Dr. Joan Bushwell, a biochemist and medical writer, discussed her

¹⁷⁴ Spira, 206-207.

¹⁷⁵ Lorenz Otto Lutherer and Margaret Sheffield, *Targeted: the Anatomy of an Animal Rights Attack* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992) 23.

experiences with the SHAC campaign. Her name, home address, and home phone number were posted on the SHAC website.¹⁷⁶ Bushwell was never targeted, but supports animal testing nevertheless. On her blog, she wrote that she supports direct research and "fully [supports] their necessity, and I also fully support their justification before an animal use committee."¹⁷⁷ Bushwell argued that, "experiments with larger animals are very expensive so they must be planned out carefully. Plus the welfare oversights for these animals... are quite strict."¹⁷⁸ Bushwell fervently defended experimenter's rights, and that the scientific community followed legal restrictions.

Following the SHAC trial, Orac, "the *nom de* blog of a (not so) humble pseudonymous surgeon/scientist," on his blog lauded the decision, writing:

If more of these "activists" faced real jail time when they cross the line from free speech to intimidation, they might think twice. Even if they only do a 2-3 of years in prison before being released on parole (which is what is likely to happen), it should be enough to send a message. Also, the possibility of having a felony conviction on one's record would give most people pause, even if the jail time is only a few months.¹⁷⁹

Orac saw the SHAC decision as a warning to other activists. Orac labeling SHAC activists as "activists" also illustrates his disdain for the group. Orac completely supported the decision. Furthermore, he described the repercussions as "only" two to three years in prison. Clearly, Orac felt the punishments for SHAC activists should be greater.

Spira's campaign caused the scientific community to distance itself from Aronson's experiments at the American Museum of Natural History; however, SHAC

¹⁷⁶ Joan Bushwell, "Being on the Animal Rights Hit List: A Speciesist Speaks," *Society Gone Bananas*, http://scienceblogs.com/bushwells/2006/09/being_on_the_animal_rights_hit.php (accessed March 13, 2010).

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Orac, "It's a Start," September 16, 2006, http://scienceblogs.com/insolence/2006/09/its_a_start_1.php (accessed March 13, 2010).

has only caused the scientific community to rally around HLS, supporting its experiments. Moreover, the scientific community, in response to SHAC, requested harsher punishments for activists.

LEGACY

After Henry Spira's campaign against the American Museum of Natural History proved successful, the campaign became famous. Lawrence and Susan Finsen praised Spira because he "led a group that accomplished what no one had to that point: they did not just protest objectionable research but actually succeeded in getting it stopped."¹⁸⁰ In an article in *Vegetarian Times*, Erik Marcus agreed, writing that Spira "set a precedent: Public outrage had stopped animal experimentation."¹⁸¹ As a result of Spira's unprecedented success, fellow activists, including Spira himself, analyzed why the campaign had won.

In *Compassionate Beasts: the Quest for Animal Rights*, Lyle Munro, a sociology professor at Monash University, also argues that Spira's campaign "represented a turning point for American animal protectionists, who for the first time witnessed the success of a focused, grassroots, activist campaign," as well as "the first time that an activist had invoked animal liberation theory against science."¹⁸² Munro recognizes that Spira's campaign emphasized that "animals were not things but sentient beings with feelings, and scientists had no right to inflict pain and suffering on what many of them callously labeled 'research tools.'"¹⁸³ Based on his philosophy regarding animals, Spira "condemned the experiments as cruel and pointless," and "had little difficulty in gaining public support for their termination after it was revealed that they had been going on at

¹⁸⁰ Finsen, 61.

¹⁸¹ Marcus.

¹⁸² Munro, 164.

¹⁸³ Ibid. *Strategic Action for Animals: A Handbook on Strategic Movement Building*, and *Activism for Animal Liberation* (New York: Lantern Books, 2008) 57.

has only caused the scientific community to rally around HLS, supporting its experiments. Moreover, the scientific community, in response to SHAC, requested harsher punishments for activists.

LEGACY

After Henry Spira's campaign against the American Museum of Natural History proved successful, the campaign became famous. Lawrence and Susan Finsen praised Spira because he "led a group that accomplished what no one had to that point: they did not just protest objectionable research but actually succeeded in getting it stopped."¹⁸⁰ In an article in *Vegetarian Times*, Erik Marcus agreed, writing that Spira "set a precedent: Public outrage had stopped animal experimentation."¹⁸¹ As a result of Spira's unprecedented success, fellow activists, including Spira himself, analyzed why the campaign had won.

In *Compassionate Beasts: the Quest for Animal Rights*, Lyle Munro, a sociology professor at Monash University, also argues that Spira's campaign "represented a turning point for American animal protectionists, who for the first time witnessed the success of a focused, grassroots, activist campaign," as well as "the first time that an activist had invoked animal liberation theory against science."¹⁸² Munro recognizes that Spira's campaign emphasized that "animals were not things but sentient beings with feelings, and scientists had no right to inflict pain and suffering on what many of them callously labeled 'research tools.'"¹⁸³ Based on his philosophy regarding animals, Spira "condemned the experiments as cruel and pointless," and "had little difficulty in gaining public support for their termination after it was revealed that they had been going on at

¹⁸⁰ Finsen, 61.

¹⁸¹ Marcus.

¹⁸² Munro, 164.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

great public expense for some seventeen years.”¹⁸⁴ Munro argued that, while Spira believed in animal liberation philosophy, his appeal to the financial matters involved in animal experimentation allowed him to be successful.

Peter Singer, who introduced Spira to animal rights philosophy, took Spira’s example and used it as an inspiration for other activists. Singer included an essay by Spira in his book, *In Defence of Animals*, that described his actions in the campaign against the American Museum of Natural History. Singer then published a book solely on Spira’s life, *Ethics into Action: Henry Spira and the Animal Rights Movement*. Additionally, Singer also produced a documentary on Spira called “Henry: One Man’s Way.” In these books and the documentary, Singer emphasizes Spira’s leadership ability as well as his determination to still “make a difference,” even though he is only one person. Singer seems to use Spira’s experiences as almost a guidebook for other activists.

Melanie Joy, an activist, published *Strategic Action for Animals* in 2008 and cites Spira’s campaign as her example. Joy lauded Spira for having “a clear objective, an understanding of the rules & framework of the game, and knowledge of the key players and the power they and he wielded.” Spira also “anticipated his opponents’ moves and changed course when necessary, without warning and without compromising his strategic plan.”¹⁸⁵ Based on Spira’s campaign, Joy offers this advice to potential activists:

Choose the issue, choose the target(s), conduct research on the target(s), the institution, and on the state of affairs that affect your campaign, frame the issue

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Melanie Joy, *Strategic Action for Animals: A Handbook on Strategic Movement Building, Organizing, and Activism for Animal Liberation* (New York: Lantern Books, 2008) 57.

for the public and powerholders, open communication with the target; announce the campaign publicly, and develop tactics.¹⁸⁶ Joy described a target as a person "who is in a position to meet the demands of the campaign," and that "the target has to be a person, because human beings, not institutions, make decisions and have feelings that can be appealed to."¹⁸⁷ Because human beings can be appealed to, Joy then suggested activists "learn everything about [their target's] vulnerabilities and strengths."¹⁸⁸ Joy then also recommended that activists should consider finding a secondary target should "efforts to pressure the [primary] target [prove to be] unsuccessful" and then "pressure the secondary target into pressuring the primary target."¹⁸⁹ Based on Spira's experiences in secondary targeting, Joy made recommendations to activists, indicating Spira's importance.

Even Spira's "opponents" praise his tactics. Following Spira's death, Roger Shelley, the former Vice-President of Corporate Affairs and Investor Relations for Revlon, Inc., thanked Spira for his legacy in *The New York Times* obituary section. Shelley acknowledged Spira as a "powerful, articulate and sympathetic advocate." Shelley recalled Spira's tactics during his Revlon campaign to end cosmetic animal testing. Shelley described his experiences with Spira:

During our negotiations you helped me and my colleagues in senior management at Revlon understand that profits and humaneness are not mutually exclusive. You made Revlon employees and their family members feel better about themselves with your patience and your understanding of how corporations work. Yours was not a shrill voice, rather it was one of compassion and reason.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ Joy, 60.

¹⁸⁸ Joy, 61.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Roger Shelley, "Paid Notice: Deaths SPIRA, HENRY" *The New York Times*, September 16, 1998, Obituaries, <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/09/16/classified/paid-notice-deaths-spira-henry.html?scp=21&sq=henry%20spira&st=cse> (accessed March 10, 2010).

Shelley concluded his sentiments by asking Spira to "rest well, my friend" because Spira had "earned it."¹⁹¹

While others attributed his success to secondary targeting, Spira suggested it was instead a variety of tactics that, when combined, proved effective. When asked what he thought had made the campaign successful, Spira commented that every step of the process was necessary.¹⁹² Spira attributed the campaign's accomplishment to the media attention, the scientific community's support, and the government's support. Additionally, Spira also cited the campaign's determination and consistent effort as a contributing factor. Spira did not select one factor that singularly distinguished him from other activists, but rather suggested it was the sum of his protest tactics that made his actions formidable.

Henry Spira was highly regarded not only by his peers, but also by those he campaigned against. Spira's legacy includes not only his success at the American Museum of Natural History, but also the precedent that set action for subsequent activists. These activists analyzed how Spira triumphed over the museum. While Munro suggested Spira's philosophy of animal liberation strengthened his cause to the media, Peter Singer argued it was Spira's leadership. Melanie Joy focused on Spira's ability to select both primary and secondary targets, and Roger Shelley praised Spira's compromising attitude. Spira himself was likely the most accurate in determining his own success, by proposing it was the grouping of tactics that led him to victory at the Museum. The debate over Spira's success illustrates one commonality: all activists

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² Singer, 71-72.

agree that Spira's campaign was unprecedented in its achievement. Spira's lasting legacy to the animal rights community was the group's first victory over animal testing.

SHAC's legacy will not only be the campaign against HLS, but the subsequent shift in government attitudes towards animal rights activism. While HLS remains open as I write this paper, the business of HLS has become more difficult to run. Meanwhile, SHAC activists have discovered that campaigning has become more difficult since Spira's campaign against the American Museum of Natural History.

While HLS did not officially comment on its financial situation, activists regularly congratulated themselves for wounding the company's financial viability. Although Mike Caulfield, an employee of HLS, "declined to say if [HLS] had lost money because of the animal rights group's three-year campaign," he did comment that, "[HLS is] profitable, but we've had to work harder than our competition to achieve it."¹⁹³ Donald Liddick cited an October 2005 hearing held by the U.S. Senate Committee on Environmental and Public Works to discuss HLS and its financial condition. In this hearing, "John Lewis, a deputy assistant director of the FBI, stated that about one hundred companies had stopped doing business with HLS as a result of SHAC intimidation, including Citibank, Merrill Lynch, Charles Schwab, and Deloitte & Touche."¹⁹⁴

Activists identified other factors that demonstrated HLS's weakness. Keith Mann argued that between 1992 and 2005, HLS's net worth declined by \$478 million dollars. Additionally, Mann wrote that in 2004 "over 100 companies associated with HLS withdrew contracts. Citibank dumped 10 million shares, Charles Schwab 5 million,

¹⁹³ Robert Hanley "Seven Animal Rights Advocates Arrested," *The New York Times*, May 27, 2004, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/27/nyregion/seven-animal-rights-advocates-arrested.html?fta=y&incamp=archive:article_related (accessed March 10, 2010).

¹⁹⁴ Liddick, 47.

Merrill Lynch 8 million," and HLS subsequently was in \$100 million of debt.¹⁹⁵ Kevin Jonas emphasized that "the British government has interceded twice to prevent the closure of the lab by offering both bank and insurance services when no other commercial company in the US or the UK would."¹⁹⁶ Jonas identified this government intervention as critical to the company's survival.

Jonas argued that the SHAC campaign is a "winner-take-all scenario." Meaning, should SHAC lose, it would weaken the animal rights movement; however, should SHAC win, it would empower the group to continue to campaign against animal research facilities. Jonas then elaborated on what the SHAC legacy would be, if the campaign proved victorious:

The politicians, law enforcement agencies, and corporate overlords that pull the state's puppet strings all recognize that when the SHAC campaign succeeds in closing HLS, any company could be next. Once activists get that taste for victory and understand the power that is theirs through direct action, they will not retreat. SHAC, and the campaigns that preceded it, are a menace to established forms of traditional activism, in that they prove conclusively that not only does direct action work, but it can be compatible with lawful campaigns.¹⁹⁷ Jonas argued that if the SHAC campaign were ultimately successful, it would prove to other activists and government agencies that the ties between a lawful campaign and the ALF are not only compatible, but are powerful. Jonas also argued that the "seemingly logical marriage of both forms of social activism has demonstrated that the grass roots can assemble an effective and cohesive fighting unit, independent of forces such as the mainstream press and political process."¹⁹⁸ However, for SHAC to prove that a campaign can be winnable without media and government support, the campaign would have to shut down HLS.

¹⁹⁵ Mann, 608.

¹⁹⁶ Jonas, 267.

¹⁹⁷ Jonas, 267.

¹⁹⁸ Jonas, 264.

However, HLS is still open for business as of March 2010. SHAC's current legacy was determined by the 2006 trial against the SHAC 7 as well as the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act, AETA. Activists believed that the trial against the SHAC 7 and AETA reflect an interest by the state in "protecting vested interests in the status quo."¹⁹⁹ In the SHAC trial, the government was able to convict the defendants based on their website. In the opinion, the court wrote:

[Jonas] and Gazzola had leadership positions in SHAC, an organization that clearly engaged in unprotected activity via its website. [Jonas] and Gazzola were instrumental in the coordination of all of SHAC's activities, both legal and illegal. There is also overwhelming evidence of their constant attempts to evade law enforcement and cover their tracks: use of encryption devices and programs to wipe their computer hard drives; attributing illegal activities to fake organizations and activists; and the use of pseudonyms. While alone this evidence is not enough to demonstrate agreement, when viewed in context, it is circumstantial evidence of their agreement to participate in illegal activity.²⁰⁰

Although the government did not have concrete evidence linking Jonas and Gazzola to illegal activities within the SHAC campaign, because the two were instrumental in running the SHAC website, and had spoken at many SHAC affiliated events and protests, they were considered "instrumental in the coordination of all of SHAC's activities, both legal and illegal." This case marked the first time the government had tried anyone under the Animal Enterprise Protection Act. The precedent created in this trial combined with the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act, has made protesting a more litigious issue and has limited the legal activities in which protestors can engage in.

Activists claim that the AETA "denies equal protection to social justice activists and restricts [the] freedom of speech and assembly," and "is excessively broad and

¹⁹⁹ Finsen, 162.

²⁰⁰ *United States v. Fullmer*

vague by covering nearly all enterprises and by implicating individuals who merely attempt or discuss 'interference' with their operation."²⁰¹ In October 2006, the ACLU wrote the House of Representatives, reminding the body that when a group is "[singled out]... on one side of a debate for criminal penalties, [Congress] must be careful to avoid silencing the discussion, dissent and debate that is so fundamental to our freedom."²⁰² Activists immediately protested the law, but it was passed unanimously through Congress in November 2006 for the purpose of "[providing] the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individuals committing animal enterprise terror."²⁰³ AETA defines an offense as:

Whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce, or uses or causes to be used the mail or any facility of interstate or foreign commerce--

(1) for the purpose of damaging or interfering with the operations of an animal enterprise; and

(2) in connection with such purpose--

(A) intentionally damages or causes the loss of any real or personal property (including animals or records) used by an animal enterprise, or any real or personal property of a person or entity having a connection to, relationship with, or transactions with an animal enterprise;

(B) intentionally places a person in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury to that person, a member of the immediate family (as defined in section 115) of that person, or a spouse or intimate partner of that person by a course of conduct involving threats, acts of vandalism, property damage, criminal trespass, harassment, or intimidation; or

²⁰¹ Equal Justice Alliance, "Defending Freedom of Speech and Assembly," *Welcome to Equal Justice Alliance*, <http://www.noaeta.org/> (accessed March 10, 2010).

²⁰² Caroline Frederickson on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, letter to the Honorable F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., and the Honorable John Conyers, Jr., October 30, 2006, American Civil Liberties Union (http://www.aclu.org/files/images/general/asset_upload_file809_27356.pdf).

²⁰³ Govtrack.us, "Text of S. 3880 [109th]: Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act," November 16, 2006, <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=s109-3880> (accessed March 10, 2010).

(C) conspires or attempts to do so.²⁰⁴

AETA embodies a variety of an activist's tactics, including those used by Henry Spira by encompassing mail. However, the "conspiracy" section of AETA clearly disturbed activists the most. When activists now target animal enterprises, they are responsible not only for actions that are committed, but also those that are merely planned.

While SHAC has succeeded in stopping some of the research conducted at HLS, the campaign has illegalized former protest tactics. Protestors must now be conscientious about federal laws limiting animal rights activism, and the increased penalties if they are caught.

CONCLUSION

While the SHAC campaign continues after a decade, the campaign against the American Museum of Natural History lasted less than two years. HLS continues to experiment on animals, while Aronson ended his experiments. Numerous factors led to Spira's legacy: his relentless pursuit of the museum, his strong leadership capabilities, and his targeting led to positive reinforcement from the media, the government, and the scientific community. With this help, Spira guided his campaign to victory and proved animal rights activism should be taken seriously.

Although SHAC has determinedly campaigned against HLS for over a decade, there has been no formal leadership in the campaign, preventing the campaign from having official guidance. This disadvantage, coupled with the violent tendencies of underground activists, weakened the SHAC campaign. The violence linked to the SHAC campaign alienated the media, the scientific community, and the government. This lack

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

of support prevented the campaign from achieving its ends, and has rather detracted from its potential strength. AETA and the trial of the SHAC 7 have weakened the reputation of animal rights activists in the United States.

With increased restrictions on animal rights activists through AETA and the SHAC 7 trial, the future of animal rights activism seems bleak. Commonly used protest tactics are now considered illegal, and activists are labeled as "terrorists." Post 9/11, the term "terrorist" carries more weight: it draws to mind images of the World Trade Center, and pointless violence. It also guarantees stronger government intervention under the Patriot Act. For animal rights activists, identifying successful past campaigns provides a solution for problems that have arisen. Should activists reject violence and announce a public leader, would the SHAC campaign then enjoy a victory? While rejecting violence would surely guarantee less antagonism from the media, the scientific community, and the government, it would not necessarily ensure a victory. Furthermore, many of the tactics Spira used himself are now illegal under the AETA, including, potentially, protesting outside of private homes, leafleting, and distributing personal information concerning targets. This leaves activists in a predicament: how can they best help animals without hurting their campaigns?

The dramatic shift in animal rights activism, as evidenced by Henry Spira's campaign contrasted by the SHAC campaign, also illustrates a changing environment for activists. If the SHAC campaign becomes a precedent, other countries could adopt similar strict policies towards activists. More frighteningly, if activists continue to engage in the same levels of violence, the US government could amend the AETA to provide harsher punishments. Additionally, AETA could be extended and applied to other activists, limiting dissenting free speech in this country.

Currently, the government is prosecuting four defendants under the AETA in *United States v. Buddenberg*. Joseph Buddenberg, Maryam Khajavi, Nathan Pope and Adriana Stumpo (the "AETA 4") were charged with harassment and intimidation, and using "the Internet to find information on bio-medical researchers."²⁰⁵ Should the government effectively apply AETA to these activists, it would set an alarming model for the government and business to prevent and stop protesters.

As of March 2010, my friend Kevin, who first introduced me to animal rights activism, also awaits trial. Kevin has been charged with 10 counts of stalking, threatening a public officer or school employee, and conspiracy to commit for his participation in protests at UCLA. His case marks the first time the California Stalking Statute has been applied to an activist.

While SHAC considers how to best proceed with increasing government pressure, it may be helpful to look to Spira's example of moderation and leadership to best guide the next step of the campaign.

U.S. House of Representatives, "Text of H.R. 3886: Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act," November 16, 2006. <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/text/summary?bill=110-3886> (accessed March 10, 2010).

U.S. House of Representatives, "House Unanimously Passes Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act," Capitol Hill Press Release, November 16, 2006. http://www.access.gpo.gov/comp2/summary_0286-25716823_11M (accessed March 10, 2010).

Mary Chris, "America's 2nd Threat," *Mother Jones*, January/February 2006. <http://motherjones.com/politics/2006/01/americas-2-threat> (accessed March 10, 2010).

"Out Town," *Manhattan Media*, Manhattan Media, n.d., <http://www.manhattanmedia.com/outtown.php> (accessed March 9, 2010).

"PETA: the Animal Rights Organization," <http://www.peta.org> (accessed March 12, 2010).

²⁰⁵ Centre for Constitutional Rights, "U.S.A. v. Buddenberg," <http://ccrjustice.org/ourcases/current-cases/u.s.-v.-buddenberg> (accessed March 10, 2010).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Materials

Websites

Activistcash.com, "Activistcash.com: Exposing anti-consumer activists and funding," <http://activistcash.com/> (accessed March 12, 2010).

"Annual Report of Huntingdon Life Sciences." Reprinted on *PrimateResearch.com*. November 20, 2006. <http://www.primateresearch.com/HLS06.pdf> (accessed March 10, 2010).

British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, "Secret Suffering: BUAV," <http://www.buav.org/investigations/secretsuffering> (accessed March 12, 2010).

Centre for Constitutional Rights, "U.S.A. v. Buddenberg," <http://ccrjustice.org/ourcases/current-cases/u.s.-v.-buddenberg> (accessed March 10, 2010).

Equal Justice Alliance. "Defending Freedom of Speech and Assembly." *Welcome to Equal Justice Alliance*. <http://www.noaeta.org/> (accessed March 10, 2010).

Frederickson, Caroline on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union. "Letter to the Honorable F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., and the Honorable John Conyers, Jr." October 30, 2006. *American Civil Liberties Union*. http://www.aclu.org/files/images/general/asset_upload_file809_27356.pdf (accessed March 10, 2010).

Govtrack.us. "Text of S. 3880 [109th]: Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act." November 16, 2006. <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/billtext.xpd?bill=s109-3880> (accessed March 10, 2010).

"House Unanimously Passes Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act." *Capitol Hill Press Release*. November 13, 2006. http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-25716825_ITM (accessed March 10, 2010).

Maag, Chris. "America's #1 Threat." *Mother Jones*. January/February 2006. <http://motherjones.com/politics/2006/01/americas-1-threat> (accessed March 10, 2010).

"Our Town." *Manhattan Media*. Manhattan Media, n.d., <http://www.manhattanmedia.com/ourtown.php> (accessed March 9, 2010).

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, "PETA: the Animal Rights Organization," <http://www.peta.org/> (accessed March 11, 2010).

Stahler, Charles. "How Many Vegetarians Are There?" *The Vegetarian Resource Group*, 1994, <http://www.vrg.org/nutshell/poll.htm> (accessed March 9, 2010).

Vegan Outreach. "Notes from Vegan Outreach." E-Newsletter. December 5, 2007.
<http://www.veganoutreach.org/enewsletter/20071205.html>
 (accessed March 9, 2010).

Online Government Publications

United States Department of Agriculture. *Animal Welfare Act*. December 22, 2009.
http://awic.nal.usda.gov/nal_display/index.php?info_center=3&tax_level=3&tax_subject=182&topic_id=1118&level3_id=6735 (accessed March 10, 2010).

United States Department of Justice. *Freedom of Information Act*.
<http://www.justice.gov/oip/> (accessed March 9, 2010).

Legal Cases

United States v. Fullmer, 584 F.3d 132 (U.S. Court of Appeals 3rd Circuit, 2009).

Newspapers

Animal People News
The Boston Globe
The Los Angeles Times
Newsweek Magazine
The New York Times
Our Town
The San Francisco Chronicle
Satya Magazine
Science Magazine
Vegetarian Times
The Wall Street Journal
The Washington Post

Books

Beers, Diane. *For the Prevention of Cruelty*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006.

Best, Steven, ed. *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*. New York: Lantern Books, 2004.

_____. *Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth*. Oakland: AK Press, 2006.

Finsen, Lawrence and Susan Finsen. *The Animal Rights Movement in America: From Compassion to Respect*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1994.

Hawthorne, Mark. *Striking at the Roots: A Practical Guide to Animal Activism*. Washington: O Books, 2008.

Joy, Melanie. *Strategic Action for Animals: A Handbook on Strategic Movement Building, Organizing, and Activism for Animal Liberation*. New York: Lantern

Books, 2008.

Lutherer, Lorenz Otto and Margaret Sheffield. *Targeted: the Anatomy of an Animal Rights Attack*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.

Singer, Peter. *Ethics into Action: Henry Spira and the Animal Rights Movement*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000.

———. *In Defense of Animals: the Second Wave*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Secondary Materials

Liddick, Donald. *Eco-Terrorism: Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements*. London: Praeger, 2006.