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The Principles of Morals and Legislation, 1789, Chapter XVII, Section 1

IV. What other agents then are there, which, at the same time that they are under the influence of man's direction, are susceptible of happiness? They are of two sorts: (1) Other human beings who are styled persons. (2) Other animals, which, on account of their interests having been neglected by the insensibility of the ancient jurists, stand degraded into the class of things.
Under the Hindu and Mahometan religions, the interests of the rest of the animal creation seem to have met with some attention. Why have they not, universally, with as much as those of human creatures, allowance made for the difference in point of sensibility? Because the laws that are have been the work of mutual fear; a sentiment which the less rational animals have not had the same means as man has of turning to account. Why ought they not? No reason can be given.

If the being eaten were all, there is very good reason why we should be suffered to eat such of them as we like to eat: we are the better for it, and they are never the worse. They have none of those long-protracted anticipations of future misery which we have. The death they suffer in our hands commonly is, and always may be, a speedier, and by that means a less painful one, than that which would await them in the inevitable course of nature. If the being killed were all, there is very good reason why we should be suffered to kill such as molest us: we should be the worse for their living, and they are never the worse for being dead.

But is there any reason why we should be suffered to torment them? Not any that I can see. Are there any why we should not be suffered to torment them? Yes, several. The day has been, I grieve to say in many places it is not yet past, in which the greater part of the species, under the denomination of slaves, have been treated by the law exactly upon the same footing as, in England for example, the inferior races of animals are still. The day may come, when the rest of the animal creation may acquire those rights which never could have been withheld from them but by the hand of tyranny. The French have already discovered that the blackness of the skin is no reason why a human being should be abandoned without redress to the caprice of a tormentor. It may come one day to be recognized, that the number of the legs, the villosity of the skin, or the termination of the os sacrum, are reasons equally insufficient for abandoning a sensitive being to the same fate. What else is it that should trace the insuperable line? Is it the faculty of reason, or, perhaps, the faculty of discourse? But a full-grown horse or dog is beyond comparison a more rational, as well as a more conversable animal, than an infant of a day, or a week, or even a month, old. But suppose the case were otherwise, what would it avail? the question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?
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For about three years my companion and I rented a small house in the country that stood on the edge of a large meadow that appeared to run from the end of our deck straight into the mountains. The mountains, however, were quite far away, and between us and them there was, in fact, a town. It was one of the many pleasant aspects of the house that you never really were aware of this.

It was a house of many windows, low, wide, nearly floor to ceiling in the living room, which faced the meadow, and it was from one of these that I first saw our closest neighbor, a large white horse, cropping grass, flipping its mane, and ambling about—not over the entire meadow, which stretched well out of sight of the house, but over the five or so fenced-in acres
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that were next to the twenty-odd that we had rented. I soon learned that the horse, whose name was Blue, belonged to a man who lived in another town, but was boarded by our neighbors next door. Occasionally, one of the children, usually a stocky teen-ager, but sometimes a much younger girl or boy, could be seen riding Blue. They would appear in the meadow, climb up on his back, ride furiously for ten or fifteen minutes, then get off, slap Blue on the flanks, and not be seen again for a month or more.

There were many apple trees in our yard, and one by the fence that Blue could almost reach. We were soon in the habit of feeding him apples, which he relished, especially because by the middle of summer the meadow grasses—so green and succulent since January—had dried out from lack of rain, and Blue stumbled about munching the dried stalks half-heartedly. Sometimes he would stand very still just by the apple tree, and when one of us came out he would whinny, snort loudly, or stamp the ground. This meant, of course: I want an apple.

It was quite wonderful to pick a few apples, or collect those that had fallen to the ground overnight, and patiently hold them, one by one, up to his large, toothy mouth. I remained as thrilled as a child by his flexible dark lips, huge, cubelike teeth that crunched the apples, core and all, with such finality, and his high, broad-breasted enormity; beside which, I felt small indeed.

When I was a child, I used to ride horses, and was especially friendly with one named Nan until the day I was riding and my brother deliberately spooked her and I was thrown, head first, against the trunk of a tree. When I came to, I was in bed and my mother was bending worriedly over me; we silently agreed that perhaps horseback riding was not the safest sport for me. Since then I have walked, and prefer walking to horseback riding—but I had forgotten the depth of feeling one could see in horses' eyes.

I was therefore unprepared for the expression in Blue's. Blue was lonely. Blue was horribly lonely and bored. I was not shocked that this should be the case; five acres to tramp by yourself, endlessly, even in the most beautiful of meadows—and his was—cannot provide many interesting events, and once rainy season turned to dry that was about it. No, I was shocked that I had forgotten that human animals and nonhuman animals can communicate quite well; if we are brought up around animals as children we take this for granted. By the time we are adults we no longer remember. However, the animals have not changed. They are in fact completed creations (at least they seem to be, so much more than we) who are not likely to change; it is their nature to express themselves. What else are they going to express? And they do. And, generally speaking, they are ignored.

After giving Blue the apples, I would wander back to the house, aware that he was observing me. Were more apples not forthcoming then? Was that to be his sole entertainment for the day? My partner's small son had decided he wanted to learn how to piece a quilt; we worked in silence on our respective squares as I thought . . .

Well, about slavery: about white children, who were raised by black people, who knew their first all-accepting love from black women, and then, when they were twelve or so, were told they must "forget" the deep levels of communication between themselves and "mammy" that they knew. Later they would be able to relate quite calmly, "My old mammy was sold to another good family." "My old mammy was — — —." Fill in the blank. Many more years later a white woman would say: "I can't understand these Negroes, these blacks. What do they want? They're so different from us."

And about the Indians, considered to be "like animals" by the "settlers" (a very benign euphemism for what they actually
were), who did not understand their description as a compliment.

And about the thousands of American men who marry Japanese, Korean, Filipina, and other non-English-speaking women and of how happy they report they are, “blissfully,” until their brides learn to speak English, at which point the marriages tend to fall apart. What then did the men see, when they looked into the eyes of the women they married, before they could speak English? Apparently only their own reflections.

I thought of society’s impatience with the young. “Why are they playing the music so loud?” Perhaps the children have listened to much of the music of oppressed people their parents danced to before they were born, with its passionate but soft cries for acceptance and love, and they have wondered why their parents failed to hear.

I do not know how long Blue had inhabited his five beautiful, boring acres before we moved into our house; a year after we had arrived—and had also traveled to other valleys, other cities, other worlds—he was still there.

But then, in our second year at the house, something happened in Blue’s life. One morning, looking out the window at the fog that lay like a ribbon over the meadow, I saw another horse, a brown one, at the other end of Blue’s field. Blue appeared to be afraid of it, and for several days made no attempt to go near. We went away for a week. When we returned, Blue had decided to make friends and the two horses ambled or galloped along together, and Blue did not come nearly as often to the fence underneath the apple tree.

When he did, bringing his new friend with him, there was a different look in his eyes. A look of independence, of self-possession, of inalienable horseness. His friend eventually became pregnant. For months and months there was, it seemed to me, a mutual feeling between me and the horses of justice, of peace. I fed apples to them both. The look in Blue’s eyes was one of unabashed “this is itness.”

It did not, however, last forever. One day, after a visit to the city, I went out to give Blue some apples. He stood waiting, or so I thought, though not beneath the tree. When I shook the tree and jumped back from the shower of apples, he made no move. I carried some over to him. He managed to half-crunch one. The rest he let fall to the ground. I dreaded looking into his eyes—because I had of course noticed that Brown, his partner, had gone—but I did look. If I had been born into slavery, and my partner had been sold or killed, my eyes would have looked like that. The children next door explained that Blue’s partner had been “put with him” (the same expression that old people used, I had noticed, when speaking of an ancestor during slavery who had been impregnated by her owner) so that they could mate and she conceive. Since that was accomplished, she had been taken back by her owner, who lived somewhere else.

Will she be back? I asked.

They didn’t know.

Blue was like a crazed person. Blue was, to me, a crazed person. He galloped furiously, as if he were being ridden, around and around his five beautiful acres. He whinnied until he couldn’t. He tore at the ground with his hooves. He butted himself against his single shade tree. He looked always and always toward the road down which his partner had gone. And then, occasionally, when he came up for apples, or I took apples to him, he looked at me. It was a look so piercing, so full of grief, a look so human, I almost laughed (I felt too sad to cry) to think there are people who do not know that animals suffer. People like me who have forgotten, and daily forget, all that animals try to tell us. “Everything you do to us will happen to you; we are your teachers, as you are ours. We are one lesson” is essentially it, I think. There
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are those who never once have even considered animals' rights: those who have been taught that animals actually want to be used and abused by us, as small children "love" to be frightened, or women "love" to be mutilated and raped. . . . They are the great-grandchildren of those who honestly thought, because someone taught them this: "Women can't think," and "niggers can't faint." But most disturbing of all, in Blue's large brown eyes was a new look, more painful than the look of despair: the look of disgust with human beings, with life; the look of hatred. And it was odd what the look of hatred did. It gave him, for the first time, the look of a beast. And what that meant was that he had put up a barrier within to protect himself from further violence; all the apples in the world wouldn't change that fact.

And so Blue remained, a beautiful part of our landscape, very peaceful to look at from the window, white against the grass. Once a friend came to visit and said, looking out on the soothing view: "And it would have to be a white horse; the very image of freedom." And I thought, yes, the animals are forced to become for us merely "images" of what they once so beautifully expressed. And we are used to drinking milk from containers showing "contented" cows, whose real lives we want to hear nothing about, eating eggs and drumsticks from "happy" hens, and munching hamburgers advertised by bulls of integrity who seem to command their fate.

As we talked of freedom and justice one day for all, we sat down to steaks. I am eating misery, I thought, as I took the first bite. And spit it out.

1986

Though it is more difficult to write about my father than about my mother, since I spent less time with him and knew him less well, it is equally as liberating. Partly this is because writing about people helps us to understand them, and understanding them helps us to accept them as part of ourselves. Since I share so many of my father's characteristics, physical and otherwise, coming to terms with what he has meant to my life is crucial to a full acceptance and love of myself.

I'm positive my father never understood why I wrote. I wonder sometimes if the appearance, in 1968, of my first book, Once, poems largely about my experiences in the Civil Rights movement and in other countries, notably African and Eastern European, surprised him. It is frustrating that, because he is now dead, I will never know.

In fact, what I regret most about my relationship with my father is that it did not improve until after his death. For a long time I felt so shut off from him that we were unable to talk, I
I know what the caged bird feels, alas!
When the sun is bright on the upland slopes;
When the wind stirs soft through sprouting grass,
And the river flows like a stream of glass;
When the first bird sings and the first bud opes,
And the faint perfume from its chalice steals—
I know what the caged bird feels!

I know why the caged bird beats his wing
Till its blood is red on the cruel bars;
For he must fly back to his perch and cling
When he fain would be on the bough a-swing;
And a pain still throbs in the old, old scars
And they pulse again with a keener sting—
I know why he beats his wing!

I know why the caged bird sings, ah me,
When his wing is bruised and his bosom sore—
When he beats his bars and he would be free;
It is not a carol of joy or glee,
But a prayer that he sends from his heart's deep core,
But a plea, that upward to heaven he flings—
I know why the caged bird sings!

—Paul Laurence Dunbar, (1872-1906),
son of two runaway slaves
THE OWNER OF A SLAVE DESTROYS TWO FREEDOMS—THAT OF HIS SLAVE AND THAT OF HIMSELF.

—John Bryant
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racism (rā' siz' ēm), n. 1. a belief that human races have distinctive characteristics that determine their respective cultures, usually involving the idea that one's own race is superior and has the right to rule others. 2. a policy of enforcing such asserted right. 3. a system of government and society based upon it. —rac' ist, n., adj.

speciesism (spe' shēz' ēm), n. 1. a belief that different species of animals are significantly different from one another in their capacities to feel pleasure and pain and live an autonomous existence, usually involving the idea that one's own species has the right to rule and use others. 2. a policy of enforcing such asserted right. 3. a system of government and society based upon it. —spe' cies ist, n., adj.
FOREWORD
by Alice Walker

This powerful book, once read with comprehension, will take a lifetime to forget. In The Dreaded Comparison, Marjorie Spiegel illustrates the similarities between the enslavement of black people (and by implication other enslaved peoples) and the enslavement of animals, past and present. It is a comparison that, even for those of us who recognize its validity, is a difficult one to face. Especially so if we are the descendants of slaves. Or of slave owners. Or of both. Especially so if we are also responsible in some way for the present treatment of animals. Especially so if we, for instance, participate in or profit from animal research (what beings who loved life died for our lipstick, lotions, medicines and so on?) or if we own animals or eat animals or if we are content to know that animals are shut up "safely" in zoos. In short, if we are complicit in their enslavement and destruction, which is to say if we are, at this juncture in history, master.

But there is hope following close behind the initial despair that one feels on reading this book. Despair because one realizes one has eaten eggs produced by mutilated (de-beaked) beings crammed four to a cage the size of a record album cover; one has tasted veal from a baby calf ripped from its mother's womb without so much as a goodbye lick or look from her; one has used cosmetics derived from "products" forced out of animals' bodies in great pain. (The civet cat, for one, is whipped in the face until it sweats the essence that is the foundation for many a sweet perfume.) We are guilty.
But this is only a first response. And normal. What we do with our heightened consciousness is the question. It is the author's clarity that produces hope. Her scholarship. Her assuredness in pointing out the "dreaded comparison" between the pain felt by humans who are abused and the pain felt by non-human animals who are abused, and recognizing it as the same pain.

The animals of the world exist for their own reasons. They were not made for humans any more than black people were made for whites or women for men. This is the essence of Ms. Spiegel's cogent, humane, and astute argument, and it is sound.

AN HISTORICAL UNDERSTANDING

Pain is pain, whether it be inflicted on man or on beast; and the creature who suffers it, whether man or beast, being sensible to the misery of it, whilst it lasts, suffers evil... The white man... can have no right, by virtue of his color, to enslave and tyrannize over a black man... For the same reason, a man can have no natural right to abuse and torment a beast.

—Dr. Humphrey Primatt, 1776

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

—Peter Singer, 1974

Comparing speciesism with racism? At first glance, many people might feel that it is insulting to compare the suffering of non-human animals to that of humans. In fact, in our society, comparison to an animal has come to be a slur.

Why is it an insult for anyone to be compared to an animal? In many cultures, such a comparison was an honor. In Native American cultures, for example, individuals adopted the names of admired animals, and had spirit guides...
form—who served both as teachers and escorts into the realms of the spirit world. Names such as Sitting Bull, Running Deer, and Hawkeye are familiar to us, expressive of the admiration Native Americans had for the animals with whom they shared both the earth and the afterlife. Native Americans, Ancient Egyptians, some African tribes, and many other ancient and aboriginal cultures the world over have worshiped various animals as gods or messengers to god. So how is it that we find ourselves in a time when comparison to a non-human animal has ceased to be an honor and is instead hurled as an insult?

By the time the New World was “discovered” and colonization began, Europeans had “subdued” most of the land which they had for centuries inhabited. Europe’s wildernesses were long-gone, replaced with a very “managed” countryside comprised of “English gardens,” rolling hills where mighty forests had long ago stood, and relatively few stands of woods, often maintained as hunting grounds.

Understandably, it came as quite a shock to the British colonists’ psyches when they encountered the unbridled and deeply forested North American wilderness. The white Puritan colonists measured “progress” and “civilization” in terms of (among other things) how far a people could distance themselves from Nature. “Countless diaries, addresses and memorials of the frontier period,” writes historian Roderick Nash, attest to this in their representations of “the wilderness as an ‘enemy’ which had to be ‘conquered’, ‘subdued’, and ‘vanquished’ by a ‘pioneer army’.” To the average colonist, explains Nash,

wilderness... acquired significance as a dark and sinister symbol. [The pioneers] shared the long Western tradition of imagining wild country as a moral vacuum, a cursed and chaotic wasteland. As a consequence, frontiersmen acutely sensed that they battled wild country not only for personal survival but in the name of nation, race and God. Civilizing the New World meant enlightening darkness, ordering chaos, and changing evil into good.¹

Holding these beliefs, white Christians were convinced that it was virtually a moral obligation to conquer any people who were still living in harmony with the devil-ridden, moral wasteland of nature—as “savages,” in their opinion. Paying no regard to the level of cultural sophistication or even to the general happiness of the people living within their native societies, the conquerors merely saw “heathens” while proceeding to destroy entire cultures, along with the ancient ecosystems which had long supported them.

In 1688, the idea of the “noble savage” was introduced by English playwright and novelist Aphra Behn in Oroomoko. The noble savage hated his fellow slaves because they were:

by Nature Slaves, poor wretched Rogues, fit to be used as Christian Tools; Dogs, treacherous and cowardly, fit for such Masters; and they wanted only but to be whipped into the knowledge of the Christian Gods, to be the vilest of all creeping things.²

The slave who had thus capitulated to his master personified the beliefs about nature and the denizens of the natural world held by the Christian conquerors, who maintained that they were serving God by whipping nature, animals, and black people into submission. And how convenient that they could obtain a slave work force while performing their sanctimonious acts. After all, there could exist no moral obligation towards any of those in league with the forces of chaos, darkness, or the devil.
THE DREADED COMPARISON

In the above passage by Aphra Behn we also see sign of the trend towards using comparison to an animal as an insult: "dogs, treacherous and cowardly..." Centuries later, an excerpt from an essay by James Baldwin exemplifies the integral part which this comparison has come to play in blacks' consciousness as they continue to struggle for equality:

The American triumph—in which the American tragedy has always been implicit—was to make Black people despise themselves. When I was little I despised myself; I did not know any better. And this meant, albeit unconsciously, or against my will, or in great pain, that I also despised my father. And my mother. And my brothers. And my sisters. Black people were killing each other every night out on Lenox Avenue, when I was growing up: and no one explained to them, or to me, that it was intended that they should; that they were penned where they were, like animals, in order that they should consider themselves no better than animals. Everything supported this sense of reality, nothing denied it; and so one was ready, when it came time to go to work, to be treated as a slave.5

All of this has a negative effect on the lives of human and non-human animals alike. As long as humans feel they are forced to defend their own rights and worth by placing someone beneath them, oppression will not end. This approach, at the very best, results only in an individual or group of people climbing up the ladder by pushing others down. There is evidence of this approach in the world today: racially motivated gang-wars among impoverished youth; in the United States, white working-class racist violence directed at working-class blacks, who suffer from the residual effects of slavery in the form of prejudice and job discrimination; in Britain, black youths attack Indian-owned businesses. It is unfortunately common that those who feel trapped within circumstances they feel powerless to change often quarrel among themselves, feeling even more powerless to impact those who actually make the laws, profit from the system, and exert great influence over economic opportunities.

But winding its way through the history of inequality within our culture has been another approach, which today grows ever stronger; its main tenet is that we cannot maintain that oppression is fine for some simply because they are not like us. Only through a rejection of violence and oppression themselves will we ever find a long-term "freedom and justice for all." It is not an "either-or" situation; the idea that one group will have its rights protected or respected only after another "more important" group is totally comfortable is finally being widely recognized as a delay tactic used by those resisting change. Women were told to keep waiting for years for their right to vote because other issues were "more important." Black people in the United States were told that their slavery was an "economic necessity" to be continued for the good of the country. Until the reforms of the early 1990's, blacks in South Africa were still being told that apartheid was necessary. Necessary for whom? Surely not the people who were living under this form of slavery.

With the exception of those who still cling—either overtly or subtly—to racist thought, most members of our society have reached the conclusion that it was and is wrong to treat blacks "like animals." But with regard to the animals themselves, most still feel that it is acceptable to treat them, to some degree or another, in exactly this same manner; to treat them, as we say, "like animals." That is, we have decided that treatment which is wholly unacceptable when received by a human being is in fact the proper manner in which to treat a non-human animal.
A line was arbitrarily drawn between white people and black people, a division which has since been rejected. But what of the line which has been drawn between human and non-human animals? We often behave as if there were a wide and bridgeless chasm, with humans on one side and all the rest of the animals on the other. Even our terminology reflects this attitude: we speak of “humans” in one breath, and in the next, lump all other animals into one grab-bag of a category entitled “non-human animals.” On what basis was this line drawn? Surely the line, if it need be drawn at all, could have been placed with equal or greater accuracy in any one of a number of places. We are, for instance, much closer genetically and behaviorally to other primates than non-human primates are to toads. So perhaps the line could be drawn after other primates. Or, the line could just as reasonably be drawn so as to separate all mammals from other creatures, for mammals share common attributes which other animals lack.

But one problem with this approach is that it presupposes some sort of “worst-to-best” ascension list, ranging from the “simplest” beings straight up to human beings—at the top, of course. This attempt to rank species reflects a chronic misinterpretation and misapplication of Darwin’s evolutionary theory, falsely concluding that humans are evolution’s “finished product.” On the contrary, Darwin’s Origin Of Species implied that humans were evolutionary first cousins to modern-day apes and orangutans, all distinctly and simultaneously evolving from a common ancestor, just as, for example, distinct species of cats branched off from an ancient feline form. Darwin went further, writing in his notebook that “animals may partake from our common origin in one ancestor... we may all be netted together.”

Darwin was even more specific in his views about the commonalities between other animals and the human species. “The senses and intuitions,” wrote Darwin in 1871, “the various emotions and faculties, such as love, memory, attention, curiosity, imitation, reason, etc. of which man boasts, may be found in an incipient, or sometimes even well-developed condition in,” as they were often called in Darwin’s day, “the lower animals.” He concluded that “there is no fundamental difference between man and the higher mammals in their mental faculties.”

Nevertheless, from the misconstrued concept that humans are evolutionarily better than animals it easily followed (to those who were predisposed to this position) that whites could be evolutionarily superior to blacks. In fact, based on the popularized (mis)interpretation of evolutionary theory came the trend of “Social Darwinism.” Darwin had spoken of natural selection in relation to adaptation, but the Social Darwinists—usually the powerful or wealthy—adopted natural selection as the key to “progress.” Darwin himself took great exception to this application of his theory, by which ruthless behavior towards different races, classes, or species could be rationalized and justified as being only a demonstration of evolution in action, a manifestation of “nature red in tooth and claw.”

Before the concept of evolution was widely known and accepted, religious doctrine—which placed (“civilized,” white, Christian) humans above all other beings—served as a justification for the subjugation of both blacks (whom pro-slavery writers and orators often claimed were of a different species!) and non-human animals; this subjugation was said to be ordained by God. Later, under the banner of Social Darwinism, both the unmitigated violence towards the “lower” animals and the enslavement of black “savages” in Africa were looked at as expressions of an evolutionary birthright.

Common only a quarter-century ago were charts depicting the evolution of primates from distant ancestors, up through
various hominids, to a black person, and finally to a fully upright Aryan male. Without much of an uproar over their scientifically-cloaked, subtly racist message (nor their poor science with regard to human evolution, human biology, and our relation to other modern primates), these charts were quietly retired. But they might give us some reason to pause as we consider a similar ranking system which places all humans up on the evolutionary pedestal, to the exclusion of other animals.

As we have seen, Darwin himself believed that evolutionary history is no basis for deciding “who is better than whom.” Evolution occurs as the result of genetic mutations and there is no moral basis for declaring that the mutated form is better than the unmutated ancestral form. But even comparison of a modern species to its own evolutionary predecessors makes better sense than what is usually attempted: comparison of humans to other animals from completely different biological families, in an effort to determine “which is best.” Actually, in evolutionary time, humans are relatively new additions to the landscape; our current stage of development finds us without a harmonious or stable position within an ecosystem. Nor have we yet “worked out” all the quirks in our physiology or behavior, leaving our species with significant problems which simply don’t exist for the members of most other highly complex species.

But is any of this relevant in determining if humans or any other animals are “worthy” of moral consideration? What are the qualities which a being need possess before treating them “like an animal” would be unacceptable? The more we learn about the earth’s environment, its ecosystems, and the creatures who live here, the more we see the absurdity in the concept of ranking species against one another. All life on earth is inextricably bound together in a web of mutual interdependence. Within that web, each species of animal has a niche for which it is more or less adapted, and attributes which others lack. It is only an anthropocentric world view which makes qualities possessed by humans to be those by which all other species are measured.

If the earth was suddenly colonized by a species more powerful and bellicose than human beings, they could just as easily use attributes special to themselves when devising their ranking system. Let us suppose that by chance the aliens closely resembled a member of the cat family. They might decide to use the ability to see in near-darkness as the determining factor for who was worthy of freedom and who would be exterminated or enslaved. Measured against the standards of the alien cats, virtually all humans would be miserably lacking and, if those cats were anything like us when it came to ethics, humans would spend their lives in bondage. Their use of night-vision as a criterion would only be as self-biased as the criteria which we have decided to use. But it is we rather than the alien cousins of cats who are presently calling the shots, and as such we have made those characteristics which are claimed to be exclusively human attributes the requirements for moral consideration.

Many philosophers have clearly comprehended our bias. In the sixteenth century, Michel Eyquem de Montaigne wrote extensively on the subject. “I see some animals,” Montaigne reflected, “that live so entire and perfect as life, some without sight, others without hearing: who knows whether to us also one, two, or three, or many other senses, may not be wanting.” 98 Some two centuries later, Lichtenberg made it clear that he thought it foolish to unfavorably judge another creature by human standards. Equally foolish was it to believe that human attributes were any more or less remarkable than those special to another species. “The most accomplished monkey,” observed Lichtenberg, “cannot draw a monkey, this too only man can do; just as it is also only man who regards his ability to do this as a
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It is only human arrogance that is able to find beauty and perfection exclusively in those things human. "Just as foolish," continued Lichtenberg, "as it must look to a crab when it sees a man walk forward." 10

Despite periodic voices of reason, action and tradition still demanded proof of our "superiority," in the form of vital differences, that would provide justification for man's dominion over the animals. What are those elusive solely-human qualities? Included among a veritable laundry list of attributes compiled in this exhaustive search for exclusivity are the ability to feel pain, to feel emotions, to reason, the possession of a soul, the ability to make free choices, and to speak a language—all claimed at one time or another to be features unique to human beings. 11

In direct conflict with Darwin's views on the subject were those espoused, two centuries earlier, by René Descartes, a stalwart proponent of human superiority over non-human animals. Descartes believed animals lacked souls (while humans possessed them), intelligence, and even the ability to feel—pleasure, pain, or anything. If you struck one, the animal would cry out only in the same manner as a clock would chime, as a result of the workings of similar internal mechanisms. Bolstered by such Cartesian philosophy, physiological experiments on animals became an even more macabre endeavor, since any cries, any displays of suffering or efforts to escape, were viewed as the sounds and movements of veritable wind-up toys.

While very few people today would publicly declare themselves in agreement with such extreme views, in our treatment of most non-human animals, we still behave like true Cartesians. And while most people, I believe, informally and in theory agree with Darwin's views which recognize that animals are thinking, feeling beings, we still search for the moral loophole—the quality or qualities possessed by humans and lacked by non-human animals—that will enable us to find a defensible reason to justify continuing to treat animals "like animals." Yet all false claims of behavioral uniqueness and exclusivity are easily dismissed with common sense and unprejudiced observation. On the subject of reason, one modern essayist argued:

Although animals are unable to do algebra, they are able to make rational decisions regarding their own interests. Dogs, for example, would never be so irrational as to intentionally inhale smoke; they must be forced to do this by contemporary "researchers." I think it is safe to say that animals, in their own way, are at least as reasonable—that is, rational in pursuit of their own interests—as human beings. 12

Attempts at moral disqualification on the basis of reason have not been used to exclude only non-human animals from the sphere of consideration. For centuries, black people were called "irrational," and this was used both as a reason to continue their "protective custody" (in the form of slavery), and to justify their virtually limitless abuse. Just as this claim has been popularly abandoned with regard to blacks, so too is it finally being widely disproved and retired with regard to animals.

Anyone who has spent time around animals knows that they both communicate with each other and try, with varying degrees of success, to communicate with our species. Montaigne suggested that both they and we fail equally at attempts to bridge the inter-species communication gap, and are equally frustrated. "This defect that hinders communication between them and us, why is it not just as much ours as theirs?" he asked. "We have some mediocre understanding of their meaning; so do they of ours, in about the same degree. They flatter us, threaten us, implore us, and we them." 13
Not a hundred years later, Descartes, in his determined way, drew an altogether different conclusion. "All human beings," he began, "no matter how dull or stupid, even madmen, can arrange various words together and fashion them into a discourse... Contrariwise," he continued,

no animal however perfect or well-bred can do anything of the sort. This is not simply because they lack the right organs, because magpies and parrots can learn to utter words as well as we can... and people born deaf and mute—who are at least as handicapped as the beasts are—have the custom of inventing their own signs, with which they communicate.14

"It seems incredible," concluded Descartes, "that the very best and brightest of monkeys or parrots could not learn to speak as well as the stupidest child... unless their souls were of an entirely different nature from our own."15

With the continued exception of some species of birds, animals still lack, of course, the vocal chords needed for verbal communication on our terms. Yet some of us are communicating with animals in ways which would make even Descartes take notice. Chimpanzees, orangutans, and gorillas have all been taught to communicate with humans through American Sign Language. Washoe, the first chimp to learn ASL, taught her adopted baby to sign. Perhaps best known is a gorilla named Koko, who since 1972 has been communicating with scientist Francine Patterson. Koko has a vocabulary in ASL of over 1000 words and understands spoken English, using ASL to respond. She can also read some printed words, including her own name, and creates new compound words to express thoughts and feelings her taught vocabulary did not provide for.

It's not only primates who are capable of such "human" communication. Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson cites the case of a parrot who unquestionably disproves the accepted belief that these birds can only repeat, devoid of context, remembered phrases. Left by his trainer at a veterinarian's office, the parrot pleaded, "Come here. I love you. I'm sorry. I want to go back."16

Yet even if some vast, undeniable distinction between humans and animals could finally be found, would that mean that we could then justify using, mistreating, even torturing, animals? Could we then say, as did eighteenth-century writer Thomas Love Peacock, that "nothing could be more obvious, than that all animals were created solely and exclusively for the use of man"?17 From any perspective other than one predisposed to slave-holding, we could not; that special, mythical quality or attribute that was the sole domain of humans would still be irrelevant. For what does someone's ability to speak French, drive a car, see in the dark, do algebraic equations, or use a tool, have to do with whether or not it is acceptable or just to enslave, torture, or in some other way inflict cruelty upon them? The only relevant requirement which should be necessary to keep us from unnecessarily inflicting pain and suffering on someone is that individual's ability to feel pain and to suffer. Similarly, the only qualification individuals should need to make it wrong for us to dominate their lives is that they possess life, that they are alive. All of these other questions of abilities and attributes can fill philosophy books, but are, for these issues, irrelevant.

This is not intended to oversimplify matters and to imply that the oppressions experienced by blacks and animals have taken identical forms. A complex web of social, political, and economic factors sustained slavery and made possible the life of a slave as it was known. This book in no way attempts to make the case that these factors are the same for animals; there are
distinct social, political, and economic factors which create and support the subjugation of animals, as well as differences between the possible manners in which blacks and animals could respond to their respective enslavements. But, as divergent as the cruelties and the supporting systems of oppression may be, there are commonalities between them. They share the same basic essence, they are built around the same basic relationship—that between oppressor and oppressed.

So, even though we may think of the experiences of black people in this country as being unique—as are, really, the experiences and reactions of every individual—there are many disturbing similarities between their treatment at the hands of white people in the United States and the treatment of animals at the hands of a large sector of the American population. Indeed, just as humans are oppressed the world over, animals receive poor treatment in nearly every human culture on earth.
Further, any oppression helps to support other forms of domination. This is why it is vital to link oppressions in our minds, to look for the common, shared aspects, and work against them as one, rather than prioritizing victims' suffering—(what we have already identified as the “either-or” pitfall). For when we prioritize we are in effect becoming one with the “master.” We are deciding that one individual or group is more important than another, deciding that one individual’s pain is less important than that of the next. A common result of prioritization is infighting among the oppressed or defenders of the oppressed, doing tragically little to upset the very foundations of cruelty.

Comparing the suffering of animals to that of blacks (or any other oppressed group) is offensive only to the speciesist: one who has embraced the false notions of what animals are like. Those who are offended by comparison to a fellow sufferer have unquestioningly accepted the biased worldview presented by the masters. To deny our similarities to animals is to deny and undermine our own power. It is to continue actively struggling to prove to our masters, past or present, that we are similar to those who have abused us, rather than to our fellow victims, those whom our masters have also victimized.

Let us remember that to those with a master mentality, there is often very little difference between one victim and the next. When both blacks and animals are viewed as being “oppressible,” the cruelties perpetrated upon them take similar forms. Later we will explore whether these similarities are due to mere chance or to something which operates deep in the minds of the masters. In the meantime, let us note that the domination of animals, which was being honed to a clumsy science centuries before black slavery in America began, was in many cases used as a prototype for the subjugation of blacks. So observed Keith Thomas in his important study *Man and the Natural World*:

Once perceived as beasts, people were liable to be treated accordingly. The ethic of human domination removed animals from the sphere of human concern. But it also legitimized the ill-treatment of humans who were in a supposedly animal condition. In the colonies, slavery, with its markets, its brandings and its constant labor, was one way of dealing with men thought to be beastly. The Portuguese, reported one English traveler, marked slaves “as we do sheep, with a hot iron,” and at the slave market at Constantinople, Moryson saw the buyers taking their slaves indoors to inspect them naked, handling them “as we handle beasts, to know their fatness and strength.”

The suffering animals currently endure at the hands of human beings in laboratories, on “factory farms,” as pets, and in the wild, sadly parallels that endured by black people in the antebellum United States and during the lingering postbellum period. The parallels of experience are numerous. Both humans and animals share the ability to suffer from restricted freedom of movement, from the loss of social freedom, and to experience pain at the loss of a loved one. Both groups suffer or suffered from their common capacity to be terrified by being hunted, tormented, or injured. Both have been “objectified,” treated as property rather than as feeling, self-directed individuals. And both blacks, under the system of slavery, and animals were driven to a state of total psychic and physical defeat, as a result of all or some of the variables mentioned above. (With animals, of course, this continues today in its most extreme form.)

From all of this we see that the liberation of animals, while a pressing and worthy goal in its own right, is not of importance only to non-human animals. While people are no longer branded, inspected at auction, or displayed in zoos, subtler forms
of oppression are still in operation which have their counterparts in animals' slavery. Advances towards releasing animals from our domination and control of their lives will also serve to lessen the oppression of blacks and others who suffer under the weight of someone else's power. By eliminating the oppression of animals from the fabric of our culture, we begin to undermine some of the psychological structures inherent in a society which seems to create and foster masters. With a philosophy of universal respect for others' lives, treating anyone—human or non-human—in a cruel manner begins to be unthinkable.

The views presented in this book of such eminent thinkers, writers, and activists as Frederick Douglass, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Richard Wright, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, and many others, show us that they were acutely aware of the similarities between human and animal slavery. Let us follow their example and begin to reject oppression in all its forms.

[Slaves] have been treated by the law upon the same footing as in England, for example, the... animals are still. The day may come when the rest of animal creation may acquire those rights which could never have been withheld from them but by the hand of tyranny. [Some] have already discovered that the blackness of skin is no reason why a human being should be abandoned without redress to the caprice of a tormentor. It may come one day to be recognized, that the number of legs, the villosity of the skin, or the termination of the os sacrum, are reasons equally insufficient for abandoning a sensitive being to the same fate... The question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?

—Jeremy Bentham, The Principles of Morals and Legislation, 1789

Lasting testimony to the severity of white oppression of blacks can be found in American literature. Not surprisingly, this literature also preserves tangible evidence of the intermingling, in the minds of some whites, of the two groups with which we are here concerned: blacks and non-human animals.

Because society's opinion of animals was so low, racist authors and anti-abolitionists propagandized against blacks by comparing them to negative stereotypes of non-human animals. Even today, we are still familiar with some of the negatively-charged animal names black people have been called: buck, fox, monkey, ape, and coon—imbued with none of the respect with which Native Americans gave to the use of animal names.
There are now between four and five millions of negroes in the United States. They or their descendants must remain forever—for good or evil—an element of our population. What are their natural relations to the whites?—what their normal condition?

The Almighty has obviously designed all his creatures—animal as well as human—for wise, beneficent, and useful purposes. In our ignorance of the animal world, we have only domesticated or applied to useful purposes a very small number, the horse, the ox, ass, dog, etc... The most ignorant farmer or laborer... knows the natures of these animals... and governs them accordingly.

[In the South] our people have practically solved their natural relations to the inferior race, and placed or rather retained the negro in his normal condition, ... in domestic subordination and social adaptation, corresponding with [negroes'] wants, their instincts, their faculties, the nature with which God has endowed them.


In his book Cruelty, Philip P. Hallie defines what to him is the essence of slavery:

People, not by virtue of their individual weaknesses or strengths, are put in the position of being as passive as grocers. When they are "good" they are good by the white master's standards for chattel, and their highest goals must be to satisfy his standards, the way a hard-working mule is a good mule... Utter passivity in total independence of individual traits, under the will of the white man—this was American slavery.25

Likewise, we might look at the relationship between a dog and his master, just one example of what is sometimes a modern slave/master-owner relationship. The dog is considered by his owner to be a "good dog" if he walks to heel, displays no great interest when nearing other dogs, doesn't run except when allowed, doesn't bark except when required, and has no emotional needs except when desired by the master. Many dogs spend their entire lives in isolation, chained to a slab of concrete or a tree in their master's backyard. If a dog wishes to do something other than what pleases his master—play with other dogs (socialize), for instance—he may be beaten or otherwise punished. All independent actions are thus discouraged, and the dog learns that he will win approval—and avoid future beatings or other punishments—by suppressing his own desires and conforming to those of the omnipotent human who legally owns him. If at any point the master grows tired of his slave, he can simply be turned over to "the pound," which euphemistically
means that he will be quietly and secretly killed. Or if he is purebred, a high-quality slave, the master may sell him over to a new owner.

Another element of both human and animal slavery concerns the slave’s inability to establish personal security or safety. In the slave/master relationship, there are no permanent rewards for fulfilling the master’s expectations; rather than engendering gratitude, exceptional performance merely raises expectations. In his essay “Picking Cotton...”, Solomon Northrup wrote of what this meant:

A slave never approaches the gin house with his basket of cotton but with fear. If it falls short in weight—if he has not performed the full task appointed him, he knows that he must suffer. And if he has exceeded it by ten or twenty pounds, in all probability his master will measure his next day’s task accordingly.26

In order to see the similarities between this and what some animals face, let us look at the example of a “dairy cow”, and examine just one facet of her life: milk production. A dairy cow is expected to produce a certain number of pounds of milk per day and, in the long-run, a certain tonnage per year. As she grows older, or perhaps suffers from an illness, she becomes less productive, ceasing to make as large a profit for her owner as she once did. Eventually, despite her years of service, when her milk output drops below a certain point of profitability she is sold and slaughtered. If at some point during her life she outdoes herself by producing more than the expected amount of milk, this is the standard by which she will thereafter be judged; more likely than not, her high productivity will result in her being used in intensive super-ovulation breeding programs as well.
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It is clear from these few examples that the slavery-related sufferings of black people are often paralleled by the sufferings of animals lost in the machinery of modern institutionalized cruelty. Innumerable other parallels exist, from the disruption of self-regulated reproduction; to birth and the consequential destruction of the familial structure; throughout life and the many cruelties, such as vivisection and hunting, to which individuals are subjected.

By viewing the experiences of animals—such as dogs and "milk cows"—through the lens of human slavery, we come to realize that master/slave relationships permeate our culture. Cultural blinders hinder our ability to see society's (current) slaves as the individuals they are, while simultaneously obscuring our own motivations from us. Whether it is a white master brutally punishing his slave for using a tone of voice he doesn't like, or a dairy farmer slaughtering his cows, the ramifications are immense. Weaving these disparate relationships together is a common thread: only the master's perspective is considered.

[The horse] is by Nature a very lazy animal whose idea of heaven is an enormous field of lush grass in which he can graze undisturbed until his belly is full, and after a pleasant doze can start filling himself up all over again.

—Captain Elwin Hartley Edwards, From Paddock to Saddle, 1972

The Negro if left to himself will not work, he will lie down and bask in the sun... It is very evident that [if slavery were abolished]... the free white operative would be compelled to pay all the expenses necessary to support this idle, drunken, lazy population.

—John Campbell, Negromania, 1851

SOCIAL RELATIONS: THE DESTRUCTION OF SECURITY

The first instinct the farmer frustrates in all animals... is that of the newborn animal turning to its mother for protection and comfort and, in some cases, for food. The chick comes out of the incubator and never sees a hen; the calf which is to be fattened for veal or beef is taken from the cow at birth, or very soon after; and even the piglet is weaned far earlier now than it used to be. The factors controlling this are mainly economic.

—Ruth Harrison, Animal Machines, 1964

I never saw my mother, to know her as such, more than four or five times in my life; and each of these times was very short in duration, and at night. She was hired by a Mr. Stewart who lived about 12 miles from my home. She made her journeys to see me in the night, traveling the whole distance on foot, after the performance of her day's work. She was a field hand, and a whipping is the penalty of not being in the field at sunrise... I do not recollect of ever seeing my mother in the light of day.

—Frederick Douglass, An American Slave, 1845

One of the most tragic aspects of life as a slave comes about through destruction of the family, and in a larger sense, the social structure. In the time of the African slave trade,
it was common to kidnap children while their parents were off gathering food or tending to some other chore. Once kidnapped, the children would be sold “down the coast;” if they survived the ordeal which followed, they would eventually end up on a Southern plantation. Thus, relationships with their entire families—extended and immediate—were at once ended; the family was never reunited.

In the States, families formed under the institution of slavery were subject to different destructive practices. “Little children,” writes one historian, “were torn from their mothers’ arms soon after they were weaned, to be kept... as ‘a pet’” by privileged Southern women. Slaves were brought to auction: children sold away from their mothers, husbands away from their wives, lovers auctioned off separately. A witness to a slave auction in 1853 recorded the following conversation with a 25-year-old female slave with three children who was to be sold that day:

“It was often remarked that the affection of the slaves was stronger toward the whites than toward their own offspring.”

—Thomas Nelson Page, The Negro: The Southerner’s Problem, 1904

If a slave gave birth to her child at the same time as the mistress of the plantation, she had to nurse the white child rather than her own.

One of the traders asked her what was the matter with her eyes? Wiping away the tears, she replied, “I s’pose I have been crying.” “Why do you cry?” “Because I have left my man behind, and his master won’t let him come along.” “Oh, if I buy you, I will furnish you with a better husband, or man, as you call him, than your old one.” “I don’t want any better and I won’t have any other as long as he lives.” “Oh, but you will though, if I buy you.”

It can only be guessed at whether these practices were employed to give blacks a sense of total defeat and hopelessness in an effort to forestall rebellion, or if they were perpetrated upon blacks “merely” through obtuse callousness on the part of slave-owners. It would seem that in most cases the latter explanation held true, because of then-common perceptions. In the eyes of the white slave-holders, black people were “just animals,”

“Veal” calves, separated from their mothers after birth, chained to their stalls. Their mothers’ milk is consumed by humans.
who could soon get over separation from a child or other loved one. In fact, when dealing with the subject of intimate relationships between blacks, antebellum racist thinkers denied that love existed. They maintained that it was just “animal lust” and “animal attraction” which were responsible for intimate bonding between two slaves, two more examples of metaphors based in societal speciesism.

Similarly, most people today find it hard to accept the notion that non-human animals feel love for one another as individuals. Even life-long pairing is dismissed as “instinct.” Anyone who has heard the protracted, pained protestations of a cow and her calf who have been separated might have had to give it a second thought, but it seems we assume that as soon as the outward signs of suffering have died down, so too have the inner torment and pain. And if it is true that the pain lingers in so verbal an animal as a human being, for whom vocalization of anguish is “standard” behavior, what are we to surmise when hypothesizing about a much less verbal animal such as a cow, for whom vocalization of anguish is naturally a much rarer event, and by whom pain is usually suffered in silence?

Every day, in countless ways, humans destroy the relationships of other animals. In the wild, sport hunters randomly shoot the mates of waterfowl, some of whom pair for life. Often, the surviving mate dies of starvation while mourning. In the annual Canadian harp seal slaughter, hunters have been filmed wielding screaming baby seals like clubs to attack the pups’ own mothers, before smashing the young pups to death on the ice. Using methods which often mirror those used in the human slave trade, we violently destroy primate communities in order to capture the infants for display in zoos, use in laboratories, or lives of captivity as pets. The strategy is to kill the mothers and other protective adults, leaving the infants defenseless, and at least ten chimps die for every infant that survives more than a year at its final destination overseas. This is not an activity new to the twentieth century; nineteenth-century philosopher and educator Professor J. Howard Moore wrote with empathy about the frantic anguish of a mother monkey as she tried unsuccessfully to defend her wounded and dying baby from the man who would soon kill her as well. Moore concluded that most “human beings...are inclined to pass over lightly all displays of feeling” by these fellow primates.

In breeding facilities for laboratories, we “produce” millions of rodents—mice, rats and rabbits—each year, delivered by caesarean section into individual cages, to provide scientists with “sterile” animals who have never been allowed contact with another of their kind. There is even an entire area of psychological experimentation—“maternal deprivation”—in which researchers create and observe in animals extreme cases of mother-child separation and pathology. Although many different species of animals have been used in these studies, non-human primates are the favorite victim of researchers’ curiosity. From the published results of one such experiment comes the following:

Separation of mother and infant monkeys is an extremely stressful event for both mother and infant, as well as... for all other monkeys [nearby]. The mother becomes ferocious toward attendants and extremely protective of her infant. The infant's screams can be heard almost over the entire building. The mother struggles and attacks the separators. The baby clings tightly to the mother and to any object to
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MONKEYS USED FOR RESEARCH

which it can grasp to avoid being held or removed by the attendants. With the baby gone, the mother paces the cage almost constantly, charges the cage occasionally, bites at it, and makes continual attempts to escape. The infant emits...shri... scream intermittently and almost continuously for the period of separation.31

In food production the tragedy continues. Chicks never see a hen; pigs have but a brief interlude with their mother sow, who is kept tethered to a metal stall to ensure minimal calorie-burning and food consumption. Dairy cows are artificially inseminated (and thus deprived of any contact with a bull) to produce a long succession of calves needed to stimulate milk production, only to have each calf ripped away from her immediately following birth. If the calf is a male—and is not needed for veal production—he will be immediately killed. If female, the calf may have the same fate as her mother: life in a milk factory, doomed to churn out babies she will never nuzzle, never run with in a field.

Lawdy, lawdy, them was tibbollashuns! Wunner dese here womans was my Antie en she say dat she skacely call to min he e' whoppin' her, 'case she was er breeder woman en' brought in chillun ev'y twelve mont's jes lak a cow bringin' in a calf...

—Martha Jackson, (born 1850), in Alabama Narratives

Do you think nothing of their families left behind? Of the connections broken? Of the friendships, attachments, and relationships that are burst asunder?

—William Pitt, Speech on the Slave Trade, House of Commons, 2 April 1792

TRANSPORTATION, OR THE UNBEARABLE JOURNEY

Deponent further sayeth The Bella I left the Guinea Coast with a cargo of five hundred blacks and odd for the barracoons of Florida:

"That there was hardly room 'tween-decks for half the sweltering cattle stowed spoon-fashion there; that some went mad of thirst and tore their flesh and sucked the blood..."

—Robert Hayden, from his poem Middle Passage

Sheep boarding ship for voyage from Australia to Middle East
Animals that die in transit do not die easy deaths. They freeze to death in winter and collapse from thirst and heat exhaustion in summer. They die, lying unattended in stockyards, from injuries sustained in falling off a slippery loading ramp. They suffocate when other animals pile on top of them in an overcrowded, badly loaded truck. They die from thirst or starve when careless stockmen forget to give them water or food. And they die from the sheer stress of the whole terrifying experience, for which nothing in their life has given them the slightest preparation.

—Peter Singer, 1974

It is known that... where they carry the prisoners to the ships, those on land weep copiously, horrified and fearful of the violence that is done to them, seeing that in addition to taking men against their will, they treat them very inhumanely on the ships, whence a great number die suffocated by their own stench and from other bad treatment. There was one night in which thirty died on one ship in port because they would not open the hatch for fear [the slaves] would escape, no matter how loudly those below shouted for them to open because they were dying; the only response they received was to be called dogs and similar names.

—A Portuguese Clergyman of the Eighteenth Century.33

Only about fifteen million of some thirty or forty million black Africans survived the ordeal of capture and transport to become slaves in the Western Hemisphere. Those who survived had managed to live through the hellish “Middle Passage,” transport by cargo boat to the New World. When demand for slaves soared in the eighteenth century, those ship captains who “tight-packed” their human cargo won out over the “loose-
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packers.” Many historical accounts indicate that two and sometimes three tiers of slave holding-areas were built in a six-foot hold. Reverend John Newton, author of the hymn beginning “How sweet the name of Jesus sounds,” instead described the area below deck as being sometimes five-feet or less in height, and “divided towards the middle, for the slaves lie in two rows, one above the other, close to each other like books upon a shelf.”

Newton’s account is certainly first-hand; before going on to become a pioneer in the movement to abolish the slave trade, he was a mate and then a master of a slave ship. Slaves were frequently so tightly packed, even on the journeys of this comparatively pious master—who forbade swearing among his crew and read the liturgy with them every Sunday—that, in Newton’s own words, “the shelf would not easily contain one more.”

The slave-holds, sometimes called “kennels,” were constructed of unplanned boards, and the newly-captured slaves were provided with no bedding for their journey; in a stormy passage, “the skin over their elbows might be worn down to the bare bones.” The above conditions, coupled with poor ventilation and a total absence of sanitation, made death from septic wounds and epidemics the norm.

Today, it is common to call such a ship a “cattle boat,” just as Jews and others were transported to the concentration camps in what have frequently been referred to as “cattle cars.” Once again, this is not just an eccentricity of our language. One historian, in fact, writing about the Middle Passage, saw fit to comment that “the slaves were treated like cattle.” Cattle, and other animals, are indeed transported in vehicles such as these, in no greater comfort than their historical human counterparts.

Steers are shipped, without regard to summer heat or winter cold, distances as great as 2,000 miles. Sometimes they experience such a journey several times in their short lives, shipped from auction, to feedlot, to auction, and finally to the slaughterhouse—their final destination. The stress of transport

THE UNBEARABLE JOURNEY

These monkeys—destined for vivisection—died in transit.

Many slaves spent the entire voyage from Africa to America in positions similar to this.
Parallels between the human and animal slave trades can also be seen in international wild animal trafficking, a multi-billion-dollar business. The wild animal trade caters to those seeking exotics for pets, private hunting parks, display in zoos, and use in medical and psychological experimentation. Animals are frequently smuggled across borders—bound and gagged—hidden in luggage, inside tires or upholstery, or in the cargo holds of airplanes and ships. Mortality is high, but the profit on the sale of the survivors is as well.

It is not only in our day that the similarities between the trade in humans and animals have been recognized. However, we might take heart that the conclusions drawn from such recognition are, in our own time, becoming more enlightened than those in the not-so-distant past. In one incident on record from the period of legal trade in human beings, the owners of a shipment of slaves sought to collect insurance for slaves thrown overboard in the course of the overseas passage. "The jury found for the owners, since," noted an historian upon examination of the records, "they had no doubt... that the case of slaves was the same as if horses had been thrown overboard."

Other domestic animals are subjected to even more intensive conditions during their lives than are "beef" cows. The horrors of the Middle Passage, with its cramped conditions, pools of excrement and urine, "acceptable" mortality-rates, seemingly interminable length of duration, and finally insanity leading to violence and cannibalism, have been projected into modernity in the form of factory farming. Sows are chained or clamped into narrow farrowing stalls for months and years on end, to conserve space and food-calorie energy expenditure. Chickens, and increasingly pigs, are stacked 3, 4, or 5 tiers high in rows of tiny "battery" cages. Pigs' tails are "docked"—cut off without anesthesia—to prevent stress-induced tail-biting.
Australia, the world's largest producer of wool, annually ships seven million sheep to the Middle East on tightly packed "slave ships," with 50,000 or more sheep on each three-week boat trip. Aside from the "usual" deaths which occur on these journeys, there are periodic disasters (disease, fire, ventilation-system breakdown) which result in the deaths of thousands. Upon reaching their destination, those who survived are killed in the Moslem "Halal" ritualistic slaughter style, typically a more protracted and painful process than most commercial slaughter, or even Kosher slaughter, which has itself become known for its unnecessary cruelty.

In the United States (as in much of the world), animals on the way to the slaughterhouse are usually not fed as this would "waste" food, the cost of which those in the industry would rather keep as profit. Depending on the distance between the farm or feedlot and the slaughterhouse which will pay the most, animals may travel 12, 36, or even 72 hours.

When those blacks who did survive Middle Passage reached the shore, what awaited them was the terror of the slave market or auction, and a life of slavery. When animals reach the end of their journey, what awaits them is either imprisonment or isolation in human society, torture, or the ultimate extreme to which slavery can be taken: the deprivation of life itself—slaughter.

The deck, that is, the floor of their rooms [in the slave ship], was so covered with the blood and mucus which had proceeded from them in consequence of the flux, that it resembled a slaughterhouse.

—Dr. Alexander Falconbridge,
An Account of the Slave Trade on the Coast of Africa, 1788

Hunting

Two men on a drunken hunting trip failed to find any deer and instead cold-bloodedly murdered a deaf black man, yesterday as he walked along a railroad track in Chico.

—Los Angeles Times

Hunting. A seemingly straightforward word, but one which connotes many often contradictory images. A carefree day in the woods with "the boys"? A show of skill? A demonstration of absolute power over someone else: the ability to end someone's life. Many people are uncomfortable with the pronoun someone being used to refer to a non-human animal. Perhaps they feel more comfortable with the term something. But a thing doesn't have a life. If you shoot it, it doesn't die because it was never alive. It can't bleed, it can't feel pain. Perhaps it was once alive, but now dead it is a thing. A corpse is a thing. So hunting can be looked at as turning someone into something. Turning a vital, living being with a past and a potential future into a corpse. It takes the independent relatively autonomous (uncontrolled) being and turns her or him into an object, something which is no longer capable of any independent thought or action. And in this way the hunter has proven himself. He has proven that he has the power, the ultimate power of life and death, and can exert it over someone else.

In the following passage from the book Black Like Me, the author, John Howard Griffin, relates an experience he had which amply illustrates that what is of essence here is not the species of prey, but the issue of power. The outcome of who will
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Today, recreational hunting is participated in by a relatively small percentage of the population; most people don’t hunt and don’t want to. Yet laws are geared to accommodate the minority. How have the interests of so few come to overshadow the beliefs of the majority? The answer lies with each state’s Fish, Game, and Wildlife Service, in whose hands the fate of the nation’s animals is primarily held. Staffed and administered largely by pro-hunting “sportsmen,” these agencies operate with the underlying premise that the nation’s wildlife exists for the pleasure of the sportsman minority.

Notably, traditional, culturally-intact Native Americans and many other aboriginal peoples hunted out of real necessity, with respect for, and in harmony with, the balance of nature. Theirs was not a profane act, nor an unconscious attempt to symbolically conquer chaos. Hunting as an exercise of power is a completely different act, one which only serves to further and further upset the balance of nature, the balance of humans to nature, and ultimately, the balance of humans themselves. It is not sufficient to pay lip-service to the concept of respect and harmony prior to (let me here run the risk of exaggeration) switching off the television set, grabbing a beer, and driving to the woods to blow away a deer. Harmony and respect were central to an entire world-view, a view of the universe, with which the very lives of Native Americans were imbued, from birth until death, and, in their philosophy, from death until rebirth.

The act of hunting, as performed in the manner explored in this chapter, was, and continues to be, an expression of the power which the ruling race or species exerts over the powerless. Prior to 1863 it was recognized that hunting down black people—“slaves”—was a sanctioned act. Perhaps our society will soon realize, with due horror, that we have been late in extending our respect and consideration to all of those who need protection.

VIVISECTION

They administered beatings to dogs with perfect indifference, and made fun of those who pitied the creatures as if they felt pain. They said the animals were clocks; that the cries they emitted when struck, were only the noise of a little string that had been touched, but that the whole body was without feeling. They nailed poor animals up on boards by their four paws to vivisect them and see the circulation of the blood which was a great subject of controversy.

—Nicholas Fontaine, Memoires pour servir a l’histoire de Port-Royal, 1738

Negroes... are void of sensibility to a surprising degree. They are not subject to nervous diseases. They sleep sound in every disease, nor does any mental disturbance ever keep them awake. They bear chirurgical operations much better than white people, and what would be the cause of unsupportable pain to a white man, a Negro would almost disregard.

—Dr. Mosely, Treatise on Tropical Diseases, 1787

The term “vivisection” means “live dissection,” but has come to be used to define any experiment performed on a living creature, human or non-human. This includes burning, freezing, non-therapeutic operations, studies which involve inducing disease or intentional injuries in a healthy individual, psychology experiments, drug testing, and virtually any other procedure which involves tinkering with someone’s life in a non-therapeutic manner.
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Speculum oris, used to pry open the mouths of suicidal slaves

Currently, each year in the United States alone, at least 30 million non-human animals die at the hands of scientists and laboratory technicians, and in breeding facilities which service our nations laboratories. That's about one animal every second of every day. In Great Britain an animal dies in a lab once every ten seconds.

Animals are used extensively in commercial product testing. They have been strapped into simulated car-crash devices, impacted repeatedly to test brain damage at different velocities. They have new hair sprays, oven cleaners, shampoos, and other consumer and industrial products fed to them, sprayed into their eyes, and injected under their skin, to test for levels of toxicity. While not required by law, these latter tests are routinely conducted—primarily to reduce legal liability in the case of poisoning—when synthetic or otherwise potentially-dangerous materials are used in manufacturing. (Many firms have again begun manufacturing products from natural, nontoxic ingredients, and do not test their products on animals.)

Experiments performed under the auspices of medical research can include anything from studies in “learned helplessness,” to experimental surgery, to the observation of the results of “noxious stimuli” on unanesthetized animals, burn studies in which “test-subjects” are created by blowtorching live animals, to the inducement of diseases and the testing of new drugs for drug and chemical companies.

Of the above, learned helplessness experiments are perhaps the least known to the public. In this area of psychological research, animals are punished, inescapably and usually with electric shocks, for normal behavior such as trying to eat food after they have been starved, or for trying to escape from another source of pain. Eventually, researchers find that with enough random and inescapable punishment, animals can be made to...
Chimpanzee infected with syphilis in experiment

**Tuskegee Syphilis Study:**

*above:* An unidentified subject receives a spinal tap.

*below left:* Case of ulcerated cutaneous syphilis on leg, photographed from rear.

*below right:* Case of ulcerated cutaneous syphilis on right arm.
stop trying to get away from the source of their torment, even after the barriers which originally prevented their escape have been removed.

Without any mandatory or established system for sharing protocols or experiment results, there is a vast duplication of research; similar—even identical—studies are performed at facilities throughout the nation and the world. Relatively few studies are significant enough (even within the researchers’ own fields of study) to ever reach publication in a medical journal, much less achieve any degree of relevant application.

At a rally in San Francisco protesting the use of animals in research, Alameda County supervisor John George said, “My people were the first laboratory animals in America.” Indeed, blacks suffered at the hands of scientists just as animals continue to do today. Perhaps the best documented and widely known example of medical experimentation on black people is the Tuskegee Syphilis Study.\textsuperscript{55} It was, in fact, the longest involuntary experiment performed on human beings in medical history.

Funded by the U.S. Public Health Service, the study was conducted in Macon County, Alabama, beginning in 1932. This was a very poor, rural area where living conditions for the black cotton-field workers were not too different from when slavery was still legal. The white scientists, working with the racist hypothesis that syphilis affected whites and blacks differently, observed the course of untreated syphilis in the black male for forty years, until the experiment was exposed by a journalist and finally ended and investigated. The men were never told they had syphilis, were not offered any treatment, nor were they told how the disease was transmitted.

Richard Wright, renowned author of \textit{Native Son}, worked as a menial laborer in what he would only identify as “one of the largest and wealthiest hospitals in Chicago.” In this excerpt from his essay “The Man Who Went to Chicago” he gives us a glimpse into his reaction to his experiences there:

Each Saturday morning I assisted a... doctor in slitting the vocal cords of a fresh batch of dogs from the city pound. The object was to devocalize the dogs so that their howls would not disturb the patients in other parts of the hospital. I held each dog as the doctor injected Nembutal into its veins to make it unconscious; then I held the dog's jaws open as the doctor inserted the scalpel and severed the vocal cords. Later, when the dogs came to, they would lift their heads to the ceiling and gape in a soundless wail. The sight became lodged in my imagination as a symbol of silent suffering.\textsuperscript{56}

In light of current knowledge about health and the causes of disease, utilizing animals in research, even for medical research focusing on life-threatening human illnesses, now appears an archaic holdover from a less sophisticated era, fairly calling back to the days of dungeons and sweat-boxes. The Western medical paradigm of seeing diseases as foreign invaders within our bodies lacks the vision and sophistication of ancient Oriental medicine, and other non-allopathic healing systems, which see chronic imbalances within us as the source of the illnesses which Western medicine can only detect in their most acute forms, usually with no clue as to what engendered them.\textsuperscript{57}
Secrecy serves to conceal the details of the horror from all but those who must participate in it to keep the cogs of the machinery running smoothly. In the case of blacks, those participants in the system included the slave owners, dealers, and hunters in the antebellum period, as well as many in the post-bellum era, such as owners of stores and restaurants serving blacks, owners of the buildings in which they lived, owners of the land they worked, police and sheriffs, and many others. In effect, segregation served to keep those outside the system blind to almost everything that institutionalized inequality entailed.

This same technique was used in Nazi Germany. Long before the mass killing of Jews actually began, a succession of restrictive laws were enacted, which served to segregate Jews away from the rest of the German population, in both the physical and social sense. Non-Jews were forbidden to speak to Jews, even in the case of a long-standing prior friendship. This was necessary to reduce people’s understanding of, and empathy for, Jewish people, a prerequisite for mass extermination. This way, whatever happened to the Jews was out of the line of peoples’ moral vision.

Secrecy and distancing are also used to protect the very profitable institutionalized cruelty to animals as it exists today. Vivisection laboratories and other facilities are notoriously difficult to enter. In most cases it is impossible for a citizen to enter without breaking the law. Even veterinarians can be denied admittance, and law-enforcement agents are not permitted to enter without a search warrant, which is difficult to obtain without evidence of wrong-doing. And yet, one cannot gather the necessary evidence without first gaining access to a lab.

Likewise, the public is not generally admitted to the windowless “factory farm” buildings, each an isolated plantation in itself, which are scattered in out-of-the-way locations across the country. On a single farm one might find ten windowless
their own victims' helpless writhings echoing what they have so often felt. Temporarily replaced in the role of victim, these new reactive torturers ascend, momentarily in their own minds, to the social- or physical-power position of their own masters.

But this ascension is short-lived and ineffectual, for the rise to power is only in their own minds. Having dominated those who are proven to be much weaker than themselves, they have done nothing to upset the relationship which is the source of their problem: that between the master and themselves, the victims. And they are still as powerless in this regard as they were before becoming someone else's oppressor. As long as their anger is directed at an innocent instead of at the perpetrator of their own victimization, the cycle—once started—will only with great effort be broken. This dynamic provides insight into the mind of the serial murderer, the compulsive hunter, and the

"The brand mark of inferiority has been indelibly, irrevocably, irretrievably, and eternally impressed by the Creator upon the Negro, and... nothing can erase or obliterate it."  
—John Campbell
Negromania, 1851

A harp seal is beaten to death for its fur

"And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hands they are delivered."

—The Bible, Genesis 9:2.
A monkey in a laboratory

"So far as I can see, unless one is initially prepared to adopt a rather rampant anthropomorphism in respect to animals, they can have no rights."

A pilloried slave

"Negroes have no rights which the white man is bound to respect."
—Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, member of the Supreme Court which heard the Dred Scott Case
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The philosophy of nonviolence which I had learned from Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., during my involvement in the civil rights movement, was first responsible for my change in diet.

I became a vegetarian in 1965. I had been a participant in all of the “major” and most of the “minor” civil rights demonstrations of the early sixties, including the March on Washington and the Selma to Montgomery March. Under the leadership of Dr. King, I became totally committed to nonviolence, and I was convinced that nonviolence meant opposition to killing in any form. I felt the commandment “Thou shalt not kill” applied to human beings not only in their dealings with each other—war, lynching, assassination; murder and the like—but in their practice of killing animals for food and sport. Animals and humans suffer and die alike. Violence causes the same pain, the same spilling of blood, the same stench of death, the same arrogant, cruel and brutal taking of life.

One night... I made the decision never to eat meat again. I had become firmly convinced that the killing of animals for food was both immoral and unnatural.

—Dick Gregory, Dick Gregory’s Natural Diet For Folks Who Eat, 1973

Animals, whom we have made our slaves, we do not like to consider our equal.

—Charles Darwin, (1809-1882)

I think the rapidly growing tendency to regard animals as born for nothing except slavery to so-called humanity absolutely disgusting.

—Sir Victor Gollancz, (1893-1967), The Unlived Life

WHAT OTHERS HAVE SAID

It should be the study of every farmer to make his horse his companion and friend, and to do this, there is but one rule, and that is, uniform sympathy and kindness. All loud and boisterous commands; a brutal flogging should be banished from the field, and only words of cheer and encouragement should be tolerated: A horse is in many respects like a man. He has five senses, and has memory, affection, and reason...

—Frederick Douglass, (1817-1895)

I am in favor of animal rights as well as human rights. That is the way of a whole human being.

—Abraham Lincoln, (1809-1865), Complete Works

...So de white man throw down de load and tell de nigger man tuh pick it up. He hand it to his womanfols. De nigger woman is de niule uh de world so fur as Ah can see...

—Zora Neale Hurston, Their Eyes Were Watching God, 1937

(Animals are) those unfortunate slaves and victims of the most brutal part of mankind.

—John Stuart Mill, 1868

At one time the benevolent affections embrace merely the family, soon the circle expanding includes first a class, then a nation, then a coalition of nations, then all humanity; and finally its influence is felt in the dealing of [humans] with the animal world. In each of these cases a standard is formed different from that of the preceding stage, but in each case the same tendency is recognized as a virtue.

—W.E.H. Lecky, The History of European Morals, 1869
Racism Embodied in the Campus of U.T.?

“Dale Baum, a history professor at A&M, said UT's statues and fountain inscription make it arguably the most Confederate campus in the South.”

“A stroll past the statues shaded by live oaks along the South Mall of the University of Texas suggests that the university has a soft spot for the Confederacy. After all, four of the bronze figures were leaders of the Southern cause, including Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States, and Robert E. Lee, the chief general. Even the Littlefield Fountain, which anchors the South Mall and at first glance appears to be a generic war memorial, is a tribute to the Confederacy, as an inscription on a stone wall makes clear without actually mentioning slavery: "To the men and women of the Confederacy who fought with valor and suffered with fortitude that states rights be maintained."

What about the statue of President Wilson? "Although Wilson's presidency represented a certain spirit of national unity, Wilson was also the most racist and reactionary president since Andrew Johnson, Levinson said. Wilson screened "The Birth of a Nation," which portrayed black people as villains and the Ku Klux Klan as heroes, at the White House."

What about the statue of George Washington? As everyone who has visited his plantation knows, he was a slave owner.

What about U.T.? Is it not located on or next to the grounds of a plantation based on slavery?

The Pease plantation, 365 acres: "Elisha Pease, the two-time governor of Texas, owned an expanse of land west of downtown, from the Colorado River to around 24th Street. Although he was a Unionist, Pease believed that the Texas economy would collapse without slave labor. It is little surprise, then, that Pease owned people of African descent who worked in the house and fields of his large estate. Woodlawn, 6 Niles road. The house was later owned by U.T. and then by State of Texas, now in private hands." Wikipedia and official Texas articles about Pease state that he was a support of the Union and do not mention his slaves at all.
Simkins Residence Hall is the last all-male dormitory at the University of Texas. Tucked into a quiet corner of campus along Waller Creek, it was the first men's dorm with air conditioning. It is notable for another reason as well: Simkins is named for a UT law professor who was a leader of the Ku Klux Klan. William Stewart Simkins, who taught at the School of Law for 30 years until his death in 1929, organized the Klan in Florida after the Civil War along with his brother, Eldred, who later became a member of the UT System Board of Regents.

Now, 55 years after opening the dorm, the university is about to begin a review that could result in the removal of Simkins' name from the building. The disclosure this week of the review came one day after the American-Statesman asked university administrators about the residence hall's name and several weeks after the release of a scholarly article examining Simkins' record. The article, posted in an online journal, the Social Science Research Network, and part of a collection to be published by the Cambridge University Press, also details the resistance by UT administrators and regents to integration in the 1950s and 1960s despite two landmark U.S. Supreme Court rulings against segregation.

"Simkins engaged in illegal, terrorist behavior during Reconstruction and doesn't merit having a building carrying his name," the article's author, Tom Russell, a former UT law professor who now teaches at the University of Denver, said in an interview. "It's particularly true in view of the fact that he was a law professor." . . . The KKK sought to enforce their ideas of white supremacy after the Civil War through intimidation and violence, including murder. Simkins, who was a Confederate colonel during the war, said in a Thanksgiving Day speech on campus in 1914 and in an article two years later in the Alcalde, the alumni magazine, that he never drew blood as a Klansman. He admitted assaulting a black man, participating in a train robbery and sowing fear in Florida's "black belt" as a masked night rider.

"The immediate effect upon the Negro was wonderful, the flitting to and fro of masked horses and faces struck terror to the race," Simkins wrote. When a white woman in Florida complained of being insulted by a black man, Simkins wrote, "I seized a barrel stave lying near the hotel door and whipped that darkey down the street."

Simkins was "not ashamed to confess my share" in the train robbery, which involved a consignment of arms and ammunition escorted by federal troops and intended for a black militia in Florida.
And in a common refrain of Klansmen, Simkins said his overarching goal was to protect "our women and children" from the "crime and insolence" of black men. That view persisted for decades at UT, according to Russell's article and other studies of the university's rocky history of integration.

Days after the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, which outlawed separate public schools for blacks and whites, UT's registrar, Henry McCown, came up with a plan to exclude many black undergraduates by requiring them to study at black schools first. "This will keep Negroes out of most classes where there are a large number of (white) girls," McCown wrote.

Four years earlier, the Supreme Court had ordered UT to admit a black student, Heman Sweatt, who had been rejected by the law school solely because of his race. Russell's article recounts how, in the mid-1950s, UT administrators and regents adopted an admissions test that they knew would exclude many blacks from the undergraduate ranks.

Russell said university records show that the faculty named the Simkins dorm, which initially housed law and graduate students, five weeks after the Supreme Court's ruling in the Brown case. . . . Simkins appears to have been recruited to UT to try to save a legislative investigation that determined the university was too heavy on faculty members who didn't have what lawmakers considered appropriate appreciation for Southern institutions and traditions, said Steven Collins, the UT System's associate vice chancellor for governmental relations. . . .

Kristin Thompson, president of the Black Student Alliance, said the university in recent years has sought to be more inclusive, erecting statues of prominent black figures such as Martin Luther King Jr. and Barbara Jordan. The Simkins name, Thompson said, needs to go: "I think it's offensive."

rhaurwitz@statesman.com; 445-3604
MLK's mark on UT

* A look back at a day the civil rights leader spent on campus.

By Denise Gamino
AMERICAN-STATESMAN STAFF

Published: 9:40 p.m. Sunday, Jan. 16, 2011

Few people know that Martin Luther King Jr. once spent the night in a little apartment on the top floor of the Texas Union at the University of Texas. The only clue that the room was a guest quarters was the sign on the door: "Quiet Room."

It was one public accommodation the civil rights leader probably never realized he had integrated.

The time was March 1962, almost 49 years ago. King was making a speech at UT, and the plan was to put him up at the historical Driskill Hotel in downtown Austin. But most of Austin was segregated then, and a UT official worried that the public would harass the black Baptist minister at the hotel. As a precaution, she decided King should be the inaugural lodger in the new Texas Union guest room, which was just large enough for a daybed, an easy chair and a bathroom.

"I was not concerned about the Driskill management at all," recalls Shirley Bird Perry, now a senior vice president at UT. "I was concerned about just a citizen or someone who'd heard he was staying there (making) some disparaging remarks."

In the early '60s, most Austin motels were segregated, but the largest hotels, such as the Driskill, allowed some black guests, records show.

Perry, a 1958 history graduate of UT who was working as program director for the Texas Union, knew she didn't have much time to prepare the unused fourth-floor bedroom, which had been built during a renovation for university consultants or other official guests who wanted to stay close by.

She went straight to a department store — Sears at Hancock Center, she thinks it was — to buy linens and towels. Then she went home to gather a clean blanket and pillow, a lamp, a bar of soap, a box of tissues and a few other items to make the room inviting. She had a telephone installed and searched the walls of the Union to find paintings to grace the bedroom on the north end of the fourth floor.
"I think I brought some flowers," she said.

King flew to Austin on Friday, March 9, the day of the speech. Perry and several UT students who served on a Texas Union committee met his plane. They drove back to campus in Perry's green Chevrolet, pointing out places of interest to King, who traveled alone.

A capacity crowd of 1,200 went to the Texas Union Ballroom that night to hear King, who had catapulted to national fame through the 1955-56 bus boycott in Montgomery, Ala., that ended with a U.S. Supreme Court decision that opened all bus seats to blacks.

King's speech was titled, "Civil Liberties and Social Action." He spoke with the eloquence and fire of a preacher, urging nonviolent protests to remove color barriers.

"Old Man Segregation is on his deathbed. The only question is how expensive the South is going to make the funeral," he chanted, according to The Daily Texan campus newspaper.

He talked about dinners with President John F. Kennedy and a conversation with Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas about civil rights. He called for an executive order declaring all segregated facilities unconstitutional.

"Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. delivered a sermon to the audience, and the audience delivered him a standing ovation," the Texan said.

"I was there! I just wish I'd had a camera to photograph him," said Bertha Means, 90, a long time civil rights activist in Austin. At the time, she was a teacher at then-Kealing Junior High School, which was designated for black students.

"It was a full house," Means remembers. "Most of them were students. There were very few blacks."

In 1962, about 200 of UT's approximately 20,000 students were black, documents show.

The student crowd was "just fabulous, applause all over the place," Means said. "It was really a great speech. He was talking about the black-and-white issue of ending segregation."

UT students, both black and white, had been holding nonviolent protests for several years in efforts to desegregate lunch counters in stores on Congress Avenue and movie theaters on the Drag. On campus at that time, dormitories, athletics and the Longhorn band were still segregated. A federal lawsuit aimed at integrating dorms was pending.

Means, who left her husband home with their five children so she could hear King's speech, was one of Austin's earliest picketers for racial equality. Her children were instrumental in integrating Barton Springs Pool and UT athletics. Her daughter, Joan, was banned from Austin High School's senior class Zilker Park picnic in 1960 because Barton Springs was segregated.
The teen spoke to the City Council and helped start a petition drive. She was allowed to attend the picnic, and Barton Springs was integrated the next year. James Means Jr. entered UT in 1964 and was the first black athlete to earn a varsity letter, receiving the honor three years in a row for running track.

At the King speech, Bertha Means says she found a seat in the middle of the Union Ballroom but made sure she got to the front to shake King's hand afterward. "I wormed my way through the crowd: 'Excuse me. Excuse me.'"\u2009"

The Texas Union held a reception in the Lone Star Room after the speech; punch and cookies were served. Several hundred people stayed for the reception, Perry said.

It was a long night at the union. King had met with the media before the speech, and after the post-speech reception, he met privately with several dozen African American students, some faculty members and Austin residents who wanted to discuss nonviolent protest tactics.

"You decide how long you want to do this," Perry told King before leaving him alone with the visitors.

She waited in the corridor while the meeting went late into the night.

That meeting set the groundwork for a declaration six months later from a group of black students who called themselves Negroes for Equal Rights. In October 1962, the group released a statement:

"While some progress has been made, we are not satisfied with existing conditions here at the university.

"Acting now with the approval and guidance of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, we will utilize any peaceful means to obtain total integration in the following areas," including housing, sports, faculty, jobs, band and drama.

When King's closed-door discussion with students in the Texas Union ended, it was time to call it a night. Perry showed King his quarters.

"He didn't realize it hadn't been used," she said. "I just told him he'd be staying in a guest room in the Texas Union. I didn't say, 'You'll be the first one.'"\u2009"

She showed him which staircase and exit to use if he wanted to go outside for a walk or to explore campus. However, she did not give him a key to the building. She instructed him to call the UT police if he went out because an officer would have to let him back inside.

The guest room in the Union did not come with room service or breakfast in bed. However, King was welcome to grab a bite from the first-floor morning food service, Perry said.
She picked him up the next morning and drove him to the airport to catch his flight.

"It was very exciting to have him, and he couldn't have been more gracious," she said. "He was very willing to kind of go with the flow."

The bedroom where MLK slept in the Texas Union has been reconfigured and is now used as an office for student groups.

The only memento of his stay is a framed exhibit of photos from that 1962 night and a three-paragraph summary of the evening. It is displayed in the Union's African American Culture Room.

King's last-minute sleepover never made the history books, but his dream did.

dgamino@statesman.com; 445-3675
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A Modest Proposal for preventing the children of poor people in Ireland, from being a burden on their parents or country, and for making them beneficial to the publick (1729)
Jonathan Swift

It is a melancholy object to those, who walk through this great town, or travel in the country, when they see the streets, the roads and cabbin-doors crowded with beggars of the female sex, followed by three, four, or six children, all in rags, and importuning every passenger for an alms. These mothers instead of being able to work for their honest livelihood, are forced to employ all their time in stroling to beg sustenance for their helpless infants who, as they grow up, either turn thieves for want of work, or leave their dear native country, to fight for the Pretender in Spain, or sell themselves to the Barbadoes.

I think it is agreed by all parties, that this prodigious number of children in the arms, or on the backs, or at the heels of their mothers, and frequently of their fathers, is in the present deplorable state of the kingdom, a very great additional grievance; and therefore whoever could find out a fair, cheap and easy method of making these children sound and useful members of the common-wealth, would deserve so well of the publick, as to have his statue set up for a preserver of the nation.

But my intention is very far from being confined to provide only for the children of professed beggars: it is of a much greater extent, and shall take in the whole number of infants at a certain age, who are born of parents in effect as little able to support them, as those who demand our charity in the streets.

As to my own part, having turned my thoughts for many years, upon this important subject, and maturely weighed the several schemes of our projectors, I have always found them grossly mistaken in their computation. It is true, a child just dropt from its dam, may be supported by her milk, for a solar year, with little other nourishment: at most not above the value of two shillings, which the mother may certainly get, or the value in scraps, by her lawful occupation of begging; and it is exactly at one year old that I propose to provide for them in such a manner, as, instead of being a charge upon their parents, or the parish, or wanting food and raiment for the rest of their lives, they shall, on the contrary, contribute to the feeding, and partly to the cloathing of many thousands.

There is likewise another great advantage in my scheme, that it will prevent those voluntary abortions, and that horrid practice of women murdering their bastard children, alas! too frequent among us, sacrificing the poor innocent babes, I doubt, more to avoid the expence than the shame, which would move tears and pity in the most savage and inhuman breast.

. . . . I have been assured by a very knowing American of my acquaintance in London, that a young healthy child well nursed, is, at a year old, a most delicious
nourishing and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked, or boiled; and I make no doubt that it will equally serve in a fricasie, or a ragoust.

I do therefore humbly offer it to publick consideration, that of the hundred and twenty thousand children, already computed, twenty thousand may be reserved for breed, whereof only one fourth part to be males; which is more than we allow to sheep, black cattle, or swine, and my reason is, that these children are seldom the fruits of marriage, a circumstance not much regarded by our savages, therefore, one male will be sufficient to serve four females. That the remaining hundred thousand may, at a year old, be offered in sale to the persons of quality and fortune, through the kingdom, always advising the mother to let them suck plentifully in the last month, so as to render them plump, and fat for a good table. A child will make two dishes at an entertainment for friends, and when the family dines alone, the fore or hind quarter will make a reasonable dish, and seasoned with a little pepper or salt, will be very good boiled on the fourth day, especially in winter.

...I grant this food will be somewhat dear, and therefore very proper for landlords, who, as they have already devoured most of the parents, seem to have the best title to the children.

...Those who are more thrifty (as I must confess the times require) may flea the carcase; the skin of which, artificially dressed, will make admirable gloves for ladies, and summer boots for fine gentlemen.

As to our City of Dublin, shambles may be appointed for this purpose, in the most convenient parts of it, and butchers we may be assured will not be wanting; although I rather recommend buying the children alive, and dressing them hot from the knife, as we do roasting pigs.

...Some persons of a desponding spirit are in great concern about that vast number of poor people, who are aged, diseased, or maimed; and I have been desired to employ my thoughts what course may be taken, to ease the nation of so grievous an incumbrance. But I am not in the least pain upon that matter, because it is very well known, that they are every day dying, and rotting, by cold and famine, and filth, and vermin, as fast as can be reasonably expected. And as to the young labourers, they are now in almost as hopeful a condition. They cannot get work, and consequently pine away from want of nourishment, to a degree, that if at any time they are accidentally hired to common labour, they have not strength to perform it, and thus the country and themselves are happily delivered from the evils to come.

I have too long digressed, and therefore shall return to my subject. I think the advantages by the proposal which I have made are obvious and many, as well as of the highest importance.

For first, as I have already observed, it would greatly lessen the number of Papists, with whom we are yearly over-run, being the principal breeders of the nation, as well as our most dangerous enemies, and who stay at home on purpose with a design to deliver the kingdom to the Pretender, hoping to take their advantage by the absence of so many good Protestants, who have chosen rather to leave their country, than stay at home and pay tithes against their conscience to an episcopal curate.

Secondly, The poorer tenants will have something valuable of their own, which by law may be made liable to a distress, and help to pay their landlord's rent, their corn and cattle being already seized, and money a thing unknown.
Thirdly, Whereas the maintainance of an hundred thousand children, from two years old, and upwards, cannot be computed at less than ten shillings a piece per annum, the nation's stock will be thereby increased fifty thousand pounds per annum, besides the profit of a new dish, introduced to the tables of all gentlemen of fortune in the kingdom, who have any refinement in taste. And the money will circulate among our selves, the goods being entirely of our own growth and manufacture.

Fourthly, The constant breeders, besides the gain of eight shillings sterling per annum by the sale of their children, will be rid of the charge of maintaining them after the first year.

Fifthly, This food would likewise bring great custom to taverns, where the vintners will certainly be so prudent as to procure the best receipts for dressing it to perfection; and consequently have their houses frequented by all the fine gentlemen, who justly value themselves upon their knowledge in good eating; and a skilful cook, who understands how to oblige his guests, will contrive to make it as expensive as they please.

Sixthly, This would be a great inducement to marriage, which all wise nations have either encouraged by rewards, or enforced by laws and penalties. It would encrease the care and tenderness of mothers towards their children, when they were sure of a settlement for life to the poor babes, provided in some sort by the publick, to their annual profit instead of expense. We should soon see an honest emulation among the married women, which of them could bring the fattest child to the market. Men would become as fond of their wives, during the time of their pregnancy, as they are now of their mares in foal, their cows in calf, or sow when they are ready to farrow; nor offer to beat or kick them (as is too frequent a practice) for fear of a miscarriage.

Many other advantages might be enumerated. For instance, the addition of some thousand carcasses in our exportation of barrel'd beef: the propagation of swine's flesh, and improvement in the art of making good bacon, so much wanted among us by the great destruction of pigs, too frequent at our tables; which are no way comparable in taste or magnificence to a well grown, fat yearly child, which roasted whole will make a considerable figure at a Lord Mayor's feast, or any other publick entertainment. But this, and many others, I omit, being studious of brevity.

Supposing that one thousand families in this city, would be constant customers for infants flesh, besides others who might have it at merry meetings, particularly at weddings and christenings, I compute that Dublin would take off annually about twenty thousand carcasses; and the rest of the kingdom (where probably they will be sold somewhat cheaper) the remaining eighty thousand.

… I desire those politicians who dislike my overture, and may perhaps be so bold to attempt an answer, that they will first ask the parents of these mortals, whether they would not at this day think it a great happiness to have been sold for food at a year old, in the manner I prescribe, and thereby have avoided such a perpetual scene of misfortunes, as they have since gone through, by the oppression of landlords, the impossibility of paying rent without money or trade, the want of common sustenance, with neither house nor cloaths to cover them from the inclemencies of the weather, and the most inevitable prospect of intailing the like, or greater miseries, upon their breed for ever.

I profess, in the sincerity of my heart, that I have not the least personal interest in endeavouring to promote this necessary work, having no other motive than the publick
good of my country, by advancing our trade, providing for infants, relieving the poor, and giving some pleasure to the rich. I have no children, by which I can propose to get a single penny; the youngest being nine years old, and my wife past child-bearing.