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OMNI, PEACE MOVEMENT AND ANIMAL RIGHTS
A goofy generation U. S. female paid $50,000 to have five puppies cloned from her late pit bull Booger by the "world's first successful canine cloning service." (In S. Korea because it was there that Seoul National University scientists created the world's first cloned dog in 2005.) The same team had already cloned "more than 20 canines."
Meanwhile, thousands of homeless dogs (and even more cats) are killed each year in Fayetteville alone.
What should be OMNI's role? Human Rights have been at the forefront of our Culture of Peace, Justice, and Compassion since our beginning. Now we should give Animal Rights our active support? Including appealing to people to rescue the animals already alive and soon to be killed? Including opposition to the commercial pet businesses that increase animals while others are killed?

FILM: EARTHLINGS
1. Videos for earthlings
   Earthlings
   95 min - Sep 19, 2008
   Uploaded by Nation Earth
   video.google.com
   Earthlings - Trailer
   3 min - Oct 21, 2007
   Uploaded by arsolto
   youtube.com

2. EARTHLINGS - Make the Connection. | Nation Earth
Official EARTHLINGS website. Nation Earth presents EARTHLINGS -- the multi-award winning documentary about society's treatment of animals, ...
Shop - Contact Us - Updates

www.earthlings.com/ - Cached - Similar

3. full-length - Earthlings

Make the Connection by Earthlings. ... Earthlings (Full Video). Nation Earth ...

www.earthlings.com/earthlings/video-full.php - Cached - Similar

Show more results from earthlings.com

4. Earthlings (documentary) - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

EARTHLINGS is a 2005 documentary about mankind's use of nonhuman animals as pets, food, clothing, entertainment, and for scientific research. ...

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earthlings_(documentary) - Cached - Similar

5. Earthlings (2005) - IMDb

6. Rating: 8.5/10 - from 2,703 users

7. Directed by Shaun Monson. Starring Joaquin Phoenix, Persia White. Using hidden cameras and never-before-seen footage, EARTHLINGS chronicles the day-to-day practices of the largest industries in the world ...

www.imdb.com/title/tt0358456/ - Cached - Similar

8. Earthlings - VEG-TV

Apr 7, 2010 ... EARTHLINGS is a feature length documentary about humanity's absolute dependence on animals (for pets, food, clothing, entertainment, ...

veg-tv.info/Earthlings - Cached - Similar

9. Watch Earthlings

Can you change?

www.watchearthlings.com/ - Cached - Similar

BOOKS

--Kuipers, Dean. Operation Bite Back: Rod Coronado’s Wars to Save ???

Democracy Now (9-8-10).

1. 'Operation Bite Back' by Dean Kuipers - latimes.com

Jun 28, 2009 ... In recent years, our mariner has been Rod Coronado, whose story is told in the important, fascinating new book "Operation Bite Back" by Dean ...

www.latimes.com/.../la-ca-dean-kuipers28-2009jun28,0,6252540.story - Cached

2. Operation Bite Back - 'Operation Bite Back' by Dean Kuipers - Los ...

In Samuel Taylor Coleridge's epic poem "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner," a ...


Show more results from latimes.com
3. **Operation Bite Back** - CSMonitor.com  
Jul 29, 2009 ... Was animal rights activist Rod Coronado a victim of over-reaching prosecution – or did he get exactly what he deserved?  
www.csmonitor.com/Books/Book-Reviews/.../operation-bite-back - Cached

4. *Frontline Factsheets*  
The Animal Liberations Front's, **Operation Bite Back** part I began in the early 90's and was directed mainly at fur research facilities and feed suppliers. ...  
www.animalliberationfront.com › ... › Activist Index - Cached - Similar

5. **Operation Bite Back**: Rod Coronado's War to Save American Wilderness - Google Books Result  
Dean Kuipers - 2009 - Biography & Autobiography - 320 pages  
As the environmental movement gains followers and momentum, Kuipers presents an insider's look at its radical wing and its uneasy relationship with the ...  
books.google.com/books?isbn=1596914580...

6. **Videos for Operation Bite Back**  
Rod Coronado - A Voice For  
5 min - Nov 25, 2006  
Uploaded by jantjeplezier  
youtube.com

-- Read excerpts from my new book **"The Bond"**  
|Humane Society of the United States to jbennet  
The Bond, will be released April 12 -- learn more and read an excerpt.  
January 10, 2011  New Book Debuts This Spring  
https://mail.google.com/mail/?hl=en&shva=1#inbox/12d718345f942c3e

Dear Dick,

I am pleased to share with you news that my book **The Bond: Our Kinship with Animals, Our Call to Defend Them**, will be published on April 12, 2011 by William Morrow. The book examines our contradictory attitudes toward animals and points to a better way forward -- something I know you feel passionately about as an animal advocate. Watch my video introduction, in which I explore one of many themes you'll find in the book: how farm animals can benefit from what I call the "humane economy." You can also read an exclusive excerpt.

Then preorder your copy of The Bond today from your favorite bookstore or online retailer.  
Sincerely,  
Wayne Pacelle, President & CEO

**HUMANE SOCIETY UNITED STATES GLOBAL SERVICE**  
The HSUS works in four big arenas to improve the lives of animals: public policy, corporate reforms, education and awareness, and hands-on animal care. See the impact we made in 2010»

**A Year Helping Haiti**  
One year following Haiti's devastating earthquake, HSI has established its first animal welfare center, a low-cost veterinary hospital, and clinics to sterilize street dogs, help horses, and train veterinarians for disasters. Full story»
Thinking Pluralistically: A Case for Direct Action
By Steve Best

A new civil war is unfolding—one between forces hell-bent on exploiting animals and the earth for profit whatever the toll, and activists steeled to resist this omnicide tooth and nail. We are witnessing not only the long-standing corporate war against nature, but also a new social war about nature.

“War” entails violence, hatred, bloodshed, and an escalation of conflict when dialogue fails. In the battle over animal liberation, significant gains are being made through education, legislation, and dialogue, but there are also impasses where negotiations break down or fail. Government and industry thugs unleash violence on activists, while the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) employs sabotage, Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) uses strong intimidation tactics, and groups such as the Animal Rights Militia and the Revolutionary Cells openly advocate violence against animal abusers.

Realizing that adopting a nonviolent approach to animal exploiters in fact is a pro-violence stance that tolerates their blood-spilling without taking adequate measures to stop it, a new breed of freedom fighters has ditched Gandhi for Machiavelli and switched principled nonviolence with the amoral (not to be confused with immoral) pragmatism that embraces animal liberation “by any means necessary.”

Fallacies of the Mainstream
Many critics of the ALF, SHAC, and direct action tactics poorly understand what makes social change movements possible and effective. They rely on a naive model of political struggle and human
nature that assumes rational dialogue can solve all conflicts. They use facile generalizations such as “violence is always wrong” and “ALF actions always get bad publicity” that are flat out wrong. In addition, they consistently misrepresent direct action advocates as naively believing that sporadic acts of vandalism and intimidation alone can win animal liberation.

Looking at modern social history, it is clear that civil disobedience, property destruction, and violence have been important political tactics for the American Revolution, the abolition of slavery, labor and national independence movements, suffragette struggles, and the Civil Rights movement. Similarly, the histories of the ALF and SHAC show that break-ins, liberations, property destruction, arson, and intimidation tactics have completely shut down some operations, weakened others, and provided otherwise unobtainable documentation of animal exploitation in fur farms, vivisection labs, and elsewhere. As evident in the 1980s era of ALF-PETA press conferences, the exposés of Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS), and the summer 2003 actions against foie gras chefs and restaurants in the Bay area, dramatic sabotage and direct action methods often get positive press coverage that reform campaigns do not generate. This valuable publicity exposes vicious industry practices and sparks important public dialogue about animal wrongs and animal rights.

Whereas advocates of direct action such as Paul Watson, Rod Coronado, and Kevin Jonas use inclusive approaches that acknowledge the validity of different approaches in different situations, critics of direct action wield exclusive approaches that deny the need for and validity of a plurality of tactics—both legal and illegal, aboveground and underground—as if they alone possess Truth and can infallibly predict which tactic will work.

If it is to succeed, the animal advocacy movement—encompassing diverse voices for welfare, rights, and liberation—must embrace a multidimensional and contextualist model of change rooted in the basic insight that different situations require different and perhaps multiple types of tactics to be deployed simultaneously. Eschewing dogma and pre-packaged answers, this approach asks: What tactic or combination of tactics is appropriate to a specific situation?

It is obvious that not all violence is justified, but it is equally obvious that not all violence is unjustified. Self-defense is one example where it is acceptable and prudent to use force against another person if necessary. Beginning in 1974, the ALF declared war against animal oppressors and the state that defends them, but the ALF did not start the conflict. It entered into a war that animal exploiters long ago began. If one party succumbs to a war initiated by another party, it employs violence in self-defense and so its actions are legitimate.
Acting as proxy agents for animals who cannot defend themselves, ALF actions in principle are just.

**The Just War Defense**

“Just War” theory emerged as a response by Christian philosophers to reconcile the nonviolent teachings of Christ with a social reality rooted in warfare and violence. As developed by St. Augustine (354-430) and St. Aquinas (1225-1274), and elaborated further by Francisco Vitoria (1492-1546) and Francisco de Suarez (1548-1617) in the 16th and 17th centuries, just war theory employs two criteria to evaluate a violent conflict. The jus ad bellum (right to war) condition addresses the grounds for entering a war and holds that if one party wages or enters into war with another party, violence must be employed as a last resort after efforts to resolve conflict through peaceful means have been exhausted. The jus in bellum (right in war) condition involves the circumstances of waging the battle once it begins and requires that violence be exercised in proportion to what is needed to end a conflict and not be excessive.

In terms of conditions for entering a conflict, direct action groups like the ALF and SHAC have strong reasons for resorting to illegal actions, sabotage, and intimidation tactics. After all the welfare campaigns of the last century, ever more animals are being killed in increasingly horrific ways. Where laws protecting animals exist at all, they are weak, poorly enforced, and constantly revised and watered-down. In cases where the legal system fails the animals, such as Paul Watson found in his fight to protect seals and whales, activists have no choice but to circumvent it and apply direct pressure on exploiters.

ALF and SHAC actions also are consistent with the ethical constraints placed on waging a conflict. One might argue conservatively that an illegitimate use of violence would entail, among other things, physical violence against human beings. But, as nonviolent groups (I do not define property destruction and psychological intimidation as violence), the ALF and SHAC never attack or injure human beings, however righteous their anger against animal exploiters; they attack property, not people. Given the gravity of the situation for the animals they represent, such direct action groups should not be criticized for using excessive force but rather commended for exercising moderation and restraint.

Moreover, the ALF only targets individuals directly involved in animal exploitation and thus avoids those who qualify as “innocent” or “non-combatants.” According to just war criteria, “collateral damage” in a war is expected and unavoidable, but combatants must seek to minimize it, as does the ALF. SHAC, interestingly, has a different tactic that blurs the line between combatant and non-combatant. By pressuring companies and individuals who do not
directly work for HLS but provide financial backing or other services, such as cleaning, SHAC sees those indirectly associated with HLS as legitimate targets.

**Limitations of “Nonviolence”**
Critics of direct action fail to see that nonviolent approaches condone or contribute to violence in a larger context. The question is not whether one will be nonviolent or violent, but rather which level of violence will one unavoidably support? As Paul Watson states in his book, *Sea Shepherd: My Fight for Whales and Seals*, “To remain nonviolent totally is to allow the perpetuation of violence against people, animals, and the environment. The Catch-22 of it—the damned-if-you-do-damned-if-you-don’t dilemma—is that, if we eschew violence for ourselves, we often thereby tacitly allow violence for others, who are then free to settle issues violently until they are resisted, necessarily with violence.” Similarly, in her Afterword to *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*, Ingrid Newkirk writes, “If a concentration camp or laboratory is burned, that is violence, but if it is left standing is that not more and worse violence?…Isn’t the chicken house today’s concentration camp?…Will we condemn its destruction or condemn its existence? Which is the more violent wish?”

There is a new face of animal rights activism, a new militancy entirely appropriate to the dire suffering of animals. Direct activists urge nonviolent and legal tactics as preferable wherever they can work. But they also understand that not all human beings respond to compassion and love; that choices are strongly conditioned by economic, political, and other institutional ties and interests; and that intractable social conflicts are not solved by education and legislation alone.

If we are ever to win the battle for animal liberation, it will be only after the animal advocacy movement stops infighting and learns to respect and utilize its amazing diversity of approaches. We must renounce dogmatic positions that see only one way to the future, and adopt a pluralist approach that understands the need to fight our battle on as many fronts as possible.

Ultimately, we need a revolutionary social transformation that dissolves the worldviews, hierarchies, and sensibilities that generate violence and conflict against humans and animals alike. Until then, let’s strive for more understanding, respect, and cooperation in our own house.

*Steve Best, Ph.D.* is chair of the Philosophy Department at University of Texas, El Paso. With Anthony J. Nocella II, he is co-editor of *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the*
Liberation of Animals, published this month by Lantern Books [see Patterson’s review in last month’s issue]. Many of his writings can be found at: http://utminers.utep.edu/best/.