

Profiting from Pain: Conflict Fundraising by “Animal Rights” Organizations

By Marcy Covault, © 2008, All Rights Reserved

Both conflict and pain are a part of our earthly experience—and that includes humans and other living creatures. Dealing with these and helping others is part of being humane, and we all support that.

However, there are those opportunists who use the emotion generated from painful situations to fundraise for their own purposes, and not for the benefit of the suffering. This deceit is often propagandized into an emotional “story” that pulls at the heartstrings of good people everywhere, who then support these opportunists with donations.

This is the nature of “conflict fundraising,” in which some organizations literally profit from the pain of others (figuratively “living off the backs” of the victims), gaining millions of dollars through deceitful propaganda and thereby enriching those who run the organizations and furthering the oftentimes ill-understood true agenda of these organizations.

Such is the modus operandi of “animal rights” organizations, such as the Humane Society of the United States (H\$U\$), People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), and others. More in a gray area are organizations that indeed do good work, but which have been heavily influenced by hardcore “animal rights fanatics” (ARFs) so that the agenda more and more approaches that of the anti-animal-use ARFs, e.g., as the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) and increasingly Best Friends Animal Society (BFAS).

Most of these organizations, with perhaps the exception of PETA (which made its intentions known from the beginning), were created to address true animal welfare issues in our society, but they have gradually evolved, through attraction of ARFs who had both intelligence and true charisma, into mouthpieces for animal rights propaganda, with the ultimate goal of ending animal use—pets, food, clothing, sports—you name it. If it is “animal use,” they are against it. Even if one can bore down through web sites and see, in black and white, what this agenda of these organizations really is, since it’s much less pleasant than the flowery propaganda put out by the organizations and almost unbelievable in its extremism, donors may ignore the truth staring them in the face.

Conflict fundraising—noble OR nefarious

During times of human conflict, fundraising to help those in distress and pain is admirable and supported by the majority of people. Many nonprofits have grown to fill a need to perform as the “Florence Nightingales” of civilized society, and they are considered worthwhile and laudable. It has been a natural progression. With the rise of global communications via television and then the internet, contacting more and more people to hawk one’s wares or support one’s cause, has quickly been refined with sophisticated marketing and propaganda tools, and there are firms that specialize in not only creating an “image” for a company, but also in influencing large numbers of people to support and promote a company. Fundraising is part and parcel of that, but to the extent that an organization (usually a “not-for-profit” entity) exploits a segment of the population or living creatures under human stewardship, that organization is NOT noble, and in fact is truly “living off the backs” of the animals of whatever target group it is terrorizing.

Survival of the fittest—nature’s way

Most of us have heard this from the time we are small, whether through nature shows or especially if we are raised in a country environment, where life and death are played out close by, often in front of our eyes. We learn that both life and death are natural, that it isn’t a perfect world, and that no one can guarantee fairness. We also hopefully learn to respect and cherish all life and to accept the realities of pain and death. What is objectionable is when the organizations that thrive in society are ones that cause pain rather than assistance to the helpless, and that includes such conflict fundraisers as the H\$U\$, as Wayne Pacelle stated (and has been trying to backtrack and qualify as taken out of context), “We have no trouble with the extinction of domestic animals. They are creations of man.”

Conflict is a part of life—with conflict resolution

As social beings, humans interact with others, and there will be conflict and conflict resolution. (Animals do more simplistically a similar thing when deciding on territory and mates, as well as hunting grounds.) On a global level, people start wars and end wars—and there are many innocent casualties—always. Nevertheless,
Profiting from Pain— Conflict Fundraising by “Animal Rights” Organizations

that seems to be the “nature” of humans from the time of remembered history. However, those organizations that employ “conflict fundraising” strategies would be foolish to try for true conflict resolution as that would dry up their fund-raising. So, while they say they are trying to help animals, for example, they are fully aware that they are not doing what it would take to truly make a positive difference toward animal welfare resolution. In that sense, they are charlatans and frauds, and certainly NOT “humane.”

“True believer” followers—conflict zombies

Like rats following the pied piper or lemmings going over a cliff into the sea, the “true believers” in humans seem to have one overriding purpose, and that is to follow their perceived leader, period. One of the most notorious examples is the mass suicide via poisoned Kool-Aid of the Jimmy Jones religious cult. Unfortunately, those who are “true believers” of the conflict opportunists are often also following blindly, like unreasoning zombies, assisting those who use conflict for self-gain (whether money, power, control, or all of these). If there is a small kernel of truth in something that a conflict fundraising organization says—and they do make sure they wordsmith so that a kernel of truth resides among the misstatements and lies—the “true believers” grab onto that kernel to justify continuing to follow these organizations, in actuality aiding and abetting conflict and acting as unreasoning zombies.

Preying on the naive—an unacceptable practice in society

The negative terms, like “loan sharks” and “child predators,” catch people’s attention, and most understand the predator/prey concept in these as applied to humans. What is less well understood is how “animal rights” groups prey upon the general public’s emotional reactions to “animal welfare” situations. Instead of addressing a single issue of animal cruelty and the most humane way to deal with it, the group uses the situation as a springboard to make a broad-brush statement about a particular class of animal owners (even if it’s a tiny percentage) in order to push their anti-breeding, anti-animal-use agenda. If you really analyse how these groups attack the occasional animal abuser, they are more interested in using the situation for, guess what, conflict fundraising. “Donate now to help the Katrina animals,” was a conflict fundraising plea used by H\$U\$, which is under investigation because they supposedly used very little to help the animals. It is alleged that most went into the general coffers for huge executive salaries, a top-notch PR firm for image, and for more lobbyists in Washington to push their agenda.

Using conflict fundraising—furthering agendas with no solutions

Money usually means power—and control. Touting a goal to become the “NRA of animal rights,” H\$U\$ CEO, Wayne Pacelle, has led that organization towards that goal in the past few years. Gobbling up other AR organizations, including Farm Sanctuary and Doris Day Animal League, the H\$U\$ has become the largest animal-rights-in-a-suit organization, using a top PR firm to raise its image as the “animal protection” and “animal expert” go-to organization, despite the fact that its CEO is a confirmed vegan, and some of its so-called experts have less-than-stellar backgrounds with groups that use intimidation and sabotage to try to coerce animal-use companies to either stop the use or compromise to what the AR group is asking this year. A prime example is the closing of the remaining horse slaughter plants in the U.S., the federal ban on horse slaughter for human consumption, and pending legislation against selling horses out of the country for human consumption. Instead of addressing solutions that would make slaughter more humane (as Canada has done, and Mexico has NOT), a massive PR campaign by the AR giants have portrayed the horse as a faithful companion that helped us settle this country, and that it was unacceptable that foreigners were wanting to eat them! Oh, and slaughter is an inhumane way for our “companion animals” to go. And now that negative consequences are occurring, the next step is exclaiming that there is “overbreeding of horses, so we must control breeding.” And even horse people are pointing fingers at each other as culprits and “overbreeders”—thereby aiding and abetting the AR long-term strategy. This divisiveness among animal owners is what the ARFs count on! [see: http://www.naiaonline.org/library/Animal_Rights_Win_Horses_Lose.htm]

Conclusion

So long as the public refuses to see what such organizations and the individuals working for them truly have as an agenda, these AR organizations will flourish, amass more assets, lobby towards their agenda, and truly wreak *harm* on animals and animal owners alike. It is unlikely that Americans will stop animal use (food, clothes, pets), BUT by the time enough people realize what’s happening, there will have been many more thousands of animal and human casualties! Does that describe an organization that *cares* about animals OR humans? A resounding NO! Does it describe an organization that uses “conflict fundraising” to further its agenda, no matter how many animals or humans are steamrollered out of existence? You bet!