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

Lisa Gålmark

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

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

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

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

¹ The Nation, 26.4.13.
As you may have guessed, it was not today nor yesterday that the Swedish women Lizzy Lind af Hageby (1878-1963) and Leisa Schartau (1876-1962) performed their test of investigative journalism and activism.

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

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

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

The majority of people involved in animal issues are women, today as well as a hundred years ago. Why did the remarkable women Lizzy Lind af Hageby and Leisa Schartau commit themselves to the issue of antivivisection? What did their work...
express? And how does their commitment correspond to the explanations and theories of earlier historical research?

**Animal – human and other, place in society**

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

11 French, Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society, p.373 ff. and Thomas, Människan och naturen, p.205.
12 French, Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society, p.394, figure 17.
Women in the antivivisection movement

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

Moral utopia finds its role

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

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

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

---

13 Ibid., p.239. In Sweden the antivivisection movements were made up of 45% women. 1,829 were women out of a total of 4,087 members in the ‘Swedish society, to fight scientific cruelty against animals’. (Yearbook, 1901).
goal is love and compassion towards all living creatures. Vivisection is in contrast to a sort of ‘neovitalism’: ‘Our life is not the mere outcome of chemical and mechanical forces.’ With the method of vivisection physiology takes several steps backwards to René Descartes and his view of animals as soulless machines, despite the fact that we now know that animals have both consciousness and emotions.

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

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

---

Philanthropy

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

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

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

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

20 Leader of *Daily Express* 18.11.03, *Morning Leader* 18.11.03, *The Star* 19.11.03, *Daily News* 19.11.03.
Ideology of the time, socialism

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

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

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

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

---

23 Thompson, *The Edwardians*, p.5 and p.347. There was 'deep self questioning at all levels of society'.
A priest, Noël, believed that health in Battersea should be attained through improving the way of living, not through cruelty. Equal distribution between poor and rich people would bring the disappearance of undernourishment and associated diseases, as well as diseases associated to luxury living.\textsuperscript{27}

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

**Ideology of the time, the threat of feminism**

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

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Manchester Dispatch} 17.9.06.

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

\textsuperscript{29} The \textit{Lucifer ljusbringaren} program: ‘Knowledge for freedom and social happiness to the people. Knowledge about humanitarian movements and their leaders. Knowledge of justice and goodness towards humans and animals.’
However they are still in the female bourgeoisie sphere because of the ideological connection between women and sentimentality and the connection to domesticated animals such as cats and dogs. When they start to debate boundaries, especially since they do not do this as admiring students at the ‘London School of Medicine for Women’; they violate the unwritten rules as public critics with the ability to gain support and admiration from the public.

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

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

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

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

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

31 Lansbury, *The Old Broom Dog*, p.7. The local trade unions collected money for the hospital. (p.19.) Battersea Dogs’ Home was a dog’s shelter. In 1907 it was suggested by Professor Starling, one of Lind af Hageby’s and Schartau’s teachers during 1902-03, that the home should provide dogs for experiments. (p 7, and p.173.)
is similar to the one described in *Shambles of Science* where the students are laughing and clapping while the animals are vivisected. In the book she and Schartau were sitting among the students, now it is Lind af Hageby who is the object of ridicule. On her side there are now many men amongst others the workers from Battersea who assist in throwing out the students. These men seem to have sympathized with antivivisection. But what about the women of Battersea? Did they send their men or was their workload so heavy that there was no time to go to meetings? What was their opinion?

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

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

**Consolidation of the role**

**Lind af Hageby vs Halliburton**

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

---

32 Ibid., p.18.
33 Ibid., p.22.
34 Concerning the function of the fountains, see Thompson, *The Edwardians*, text to picture on page 11.
35 Debate (1907), pp.4-10. Verbatim report.
decades and it had periodically emerged again without resulting in any great discoveries. Experiments of today are less cruel, and the causing of pain is more considered than in the 1860s and 70's, she says, but the excuses are now wholly different than they were 50 to 60 years ago. Today it is said that vivisections are done in the interests of humanity and that they are necessary to medicine. This is not true, Lind af Hageby claims. With the support of quotations she emphasizes the variations between the physiology of different species and their varied reactions to different drugs. The results are not transferable to humans. Her second objection to vivisection from a scientific angle is that the method used to cause disease and unnatural conditions signifies that results will be unreliable. When the science of physiology begins to study the wholeness of the organisms and their ‘unicity’, it will become exact. To isolate parts without recognizing their interrelation hinders physiology from making progress. The method of vivisection will be abandoned during the twentieth century, Lind af Hageby says to the audience - who shout either ‘Yes!’ or ‘No!’ and applaud.

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

**Halliburton vs Lind af Hageby**

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

---

30 Ibid., p.9.
37 Ibid., pp.10-17.
negative feelings towards him, or fear those he represents; and he has 'nothing sensational to put before you'.\textsuperscript{38} There are people who will believe anything, and what can you say to them? he wonders. 'Truth', the audience yells, and 'Science'.\textsuperscript{39}

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., p.11.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., p.10.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p.12.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p.16.
bedside, post-mortem examination. All this is necessary to make physiological discoveries.

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

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

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

Sex as a disadvantage

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

---

42 Ibid., p.27.
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid., p.28. The debate was reviewed extensively in the Daily News, Tribune, Morning Leader, Star and Morning Post 17.5.07.
arguments from Lind af Hageby. The conditions of power were already settled, why bother?

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

Lind af Hageby and Halliburton as symbols

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

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

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

45 See French, Antivivisection and the medical science in Victorian society, p.338 for more on the consolidated profession.
it presented a man, a professional person on one side and a woman, a foreign aristocrat on the other.

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

**Lind af Hageby as a lawyer in 1913**

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

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

\(^{46}\) Lind af Hageby emphasizes this often. For example: ‘All inquiry, all controversy, all discussion of a subject...tend to further the final triumph of truth and justice’. (Anti-vivisection Review, II, (1910-11), p.31.)

\(^{47}\) Notes of court proceedings in the High Courts of Justice, King's Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, 3rd - 23rd April, 1913 before Mr. Justice Bucknill and a special jury. Lind-af-Hageby - v - Astor & others. Third day, p.3.

\(^{48}\) *Daily Telegraph* 14.4.13.

\(^{49}\) Photograph: 'Two years shop campaign in Piccadilly. The Anti-Vivisection window' and exhibition 'Dog on operation-board'. (Animal Defence and Anti-Vivisection Society Report (1913), p 17.)
way she acts. According to the papers it is a record with a total of 32 hours or 330,000 words.50 'But by far the most striking feature of the case was the high standard of intellectual ability displayed by Miss Lind af Hageby, and the astonishing physical task of which she acquitted herself,' the *Daily Telegraph* wrote.51 In spite of it being words from a 'highly-strung woman, [she] did not depart from womanliness.' and 'Who says now that women should not be admitted to the Bar?' were other typical comments.52 However the Jury do not see that the *Pall Mall Gazette* articles were aimed especially at Lind af Hageby personally and therefore she loses the trial.

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

50 *Daily Chronicle* 4.4.13, *Daily Telegraph* 24.4.13, *Daily Mirror* 24.4.13. The introductory speech was nine hours long.
51 *Daily Telegraph* 24.4.13.
52 *Daily Chronicle* 24.4.13; *Liverpool Evening Express* 24.4.13.
53 Lecture (1914), no. 1, p.2.
54 Ibid.
55 Ibid., p.16.
56 Ibid., p.19.
of qualities, a spiritual bisexuality, which will by and by create the perfect humanity which we are seeking.\textsuperscript{57}

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

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

\textbf{Lind af Hageby's antivivisection becomes women's rights}

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

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

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., p.21.
Victorian age. Perhaps the model symbolized more than it was meant to; not only a critique against vivisectors and the practice of the vivisection law but also against the conditions for women in a society where men had the power in the home as well as in the rest of society. The impression of the trial was foremost not about antivivisection. The reaction of the press to Lind af Hageby as lawyer overshadowed this. The fact that she was a woman was emphasized in every paper.

The new woman

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

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

---

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

Symbols and surrogates?

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

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

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

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

---

61 French, Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society, pp.372-75.
not solely companion animals. The view of animals taken by Lind af Hageby was aimed at animals directly, not animals as a surrogate for something else. Animals as well as humans should be embraced with compassion not because they were companion animals (if they were) but because they could feel pain and because it was ‘wrong to exploit them for our supposed service and for our use’. The coherence in Lind af Hageby’s and Schartau’s theory and practice means that the animals cannot have been just symbols for something else. Exactly how common their outlook was among other antivivisectionists nobody knows due partly to the fact that the philosophical and ideological differences have not gained attention from historians. Rather, the battle between Lind af Hageby and Schartau versus their opponents seems to have revolved around whose perception is the true one: which perspective is the appropriate one for judging and expressing opinions about the situation of animals? In this sense, on this level, the animals become symbols, tools in a battle for power: who has the right qualifications to perceive what is happening to an animal? Who has the power to assert their own perception? From this perspective the whole antivivisection issue becomes a symbol for conditions of power. One can extend this perspective further: if the methods of science were the battleground, animals were the weapons used. ‘It was not experiments on animals they were protesting against, it was the shape of the century to come’, French writes about the first wave of antivivisection. The Swedish historian Sverker Sörlin has in a similar manner described the antivivisectionists in Sweden as ‘conservative cultural pessimists’ who were more interested in the moral fate of humanity than in the suffering of the animals.

It may be that one must see antivivisection as an issue that can harbour and interest different forces in society at different times in history. Lind af Hageby and Schartau express a rather utopian view as early as 1901 and throughout the period there is an optimism and almost religious faith in what they call the social evolution towards a better world. The privileged were constantly
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64 French, Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society, p. 412.
relinquishing their power to those that did not have any. It is important to emphasize the difference between the periods before and after the turn of the century. As we have seen antivivisection seems to have become an issue appealing to different social groups.

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

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

---

68 Lind af Hageby was used to being criticized for defending animals. 'Is it proper to care about animals when people are suffering? I have found that people asking this question generally do not do anything to prevent either of these problems'. (*Daily News* and *Leader*, 26.3.14.)
phenomenon intelligible. How much relevance it has for women antivivisectionists in general is however uncertain.

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

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

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

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

Women leaders

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

---

Thomas, Människan och naturen, p.210. Women’s struggle has been criticized in the same manner. Marxists for example suggest that equality between the sexes would come without effort once class society is dissolved.
In the new antivivisection associations there were possibilities for women to excel and they did get many women members. There were also many women models like Frances Power Cobbes whose pioneering efforts must have appealed to women as well as the fact that she acted in the area of women’s rights. The two doctor pioneers Elizabeth Blackwell and Anna Kingsford, were antivivisectionists who played important roles. The movement explicitly encouraged women to become doctors.70

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

Women, nature, animals

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

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

70 Another alternative was to stop going to doctors, according to Blackwell cited in French, *Antivivisection and the medical science in Victorian society*, p.240.
71 Elston, ‘Women and antivivisection’, p.286. According to French, *Antivivisection and the medical science in Victorian society*, feminism was important in attracting women to antivivisection, p.246.
Historians Carolyn Merchant and Cynthia Russett emphasize the connection between women and nature within science. Male scientists during the nineteenth century describe their activities as a conquest of nature, and nature as a woman. Francis Bacon in the seventeenth century used rape as his central metaphor describing the process whereby the scientist subdued nature 'and wrested her secrets from her'. Claude Bernard, prominent physiologist in the nineteenth century, talked of nature 'as a woman, who must be forced to unveil herself when attacked by the experimenter and who must be put to the question and subdued'. Both these men were front-line figures in modern science.72 Lind af Hageby and Schartau react to this metaphor by seeing the scientist as a jealously armed man who attacks to rip secrets from the bosom of nature. The first chapter of *Shambles of Science* starts as follows:

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

Elston has shown that medical science, and medical practice, were often formulated as metaphor for rape in British antivivisection literature after 1880.74

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

---

74 Elston, 'Women and antivivisection', p.279.
Women's experiences

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

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

The experience of being at the mercy of male doctors on an operating table may not in itself be a sufficient explanation as to why many women were committed to antivivisection nor can other explanations in themselves explain the phenomenon.
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77 Blackwell in Moscucci, The science of woman, p.158.
78 Johannisson, Den mörka kontinenten, p.177, p.204 and p.208.
79 Many women did not want to undress themselves before a male doctor. There were long queues to the first women doctors. (Dally, Women under the knife).
When different circumstances and facts concur a certain pattern of acts become probable. There must have been many middle class women with operated abdomens who did not sympathize with antivivisection as there were women doctors who were pro-vivisectionists. One of them was Elizabeth Garret Anderson (1836-1917), the first registered female British doctor who had studied and attained her degree in England.

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

Professionalization, gender and antivivisection

French has read the periodicals of the antivivisection movement of the 1860-80s. He concludes that women involved in antivivisection were discontent and distrusting of the entire profession of physicians. The distrust was spread amongst other groups as well. G B Shaw, for example, in his book Doctor's...
Dilemma of 1906, attacks vivisection and criticizes the medical profession for being commercial.

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

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

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

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

---

85 Ibid., p 294.
86 Protocol (1908).
87 The ‘ten little rules’ can be found in the Antivivisection Review, II (1910-11), p. 35.
88 Dally, Women under the knife, p.93 and Moscucci, The science of women, p.107.
The turn of the century was the golden age of hysteria as historian Karin Johannisson has shown. This diagnosis was very frequent in medical circles. In the US in 1910 a neurologist claimed that women’s sympathy for dogs was an expression of ‘zoophilic psychosis’. Women could be divided into two types: one being the motherly type, the other the prostitute, and women caring about dogs did not belong to the first group. Prostitution, animals, and independent women could in this manner be mixed and stigmatized as a punishment for women who tried to free themselves from the limited domestic sphere.

To search for a different kind of life

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

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

89 Johannisson, Den mörka kontinenten, p 149.
90 Lederer, Subjected to science, p.36.
91 Diary 26.6.06; Lind-af-Hageby (1907) Evidence.
92 ‘How in heaven’s name you in these enlightened times dare to advise me to get myself a home I do not know!! Do I not have a “home”???’ (Letter to Ernst 16.8.13).
Lind af Hageby and Schartau reflect the time they live in; the values that are still a result of the Victorian age; they are part of it. But they are also dissidents in their criticism of society, both in ideology and in their choice of lifestyle. The experience of being a woman in a society constructed by males and the identity that culture moulds them into have given them special foundations to practice and maintain that part of the human brain which mediates experiences and expressions of empathy.

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

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

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

It was the disadvantageous position which Lind af Hageby and Schartau perceived in the situation of vivisected animals. They had the expertise and their view was reinforced by the negative
picture of medicine which had become part of women's experiences. But the values surrounding woman as a gender, either as a mother tied to the home setting and probably getting ill due to under-stimulation, or as a free wild sexualized prostitute beast, must have affected their identification with animals.

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

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