

Legislate or Liberate? A study of anarchist
and parliamentary left approaches to animal
advocacy in Britain.

by

Will Boisseau

A Doctoral Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of Doctor of Philosophy.

Loughborough University

February 2016

© Will Boisseau 2016

Abstract

This thesis makes an original contribution to knowledge by exploring parliamentary left and anarchistic approaches to animal advocacy using a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework. This is significant because CAS is a field of scholarship which developed in order to theoretically support animal activists; nonetheless, in its focus on direct action and its rejection of reformist politics, CAS has too often ignored the legislative developments which are extremely important to most animal activists. Therefore, this thesis makes an overarching claim that CAS scholarship should treat the relationship between direct action and legislative reform more seriously. This thesis considers the relationship between direct action activists and legislative politics and as such makes a useful contribution to both CAS and wider animal rights scholarship. More broadly, the thesis provides a particularly useful assessment of one social movement at a time of rapidly changing moral, political and activist landscapes as Britain enters a new 'age of dissent'.

The work consists of three parts: the first part provides historical and theoretical information about the movements under consideration, which provides context for the rest of the thesis; the second part considers two themes – class and gender - that are central to leftist and animal rights literature, in order to consider important dimensions in the history of animal advocacy in Britain; and the third part, the case studies, scrutinise the framework by analysing how animal activists have dealt with certain key issues in practice. Throughout these chapters I analyse the central research questions which explore the relationship between direct action and legislative politics in terms of animal activism; in particular, what separates such approaches and how have activists pursuing different overall strategies been able to work together. The thesis adopts a CAS methodology, which includes the triangulation of archival material alongside interviews and a range of primary and secondary sources. The core originality of the thesis lies in the interview material conducted with 55 animal activists including politicians, scholar-activists, direct action campaigners, vegan outreach organisers and political lobbyists. The thesis explores the different approaches and relationships between parliamentary left and anarchistic animal activists by analysing four key themes: speciesism, the rights-liberation-welfare debate, direct action and total liberation. Throughout the thesis I ask if different activists can be separated dichotomously in relation to these themes, and how animal activists of different ideologies relate to these concepts and themes. Aside from the core contribution to animal advocacy scholarship, the thesis also contributes knowledge to British social, cultural and political history, as well as to anarchist studies and social movement studies.

Key Terms: Critical Animal Studies, Animal Advocacy, Anarchism, Parliamentary Left, Total Liberation, Speciesism

Contents

1. <u>Introduction</u>	4
2. <u>Anarchism and Animal Advocacy</u>	74
3. <u>Animal advocacy and the British parliamentary left</u>	111
4. <u>'Ordinary Unenlightened People': Class and Animal Advocacy</u>	149
5. <u>'Everything fits together': Gender and Animal Advocacy</u>	194
6. <u>Case Study 1: Hunting: 'A "them and us" issue'</u>	230
7. <u>Case Study 2: Vivisection: 'We are up against big business'</u>	276
8. <u>Case Study 3: Vegan Outreach: 'A philosophy and not a diet'</u>	322
9. <u>Conclusion: 'Social change is messy'</u>	364
10. <u>Bibliography</u>	389

1. Introduction

In *Free The Animals*, Ingrid Newkirk's fictionalised account of the animal liberation movement, Valerie, who forms the North American Animal Liberation Front (ALF) in the early 1980s, soon finds it necessary to travel to England – 'the bastion of animal rights activism' - for advice and training from the movement's founders.¹ In London, Valerie visits the offices of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV), a national animal rights organisation which has campaigned for legislative action since its formation in 1898. Valerie meets Kim Stallwood, the BUAV's Campaign's Officer: 'a vigorous Labour Party supporter and a fervent champion of the British working class as well as of the animals'.² Stallwood is busily campaigning for parliamentary legislation to prohibit eye-irritancy tests conducted on rabbits; a slow process and one which will meet with much opposition 'both from private research corporations and what he called the "Tory Gories"'.³ However, it is not Stallwood who Valerie has travelled to visit; the American activist knows that the BUAV share an office with the ALF Supporters' Group and so she aims to meet Ronnie Lee, who co-founded the ALF in 1976.

Whereas Stallwood, a socialist, focuses on parliamentary campaigns and pressurising the Labour Party to enact progressive legislation, Lee, an anarchist, believes that direct action from a non-hierarchical, grassroots organisation will bring about animal liberation. As the fictionalised Stallwood says of Lee:

He thinks we're all wet, you know... thinks there's only one way to go: direct action, animal liberation... Thinks what I do, what the BUAV does, is a waste of bloody time the animals can't afford. If you ask me, the animals need everything.⁴

In reality, these relationships are more complex and intertwined, as interviews with both Stallwood and Lee in this thesis show; nonetheless, Newkirk has identified

¹ I. Newkirk, *Free The Animals: The amazing true story of the animal liberation front in North America* (New York: Lantern Books, 2012).

² *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 39.

the two broad strategies used by animal advocates in Britain since the rise of the radical animal rights movement in the mid-1970s: anarchistic direct action and legislative change in association with left-leaning parliamentarians.

Anarchists and the parliamentary left

This thesis focuses on activism in Britain since the mid-1970s, and seeks to uncover the lost history of animal rights activism whilst analysing the relationship between animal activism and the British left. 1976 can be seen as the date marking the resurgence, if not the birth, of the radical animal rights movement in Britain; not only because of the formation of the ALF but because national animal protection organisations united to create Animal Welfare Year in an attempt to put animal protection on party political agendas.⁵ As we shall see, these two wings of the broad animal advocacy movement took the form of anarchistic activists engaging in direct action and lobbyists who engaged with politicians (chiefly in the Labour Party) to promote animal protection legislation.

Although the radical animal advocacy movement has grown since the 1970s, and has shifted leftward since the days of the first conservative animal welfare societies,⁶ the first two chapters show that there was a longstanding historical and ideological connection between the British left and animal issues. For instance, early Labour politicians such as Ramsay MacDonald, J. R. Clynes, Philip Snowden and Arthur Henderson were all significant opponents of vivisection in the first decades of the twentieth century.⁷ These Labour leaders also played a significant role in opposing hunting. For instance, the inaugural public meeting of the League for the Prohibition of Cruel Sports in 1925 was attended by numerous Labour politicians.⁸ In

⁵ C. Hollands, *Compassion is the Bugler: The Struggle for Animal Rights* (Edinburgh: Macdonald Publishers, 1980).

⁶ The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) founded in 1824, the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV) founded in 1898. H. Kean, *Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain Since 1800* (London: Reaktion Books, 1998).

⁷ E. Hopley, *Campaigning Against Cruelty: The Hundred Year History of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection* (London: British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 1998), p. 36.

⁸ League for the Prohibition of Cruel Sports, 'Messages of Sympathy and Goodwill: Received on Inaugural Public Meeting, November 25th 1925' (TUC Library, HV47/25).

2015 the Labour Animal Welfare Society believed that this political lineage included figures as diverse as George Lansbury, Kier Hardie, Thomas Hardy, George Bernard Shaw and Christabel Pankhurst.⁹

Chapter three will show that connections between the British left and animal advocacy were strengthened in the 1890s by activists such as George Bernard Shaw, Edward Carpenter and, in particular, Henry Salt. Salt's most significant work, *Animals' Rights: Considered in Relation to Social Progress* (1894), pre-empted many contemporary concerns of leftist animal advocates. In particular, Salt argued that animals and the working-class were oppressed due to power structures which operated in similar ways; Salt also believed that compassion for one oppressed group should automatically entail compassion across the species divide. Salt's ideas were largely ignored by most of the British left for much of the twentieth century, but in the 1970s Labour once again adopted policies which aimed to protect animals.¹⁰ Salt's ideas also helped formulate the concepts (although not the exact terms) of intersectionality and total liberation as related to animals by Critical Animal Studies (CAS) scholars in the twenty first century.

As will become clear throughout the thesis, particularly in the three case study chapters, anarchism and certain animal advocates share a practical connection because of their common action repertoire, in particular the use of diverse forms of direct action and a non-hierarchical structure using consensus decision-making. However, there is also a theoretical and ideological connection between anarchism and animal advocacy which will be explored in chapter two. This theoretical connection began with the work of Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin whose study *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* highlighted the cognitive capabilities of animals and argued that cooperation – and not just competition – was an important factor in the successful development of a species.¹¹ Kropotkin did not intend his work to imply that animals should not be consumed or used by humans; nonetheless, subsequent libertarian thinkers took *Mutual Aid* as a starting point for their animal activism. Élisée Reclus, the French geographer and anarchist, framed his conception of equality with

⁹ Labour Animal Welfare Society, *Animal Welfare Policy* (Labour Party: 2015).

¹⁰ Labour Party Annual Conference Report, 1979, p. 394.

¹¹ P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (New York: Black Rose Books, 1989).

animals in terms of his understanding of *Mutual Aid*.¹² Writing almost a hundred years after Reclus, Brian Dominick argued that animal liberation and social revolution were inseparable.¹³ Continuing this tradition, Bob Torres expanded on Dominick's idea that animal oppression is linked to that of race, class and gender.¹⁴

These connections continue to the present day, and hold great significance for activists, as becomes clear through interviews with animal activists from across the broad animal advocacy spectrum. It is important that discussion of the parliamentary left does not simply refer to the Labour Party, but also includes the Green Party of England and Wales which has adopted numerous animal protection policies and has even served exclusively vegetarian and vegan food at past annual conferences.¹⁵ Animal Aid director Mark Gold, writing during the New Labour era, believed that Salt's ideals are closer to those of the Green Party than the 'modern Labour Party' because of the Greens' acceptance of issues embraced by Salt such as animal advocacy, environmentalism, anti-militarism, human rights and conservation.¹⁶ Moreover, many activists believe that in recent decades there has been 'an amazing crossover in the radical Green and Animal Liberation movements... we are not two struggles but one'.¹⁷ Despite this connection, much of the discussion of the parliamentary left in the thesis still relates to the Labour Party as the largest left-leaning political party, and the party which was most likely to enact progressive animal protection legislation.

During the 2015 General Election campaign there was 'a big argument' on social media 'between animal rights people who support Labour and those who'll be voting for the Green Party'; whilst other bloggers maintained an anarchist position and resented what they regarded as the 'double-crossing of the animal rights

¹² É. Reclus, *On Vegetarianism, The Great Kinship of Humans and Fauna* (Jura Media, 1992).

¹³ B. A. Dominick, *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution: A Vegan Perspective on Anarchism and an Anarchist Perspective on Veganism* (London: Critical Mess Media, 1995), p. 8.

¹⁴ B. Torres, *Making A Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2007), p.11.

¹⁵ T. Pye, 'Putting Animals into Politics', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 2, p. 44.

¹⁶ M. Gold, *Animal Century: A Celebration of Changing Attitudes to Animals* (Charlbury: Jon Carpenter, 1998), p. 13.

¹⁷ *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 17. 1997. This activist was referring to the broad Green movement, and not just the Green Party.

movement' by party politics.¹⁸ As we shall see, other forms of leftism, including strands associated with Marxism, trade unionism and the New Left, largely fall outside the scope of this thesis; however, the thesis does not intend to reduce the scope of the British left to anarchists or the mainstream parliamentary left.

It is sometimes deemed necessary in theses considering contemporary anarchism to describe 'which anarchism, or anarchists' they are discussing'.¹⁹ Anarchism, like all political ideologies, embraces a wide variety of nuanced, and often competing, positions. However, it is easy to identify core anarchist values that include the belief that 'hierarchical structures of authority do not allow human beings to participate in social and political change' and as such 'hierarchies, like the State, are structured to oppress and subvert individual and group rights'.²⁰ Anarchists also oppose capitalism and other forms of social oppression. Uri Gordon's work on the anarchist movement situates anarchism as a contemporary social movement, a collection of ideas and an intricate political culture, a term meaning 'a family of shared orientations to doing and talking about politics, and to living everyday life'.²¹ In this thesis, I often talk about anarchistic, rather than anarchist, animal activists; because, like much of the contemporary movement, these activists may share a distinct collective identity and action repertoire, but might not label themselves as anarchists.²² Indeed, one could argue that a euphemism such as 'direct action left' could be used rather than the 'a-word'; but, as Gordon argues, with anarchism 'you know it when you see it',²³ and from the circled 'A' in the ALF symbol to the non-hierarchical affinity group structure of hunt saboteurs and the opposition to the state and capitalism, we arguably know we are witnessing an anarchist (or at least anarchistic) movement.

This thesis maintains that anarchists and the parliamentary left both have a substantial relationship with animal advocacy; however, at no point is it suggested

¹⁸ Red Black Green, 'Where has the Hunting Act gone?', April 23rd 2015 [viewed online, <https://network23.org/redblackgreen/2015/04/23/where-has-the-hunting-act-gone/>, last accessed 14/09/15].

¹⁹ M. Wilson, *Rules Without Rulers: The Possibilities and Limits of Anarchism* (Winchester: Zero Books, 2014), p. 7.

²⁰ A. J. Nocella II, 'A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent: Critical pedagogy, critical criminology, and critical animal studies'. *Social Science – Dissertations*. 2011. Paper 178.

²¹ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!: Anti-authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008), p. 4.

²² *Ibid.* p. 12.

²³ *Ibid.* p. 3.

that there are not numerous complications and misnomers. For instance, many animal activists resent the alliance between animal advocacy and a wider political ideology. One activist, writing in the *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter* believed it was a mistake for animal protectionists to align themselves with the Labour Party at the 1983 election, because after Labour's defeat 'when the Animal Rights Movement makes representation to the Government, it will not be as a pressure group but as part of the opposition'.²⁴ On the other hand, some leftists resent the inclusion of animal advocacy within their ideological framework. For instance, anarchist activists writing in *A Murder Of Crows* begrudged the fact that 'we find many within radical and anarchist circles *acritically* embracing animal liberation philosophy and veganism'.²⁵

Basis of comparison

The parliamentary left discussed in this thesis, in both the Greens and Labour Party, typically identifies as socialist (although perhaps this is less obviously the case with interviewees who served as New Labour ministers). Interestingly, then, the thesis compares the approach to animal advocacy of two very diverse strands of British socialism. Since its emergence, socialism has been split into two distinct wings, political socialism, as represented by classical Marxism and social democracy (including the Labour Party) which sought to bring about gradual reforms and piecemeal changes, and libertarian socialism which aimed to avoid 'the hazards of the parliamentary arena and the tragedy of despotism' by rejecting hierarchy and the state.²⁶ Since the 1990s, social democratic parties have largely accepted neoliberalism.²⁷ Although the anarchist and parliamentary left movements now appear incompatible, this was not the case during the development of socialism in

²⁴ P. Mosby, *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter*, No. 9, February 1984, p. 2.

²⁵ *A Murder of Crows*, Issue 2, March 2007 [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/various-authors-a-murder-of-crows>, last accessed 19/10/2015], p. 72.

²⁶ M. Fleming, *The Anarchist Way to Socialism: Élisée Reclus and Nineteenth-Century European Anarchism* (New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), p. 228; G. D. H. Cole, *A History of Socialist Thought: Vol. II: Marxism and Anarchism 1850-1890* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1954).

²⁷ L. Panitch, C. Leys, *The End of Parliamentary Socialism: From New Left to New Labour* (London: Verso, 1997).

Britain. Anarchist activist Albert Meltzer argued that at the start of the twentieth century groups of workers, such as the miners, 'were typical in seeing no difference between the ultimate aims of either [anarcho-syndicalism or 'state socialism'], many supporting one or the other simultaneously, going for direct action when it paid off, and electing MPs... for whatever crumbs it afforded'.²⁸ John Sanbonmatsu argues that the inclusion of animal issues and radical social reform by figures such as Henry Salt, John Oswald, Thomas Young, Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Voltairine DeCleyre make it seem 'plausible' that

had the early pluralism of anarchist and socialist thought been allowed to ferment and mature, radical thought might have developed in a more ecological, feminist, and animal liberationist direction.²⁹

In these different approaches we can anticipate the diverse ways that anarchistic activists and the parliamentary left will relate to animal advocacy: whereas anarchists seek to fundamentally change the political and economic order of society and reject social hierarchies and the state, the parliamentary left may seek gradual reforms through legislation.

Some activists would argue that the opinions represented here are too diverse to be regarded as part of the same movement. ALF hunger striker Barry Horne, for instance, believed that 'unity is inconceivable' between groups such as the ALF who used militant direct action and parliamentary lobbyists such as Compassion In World Farming (CIWF) and the BUAV: 'we're not talking here of one big happy family that has unfortunately fallen out over minor issues. We're actually talking about two opposing factions who believe in different goals'.³⁰ Other activists agreed that 'we're told that there's room for both ALF activity and for parliamentary and educational campaigns in the struggle' but 'unity is absurd when we consider the differing elements within the "movement"'.³¹ Rather than simply including all these groups as part of one united movement, perhaps representing the 'wets' and the 'militants' as

²⁸ A. Meltzer, *I Couldn't Paint Golden Angels: Sixty Years of Commonplace life and Anarchist Agitation* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1996), p. 38.

²⁹ J. Sanbonmatsu, 'Introduction', in J. Sanbonmatsu (ed.), *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011), pp. 15-16. Sanbonmatsu blames the homogenization of Marxist thought for the decline of socialist pluralism.

³⁰ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 6. January 1992, p. 7.

³¹ A. Mullan, 'Forget Unity!', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 9, Spring 1993, p. 39.

some activists have,³² I accept that there are often insurmountable ideological differences between activists who identify with different positions regarding animal advocacy; nonetheless it is possible to talk about an animal advocacy movement that encompasses all these diverse strands because they are all united by a concern for animals and the desire to change the current situation.

Parliamentary campaigning in alliance with sympathetic politicians and anarchistic direct action are the two main ways in which activists have sought to achieve progress for animals. Whilst these strands have not always been able to work together, the different strands of activism always interrelate and have an effect on one another. As the thesis will show, even if parliamentary and direct action campaigns are not intentionally connected, it is still interesting to consider phenomena such as the ‘radical flank effect’ of such activism, whereby ‘the moderates get tainted with the same brush as the radicals’, as with ‘the media’s reaction to the peaceful protests associated with the live animal export trade in the UK in the mid-1990s’.³³ Moreover, it can be the case that parliamentary campaigning can complement direct action. As George McKay explains:

The divergence of tactics in the anti-poll tax campaign was critical: while the parliamentary Labour Party sought to campaign against the tax by protest and debate, more grassroots organisations sprung up dedicated to *resistance*.³⁴

As we will see, these two ‘wings’ of activism have been the principal ways in which animal advocates have responded to issues such as hunting, vivisection and vegan outreach.

Even if one accepts the belief of one anarchist collective that ‘the phrase “unity within the movement” is as nonsensical as it is unlikely’, it is clear that even militant direct action activists believe that a left-leaning government would be best placed to adopt animal protection measures.³⁵ For instance, Barry Horne ended his first hunger strike in February 1997 because whilst he ‘knew from the outset that [his] demand[s] would not be met by the present Tory government’, he was aware that

³² Arkangel: *For Animal Liberation*, No. 4.

³³ L. Munro, ‘Strategies, Action Repertoires and DIY Activism in the Animal Rights Movement’, *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 75-94, p. 81.

³⁴ G. McKay, ‘DiY Culture: Notes towards an intro’, in G. McKay (ed.), *DiY Culture: Party & Protest in Nineties Britain* (London: Verso, 1998), p. 6. Emphasis in original.

³⁵ S.A.R.P Newsletter, No. 5. November 1991, p. 7.

Labour, who looked likely to form the next government, 'have committed themselves to ending cosmetic testing together with tobacco, alcohol and weapons research using animals' therefore 'there is a degree of hope upon which we can build'.³⁶ Similarly, ALF Press Officer Robin Webb argued that a reduction in militant direct action during the late 1990s 'was connected to the Labour Party gaining power in the 1997 General Election and the hope that Labour would deliver more change'.³⁷

Clearly, many animal activists recognise a shared interest and common cause across the parliamentary-direct action divide. As Andrew Upton explains:

Robin Webb, the long-serving ALF spokesperson, referred to the precedent of Nancy Phelps, who campaigned for the UK Labour Party in the run-up to the 1997 general election even though she had served jail sentences, as an illustrative example of how protesters were autonomous about the campaigns they did and didn't choose to participate in. In this case, both parliamentary/insider and direct action approaches were deployed; recognition on the part of the protesters that direct action alone is not enough to drive political change.³⁸

Some activists agree, in theory at least, that 'all animal rights activity is justified on the grounds that all actions are aimed at ending animal abuse'.³⁹

It is also interesting to compare anarchists and the parliamentary left because there is clearly a relationship between the two in the ideological development of many animal activists. This is particularly notable in the environmental movement, where the occasional alliance of anarchists and Green Party supporters 'allowed a continued feeling of a movement committed to diversity'.⁴⁰ ALF founder Ronnie Lee was once a self-identified anarchist, but now campaigns for the Green Party because, he says:

³⁶ *Underground: The Magazine of the North American Animal Liberation Front Supporters' Group*, No. 7, Spring 1997.

³⁷ R. Monaghan, "'Not Quite Terrorism": Animal Rights Extremism in the United Kingdom', *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 36, No. 11, 2013, p. 937.

³⁸ A. Upton, "'Go on, Get Out There, and Make It Happen": Reflections on the First Ten Years of Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC)', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 2011, p. 246.

³⁹ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 3. September 1991, p. 3.

⁴⁰ M. Wilson, *Rules Without Rulers*, p. 108.

The best we can do is to try and make sure we have good leaders rather than bad ones, and anarchism is actually harmful to this process, because by refusing to support good leaders, anarchists are actually making it easier for bad leaders to come to power.⁴¹

Other activists have moved from a parliamentary left position to an anarchist viewpoint; for instance, Bill Hanton resigned from the Labour Party once he had come 'to the conclusion that anarchism and syndicalism is the only philosophy which... [can] help the working class'.⁴²

It is interesting to compare parliamentary left and anarchistic approaches because both sets of tactics have a significant effect on campaigns for animals. As certain BUAV activists noted: 'All radical reform movements throughout history have been composed of a broad spectrum of tactics, activists and constituent bodies'.⁴³ These activists compared the animal advocacy movement to 'organised labour, the suffragettes, Indian Nationalism, civil rights in America, [and] the peace movement' who 'have all furthered their objectives' with the aid of both parliamentary campaigning and direct action.⁴⁴ The 'multi-strategic nature of the [animal advocacy] movement', with its 'diversity of tactics, objectives and support' could well provide inspiration for the entire British left.⁴⁵ As Sara Mills and Patrick Williams argued in *Marxism Today*, such tactics include

working within and without the parliamentary system; being basically pro-Labour as notionally the most progressive party, but prepared to let non-party principles determine strategies and allegiances, and using whatever methods seem appropriate to the need.⁴⁶

Part of the originality of this thesis lies in comparing anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to a particular issue. Besides, these two positions may now appear incompatible, but this was not always the case during the development of the British left, and as George McKay explained, these diverse movements are

⁴¹ R. Lee. "How long... ?" Revisited', *Critical Society*, No. 5, Winter 2010/11, pp. 1-5, p. 3.

⁴² C. W. Gibson MP to Bill Hanton, 27/08/1952, Sparrows' Nest Archive, Ron00622-3.

⁴³ 'BUAV in Crisis' (Campaign for a Progressive BUAV, May 1985). Hull History Centre, DBV/21/37.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ S. Mills, P. Williams, 'Political Animals', *Marxism Today*, April 1986, p. 33.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

still able to have a mutually beneficial impact on certain issues.⁴⁷ This may particularly be the case with animal advocacy. Indeed, when Tony Benn planned a documentary about the British political process, he hoped to make animal issues the centre piece, because for him this was ‘the issue that brings together all the various elements of extra-parliamentary and parliamentary activity’.⁴⁸ There is a growing body of work that considers the connections between different strands of socialism, for instance classical Marxism and anarchism, and this thesis will contribute to that work.⁴⁹

The thesis is also original because it considers the parliamentary left using a CAS framework; as I will explain, one previously dominant interpretation of CAS scholarship has largely ignored legislative politics. This may be because the version of CAS set out by scholars from the Institute of Critical Animal Studies (ICAS) focused solely on radical direct action activism. The original ICAS scholars gained their experience and activism in North America. In this thesis I make an original contribution to animal studies scholarship and expand the narrow definition of CAS by considering the relationships between the parliamentary left and radical animal activism. It might be the case that ICAS scholars ignored parliamentary activism because America does not have the same leftist tradition as Britain. There is a proud leftist tradition in America, but the parliamentary/direct action split that we witness in Britain is not identical in America. For instance, in Britain groups such as the CND, feminist groups and environmentalists have always been split by those who thought that their movement should work with the British Labour Party and those who demanded radical extra-parliamentary action.

At the radical end of the spectrum, this thesis is significant for both anarchist studies and CAS. It is important for anarchist studies to consider the relationships discussed in this thesis because anarchists, like other leftists, often regard reforms as an important stepping stone to more thoroughgoing revolutionary changes. This thesis helps explain how one group of anarchists – anarchist animal activists – help force reforms whilst still attempting to lead the way to total animal liberation.

⁴⁷ G. McKay, ‘DIY Culture’.

⁴⁸ T. Benn, *Free at Last: Diaries 1991-2001* (London: Arrow Books, 2003), pp. 305-306.

⁴⁹ A. Prichard, R. Kinna, S. Pinta, D. Berry, *Libertarian Socialism: Politics in Black and Red* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); A. Prichard, O. Worth, ‘Left-wing convergence: An introduction’, *Capital & Class*, Vol. 40. No. 1. February 2016, pp. 3-17.

The thesis also contributes to work that connects the British left to issues such as the environment and the countryside, and other subjects beyond traditional workplace and industrial concerns. Recent work by Claire Griffiths and Michael Woods considers Labour's historical and ideological relationship with the countryside.⁵⁰ Environmentalism has become a popular theme within anarchist studies, with work focusing on direct action groups such as the Earth Liberation Front and Earth First!⁵¹ Such work has identified the Environmental Justice Paradigm, which is a 'well-developed environmental ideological framework that explicitly links ecological concerns with labour and social justice issues'.⁵² Such scholarship is also related to work on the total liberation frame which links racism, injustices, environmentalism and animal activism, and this thesis contributes to such work by considering total liberation in relation to animal activism. The relationship between direct action and legislation is particularly significant in relation to environmental politics, and this thesis seeks to develop knowledge and understanding of this connection by considering this connection in relation to animal rights activism.

Animal advocacy and the left

When I began research on this thesis my starting hypothesis, which was based on previous study of the Labour Party and British trade union movement, as well as personal involvement in anarchistic punk scenes, socialist and trade union politics, and 18 years' experience as a vegetarian and vegan, was that whilst the parliamentary left have shown an interest in animal welfare issues, animal *rights* have been marginalised in mainstream parliamentary politics. Because of this, I believed that a cultural and ideological 'home' for radical animal activism, including direct action, could be located in the anarchistic left. As we shall see, it soon became clear that CAS provided a useful framework to explore this initial premise. The thesis

⁵⁰ C. V. J Griffiths, *Labour and the Countryside: The politics of rural Britain 1918-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); M. Woods, *New Labour's Countryside: Rural Policy in Britain Since 1997* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2008).

⁵¹ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.) *Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defence of the Earth* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2011).

⁵² D. E. Taylor, 'The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm: Injustice Framing and the Social Construction of Environmental Discourses', *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol. 43, No. 4. 2000. pp. 508-580, p. 539.

also makes an original contribution to a number of other fields, including Labour Party and anarchist history, anarchist studies, social movement studies, ecofeminism and animal rights theory.

It was clear from my previous studies that animal issues are entirely neglected from accounts of the British Labour Party. No major history scrutinises Labour's relationship to animal issues,⁵³ (although brief mentions of fox hunting are included in studies of Labour's political thought)⁵⁴ and so the thesis makes an original contribution to studies of the Labour Party by considering the party's relationship to animal advocacy.⁵⁵ Conversely, it is also clear that any history of the anarchist movement would not be complete without some assessment of animal issues, not least because of the early connections provided by Kropotkin and Tolstoy.⁵⁶ This thesis enriches anarchist histories by examining anarchistic animal activism in Britain since the 1970s and it thereby sheds light on anarchist ideologies and organising practices.

The thesis also engages with, and contributes to, anarchist studies, social movement studies, and ecofeminism. Anarchist studies typically discusses animal activism, both as a key part of the contemporary anarchist movement, and as a useful case study for exploring wider anarchist ideas.⁵⁷ The thesis contributes to anarchist studies on both counts, by uncovering the history of anarchistic animal activism in the ALF and SHAC and by scrutinising key anarchist concepts such as the relationship between reform and revolution. Similarly, recent works on social movements, such as the introductory text by Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani,

⁵³ A. Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2008); K. Laybourn, *A Century of Labour: A History of the Labour Party, 1900-2000* (Gloucester: Sutton, 2001); H. Pelling, A. J. Ried, *A Short History of the Labour Party* (Hampshire: Macmillan, 1996); J. Callaghan, S. Fielding, S. Ludlam, (eds.), *Interpreting the Labour Party: Approaches to Labour Politics and History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

⁵⁴ D. Tanner, P. Thane, N. Tiratsoo, (eds.), *Labour's First Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 39.

⁵⁵ Other scholars are also beginning to address this gap: D. Weinbren, 'Against all cruelty: The Humanitarian League, 1891-1919', *History Workshop Journal*, 1994, No. 38, pp.86-105; M. Tichelar, 'Putting Animals into Politics: The Labour Party and Hunting in the first half of the Twentieth Century', *Rural History*, 2006, Vol. 17. No. 2. pp. 213-234.

⁵⁶ G. Woodcock, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004); P. Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (Oakland: PM Press, 2008).

⁵⁷ B. Franks, *Rebel Alliances: The means and ends of contemporary British Anarchism* (Edinburgh: AK Press and Dark Star, 2006); R. Amster, A. DeLeon, L. Fernandez, A. J. Nocella II, D. Shannon (eds.), *Contemporary anarchist studies: An introductory anthology of anarchy in the academy* (London: Routledge, 2009); R. Kinna, *Anarchism: A Beginners' Guide* (Oxford: One World, 2005).

use examples from the animal rights movement to support their arguments.⁵⁸ This thesis engages with social movement themes such as action repertoires, collective identity, and the repression of social movements. The thesis also contributes to ecofeminist work, particular the writings of Carol Adams and Josephine Donovan, by scrutinising ecofeminist concepts such as intersectionality and hierarchy in relation to anarchistic and parliamentary left animal activism.⁵⁹

Animal rights literature

Although this thesis identifies animal activism as a movement which readily interrelates with the British left, existing animal rights scholarship has not always described the connection in these terms. Traditionally, the most common view held by academics studying the animal advocacy movement was that ‘classifying pro-animal protestors as left or right politically misses the point’ because ‘saving animals is the single goal, to which all other ideologies and identities are subordinate’.⁶⁰ More recently, Richard Posner has argued that ‘animal rights have no particular political valence. They are as compatible with right wing as left wing views’.⁶¹ Even animal rights philosopher Peter Singer identified animal activists as coming from ‘all social classes, age groups, races, religious and *political persuasions*’.⁶² One influential political account of British animal activism comes from Robert Garner’s *Animals, Politics and Morality*, and even here we are told that ‘there is not a great deal to choose between the stances of Labour and the Conservatives on the issue of animal

⁵⁸ D. Della Porta, M. Diani, *Social Movements: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), p. 22, p. 107.

⁵⁹ C. J. Adams, *Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the Defence of Animals* (New York: Continuum, 1995); C. J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (London: Continuum, 2011); L. Kemmerer, (ed.), *Sister Species: Women, Animals and Social Justice* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2011); C. J. Adams, J. Donovan, (eds.), *Animals & Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

⁶⁰ J. M. Jasper, D. Nelkin, *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest* (New York: The Free Press, 1992), pp. 40-41.

⁶¹ R. A. Posner, ‘Animal Rights: Legal, Philosophical and Pragmatic Perspectives’, in C. R. Sunstein, M. C. Nussbaum, (eds.), *Animal Rights: Current Debates and New Directions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 61.

⁶² L. Green, P. Singer, D. Hine, *Animal Liberation: A Graphic Guide* (London: Camden Press, 1987), p. 25. Emphasis added.

protection' (although 'Labour clearly has the edge').⁶³ Elsewhere Garner explains that 'as far as animal welfare has troubled decision-makers, it has... been regarded as a cross-party issue'.⁶⁴

Indeed, just as academics writing about the animal advocacy movement have perceived a lack of wider ideological engagement, scholars focusing on the British left have noticed that traditionally 'the Left has had little to say about the burgeoning animal rights movement'.⁶⁵ For Garner, there have been some 'rather half-hearted efforts to capture animal rights for the left'; however these have been underwhelming for two reasons. Firstly,

[s]ocialism's historic roots lie in the same set of materialist and anthropocentric values as liberal capitalism and it therefore has no greater claim to be considered as an ideology that can incorporate animal protection.⁶⁶

Secondly, a mainstream political party, hoping to build 'a coalition of support' strong enough to reach high office cannot afford to 'take on board the absolutist demands of the animal rights movement', at least until such demands are approved by a greater percentage of the electorate.⁶⁷ Ted Benton's work *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights & Social Justice* went some way to elaborating the theoretical connections between animal rights and a Marxist framework; nonetheless Benton recognised that a paradox exists 'in the mutual suspicion, hostility, or at best, indifference which has pervaded the relations between radical social movements (primarily socialist in orientation) and those which campaign for radical changes in our relations to non-human nature'.⁶⁸ As we shall see, CAS scholarship has challenged the presumed indifference between the left and animal issues; but even CAS co-founder Steven Best believes that 'the entire spectrum of the Left is oblivious to the fact that in the last few decades a new movement has emerged that

⁶³ R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, Second Edition, 2004), p. 201.

⁶⁴ Garner adds 'with the notable exception of hunting'. R. Garner, 'Defending Animal Rights', *Parliamentary Affairs: A Journal of Comparative Politics*, Vol. 51. No. 3, July 1998. pp. 458-469, p. 464.

⁶⁵ S. Mills, P. Williams, 'Political Animals', p. 30.

⁶⁶ R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality*, p. 200.

⁶⁷ R. Garner, 'Defending Animal Rights', p. 458.

⁶⁸ T. Benton, *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights & Social Justice* (London: Verso, 1993), p. 1.

is of immense ethical, political and ideological significance'.⁶⁹ Little wonder that Keith Tester felt able to dismiss the movement by arguing that: 'Politically, animal rights exists in something of a fundamentalist ghetto'.⁷⁰

I do not dispute the fact that a large number of British leftists entirely ignore animal rights, and this is matched by the many animal advocates who focus solely on their single issue without a wider ideological framework. Indeed, some animal advocates even believe that 'if people really cared about animals they would be prepared to sacrifice their political beliefs'.⁷¹ However, I challenge the view expressed by Garner, Benton and Singer by arguing that there is a strong (though partial) relationship between animal advocacy and the British left. These writers have underestimated the connection for two reasons. Firstly, as we explore below, there are genuine differences between the terms animal rights and animal welfare, yet often these are used interchangeably. For instance, when Richard Posner argued that animal rights were equally compatible with the political right or left, he seemed to have misunderstood the term animal *rights*, believing that it simply meant preventing 'cruelty' to animals, like chimpanzees 'or any other animals with whom we sympathise'.⁷² Such a statement accurately describes animal welfare, and it is nearer the truth that animal welfare crosses such ideological boundaries.⁷³ However, an animal rights approach which questions the ultimate use of animals in the meat, hunting and vivisection industries is more often supported by the political left. Ted Benton and Simon Redfern, in their article 'The Politics of Animal Rights – Where is the Left?' argue that 'much of the reaction of the Left has been, predictably enough, sceptical and dismissive'.⁷⁴ However, despite the neatness of the title juxtaposing 'Rights' and 'the Left', it emerges that it is animal *welfare* which has become 'close to a national consensus' and therefore a non-ideological issue.⁷⁵ Garner may be correct that animal *welfare* is often a cross-party issue, but animal *rights* are more readily

⁶⁹ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 79.

⁷⁰ K. Tester, *Animals and Society: The Humanity of Animal Rights* (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 192.

⁷¹ Minutes of the General Election Coordinating Committee for Animal Protection, 20th July 1982, Hull History Centre.

⁷² R. A. Posner, 'Animal Rights', p. 59.

⁷³ Kim Stallwood informs me that such misuse of the term 'animal rights' is common within the American movement. Interview with Kim Stallwood, 25/10/2013.

⁷⁴ T. Benton, S. Redfern, 'The Politics of Animal Rights – Where is the Left?', *New Left Review*, 215, pp. 43-58, p. 53.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

embraced by those on the left of British politics, as Garner discovers by studying the political leanings of politicians who support pro-animal Early Day Motions.⁷⁶ The second reason why these works have ignored the connection between animal advocacy and the left is because ‘the Left’ here relates solely to traditional Marxist and parliamentary socialist politics. If one expands their conception of the left to include anarchists, and the Green Party, then it no longer makes sense to argue that ‘the entire spectrum of the Left is oblivious’ to animal advocacy.⁷⁷ As we shall see, the ALF was formed by self-identified anarchists and there continue to be tactical similarities and a shared sense of collective identity between anarchists and radical animal advocacy groups. A developing school of scholarship that should accept animal advocacy and anarchists as part of the left is CAS.

Critical Animal Studies (CAS)

CAS emerged as an independent field of scholarship during the 2000s to provide theoretical support to the animal liberation movement in the same way that ‘the women’s struggle created women’s studies, [and] the Black liberation movement created African and Black studies’.⁷⁸ Although CAS was not named until 2006, Nik Taylor and Richard Twine explain that ‘Any contextualisation of CAS must confront the fact that, in an intellectual sense, it existed before the term was coined’.⁷⁹ Some scholars have dated this lineage to philosophers such as Pythagoras or the growth of Jainism, Buddhism and Hinduism.⁸⁰ A more concrete foundation of ideas that would later be developed into CAS comes from the British socialist movement and in particular the work of Henry Salt and the Humanitarian League, who campaigned for

⁷⁶ R. Garner, *The Political Theory of Animal Rights* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005). Indeed, Garner notes that Labour MPs are more likely to sign supportive Early Day Motions.

⁷⁷ S. Best, *Total Liberation*, p. 79.

⁷⁸ A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, ‘The Emergence of Critical Animal Studies: The Rise of Intersectional Animal Liberation’, in: A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Approach for Liberation* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014), p. xxii.

⁷⁹ N. Taylor, R. Twine, ‘Introduction: Locating the “critical” in critical animal studies’, in: N. Taylor, R. Twine (eds.), *The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: From the Margins to the Centre* (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 4.

⁸⁰ L. Kemmerer, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.), *Call to Compassion: Religious Perspectives on Animal Advocacy* (New York: Lantern Books, 2011).

animal issues, as well as for prison reform and against corporal punishment and militarism.⁸¹ Dawne McCance, in her introduction to CAS, locates the discipline's foundation in the philosophical collection *Animals, Men and Morals*.⁸² The modern animal advocacy movement is often dated from the mid-1970s, and Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation* (1975) is regarded as a foundational text. In *Animal Liberation* Singer explains that a 'liberation movement is a demand for an end to prejudice and discrimination based on an arbitrary characterisation like race or sex'.⁸³ Thus Singer, who recognised that his arguments 'had all been said before' by Salt, compared the animal rights movement to Black, LGBT and women's liberation movements.⁸⁴ Peter Singer and philosopher Tom Regan arguably provide the diverse theoretical basis for the modern animal advocacy movement; which is not to say that Singer and Regan share a theoretical premise of animal rights, in fact their approaches are quite distinct. Singer is a utilitarian philosopher whose normative ethical theory suggests that the consequences of one's actions are the ultimate foundations on which the morality of such actions should be judged. Tom Regan, on the other hand, adopts a nonconsequentialist deontological theory; as Regan explains:

Not all nonconsequentialist theories agree, however, on whether the value of consequences has any role to play in the determination of what we ought to do. Some theories (what we might call extreme deontological theories) hold that the value of consequences is entirely irrelevant to this determination, while others (moderate deontological theories) hold that, though the value of consequences is relevant, other things are relevant too.⁸⁵

There is also a long and significant tradition of feminist activism and writing in defence of animals.⁸⁶ Indeed, according to Twine and Taylor 'a significant catalyst for debate on animal ethics came from ecofeminist writings'.⁸⁷ In particular, Carol Adams' work *The Sexual Politics of Meat* helped develop intersectional theory to

⁸¹ 'Aims and Objectives of the Humanitarian League', *The Humanitarian*, Vol. 8, No. 169, January 1917, p. 7.

⁸² D. McCance, *Critical Animal Studies: An Introduction* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013), p. 7; R. Godlovitch, S. Godlovitch, J. Harris (eds.), *Animals, Men and Morals: An Inquiry into the Maltreatment of Non-humans* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1971).

⁸³ P. Singer, *Animal Liberation* (London: Pimlico, second edition 2005), p. xii.

⁸⁴ Ibid, p. xvi. A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, 'The Emergence of Critical Animal Studies', p. ixx.

⁸⁵ T. Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), p. 144.

⁸⁶ Interview with Carol J. Adams, 24/04/2015; T. Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights*.

⁸⁷ N. Taylor, R. Twine, 'Introduction', p. 4.

include other animals.⁸⁸ In fact, eco-feminist scholarship, particularly the works of Adams and Donovan, helped shape many of the themes and concerns of CAS, particularly discussions regarding the intersectionality of oppression; however, due to internal disagreements within CAS scholarship, the significance of such eco-feminist work has been largely ignored by contemporary scholars associated with ICAS. Although these diverse theoretical roots are clearly significant, they are not the focus of this thesis because, as we see, animal activists do not distinguish so clearly between the philosophers they support.

CAS also emerged through debates with related disciplines such as Animal Studies and Human-Animal Studies.⁸⁹ However, CAS challenges Animal Studies which is 'rooted in vivisection and animal testing in the hard sciences' and Human-Animal Studies which 'reinforces the socially constituted human-animal binary'.⁹⁰ Some CAS scholars are also influenced by posthumanism; however, others believe that such scholarship is 'dissociated from popular struggles and [so] undermines activism'.⁹¹ While this thesis draws on a CAS framework, I contribute to and extend this framework through close examination of the complex and, at times, contradictory interrelationships between legislative politics and the politics of direct action.

Institute for Critical Animal Studies (ICAS)

While the roots of CAS draw on a diverse range of eco-feminism, animal rights theory and socialist scholarship, a significant contribution to the field of CAS emerged from the work of ICAS. ICAS was founded by Anthony Nocella and Steven

⁸⁸ C. J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat*.

⁸⁹ A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, 'The Emergence of Critical Animal Studies', p. xxii.

⁹⁰ *Ibid*, p. xxiii.

⁹¹ J. Sorenson, 'Introduction: Thinking the Unthinkable', in J. Sorenson, (ed.), *Critical Animal Studies: Thinking the Unthinkable* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars', 2014), p. xix. Critical posthumanism seeks to challenge the divide between humans and animals whilst engaging with inter-species relations; however, mainstream posthumanism – which has been rejected by CAS scholars – more commonly stands for technologically-mediated transcendence of human limitations. See: C. Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism?* (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis, 2010); D. J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (London: Free Association Books, 1991).

Best during the collaboration which led to the edited collection *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?: Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*.⁹² As Nocella explains:

What we wanted to do, similar to other revolutionary themes, is we wanted to create a book that articulated and explained why these “wild, scary, violent, terrorist individuals” destroy labs and farms to liberate nonhuman animals.⁹³

After the success of the collection, Best and Nocella decided to create an institute:

For articulating revolutionary activities while bringing different struggles together from the American Indian Movement to the Black Panther Party, from the Zapatistas to the... queer movement and disability. We really wanted to bring different struggles – that are revolutionary, outside the system, that wasn't [sic] reformist – together.⁹⁴

A definition given on the ICAS webpage explains that

Critical Animal Studies (CAS), rooted in animal liberation and influenced by anarchism is an intersectional transformative holistic theory-to-activist activist-scholarly global community to strive to support, examine, explain and be in solidarity with radical and revolutionary actions, theories, groups and movements for total liberation, in hopes for a just, equitable, inclusive, respectful, and peaceful world.⁹⁵

CAS scholarship is not simply interested in understanding the animal advocacy movement, instead it also aims to promote ‘a holistic social justice struggle that includes and respects nonhuman animals’.⁹⁶ CAS is influenced by critical theory, anarchist studies and social justice and takes a ‘multidisciplinary intersectional and multi-movement approach to the advocacy for total animal liberation’.⁹⁷ CAS is shaped by an understanding of contemporary animal advocacy and ‘its proponents theoretically support the Animal Liberation Front’s (ALF) anarchic style, philosophy,

⁹² S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (New York: Latern Books, 2004).

⁹³ Interview with Anthony J. Nocella II, 15/09/2015.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ ICAS, ‘Definition of Critical Animal Studies’ [viewed online, <http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/about/>, last accessed 02/09/2015].

⁹⁶ A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, ‘The Emergence of Critical Animal Studies’, p. xxvii.

⁹⁷ A. J. Nocella II, ‘A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent’.

tactics, strategies, and decentralised non-hierarchical organizational structure'.⁹⁸ Of course, it would be wrong to present a homogenous view of CAS as a field of study which is directed by the central organisation in North America. It is clear from the diverse range of participants and theoretical ideas presented at the 4th European conference for Critical Animal Studies that CAS covers a wide range of intellectual voices and activist experiences, including a willingness to consider or support welfare tactics and legislation, and a rejection of some tactics associated with the ALF.⁹⁹ Following the 4th European conference for CAS, a new organisation, the European Association for Critical Animal Studies (EACAS), was founded as an 'autonomous non-hierarchical association for critical animal studies in Europe', the organisation envisaged 'no Directors or Board but an equal membership of academics, students and activists'.¹⁰⁰ EACAS draws on socialist, anarchist and feminist theory and practice and aims to carve-out a space for anti-speciesist approaches in academia.

Throughout this thesis I draw on a framework built on the ten key CAS principles, which were set out by the original ICAS scholars: Steve Best, Anthony Nocella, Richard Kahn, Carol Gigliotti and Lisa Kemmerer in 2007.¹⁰¹ In using this framework I intended to contribute to and extend CAS scholarship by providing a close examination of the complex relationships between direct action and legislative politics. These principles distinguish CAS from dominant orientations of animal studies as well as prominent tendencies in the animal welfare movement: firstly, CAS stresses the significance of interdisciplinary collaborative writing and research; secondly, CAS rejects 'pseudo-objective academic analysis by explicitly clarifying its normative values and political commitments'; thirdly, CAS rejects narrow academic viewpoints and theory-for-theory's sake, instead CAS seeks to link theory to practice; fourth, CAS focuses on the intersectionality of oppression and domination; fifth, CAS promotes anti-capitalist and radical anti-hierarchical politics; sixth, CAS rejects

⁹⁸ A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, 'The Emergence of Critical Animal Studies', p. xxix.

⁹⁹ 4th European conference for Critical Animal Studies, 6th and 7th October 2015, Instituto de História Contemporânea, New University of Lisbon.

¹⁰⁰ EACAS, 'Announcing the New European Association for Critical Animal Studies (EACAS)', [viewed online, <http://www.eacas.eu/2015/11/01/announcing-the-new-european-association-for-critical-animal-studies-eacas/>, last accessed 22/06/2016].

¹⁰¹ Ibid. S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5. No. 1. (2007), pp. 4-5.

reformist single-issue ‘animal interest’ politics’; seventh, CAS champions the politics of total liberation; eighth, CAS challenges the socially constructed binary opposition between human and nonhuman animals; ninth, CAS supports direct action and the ALF; finally, CAS seeks to build openings for constructive critical dialogue on issues relevant to CAS among academics and activists.

The key CAS principles are significant for this thesis for three reasons: firstly, they are principles which I share and as such they have helped form the methodology and research questions; secondly, the principles themselves helped form the framework by which I analyse parliamentary left and anarchistic activism; finally, I hope to build on current CAS scholarship which in reality, and particularly within ICAS, sometimes falls short of the founding principles. For instance, ICAS scholarship neglects the practice of animal activists who often link reformist and revolutionary tactics in a much more complex way than is presumed by the blanket rejection of welfarism given in the ten key CAS principles. Of course, in drawing on these ten key CAS principles, which were created by a range of scholars, not all of whom are associated with the current ICAS administration, I do not wish to limit CAS to ‘one thing’ in which all proponents are following a rigid set of guidelines set out by the movement’s leaders.

CAS and anarchism

From its foundation, ICAS brought a range of scholar-activists together who ‘all had a different take on things’. Some of the founders promoted a specifically anarchist philosophy whilst others ‘wanted nothing to do with anything that would help human beings’.¹⁰² Whilst Nocella was a self-identified anarchist who believed that CAS should be ‘greatly motivated by anarchism’ as an ‘economic, social and political ideology’,¹⁰³ Best came from ‘an old school Marxist perspective’ but gradually came to incorporate anarchist ideas.¹⁰⁴ Lisa Kemmerer argues that

¹⁰² Interview with Lisa Kemmerer, 25/08/2015.

¹⁰³ A. J. Nocella II, ‘A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent’.

¹⁰⁴ Interview with Anthony J. Nocella II, 15/09/2015; S. Best, ‘Rethinking Revolution: Total liberation, alliance politics, and a prolegomena to resistance movements in the twenty-first century’, in. R.

anarchism was only ‘one of the causes that members brought to the floor, but it was no more anarchist than it was any of the other peripheral – and they were peripheral – issues, the main issue was animal liberation’.¹⁰⁵

Clearly, not all self-identified CAS scholars are, or should be, self-identified anarchists. Nonetheless, Nocella believes that ‘anarchism is the theory that pushes total liberation and intersectionality and you really can’t understand intersectionality and total liberation if you’re not an anarchist’.¹⁰⁶ Of course, much work on intersectionality has been undertaken by leftist black feminists who do not identify with anarchism, and may resent a white male leader dictating the terms of a concept that arose from the black feminist movement to describe their own experience of oppression.¹⁰⁷ In fact, Carol Gigliotti believes that one significant problem with the original ICAS project was its lack of overall commitment to feminist principles:

I found that my approach to things being a woman, even though I know now that there are many men who are die-hard feminists, my son being one of them, but at the time I felt like we could have used a little more feminism in the group, I was glad I was there.¹⁰⁸

The connections between anarchism and CAS were developed in the collection *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, in which the editors note that CAS shares with the anarchist critique the belief that ‘the market and the state’ are ‘absolutely central to creating and perpetuating the violent geographies that we see’.¹⁰⁹ Moreover, both anarchism and CAS, in theory at least, ‘[do] not seek reform, but transformative revolution and total liberation’.¹¹⁰

Amster, A. DeLeon, L. A. Fernandez, A. J. Nocella II, D. Shannon, (eds.), *Contemporary Anarchist Studies*.

¹⁰⁵ Interview with Lisa Kemmerer, 25/08/2015.

¹⁰⁶ Interview with Anthony J. Nocella II, 15/09/2015. Of course, different strands of feminism understand intersectionality in ways which do not necessarily incorporate anarchism.

¹⁰⁷ S. Smith ‘Black feminism and intersectionality’, *International Socialist Review*, #91, [viewed online, <http://isreview.org/issue/91/black-feminism-and-intersectionality>, last accessed 29/06/2016].

¹⁰⁸ Interview with Carol Gigliotti, CAS Scholar, 09/09/2015.

¹⁰⁹ Particularly in relation to the ‘extreme levels of violence against nonhuman animals entangled in the urban fabric which is so commonplace and pervasive that most do not see it’. A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth, ‘Introduction: The Intersections of Critical Animal Studies and Anarchist Studies for Total Liberation’, in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation: Essays on Complementary Elements of Total Liberation* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2015), p. 8, p. 18.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 9.

The situation is complicated because there is a difference between the ICAS interpretation of CAS, and the way in which a scholarly field has grown with that name. Lisa Kemmerer argues that 'Critical Animal Studies isn't one thing' that can be controlled by ICAS; on the other hand, Nocella is disturbed that people who do not adhere to the CAS founding principles, such as supporting total liberation and intersectionality, are operating under the CAS banner because: 'as one of the co-founders of ICAS and Critical Animal Studies I argue that that's not Critical Animal Studies and looking at the history that's what we believed in'.¹¹¹ The situation is further complicated because original ICAS members such as Kemmerer and Gigliotti have now left ICAS because they believe that the organisation no longer lives up to the ideals it claims to promote. Kemmerer argues that:

One of the problems with Critical Animal Studies is it has had one leader who basically took over the organisation and has kept hold of the reins of power for the last, almost a decade, so that very much is against anarchy, it's against feminism, it's against [libertarian] Marxism, so there's an example of where the organisation completely falls on its face in actually living up to some of the things that people are associating with ICAS... it's a white man who has got hold of the power and has held onto it and has driven out a lot of people because of his heavy handed leadership.

They've got a white male leader who's been there years, and their board and the way they've got it set up, their laws, don't provide for any kind of roll over. So they've got a white man in charge and he's staying there and he rules with kind of an iron fist which is why he's driven out the other people who are the founders, because that's not how we envisioned it and that isn't what we wanted. So in that sense, yes it's a sell out and it's not living up to its ideals... Critical Animal Studies is bigger than this group that we started and it's now bigger than this administration that has a hold of it.¹¹²

New developments in animal studies, such as the Vegan Studies Project, and new academic associations such as the European Association for Critical Animal

¹¹¹ Interview with Lisa Kemmerer, 25/08/2015; Interview with Anthony J. Nocella II, 15/09/2015.

¹¹² Interview with Lisa Kemmerer, 25/08/2015.

Studies (EACAS), have sought to expand CAS from the anarchistic base of ICAS.¹¹³ Indeed, animal studies has now gained momentum in a range of disciplines, in history the 'animal turn' and looking through the 'animal lens' has gained traction to such an extent that it is now possible to talk of the 'triumph' of 'animal history'.¹¹⁴ Carol Gigliotti supports these expansions because she believes that ICAS have been wrong to try and limit CAS scholarship to certain approaches, such as anarchism:

There are people who are really thinking through this in a much wider way, and I feel it's the responsibility of people in ICAS to really think about those things and not to limit what can be thought of. I mean, the idea, for instance, that the arts are just a throwaway thing and don't really count in all this. You know, people are changed by film, by books, by visual arts, by animation, by graphic novels, that's a powerful way to get to these issues.¹¹⁵

This thesis is intellectually and methodologically rooted in CAS. However, it seeks to expand the CAS framework set out in the ten ICAS principles. Like all CAS work, this thesis follows a normative animal rights approach which seeks to eliminate the domination and oppression of all animals, including humans. However whereas ICAS scholarship has taken a normative stance within animal activism, and sees only anarchistic activism rooted in direct action tactics as a true form of activism, this thesis closely examines the interrelations between reformist and revolutionary tactics and expands the original CAS framework. The thesis does not seek to show that there is one superior set of tactics that all animal activists must follow; instead the problematized framework that I set out is intended to show a nuanced analytical differentiation between direct action politics and legislative politics. In order to undertake this task it was important that the thesis was not theoretically grounded in CAS alone, but instead I directly draw on a range of concepts and themes developed from social movement studies, eco-feminism, labour history and anarchist studies. Such themes enable me to consider the animal rights movement in relation to wider social movement studies, whilst using a CAS framework to consider the relationships between anarchistic and parliamentary left animal activism.

¹¹³ European Association for Critical Animal Studies, <http://www.eacas.eu/>; L. Wright, *The Vegan Studies Project: Food, Animals, and Gender in the age of Terror* (Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 2015).

¹¹⁴ J. Specht, 'Animal History after its Triumph: Unexpected Animals, Evolutionary Approaches and the Animal Lens', *History Compass*, Vol. 14. No. 7. pp. 326-336.

¹¹⁵ Carol Gigliotti, CAS Scholar, 09/09/2015.

The thesis contributes to the work of the new EACAS, which seeks to promote veganism and works to dismantle the animal-industrial complex, whilst reflecting the complex and often contradictory nature of animal activism in Britain. The thesis also contributes to the work of the Centre for Animals and Social Justice (CASJ), a British think tank that was founded by academics and activists

which heralds a unique and innovative approach to advancing animal protection. We are dedicated to research, education and policy engagement that establishes animals' rightful status as recipients of social justice.¹¹⁶

Despite the unique work that CASJ undertake, both in persuading 'society to respect animals' and attempting to promote 'effective animal protection', the work of CASJ would not fall under the rigid definition of CAS set out in the ICAS framework. One of the strongpoint's of this thesis is that it promotes a flexible version of CAS which would include such scholarship as the work being undertaken by CASJ. I agree with Carol Gigliotti that although the original group that set out the key CAS principles are no longer working together, the fact that CAS scholarship is expanding in a number of diverse ways with different positions should be celebrated:

The idea of Critical Animal Studies and the idea of animal rights/liberation/advocacy, at this point in time I'm old enough to know that we need everything, from different points of view, and just hammer away at it, this [current situation of animal abuse] has to change – for animals and people and the environment.¹¹⁷

It should also be noted that Nocella has recently announced the founding of Radical Animal Studies, which seeks to promote anarchism and support for the ALF in the way that the original ICAS project did. The thesis follows a prefigurative approach, not only in the horizontal nature of the research methodology, interview techniques, sampling method and main questions arising from the animal activist movement, but in the fact that through CAS scholarship one is able to challenge speciesist approaches in academic and promote veganism through research, in teaching and by organising conferences.

¹¹⁶ Centre for Animals and Social Justice, 'About Us' [viewed online, <http://www.casj.org.uk/about/>, last accessed 23/06/2016].

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

The thesis does not simply adopt every existing CAS assumption, but aims to offer a contribution to CAS scholarship by developing or challenging certain aspects of CAS. In particular, it becomes clear that the CAS rejection of reformist politics is unhelpful for animal activists who often seek gradual improvements alongside more fundamental changes in the longer term. In this thesis I broadly accept the ICAS definition of CAS, whilst recognising that many other scholars are operating under a slightly different framework, in particular one that is not explicitly anarchist. Moreover, some CAS scholarship can be *uncritical* of the animal rights movement. For instance, Jennifer Grubbs and Michael Loadenthal criticise scholars who ‘write in praise of a daytime picket in front of a foie gras seller and then distance him- or herself from another set of activists who return to that facility at night and set fire to it’.¹¹⁸ According to Grubbs and Loadenthal ‘this is hypocritical’ and in ‘separating the “good” protestor from the “bad” protestor’ these academics ‘serve the state’s game’.¹¹⁹ The variety of CAS adopted in this thesis is able to question, analyse and critique the animal rights movement itself. In the thesis I therefore seek to develop a ‘critical’ approach to CAS, both on the pro-militant side of the equation and when looking at legislative politics and current scholarship.

This thesis makes an original contribution to CAS scholarship by exploring the British parliamentary left, and in particular the relationship between direct action and legislation, in a CAS framework. This is an important contribution because CAS, in its focus on direct action and its rejection of reformist politics, has too often ignored the legislative process. Although CAS rejects reformist politics on principle, the reality is that many animal activists combine support for both direct action and parliamentary activity. As Brian Dominick notes:

Stricter tendencies among both the anarchist and vegan milieus would be well served to recognize that while reformism is not the way to victory, reform plays a key role in the struggle for progress and public awareness.¹²⁰

Therefore it is surprising that CAS scholarship has not done more to consider the relationship between direct action activists and legislative politics. As previously

¹¹⁸ J. Grubbs, M. Loadenthal, ‘From the Classroom to the Slaughterhouse’, in A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies*, p. 184.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ B. Dominick, ‘Anarcho-Veganism Revisited’, in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p. 27.

noted, such relationships are not unique to the animal advocacy movement, but affect every social movement that adopts a diversity of tactics, and therefore this thesis has broad implications, not just for CAS and animal advocates but also for the wider study of social movements.

Research Questions

This thesis studies anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy in Britain since the 1970s; using a comprehensive selection of primary and secondary sources I analyse complications and uncomfortable tensions between practice and principle. The framework for assessment is described below. The principle research questions revolve around what separates anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal rights. The main research question explores the relationship between direct action and legislative politics in terms of animal activism: what separates such approaches and how have activists pursuing different overall strategies been able to work together. The thesis asks how these relationships have played out in relation to particular issues: hunting, vivisection and vegan outreach. Throughout the thesis I ask if animal rights activists can be separated dichotomously in relation to whether they pursue a rights/liberation or a welfare approach. I also question the relationship between animal activists of different ideological persuasions and current key leftist concepts of total liberation and intersectionality. Significantly, these research questions stemmed from current debates and discussions within animal activism. Through these questions the thesis makes an overarching case that CAS scholarship should take the relationship between direct action and legislative reform more seriously.

The thesis is structured in such a way as to drive this analysis forward. The first part of the thesis (chapters two and three) provide historical context and theoretical grounding; the second part of the thesis (chapters four and five) explore in some detail the themes of class and gender which have been important in left and CAS scholarship, as well as in practical politics; the final part (chapters six to eight) are three case studies which are tightly focused around the themes set out in a CAS

framework. Such a structure facilitates an appraisal of the way in which different kinds of groups and forms of protest can be located in terms of a CAS framework, and enables clear comparison across the cases.

The thesis has academic and practical aims and outcomes. Firstly, in terms of CAS scholarship, the thesis argues that animal activists have recognised the interrelation of direct action and legislative politics, and as such CAS should amend its exclusive focus on direct action in order to reflect the actual experiences and needs of activists. CAS scholarship should also consider the implications for animal activists regarding how best to further the aims of the animal rights movement by utilising direct action and legislative tactics and strategies. Furthermore, future CAS scholars should build key principles that are more inclusive of the breadth of animal activism and scholarship rather than the narrowly focused principles originally set out by Best and Nocella. Such CAS scholarship will be better placed to theoretical support and facilitate debates amongst current animal activists in Britain and across the world.

CAS Framework

It is interesting that CAS scholarship shares key concepts with anarchistic animal advocacy. We will see that both anarchist activists and large sections of the parliamentary left have supported pro-animal initiatives, and yet CAS has not combined with the parliamentary left in the same way that it has with anarchism. One might presume that this is because anarchistic animal activism shares with CAS the support for direct action and an animal liberation approach. In this section four key elements of a CAS framework are introduced, and as the thesis develops we explore whether anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocacy really is divided by their relationship to this framework. Throughout the thesis I show that that the four points drawn from the original ICAS framework do not adequately account for the difference between parliamentary activism and direct action politics. Therefore, throughout the thesis I expand on the CAS framework by demonstrating the complex and often contradictory nature of the interrelationships between direct action and parliamentary

politics. Expanding the CAS framework in this way is significant for future research because subsequent CAS scholars should not be hampered by the blanket rejection of animal welfare and reformist politics given in the ten key CAS principles. The four elements are: speciesism, rights/liberation, direct action and total liberation.

Speciesism

The first key component of a CAS framework that may help explain the difference in approach between parliamentary left and anarchistic animal activists is the inclusion of the concept of speciesism, either as a tool to educate the public or as a moral justification for certain actions. CAS rejects 'speciesist values' and seeks to deconstruct the 'socially constructed binary oppositions between human and nonhuman animal[s]'.¹²¹ Throughout this thesis I aim to problematize this distinction and show that the split between parliamentary left activism and direct action politics cannot be neatly separated by support for, or rejection of, speciesism. Firstly, anarchists such as Murray Bookchin may believe that humans are in some sense superior to other species, but that this superiority makes them aware of the interests of other species and therefore duty bound to protect them.¹²² Moreover, supporters of animal advocacy in the parliamentary left could well use intrinsic arguments about the moral worth of animals and the concept of speciesism; this is certainly true of the Green Party who do relate to the concept of speciesism, and also to the Bennite left who thought that animals had an intrinsic moral worth. Finally, animal advocates who rely on the concept of speciesism may neglect other interrelated forms of oppression, and this may complicate the relationship between animal activism and other leftist positions. In particular, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) are concerned with speciesism but less willing to consider critiques of their campaigns from feminist perspectives.

¹²¹ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', pp. 4-5.

¹²² M. Bookchin, *Re-Enchanting Humanity: A Defence of the Human Spirit Against Anti-Humanism, Misanthropy, Mysticism and Primitivism* (London: Cassell, 1995).

The concept of speciesism was first used by Richard Ryder, and developed throughout the 1970s to situate animal exploitation alongside other forms of prejudice, for instance racism and sexism. The concept of speciesism suggested that it was irrational to use species membership as an arbitrary cut-off for moral inclusion, when more significant characteristics, such as the ability to feel pain, cut across species divides.¹²³ As Peter Singer explained:

Speciesism... is a prejudice or attitude of bias in favour of the interests of members of one's own species and against those of members of other species. It should be obvious that the fundamental objections to racism and sexism... apply equally to speciesism. If possessing a higher degree of intelligence does not entitle one human to use another for his or her own ends, how can it entitle humans to exploit nonhumans for the same purpose?¹²⁴

Speciesism is a significant component of a CAS framework; however, this is not to say that current CAS scholars interpret it in exactly the same way to Ryder and Singer. For instance, David Pellow rejects the original use of speciesism because 'this is the kind of blanket equivalence of oppression that is unhelpful for thinking about how power functions across populations and for building coalitions'.¹²⁵ David Nibert agrees that the view that speciesism is simply a form of prejudice – 'a view promoted by many advocates and defenders of other animals' – 'hampers somewhat the analysis of the social structural causes of oppression of other animals'.¹²⁶ Other CAS scholars have challenged the original concept of speciesism. For example, Erika Cudworth argues that speciesism is human centric, that it 'homogenizes the differences within the concept of "species" and does not attempt to account for different forms and degrees of exploitative relations with Other animals'.¹²⁷ Cudworth believes that the original understanding of speciesism 'has underplayed the importance of social intersectionality' and so CAS scholars need to

¹²³ R. D. Ryder, *Victims of Science: The Use of Animals in Research* (London: Davis-Poynter, 1975); R. D. Ryder, *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Towards Speciesism* (Oxford: Berg, 2000).

¹²⁴ P. Singer, *Animal Liberation*, p. 6.

¹²⁵ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), p. 44.

¹²⁶ D. Nibert, *Animal Rights/Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), p. 7.

¹²⁷ E. Cudworth, *Social Lives with Other Animals: Tales of Sex, Death and Love* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 67.

develop 'a fully intersectionalized analysis of species in terms of social domination'.¹²⁸

Despite these developments, the concept of speciesism remains an important part of a CAS framework, and the concept is also employed by many animal activists. However, speciesism is not regarded as a mere prejudice exactly equivalent to other forms of bigotry, but as a system of oppression that must be understood from a system perspective that accepts that currently all humans benefit from their hierarchical position above other animals, although in different ways and to different degrees.¹²⁹ David Nibert explains that there are three elements of mutually reinforcing mechanisms of oppression: firstly, economic exploitation of 'the Other'; secondly, iniquitous social power which is politically reflected and reproduced by the state; and finally ideology which is emergent from and reproduces economic relations.¹³⁰ This helps explain speciesism as a belief system that legitimises and fosters exploitation and oppression. Of course, these mutually reinforcing mechanisms also relate to patriarchy, white supremacy and other forms of oppression. Nibert follows the approach of Iris Marion Young who sees oppression as the overarching concept in which systematic institutional processes prevent people from developing their potential through exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness and violence which are subsections of oppression.¹³¹ Erika Cudworth sees domination as the overarching concept which includes oppression, exploitation and marginalization.¹³² Oppression limits the life chances and inhibits the potential of an individual organism or group to flourish; exploitation amounts to the use of someone (or something) as a resource for the ends of the user; and marginalization is the conceptualising or making of someone as relatively insignificant. In this way speciesism is part of a complex web interfacing in a network of oppression. Val Plumwood argues that different forms of oppression – such as those involving gender, nature, race, colonialism and class - exist in a web of relations.¹³³ This web means that different forms of intersecting oppressions are unique and autonomous,

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Interview with Anthony J. Nocella II, 15/09/2015.

¹³⁰ D. Nibert, *Animal Rights/Human Rights*.

¹³¹ I. M. Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 38.

¹³² E. Cudworth, *Developing Ecofeminist Theory: The Complexity of Difference* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

¹³³ V. Plumwood, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (London: Routledge, 1993), p.2.

yet at the same time rely on a unified model of operation with a common structure and ideology.¹³⁴ Such intersecting frameworks of oppression may include hierarchical thinking, value-dualisms, 'power-over' concepts of power, concepts of privilege and the logic of domination.¹³⁵ Whilst different forms of oppression might be based on common structures and ideologies, the lived experience of such oppression is, of course, experienced in multiple different ways. Animals caught in the animal-industrial complex do not simply have limited life chances but are bred into existence in ways which best serve the industries that exploit them, their very existence is based on their use as a resource, they are not simply made to seem relatively insignificant but tortured, turned into living commodities and killed for consumption.

Although the concept of speciesism has changed since the position formulated by Ryder and Singer, Carol Gigliotti explains that

the critique of *speciesism* is fundamental to understanding any critical approach to the myriad methodologies of power, and the only effective route to unhinging those systems while at the same time providing a clearer vision of how we might value all members of the planet.¹³⁶

Before considering how speciesism may help differentiate anarchistic and parliamentary left positions, it is interesting to record two common arguments against the concept of speciesism. The first, noted by Tim Wise and others, is that 'whether they admit it or not, most believers in animal rights do recognise a moral and practical difference between animals and people'.¹³⁷ For instance, most people would not feel or react in the same way to seeing a dead (nonhuman) animal at the roadside as most would on seeing a dead human child.¹³⁸ The second, related, criticism, is that other 'animals are themselves imprinted "speciesists" in that they

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ E. Cudworth, *Developing Ecofeminist Theory*.

¹³⁶ C. Gigliotti, 'The Struggle for Compassion and Justice through Critical Animal Studies', in L. Kalof, (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Forthcoming).

¹³⁷ T. Wise, 'Animal Whites', August 13th 2005 [viewed online, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2005/08/13/animal-whites/> last accessed 23/09/2015].

¹³⁸ K. Socha, 'The "Dreaded Comparisons" and Speciesism: Leveling the Hierarchy of Suffering', in K. Socha, S. Blum, *Confronting Animal Exploitation: Grassroots Essays on Liberation and Veganism* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2013), p. 227.

have instinctively different relationships with members of their own kind than they do with members of prey or predator populations'.¹³⁹

Whether or not one accepts the CAS concept of speciesism is vital to understanding one's approach to animal advocacy, and especially the distinction between anarchism and parliamentary left approaches. Katherine Perlo explains this distinction as based on the comparison between extrinsic and intrinsic arguments. Perlo explains that

“Extrinsic arguments” are those that seek to promote an aim and its underlying principle by appealing to considerations politically, historically, or logically separable from that aim and that principle. “Intrinsic arguments” appeal to considerations within and inseparable from the aim and principle.¹⁴⁰

A CAS framework, which accepts the ‘need to *tackle speciesism head-on*’, would use intrinsic arguments about the moral equality of species, whereas those using extrinsic arguments might stress the health, environmental or economic benefits of animal advocacy.¹⁴¹ We will explore this theme throughout the thesis and consider whether the use of intrinsic arguments is typically incorporated by anarchistic activists rather than parliamentary leftists.

Before we move on to considering the rights or liberation approach developed by a CAS framework it is worth considering one further complication arising from the concept of speciesism that will be dealt with throughout the thesis. That is, if harm to animals is regarded as morally equivalent to harm to humans then the tactical response should be equal in both instances. As Ronnie Lee argues:

[T]o say that the killer of a vivisector acted immorally, whereas the killer of a Nazi people torturer didn't, is to be guilty of speciesism. That's because it would be saying that the torture of humans merited more serious action than the torture of other animals.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ R. A. Epstein, ‘Animals as objects, or subjects, of rights’, in C. R. Sunstein, M. C. Nussbaum, (eds.), *Animal Rights*, p. 154.

¹⁴⁰ K. Perlo, ‘Extrinsic and Intrinsic Arguments: Strategies for Promoting Animal Rights’, *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 5. Issue. 1, 2007, pp. 1-14, p.1.

¹⁴¹ Ibid. Emphasis in original.

¹⁴² Ronnie Lee interview, March 27th 2010 [viewed online, <https://arzonetranscripts.wordpress.com/2010/03/27/ronnie-lee-interview/>, last accessed 23/09/2015].

As this example makes clear, acceptance of the concept of speciesism can be used to argue that violent or coercive tactics can be directed at animal abusers as legitimately as against human abusers, and this leads to complications for animal activists hoping to build links with wider social justice causes. Such complications will be considered throughout the thesis, for now it is important to remember that speciesism is regarded as a system of oppression and that, from a CAS perspective, workers in industries that abuse animals are caught in interrelating webs of class, race, nationalist and statist oppressions that animal activists also need to understand.¹⁴³

Rights and Liberation

The second key component of a CAS framework that may help explain the difference between anarchistic and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy is that CAS embraces an animal rights or animal liberation approach whilst rejecting an animal welfare approach. Throughout the thesis I show that there is not a neat dichotomy between anarchistic activists who support rights or liberation and parliamentarians who support a welfare approach. Firstly, as we see in the next chapter some anarchists reject the concept of 'rights'. We see in the third chapter that animal rights activists such as Kim Stallwood support a parliamentary approach, moreover many animal rights activists now adopt what Gary Francione calls a 'new welfarist' approach, in which reformist means are adopted in the short term in the hope of achieving abolitionist ends.¹⁴⁴ In the case study chapters I show that the relationship between animal welfare and rights is more complex than the original CAS framework would imply, not only because some parliamentary legislation supports animal rights (such as the 2004 Hunting Act), but because rights activists often see welfare reforms as a stepping stone to more thoroughgoing revolutionary change. Throughout the thesis I also challenge the blanket rejection of 'welfarism' that appears in the key CAS principles. In chapter three I argue that British Labour

¹⁴³ Interview with Anthony J. Nocella II, 15/09/2015.

¹⁴⁴ G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), p. 41.

and trade union activists held the sincere belief that animals should not suffer unnecessarily prior to slaughter. Using previously unstudied archival material I discuss a case from 1960 in which horses from Southern Ireland were being shipped in appalling conditions to slaughterhouses in France causing protest, and the threat of industrial action, from some British trade unionists. CAS has rejected such welfarism as little better than those who exploit animals, I argue that welfare reforms would improve the lives of millions of animals whilst acting as a potential stepping stone for more radical changes.

These terms warrant some scrutiny; not only because they are key to understanding the theoretical division between parliamentary and anarchistic approaches to animal advocacy, but also because ‘whether one considers oneself to be part of the “animal protectionist”, “animal rights”, “animal welfare”, “animal advocacy” and/or “animal liberation” movement is of great concern and importance to some academics and activists’.¹⁴⁵

In this section I explain the way that these terms are defined and understood throughout the thesis. Animal welfare is the belief that animals should be treated humanely whilst avoiding unnecessary suffering, a belief in animal welfare means that animals can still be consumed as food, hunted, or used in experiments but that this should not be done with gratuitous or unnecessary violence. An animal rights position, on the other hand, states that animals should not be used instrumentally as a means to human ends under any circumstances. Finally, an animal liberation approach accepts the premise of animal rights, but focuses on the domestication of animals and has adopted tactics including direct action and the liberation of animals.

Even with these definitions, such terms are still often contested. Tom Regan explains that words such as ‘humane’ and ‘welfare’ ‘can either conceal or reveal the truth’, ‘depending on who is using them’.¹⁴⁶ In everyday language, anyone concerned with improving some aspect of animal use is grouped together using one term, thus

¹⁴⁵ J. Greenebaum, “‘I’m Not an Activist!’: Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare in the Purebred Dog Rescue Movement”, *Society & Animals*, 2009, Vol.17. No. 4. pp. 289-304, p. 290.

¹⁴⁶ T. Regan, *Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), p. 203.

'someone who advocates that pigs have larger stalls, so as to improve the quality of their short lives, is described as a believer in an animal right'.¹⁴⁷

In this thesis I use the term 'animal advocacy movement' as a catchall term to refer to the diverse wings of animal activism; the genuine split occurs when one considers welfare, rights and liberation approaches. An animal *welfare* approach reflects the views of early societies such as the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), which formed in 1824, who wanted animals to be treated 'humanely' whilst avoiding 'unnecessary' suffering. The welfare position 'assumes the legitimacy of treating animals instrumentally as means to human ends as long as certain "safeguards" are employed'.¹⁴⁸ Such safeguards typically take the form of the 'Five Freedoms' as set out in the Brambell report of 1965:

1. Freedom from Hunger and Thirst - by ready access to fresh water and a diet to maintain full health and vigour.
2. Freedom from Discomfort - by providing an appropriate environment including shelter and a comfortable resting area.
3. Freedom from Pain, Injury or Disease - by prevention or rapid diagnosis and treatment.
4. Freedom to Express Normal Behaviour - by providing sufficient space, proper facilities and company of the animal's own kind.
5. Freedom from Fear and Distress - by ensuring conditions and treatment which avoid mental suffering.¹⁴⁹

Such an approach has been heavily criticised by proponents of animal *rights*, such as Gary Francione, who argued that the 'most ardent defenders of

¹⁴⁷ S. Donladson, W. Kymlicka, *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 19.

¹⁴⁸ G. Francione, 'Animal rights and animal welfare', *Rutgers Law Review*, No. 48, 1995, p. 397.

¹⁴⁹ Farm Animal Welfare Council, 'Five Freedoms', [viewed online, <http://www.fawc.org.uk/freedoms.htm>, accessed 18/04/2013]; *Report of the technical committee to enquire into the welfare of animals kept under intensive livestock husbandry systems* (London: HMSO, 1965).

institutionalised animal exploitation themselves endorse animal welfare'.¹⁵⁰ Moreover, Francione believes that welfare groups will never challenge the property status of animals or seek fundamental change because 'these groups, which are far more like bourgeois charities than revolutionary organisations, are not likely to have a go at the institution of private property'.¹⁵¹

An animal *rights* position, which gained prominence since the 1970s with the work of Regan, Singer and Francione, states that animals should not be used instrumentally as a means to human ends under any circumstances.¹⁵² Steven Best and Anthony Nocella set out the difference between a rights and a welfare approach. An animal rights position aims to abolish animal suffering 'demanding not bigger cages and "humane treatment", but rather empty cages and total liberation'; animal rights philosophy insists that 'animals are subjects of their own life and no one's to own'; and finally animal rights theory 'puts human and nonhuman animals on an equal moral plane and rejects all exploitative use of animals, whether human beings benefit or not'.¹⁵³ On the other hand an animal welfare approach seeks to reduce animal suffering, it accepts the property status of animals and 'reinforces the moral gulf between human and nonhuman animals' by allowing for the continued use of animals to further human interests.¹⁵⁴

The term 'animal rights' is often used interchangeably with 'animal *liberation*'; indeed, a CAS framework is compatible with both terms. Steven Best explains that whilst liberationists 'often rely on rights-based assumptions while upholding abolitionists' goals' they also aim to 'free animals from captivity and to attack exploiters through various means' including diverse forms of direct action and economic sabotage.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, liberationists might focus on the property status and confinement of animals whereas rights advocates would focus on the pain

¹⁵⁰ G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), p. 1.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 187.

¹⁵² T. Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights*, P. Singer, *Animal Liberation*, G. Francione, R. Garner, *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).

¹⁵³ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Introduction: Behind the Mask: Uncovering the Animal Liberation Front', in S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?*, pp. 26-27.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation*, p. 82.

experienced by animals.¹⁵⁶ Whilst animal rights and liberation are often used synonymously, both are often regarded as incompatible with animal welfare. As Corey Lee Wrenn argues, 'welfareism... only serves to make non-human animal exploitation more efficient and is thus counterproductive'.¹⁵⁷ For Wrenn, 'there is little hope of reconciling these two approaches'.¹⁵⁸

Other activists, and CAS scholars, agree that animal rights or liberation is incompatible with a welfare approach because whereas the former seek to end all animal abuse, the latter helps in the smooth running and continued exploitation of animals. Moreover, welfare improvements, such as the Five Freedoms, work only to appease 'wider public concern and made continuous monitoring of agricultural practices seem unnecessary'.¹⁵⁹ The distinction is both a theoretical and a tactical split, and is maintained because of a reluctance on the part of many animal activists to make compromises on behalf of other animals. This is partly due to the feeling that such compromises will not work. For instance, the Brambell Report was seen as 'a realistic compromise between what his committee would like to see and what the livestock industry was moving towards', and so the resulting legislation was 'merely a compromise on a compromise'.¹⁶⁰ Other activists see such compromises as a speciesist betrayal that the animals in factory farms, and other places of abuse, would not themselves agree to if they were able to formulate their own political demands. The ALF position is that:

We don't talk to those people who kill animals... You can't compromise with us as long as the victims all die on one side. We're not open to discussion, because we can't take you seriously in a discussion when you drown in the blood of animals.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁶ R. D. Ryder, *Speciesism, Painism and Happiness: A Morality for the Twenty-First Century* (Exeter: Societas, 2011).

¹⁵⁷ C. L. Wrenn, 'Resisting the Globalization of Speciesism: Vegan Abolitionism as a Site for Consumer-Based Social Change', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 2011, pp. 9- 27, p. 21.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ B. A. Holderness, *British Agriculture Since 1945* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), p. 161.

¹⁶⁰ Lucy Newman, Secretary, National Society Against Factory Farming to TUC, 24th October 1979. Modern Records Centre, Warwick.

¹⁶¹ ALF, *Animal Liberation Through Direct Action* (Undated, ALF).

Clearly there is a large difference between rights/liberation and welfare approaches. ALF Press Officer Robin Webb believes that 'Had welfare been the driving force, we would still have slavery today, albeit perhaps a kinder version'.¹⁶² Nonetheless, there is a connection between these two diverse wings of the animal advocacy movement. Firstly, many individual animal welfare advocates support animal rights as their ultimate goal.¹⁶³ Animal rights groups may also seek welfare reforms as a short term strategic goal, a position Gary Francione terms the 'new welfarists'.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, in 1983 the ALF Supporters' Group received letters from 27 animal protection groups, including both those who advocated for welfare and rights, who stated that they supported the ALF.¹⁶⁵

Some activists, such as former ALF Press Officer Roger Yates, view animal welfare as appropriate within the political arena, because such reforms would be accepted by the public at large; whereas animal rights legislation would be very weak and probably ineffective because there has not been the necessary public education and cultural changes that would be needed to improve the status of animals.¹⁶⁶

One might presume that animal welfare is typical of animal advocates in the parliamentary left whereas an animal rights or liberation position is more likely to be held by anarchistic animal advocates. This would help explain the connection between CAS and anarchism. Indeed, Kevin Watkinson and Donal O'Driscoll argue for such a distinction. The activists believe that the positioning of animal advocates in the rights-welfare-liberation divide 'for the most part, depends on where individuals are on the political spectrum – whether they believe in a strong hierarchical state, a liberal representative democracy or no state at all'.¹⁶⁷ Interestingly, the key divide here is between a rights/welfare position, which relies on some form of state intervention, and a liberation approach which does not need state action. Other

¹⁶² R. Webb, 'ALF Press Office News', *Arkangel*, No. 21, c. 1999, p. 12.

¹⁶³ N. Taylor, 'In It for the Nonhuman Animals: Animal Welfare, Moral Certainty, and Disagreements', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 12. No. 4, 2004. pp. 317-339.

¹⁶⁴ G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder*, p. 41.

¹⁶⁵ *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter*, No. 7, October 1983, p. 7.

¹⁶⁶ R. Yates, 'Growling with Kim Stallwood', [viewed online, <http://human-nonhuman.blogspot.ie/2013/07/growling-with-kim-stallwood.html>, last accessed 24/09/2015].

¹⁶⁷ K. Watkinson, D. O'Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism: Open Letter #3* (Leeds: Dysophia, 2014), p. 2.

activists explain that a liberation approach is compatible with revolutionary anti-statism because:

The crumbs from the political tables of compromise will not achieve liberation of our mother earth and her animals, they will only result in false faith in a political and corporate structure that cannot survive without animal and earth abuse.¹⁶⁸

One may therefore presume that the distinction is parallel to the divide between legislation and direct action. However, it is possible to engage in direct action for animal welfare, such as rehoming an abused companion animal.¹⁶⁹ Moreover, legislation such as the 2004 Hunting Act, which is designed to outlaw an activity rather than preventing 'unnecessary' suffering, is an example of parliamentary reform for animal rights. Moreover, before considering the distinction between direct action and legislation in more detail, it is interesting to consider two further complications to the welfare-rights divide. Firstly, there are animal rights groups who use the language of welfare in order to appeal to the public. One activist accused the BUAV of using the term welfare when they meant rights, which this activist believed was 'a sell out to those who can't speak for themselves'.¹⁷⁰ Other campaign groups may use the term animal rights whilst theoretically distancing themselves from the concept of rights. For instance, Feminists for Animal Rights believed that 'rights are inherently paternalistic' because 'even so-called inalienable rights have to derive from somewhere'; and rather than challenging all hierarchy and power structures, the concept of rights instead simply made recipients of such rights 'honorary straight white men'.¹⁷¹ Anarchists have also critiqued the concepts of both rights and liberation. For instance, Watkinson and O'Driscoll believe that rights rely on enforcement from a state and Brian Dominick has come to believe that liberation is 'a particularly human concept' and 'beyond the capabilities of any [nonhuman]

¹⁶⁸ Western Wildlife Unit, *Memories of Freedom* [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/western-wildlife-unit-of-the-animal-liberation-front-memories-of-freedom>, last accessed 24/09/2015].

¹⁶⁹ N. Taylor, 'In it for the Nonhuman Animals'.

¹⁷⁰ *ALF Supporters' Group*, No. 5, June 20th 1983, p. 7.

¹⁷¹ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. 5. No. 3-4, Summer/Fall 1990, p. 12.

animal'.¹⁷² We will return to this complex relation between animal rights and animal welfare throughout the thesis.

Direct Action

The third key component of a CAS framework that may help to characterise the difference between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy is the support for direct action rather than legislative reform. Throughout the thesis I show that parliamentary leftists and anarchistic activists do not neatly divide between support for legislative politics and direct action. Of course direct action is a key part of an anarchist tactical and philosophical repertoire, but many anarchistic animal activists seek short term legislative changes, or hope that militant tactics will encourage parliamentary change. Similarly, I will also show that it is possible for parliamentarians to support direct action. Past and present Labour MPs such as Tony Benn, Kerry McCarthy and Chris Williamson have praised the role of non-violent direct action. Throughout the thesis I also consider complications to the direct action/legislation dichotomy, for instance the relationship between prefigurative politics and the use of coercive or violent tactics that target individual workers or other groups subjected to interrelated forms of oppression. Throughout the thesis I make the main overarching claim that CAS scholarship should take the relationship between legislative reform and direct action more seriously.

CAS 'openly supports and examines controversial radical politics and strategies used in all kinds of social justice movements, such as those that involve economic sabotage from boycotts to direct action'.¹⁷³ Direct action, which is an 'action without intermediaries, whereby an individual or a group uses their own power and resources to change reality in a desired direction' and which demands 'taking social change into one's own hands, by intervening directly in a situation rather than appealing to an external agent (typically a government) for its

¹⁷² B. A. Dominick, *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution*, p. 16; K. Watkinson, D. O'Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism*.

¹⁷³ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies'.

rectification', has traditionally been associated with anarchism, and anarchists 'take great pride' in this connection.¹⁷⁴

Direct action for animals is associated with the formation of the ALF in 1976, although such tactics were developed during the 1960s within the Hunt Saboteurs Association (HSA).¹⁷⁵ By 1972 members of the HSA 'decided more militant action was needed', and so a small group of activists formed the Band of Mercy, who engaged in property damage in defence of animals.¹⁷⁶ The Band of Mercy, named after a nineteenth-century RSPCA youth group, began their campaign by 'destroying guns and sabotaging hunter's vehicles by breaking windows and slashing tyres'.¹⁷⁷ The group, including Ronnie Lee, expanded their attention to other areas of animal abuse, and received national attention by 'burning seal hunting boats as well as pharmaceutical laboratories'.¹⁷⁸ Lee and fellow activist Cliff Goodman were 'eventually... arrested and ended up [receiving] three year sentences of which we only did a year'.¹⁷⁹ As Lee explains:

It was when I came out from that jail sentence that the Animal Liberation Front was formed because there were a lot of people who heard about [us], who then wanted to get involved in it from hunt sabs and different groups. I think we were concerned that the name Band of Mercy sounded like some sort of religious group, it didn't say anything about animals, it didn't say anything about what we were about which was animal liberation, so we decided to change the name to the Animal Liberation Front.¹⁸⁰

Lee believes that the ALF always had a connection to anarchism 'in the sense that both believed in direct action, I was very much a believer in direct action in those days to protect animals... I think that was where the common ground was'.¹⁸¹ Direct action here is more than just a tactic, it is a 'process whereby activists develop decentralized and egalitarian politics based on cells, affinity groups, and consensus

¹⁷⁴ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!*, p. 17; B. Franks, *Rebel Alliances*, p. 115.

¹⁷⁵ R. Lee, *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter*, No. 9. February 1984, p. 5.

¹⁷⁶ ALF, *Animal Liberation through Direct Action*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.* Interview with Ronnie Lee, ALF founder, 25/04/2013.

¹⁷⁹ Interview with Ronnie Lee, ALF founder, 25/04/2013.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

decision-making models'.¹⁸² Direct action is not only a key part of a movement's action repertoire, but can help bolster a group's collective identity. Participants in direct action may feel a 'visceral empowerment' whereby activists 'immediately feel in control of a situation that was previously defined by others'.¹⁸³ Moreover, direct action is not regarded as an appendage to parliamentary lobbying; instead it is seen as the strategy that will bring about animal liberation by itself. One activist argued that 'I obviously do hope that Government will intervene but whether it does or not is immaterial as the ALF will achieve what I want – all animal abuse ended'.¹⁸⁴ Ronnie Lee agreed that:

We do not need the RSPCA to put pressure on the Government to end animal abuse because with sufficient action and efficient organisation we can end animal abuse *with our own hands* without reference to any governments... true animal and human liberation will not come by means of negotiations with governments but only through their abolition.¹⁸⁵

It would therefore seem that anarchistic activists are connected to a CAS framework through the use of direct action, whereas the parliamentary left have hoped to protect animals through legislation.¹⁸⁶ This is not to say that direct action and legislative reform cannot interrelate. Indeed, there are many ways in which the animal advocacy movement can utilise both legislative and direct action approaches. For instance, groups may be split into 'aboveground' and 'underground' factions. This was the case in the campaign against HLS in which Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) worked as an aboveground group whilst the ALF undertook illegal direct action against the targets publicised by SHAC. These actions were 'associated with an overarching campaign' and aimed to 'give greater credence to SHAC's "legal" campaign'.¹⁸⁷ Different strands of the movement can also work together, such as the BUAV publicising material collected from ALF raids. Legislation may be seen as the 'final stage of the battle', and so animal advocates may not want to concentrate on

¹⁸² A. J. Nocella II, 'A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent', p. 16.

¹⁸³ M. Schnurer, 'At the Gates of Hell: The ALF and the Legacy of Holocaust Resistance', in S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?*, p. 112.

¹⁸⁴ *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter*, No. 4. April 30, 1983, p. 3.

¹⁸⁵ *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter*, No. 13. October 1984, p. 4. Emphasis in original.

¹⁸⁶ Some parliamentarians, notably Tony Benn, also supported civil disobedience and direct action; other parliamentarians support direct action in other contexts, for instance strike action.

¹⁸⁷ A. Upton, 'Contingent communication in a hybrid multi-media world: Analyzing the campaigning strategies of SHAC', *New Media & Society*, Vol. 13, No.1, 2011, pp. 96-113, p. 101.

legislative campaigns ‘while the enemy has superior forces’, and instead they might focus on shifting public opinion.¹⁸⁸ Direct action can be used to uphold existing legislation, as is the case with hunt saboteurs after the 2004 Hunting Act, and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society who use direct action ‘aimed at forcing various governments to simply obey existing endangered species protection laws’.¹⁸⁹ Finally, the frequency and intensity of direct action could force reforms from governments, even if this does not involve the kinds of compromises that anarchistic activists also reject. One ALF activist explained that:

If animal abuse is legislated against, it will be because they *have to* legislate against it for fear of what the ALF and people who accept the ALF view are doing.¹⁹⁰

Despite these possible correlations, there remains a wide gulf between direct action and legislation. Some anarchists reject all legislation because they believe that ‘any appeal for additional laws merely strengthens the power of the legal system and its mythology of justice’ and because ‘we will not change anything by asking the rulers to make misery more bearable’.¹⁹¹ Some ALF activists even came to believe that the opinion that ‘Government will legislate against animal abuse’ was, ‘in fact no better than the beliefs and ideologies of the animal abusers – it has led and is leading now, to the deaths of millions of animals’.¹⁹² Others believe that legislative action is designed to steal the thunder of protest groups and to stem the demand for more thoroughgoing reforms.¹⁹³

The split between direct action and parliamentary lobbying is often based on whether individual activists belong to or support the national animal advocacy groups or small, grassroots animal organisations. This split has not remained collegial; many grassroots activists are disturbed at the large salaries given to professional animal lobbyists. One ALF supporter asked: ‘who really cares about the animals, a person on £25,000 a year? Or an activist prepared to risk prison for what they believe

¹⁸⁸ E. Hopley, *Campaigning Against Cruelty*, pp. 65-66.

¹⁸⁹ D. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 51.

¹⁹⁰ *ALF Supporters’ Group Newsletter*, No. 2. December 1982, p. 2. Emphasis in original.

¹⁹¹ *A Murder of Crows*, Issue 2, March 2007, p. 87, p. 89.

¹⁹² *ALF Supporters’ Group Newsletter*, No. 3. February 1983, p. 5.

¹⁹³ R. Garner, ‘Defending Animal Rights’.

in?'.¹⁹⁴ The split is often described in terms of urgency. For instance, whereas direct action can immediately save the lives of individual animals, legislative reform may take years to materialise. Writing in 1983, one animal liberationist somewhat optimistically argued that:

Possibly traditional methods may end animal abuse in 1990 or 2000 (or later) but this is of little help to the animals being abused, tortured, mutilated and murdered in agony NOW.¹⁹⁵

Before moving on to look at the final key element of a CAS framework, it is worth briefly mentioning that a further complication may arise from the willingness of some animal advocates to use violent or coercive forms of direct action. It is important to remember that many animal activists have a 'different definition of what qualifies as "violence"', in particular such a definition would exclude damage to property which may be seen as 'justified, even required, in order to counter the real violence which they see as the abuse and murder of nonhumans'.¹⁹⁶ This thesis adopts Uri Gordon's definition that an act is violent 'if its recipient experiences it as an attack or as deliberate endangerment', which could make some forms of property damage violent, and others non-violent.¹⁹⁷ A discussion on the use of violent or coercive tactics and the impact on anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy will take place in chapter four. Nonetheless, other activists and mainstream theorists reject all 'violent' action, including property damage, and believe that such actions are undertaken by 'malcontents' who have 'no place in the animal rights movement and no standing in it'.¹⁹⁸

Total Liberation

The fourth and final key component of a CAS framework, that may account for the sympathies between anarchism and CAS, is the focus on total liberation.

¹⁹⁴ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 14, May 1993, p. 13.

¹⁹⁵ *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter*, No. 4. April 30 1983, p. 2.

¹⁹⁶ A. J. Nocella II, 'A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent', p. 147.

¹⁹⁷ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!*, p. 93.

¹⁹⁸ T. Regan, *Empty Cages*, p. 203.

However, once again, throughout the thesis I expand on the original CAS framework by showing complexities and complications in the relationship between total liberation, anarchism and the parliamentary left. For instance, in chapter three I show that in Labour-controlled councils during the 1980s activists like Val Veness suggested that the status of animals was interconnected to the status of women and other oppressed groups. In chapter four I consider the possible relationship between the parliamentary left and total liberation which can be seen in Labour's support for low paid workers in agricultural industries alongside their support for animal welfare. The thesis also discusses complications with total liberation which can be seen in some forms of coercive or violent campaigning.

CAS has used the concept of total liberation to promote a movement that simultaneously campaigns for human, animal and Earth liberation and 'in order to advance an anti-capitalist and, more generally anti-hierarchical politics' that seeks to 'dismantle all structures of exploitation, domination, oppression, torture, killing, and power in favour of decentralising and democratizing society'.¹⁹⁹ A parliamentary left approach is not necessarily compatible with a total liberation approach because 'statist' hierarchy is often included amongst the intersecting forms of oppression that CAS scholars critique.²⁰⁰

The concept of total liberation itself was not invented by CAS scholars, but was adapted from previous struggles. Most notably, Frantz Fanon used the term total liberation to call for 'colonized and working-class people to free their minds from, and fight back against, colonial enslavement'.²⁰¹ However, the use of total liberation to describe the connections between human, animal, and Earth liberation was developed by Steven Best to argue that 'human liberation is incomplete – as it would still be rooted in domination and oppression – if it does not include these other facets'.²⁰² Best's theory is influenced by anarchist thinkers such as Élisée Reclus, alongside more recent social justice movements such as 'deep ecology,

¹⁹⁹ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', p. 5.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ S. Colling, S. Parson, A. Arrigoni, 'Until All Are Free: Total Liberation through Revolutionary Decolonization, Groundless Solidarity, and a Relationship Framework', in A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies*, p. 56.

²⁰² Ibid., p. 52. S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation*.

ecofeminism and the Environmental Justice Paradigm'.²⁰³ David Pellow and Hollie Nyseth Brehm believe that the concept of total liberation has emerged as a dominant social movement frame due to the combination of radical environmental and animal rights activists with 'the politics of social justice'.²⁰⁴ According to Pellow and Nyseth Brehm, anarchism is a central component of the total liberation frame, along with anti-capitalism, support for direct action, and 'an ethic of justice and anti-oppression for people, nonhumans and the ecosystems'.²⁰⁵

CAS scholars have also referred to the concept of intersectionality, indeed 'recognising the intersectionality of oppression is fundamental to a CAS approach'.²⁰⁶ Anthony Nocella explains that such an understanding draws on the work of feminist theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw whilst stressing that

The oppressions are related because of authoritarian institutions, individuals, and systems of domination, *not* because the experiences of oppression are completely parallel... they are all different experiences and should be treated as distinct and separate.²⁰⁷

Erika Cudworth argues that 'anarchism is highly open to intersectionality, if not already characterized by it', because anarchists challenge multiple forms of hierarchical domination 'around "race", ethnicity and nation; caste, class and wealth; formations of sex, sexuality and gender; colonialism, imperialism and warfare amongst others'.²⁰⁸ Anarchists have traditionally been able to include all of these forms of oppression in one overarching critique of state capitalism and other forms of statist society. Parliamentary leftists may well recognise all of these forms of oppression, but it is understandable if a parliamentary framework does not stress the interrelated nature of such oppressions – especially the critique of the state. Indeed,

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 53. D. N. Pellow, H. N. Brehm, 'From the New Ecological Paradigm to Total Liberation: The Emergence of a Social Movement Frame', *The Sociological Quarterly*, No. 56. (2015), pp. 185-212, p. 186.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 193.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, 'The Emergence of Critical Animal Studies', p. xx.

²⁰⁷ Interview with A. J. Nocella II; A. J. Nocella II, 'Anarchist Criminology Against Racism and Ableism and for Animal Liberation', in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, pp. 44-45.

²⁰⁸ E. Cudworth, 'Intersectionality, Species and Social Domination', in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p. 93.

parliamentarians often have to form a hierarchy of issues in which some decisions are prioritised in an electoral programme.²⁰⁹

Finally, a complication may occur when anarchistic animal activists neglect these intersecting forms of oppression when targeting individuals who they perceive to have abused animals. For instance, the *Newsletter of the Nottingham ALF* joked about the threat of violence towards women in meat and dairy commercials; in this instance activists neglected the intersection of species and gender oppression.²¹⁰ The North American anarchist journal *Rolling Thunder* responded to the issue of intimidation tactics by animal activists by arguing that such actions ‘hardly sets an example of struggle against all forms of domination’.²¹¹

CAS Methodology

The animal rights movement places great importance on scholarship about their activism; indeed, given the significance of works such as Singer’s *Animal Liberation*, academics have played a key role in developing and shaping animal advocacy since the 1970s. David Pellow believes that ‘sharing knowledge and ideas from one generation or movement to the next’ is an important task, moreover

it would be difficult to overstate the importance of movement activists and historians, organic intellectuals, and educational institutions in facilitating that knowledge transmission. This is precisely why states seek to repress the histories and ideas associated with many social movements.²¹²

Given the vital role of such work, ICAS scholar-activists have attached importance to developing a CAS methodology in which such research can be undertaken. In particular, CAS aims to develop ‘interdisciplinary collaborative writing and research’ which ‘perceives that relations between human and nonhuman

²⁰⁹ A. Cochrane, *An Introduction to Animals and Political Theory* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2010), p. 129.

²¹⁰ *Newsletter of the Nottingham ALF* (undated, c. 1980).

²¹¹ *Rolling Thunder: An Anarchist Journal of Dangerous Living*, No. 6. Fall, 2008. p. 22.

²¹² D. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 41.

animals are now at a point of crisis which implicates the planet as a whole'.²¹³ CAS has a point of departure which states that animal abuse is morally indefensible, and CAS research aims to aid the animal advocacy movement in their efforts to end all forms of animal abuse. The thesis starts with the set of normative assumptions of a CAS framework, as well as the belief that both anarchistic and parliamentary activism can benefit animals; indeed, it would be of little worth discussing anarchists and parliamentary left means to achieve certain ends if the ends themselves are not justified.²¹⁴ CAS rejects 'abstract, esoteric, jargon-laden and insular' scholarship and instead seeks to 'illuminate problems and pose solutions through vivid, concrete, and accessible language', and this is the approach I have tried to adopt in this thesis.²¹⁵

Another important element of a CAS methodology is that such research accepts that contradictions will emerge when studying participants in a social movement. Rather than ironing out these contradictions to make one coherent narrative which might be seen as the correct method of activism for contemporary animal advocates, it is more important to accept such inconsistencies. In fact, it is this approach which helps me expand on the original CAS principles as set out by the ICAS scholars. Steven Best has argued that 'reality is complex, ambiguous, paradoxical, dilemma-ridden, and often undecidable' and therefore CAS rejects 'absolute truths, universal values and reductionist models'.²¹⁶ In this thesis I show that the original CAS framework as articulated by Best and Nocella does actually accept 'absolute truths' and 'reductionist models' when it rejects all tactics which seem to fall outside the scope of radical anarchistic direct action. In this thesis I expand the CAS framework by challenging these existing 'absolute truths' that appear in the work of Best and Nocella by considering the relationship between direct action and legislative reform from a CAS perspective.

A CAS methodology shares key elements with grounded theory in that 'theories arise inductively from the facts on the ground – and this keeps us from selectively ignoring the data in order to make reality seem to fit our pre-existing

²¹³ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', p. 4.

²¹⁴ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!*, pp. 9-10.

²¹⁵ S. Best, 'The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: Putting Theory into Action and Animal Liberation into Higher Education' July 22, 2009. *State of Nature: An Online Journal of Radical Ideas* [viewed online, <http://www.stateofnature.org/?p=5903>, last accessed 07/07/2015].

²¹⁶ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation*, p. 52.

hypotheses'.²¹⁷ In a co-authored chapter with Jim Donaghey, in which we drew data principally from interview material, we state that our method is influenced by CAS and grounded theory because:

Grounded theory informs the interview method, and is a fruitful approach for anarchist-associated themes in general for several reasons. For example, interviewees, and the data they offer, are given primacy over imposed theoretical abstractions. Indeed, this approach 'means openness, a willingness to listen and to "give voice" to respondents...' and 'the need to get out into the field to discover what is really going on'.... This approach, then, mitigates against the foisting of ideological preconceptions onto a research topic, or the warping and misrepresentation of interviewees' testimony to suit particular biases, while valuing the critical analyses generated from immersed and insider perspectives.²¹⁸

Interviews

Conducting interviews with activists is a particularly significant part of a CAS methodology. This is because such an approach allows the researcher to adopt a collaborative approach in which key research questions can be formally and informally discussed with a wide range of activists. Indeed, it is important for the interviewer to be 'willing to share one's own thoughts and experiences rather than treating the interview as an instrumental information-gathering exercise' because such an approach 'aids in the generation of rapport and a richness of research that would be otherwise unattainable'.²¹⁹ Such interviews are not just important for a CAS framework, but are significant for scholars studying a wide variety of social movements. Bret Eynon's description of the use of interviews on scholarship relating

²¹⁷ p. Jones, 'Afterword: Flower Power', in K. Socha, S. Blum (eds.), *Confronting Animal Exploitation*, p. 266.

²¹⁸ W. Boisseau, J. Donaghey, "'Nailing Descartes to the wall": Animal Rights, Veganism and Punk Culture', in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p. 72; A. Strauss, J. Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for developing grounded theory* (London: Sage, 1998), p. 9, p. 43.

²¹⁹ J. Gröling, 'Studying perpetrators of socially-sanctioned violence through the I/eye of the CAS scholar', in R. Twine, N. Taylor (eds), *The Rise of Critical Animal Studies*, p. 90.

to social movements during the 1960s equally applies to the animal rights movement, in which a study incorporating interviews with activists can

help illuminate movement political culture, the experience of taking action, and the related evolution of individual and collective consciousness. It could reveal the roots of activism in pre-existing networks and traditions, and the links between various movements... and the relationship between local and national developments. It could help us understand how activists made sense of a chaotic swirl of fast-paced events.²²⁰

My research has followed an interdisciplinary approach. Whilst conducting the interviews I followed social research methods and took inspiration from the oral history movement. Oral history shows that most scholarship is written ‘from above’ – ‘from the perspective of the powerful privileged few’, and using interviews is a way of providing more ‘accurate and authentic pictures’ by letting grassroots activists speak for themselves.²²¹ Such an approach is particularly inspired by ‘principles of progressive and feminist politics’ in its respect for the experiences of ‘ordinary people’.²²² Sociologist Judith Stacey described such methods as ‘an egalitarian research process characterised by authenticity, reciprocity, and intersubjectivity between the researcher and her “subjects”’.²²³ Kathryn Anderson and Dana Jack, who believe that ‘oral interviews are particularly valuable for uncovering women’s perspectives’, argue that feminist interview techniques shift the methodology ‘from information gathering, where the focus is on the right questions, to interaction, where the focus is on the process, on the dynamic unfolding of the subject’s viewpoint’.²²⁴ Feminist interview approaches are particularly useful for studying animal rights activists because women constitute 60-75% of the animal advocacy movement.²²⁵

²²⁰ B. Eynon, ‘Cast Upon The Shore: Oral History and New Scholarship on the Movements of the 1960s’, *The Journal Of American History*, September 1996. pp. 560-570. pp. 560-561.

²²¹ S. Humphries, *The Handbook of Oral History: Recording Life Stories* (London: Inter-Action Imprint, 1984), p. x.

²²² K. Blee, ‘Evidence, empathy and ethics: Lessons from oral histories of the Klan’, in. R. Perks, A. Thomas, *The Oral History Reader* (London: Routledge, 1998), p. 333.

²²³ Ibid; J. Stacey, ‘Can there be a feminist ethnography?’, in. S. Berger Gluck, D. Patai (eds.), *Women’s Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History* (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 112; Stacey also encourages participant-observation.

²²⁴ K. Anderson, D. C. Jack, ‘Learning to Listen: Interview Techniques and Analyses’, in S. Berger Gluck, D. Patai (eds.), *Women’s Words*, p. 11, p. 23.

²²⁵ C. J. Adams, ‘foreword’, in L. Kemmerer (ed.), *Sister Species*, p. x.

The research includes interviews with 55 activists conducted between April 2013 and September 2015. Interview methods included semi-structured interviews, telephone interviewing or online communication. Interviewees were able to choose the nature and format of their interviews. Of course, every interview was unique; the differences between interviews often depended on rapport with interviewees, location, and formality. These interviews have been conducted with activists who take part in direct action for animals, as well as Labour Party and Green Party politicians, scholar-activists and representatives from national and international animal protection organisations including: Animal Aid, Viva!, BUAV, HSA, League Against Cruel Sports, VegFest UK, Northern Vegan Festival, Centre for Animals and Social Justice, Labour Animal Welfare Society, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Veggies, Animal Welfare Party, SPEAK campaign, Food Not Bombs, PALS and London Animal Action. Some interviewees engage in direct action for animals with little fanfare, whilst others have become leading movement figures or held high political office.

I approached potential participants with an outline of my thesis aims and objectives before asking if they were willing to be interviewed and giving them the opportunity to question me about the aims of this research. Andrew Upton highlights the problems with interviewing participants in the animal rights movement who may engage in clandestine and potentially illegal activities. Upton writes that it is often difficult to gain trust unless you have an 'in' who can recommend you to other potential interviewees.²²⁶ This problem was partly overcome by using snowball sampling, which is a technique

in which the researcher samples initially a small group of people relevant to the research questions, and these sampled participants propose other participants who have had the experience or characteristics relevant to the research. These participants will then suggest others and so on.²²⁷

Interestingly, this approach proved valuable for both animal liberationists who participated in direct action, and for politicians who may have otherwise ignored my

²²⁶ A. Upton, 'In Testing Times: Conducting an Ethnographic Study of UK Animal Rights Protesters', *Sociological Research Online*, 16 (4) 1, [viewed online, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/4/1.html>, last accessed 19/10/2015].

²²⁷ A. Bryman, *Social Research Methods 4th Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 424.

interview requests. In the case of the Hunt Saboteurs' Association, national officer Alfie Moon facilitated my interviews by writing to the hunt sab mailing list and asking if anyone was willing to participate in my research. I also adopted the 'respondent-driven and reputation sampling' approach used by Pellow and Nyseth Brehm who found 'potential study participants through conferences, as well as through social media and online sources like movement Web sites and blogs', potential interviewees were then selected 'based on their reputation among other activists as key participants'.²²⁸ For instance, a paragraph in the *S.A.R.P* [Support Animal Rights Prisoners] *Newsletter* reveals the key participants in the ALF Press Office throughout the 1980s and early 1990s:

Ronnie Lee, the ALF's founder member and first Press Officer, was arrested in March 1986 and is currently serving a 10 year prison sentence. Roger Yates, the Northern Press Officer, stood trial at the same time and subsequently also served a term in gaol. The next Press Officer, Robin Lane, was arrested in May 1987 and was again incarcerated for his beliefs. Since that time good communications between the Animal Liberation Front and the media have, by necessity, been at best difficult and at worst impossible.²²⁹

I was then able to contact and interview the three key ALF Press Officers; Lee and Lane after meeting for a semi-structured interview, and Yates by sending a series of questions via e-mail. Before embarking on this methodological approach I considered the drawbacks of my interviewee sampling strategy. In particular, if I was – in part – relying on interviewees to recommend other participants in the research, then there was a very real danger that interviewees would continuously recommend other participants who either shared their philosophy and outlook, or perhaps simply shared demographic similarities such as class and race. I was able to overcome this limitation by selecting several 'starting points'. These 'starting points' were chosen by studying existing animal rights literature and deciding which activists I would approach with information about my thesis and an interview request. Therefore, although snowballing may result in the production of similar interviewees, there were several starting points for these samples, and throughout the research I continuously

²²⁸ D. Pellow, H. Nyseth Brehm, 'From the New Ecological Paradigm to Total Liberation', p. 189.

²²⁹ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 5, November 1991, p. 4. The activists mentioned here were all willing to be named because their views and activism are already in the public domain.

chose new potential interviewees to approach to start the 'snowballing' process again. Moreover, throughout the research I did not find it to be the case that interviewees only recommended those who thought like they did. My interview sample included a diverse range of people with different opinions and from different demographics and I did not feel that the use of snowball sampling was a hindrance. My research took a horizontal, non-hierarchical, approach in which activists not only suggested participants, but discussed key questions, challenges and research outcomes with me as the project developed.

Although interviewees always decided the type of interview, my preference was to meet interviewees in person, which usually allowed for a more in-depth discussion with longer replies and the possibility for informal conversations. Such semi-structured interviews are a means of allowing activists' 'voices to be heard and in their own words'.²³⁰ Such an approach in which broad questions are asked allows interviewees to follow their 'own thought processes or paths of association' which allows the researcher to learn information that was initially unexpected, including new frameworks in which to view the topic.²³¹ However, sometimes activists specified that they would be willing to speak on the phone, which again led to an exchange in which I would clarify points and easily ask follow-up questions. As Alan Bryman explains, such telephone interviewing 'is likely to have certain benefits' and 'it may be that asking sensitive questions by telephone will be more effective, since interviewees may be less distressed about answering when the interviewer is not physically present'.²³² When it came to transcribing the interviews, I produced 'authentic transcripts', and offered interviewees the chance to view the transcripts to prevent any errors of interpretation or fact.²³³

Sometimes participants stated that they would rather respond to a set of questions by e-mail, either because they believed that this would be time saving or, as one activist responded: 'I also much prefer typing than talking as I can see what I write rather than randomly rambling then wondering whether I talked nonsense'.²³⁴

²³⁰ A. Bryman, *Social Research Methods*, p. 492.

²³¹ V. R. Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists* (London: Sage, 1994), p. 41.

²³² A. Bryman, *Social Research Methods*, p. 488.

²³³ S. Humphries, *Handbook of Oral History*, p. 44, p. 46. Most interviewees indicated that they did not wish to view their transcript.

²³⁴ Correspondence with interviewee, 05/12/2013.

These e-mail interviews took pressure off interviewees to reply quickly and gave them ‘the opportunity to provide considered replies... and gave interviewers greater opportunity to respond to interviewees’ answers’.²³⁵ Moreover, because a great deal of motivation is required to respond to e-mail interviews, ‘replies are often more detailed and considered than with face-to-face interviews’.²³⁶

Interviewees always appeared open, and were typically willing to discuss any topic, although there was an understandable reluctance to talk about police infiltration which had a direct impact on the lives of some of the interviewees. Nonetheless, I was aware of Andrew Upton’s warning that the ‘political demonization of activists perhaps explains the overall dearth of research into the movement’s more militant wings’ because of ‘the movement’s deep-seated mistrust of outsiders and those perceived as threats to the movement’.²³⁷ For instance, Max Gastone, SHAC’s legal representative and adviser, who did agree to be interviewed for this thesis, explained to Upton that: ‘I do get asked to participate in academic research projects but often it is a one-way system and one which raises the question: where is the end result?... Put crudely, "What do we get out of this?"’.²³⁸ It is hoped that activists will ‘get something’ out of this thesis, which may contribute to activists’ discussion and analysis of recent campaigns, particularly those against hunting and vivisection and for vegan outreach. For instance, this thesis discusses the strengths and weaknesses of direct action and legislative campaigns in relation to three contemporary animal issues: hunting, vivisection and vegan outreach. Activists engaged in campaigns around these issues may read this work and analyse the relationship between legislative and direct action wings of their movement. It seems that a great deal of activists’ time and energy is currently spent on criticising different wings of the broad animal rights movement, perhaps this thesis will aid those activists who wish to respect a diversity of tactics. Current intersectional issues are also discussed in this thesis, and this may also aid activists, particularly when activists seek to make solidarity alliances and avoid the condescending pronouncements about ‘unenlightened’ meat eaters that have previously been typical in animal rights literature. In particular, the vegan outreach section which offers

²³⁵ A. Bryman, *Social Research Methods*, p. 668.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ A. Upton, ‘In Testing Times’, 5.4.

²³⁸ Ibid.

discussions about veganism as an invitational approach, alongside leftist critiques of veganism, may be interesting to animal activists as this is a previously unscrutinised aspect of animal rights campaigning.

Anonymity of interviewees

All interviewees were e-mailed an informed consent form, which explained that the study is designed to further knowledge and that all procedures have been approved by the Loughborough University Ethical Approvals (Human Participants) Sub-Committee. Interviewees were informed of the purpose and details of this study, including the nature, object and duration of the study and they had the opportunity to ask questions about the research and their participation. Interviewees knew that they were under no obligation to take part in the study and that they had the right to withdraw from the study at any stage, and that they would not be required to explain the reasons for their withdrawal. Interview participation began from the starting point of anonymity and it was then discussed whether interviewees wished to be referenced using their real name. The responses fall into several different categories and this reflects the activist-led nature of the research in which interviewees and researcher could informally discuss the project. Some interviewees chose to remain anonymous, others were happy to be named, others were willing to give only their first name, others give a known pseudonym – for instance their ‘punk name’, which is usually made up of their real first name and a second name derived from a band or a fanzine which they have been involved with – and, finally, some chose an unknown pseudonym.

Many interviewees, whether politicians, activists, lobbyists or academics, are already in the public eye, and therefore were more than happy for their names to appear alongside their quotes. Indeed, with many interviewees, I also reference their other published work, or use details about them in other sources about the animal advocacy movement. It therefore made sense to use the names of these well known activists where possible because quotes in this thesis could be cross-referenced with quotes, comments and opinions that appear in other sources. Some interviewees

were not only rank and file activists, but played a prominent role in founding and shaping the animal rights movement, and therefore I felt it was important that these individuals be named (with their consent) rather than appear as anonymous because I believed that their views on the direction of the animal rights movement were particularly significant. For some of the politicians interviewed, particularly former ministers and current members of the Shadow Cabinet, it obviously made sense to be referenced using their real name, and given this I felt it was right to offer all other interviewees the choice as to whether they wanted to be anonymous or give a pseudonym or use their real name. I did not want to act in the privileged position as a researcher and decide that all 'activists' would be anonymous, particularly if the decision was left to me as to who qualified as an anonymous activists and who appeared as a named politician, academic or 'celebrity activist'. I was, however, always aware of the need to protect research subjects, and discussed any potentially sensitive information with activists to make sure that they were happy with their status as a named or anonymous participant. Ultimately, the final decision rested with the interviewees themselves. I was also aware of the potentially serious repercussions for researchers, particularly given the imprisonment of Rik Scarce for refusing to testify to a federal grand jury about his interviews with animal rights activists.²³⁹ Such cases show the significance of research into the animal rights movement, and the importance of discussing research questions with the Ethical Approvals Committee.

Triangulation

David Pellow explains that researchers should use a variety of methods, such as interviews, fieldwork and document analysis, to offer 'an opportunity to triangulate sources of evidence to provide a more complete presentation of the data'.²⁴⁰ Alan Bryman explains that such triangulation entails 'using more than one method or

²³⁹ R. Scarce, *Contempt of Court: A Scholar's Battle for Free Speech from Behind Bars* (Maryland: AltaMira Press, 2005).

²⁴⁰ D. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. xiii.

source of data in the study...resulting in greater confidence in findings'.²⁴¹ Such methods fit into a CAS methodology which highlights the importance of mixed methods and interdisciplinary research. The interview material was supported by archival work including the General Election Coordination Committee for Animal Protection (GECCAP) papers; minutes, papers and documents from the Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals against the Government's Proposals and BUAV papers and documents; numerous records relating to the Labour Party and animal protection in the TUC Library, Labour Archive and Study Centre and Modern Records Centre; and material relating to anarchists and vegetarians in the Sparrows' Nest, Nottingham and Vegetarian Society archives. I also studied numerous movement publications. These publications were selected using respondent-driven and reputation sampling, in which interviewees either recommended, or wrote for, such publications. I analysed these publications thematically with particular reference to concepts such as speciesism, total liberation, direct action or legislation, the rights-liberation-welfare divide, class, gender, hunting, vivisection and vegan outreach. This successfully allowed for triangulation. For instance, material from a semi-structured interview with former BUAV Campaigns Officer Kim Stallwood could be compared against contemporary published material in movement magazines and newspapers, unpublished records, minutes and papers in the Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals archive, and subsequent material written by Stallwood. This approach was repeated for a number of interviewees. Triangulation is particularly important when interviewing participants about events which happened (in some cases) many years ago because 'memory is a treacherous thing', and because interviewees may have their own 'partiality, bias, and distortions'.²⁴² I therefore always compared interviewees' testimony with existing secondary and primary material.

Limitations

²⁴¹ A. Bryman, *Social Research Methods*, p. 392.

²⁴² P. Friedlander, 'Theory, Method and Oral History', in R. Perks, A. Thomas, *The Oral History Reader*, p. 318. K. Blee, 'Evidence, empathy and ethics', p. 335.

In writing this thesis it was necessary to decide upon certain limitations relating to the groups and geographical region under consideration. There is clearly some relationship between every ideological position and animal issues, for instance even British fascist groups have campaigned against some elements of animal abuse.²⁴³ The thesis focuses on anarchists and the parliamentary left; however, this is not intended to imply that the diverse spectrum of the British left can be reduced to these two broad ideological categories. One might, for instance, suggest that trade unionists, Marxists (including Trotskyist groups) or liberals should be included. Indeed, attempts were made to interview representatives from groups such as the Socialist Party and the Socialist Workers' Party. Their refusal to participate reinforced my belief, gained from informal discussions with activists and reading movement publications, that these groups do not prioritise animal issues. One interviewee who engaged in radical socialist politics (outside the anarchist movement and the parliamentary left) reported that comrades often took a condescending attitude to animal issues:

I think vegans are the butt of jokes a lot of the time ... veganism is still a bit more fringe and people don't really understand it and I think within the left people are quite dismissive of veganism, I would say.²⁴⁴

Indeed, the traditional attitude of Marxists (including Marx and Engels) to animal issues has been to dismiss animal campaigns as 'bourgeois hypocrisy'.²⁴⁵ Marx presumed that a communist society would still include the use and consumption of animals.²⁴⁶ Engels was a fox-hunter, and neither Engels nor Marx 'thought to question the anthropocentric prejudices of their time'.²⁴⁷ Trotsky rejected the 'vegetarian-Quaker prattle' about the 'sacredness of life' – of humans as well as other animals – because 'we were revolutionaries'.²⁴⁸

²⁴³ For instance the National Front claimed that their campaign against ritual slaughter was from a purely animal welfare perspective, *Sussex Front* (Labour Archives and Study Centre, LP/RD/94/18).

²⁴⁴ Interview with Tansy Hoskins, author, vegan, peace activist, 18/08/14.

²⁴⁵ R. Gunderson, 'Marx's Comments on Animal Welfare', *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture and Society*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 543-548, p. 545.

²⁴⁶ K. Marx, 'Production and Intercourse. Division of Labour and Forms of Property – Tribal, Ancient, Feudal' in *The German Ideology* (1845) [viewed online, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm#a4>, last accessed 16/10/2015].

²⁴⁷ J. Sanbonmatsu, 'Introduction', p. 16.

²⁴⁸ S. Lukes, *Marxism and Morality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 23.

Perhaps a greater case could be made for the inclusion of the Liberal Democrats. Activists such as Richard Ryder and Peter Chegwyn, who campaigned for the Liberals and Social Democrats against Bloodsports, helped maintain the connection between Liberals in parliament and animal advocacy. During the 1980s the Young Liberals and the Liberal Animal Welfare Group organised a one day seminar on animal rights.²⁴⁹ However, the connection between liberalism and animal advocacy has already been explored by Robert Garner and Alasdair Cochrane; and even given this generous interest, the Liberal Democrats (if not liberalism more broadly) have not had the same connections as parliamentary leftists and anarchists to animal advocacy.²⁵⁰ For instance, whilst opposing the 1986 Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, the Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals campaign was underwhelmed by the modest support from Liberal and Social Democratic Party MPs as compared to Labour politicians.²⁵¹ The Liberal Party's attitude to animal abuse during the 1980s was explained by its then leader David Steel: in terms of farm animal welfare strict regulation was unnecessary because 'ill-treated animals do not thrive, and animals that do not thrive do not pay'.²⁵² Moreover, hunting was a matter of free choice, and, for Steel, 'hunting with hounds or hare coursing... are not to my taste and [...] I therefore do not participate. But I remain convinced that this matter should be one for the conscience of individual MPs'.²⁵³ An indication of the attitude of some animal rights activists towards the Liberals in parliament is found in an unsigned letter in the GECCAP files during the 1982 Liberal Conference, in which the GECCAP delegate explained that 'on the whole we've found them [to be] a rather spineless collection of misfits'.²⁵⁴ Moreover, there is less basis of comparison between the Liberal Democrats and either anarchists or the parliamentary left than the two latter leftist ideologies have together; for instance, anarchists and the parliamentary left have roots in the working-class movement. As we will see, the Conservative Party do not warrant inclusion because they have typically been hostile to the aims of animal activists. A greater case could be made for including centre left nationalist parties such as the Scottish National Party and Plaid Cymru, although

²⁴⁹ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, Minutes, 29th October 1985, DBV/14/1.

²⁵⁰ A. Cochrane, *An Introduction to Animals and Political Theory*; R. Garner, *The Political Theory of Animal Rights*.

²⁵¹ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, Minutes, 12th March 1984.

²⁵² Parliamentary Liberal Party Press Office, 30/11/1982. Hull History Centre.

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Unsigned letter in GECCAP papers, 22nd September 1982.

scrutinising the national differences that might emerge seems beyond the scope of this thesis.

The other limitation is that the thesis focuses on activism in Britain, rather than comparing political situations in different contexts. I understand that a 'comparative, cross-regional approach' is 'increasingly important to understanding the social dimensions of vegetarianism' and other animal issues at local and regional levels.²⁵⁵ However, given the nature of my interviews, especially the use of snowballing and respondent-driven and reputation sampling, it proved unfeasible to conduct a thesis that was international in scope. However, I did interview a number of international academics regarding the theoretical aspects of the thesis.²⁵⁶ However, the thesis does not simply focus on the situation in Britain because it is written at an institution in the UK; rather it is because Britain is often seen as the torchbearer of animal activism and so is a particularly significant case study. Patti Strand the founder of the National Animal Interest Alliance in America, views Britain 'as the Afghanistan for the growth of animal rights extremism throughout the world'.²⁵⁷ This ties in with the traditional, although clearly incorrect, belief that Britain – in which the first animal protection organisations emerged – is a 'nation of animal lovers'.²⁵⁸ Of course, an angle for future research would be to compare the situation in different countries. I am also aware that, as with much of the animal rights movement in Europe and North America, this thesis focuses predominantly on white activists. An avenue for future research that aimed to redress this imbalance might, for instance, focus on veganism or vegetarianism and animal advocacy amongst different religious groups.²⁵⁹ Focusing on religion would prove to be a particularly interesting frame of analysis, but including such a frame is not immediately relevant to the activists interviewed in this thesis, and therefore falls outside the primary purpose of the thesis.

²⁵⁵ J. A. Klein, 'Afterword: Comparing Vegetarianisms', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 199-212, p. 199.

²⁵⁶ I am also grateful to many participants at the 4th European conference for Critical Animal Studies, 6th and 7th October 2015, Instituto de História Contemporânea, New University of Lisbon, who explained the parallel dynamics in their countries.

²⁵⁷ Quoted in S. Best, R. Kahn, 'Trial By Fire: The SHAC7, Globalization, and the Future of Democracy', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 2. No. 2, 2004, pp. 1-36, p. 8.

²⁵⁸ RSPCA, 'Our History', [viewed online, <http://www.rspca.org.uk/utilities/aboutus/history>, last accessed 16/10/2015].

²⁵⁹ L. Kemmerer, *Animals and World Religions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Vocabulary

There are some significant issues of vocabulary that must be explained when considering animal advocacy. The first issue is how to refer to animals. Such language has been significant for scholars and activists. Joan Dunayer explains that 'language can perpetuate or combat speciesism' and 'unwittingly, even animal rights advocates used speciesist language'.²⁶⁰ Animal rights scholars often refer to 'nonhuman animals', 'Other animals', 'animals other than humans' or 'aothas' ('animals other than human animals') rather than simply to 'animals'.²⁶¹ This is in order to challenge the human/animal binary and to acknowledge that humans are simply one animal amongst many. Some scholars believe that that traditional verbal separation between humans and all other animals contributes to human supremacy. John Lupinacci argues that the phrase 'more-than-human' 'draws attention to the larger set of living relationships within which human-human relationships are a very small number in comparison' and so using 'more-than-human' is a 'nice alternative to the marginalizing, commonly used phrase of non-human'.²⁶² I agree that the dichotomous 'human/animal' outlook should be challenged; however none of the suggested wordings escape from speciesist language because humans are still the privileged category. Therefore, in this thesis I stick to the more straightforward term 'animals', a term that includes all animals other than humans, but is not intended to imply inadequacy on one side.

Some activists have similarly questioned the use of other commonplace terms such as 'meat'. One activist argued that 'I do wish that vegetarians... would stop using the word "meat" when what they really mean to say is "dead animal"'.²⁶³ Scholars such as Carol Adams and David Nibert also reject euphemistic terms including meat, pork and beef. Nibert rejects the use of the word 'meat' to mean 'the

²⁶⁰ J. Dunayer, *Animal Equality: Language and Liberation* (Derwood: Ryce, 2001), p. xviii.

²⁶¹ P. Beirne, *Confronting Animal Abuse: Law, Criminology, and Human-Animal Relationships* (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009), pp. 17-18.

²⁶² J. Lupinacci, 'Recognising Human-Supremacy: Interrupt, Inspire, and Expose', in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p.182; 'More-than-human' term from D. Abram, *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perceptions and Language in a More-Than-Human World* (New York: Vintage, 1996).

²⁶³ S. Busell, 'Letter', *Alive!: Journal of the Vegetarian Society*, May/June 1979.

bodies of other animals' because 'One of the ways in which oppression masquerades as somehow right and natural... is through the use of language'.²⁶⁴ Despite this, however, in this thesis I use the most straightforward terms such as 'meat' and 'dairy', which after all are commonly used and understood by animal activists.

Activists and scholars understand the term 'meat', even if its use is challenged, however terms such as 'vegetarian' and 'vegan' are more complex. The simple definition, and therefore the one used in this thesis, is that vegetarians omit all meat from their diet (including, of course, fish and chicken) whereas vegans omit all animal products such as milk, eggs, wool and leather – at least 'as far as is possible and practical'.²⁶⁵ Interestingly, the original use of the term vegetarian, in the 1830s, indicated a person who omitted all animal products.²⁶⁶ Current vegan activists often believe that veganism is a philosophy rather than a diet, and amounts to the aim to 'do the least harm' possible, to both humans and animals; so, for instance, a product produced under human-slave labour that did not contain any animal products would not meet this definition of vegan.²⁶⁷ Further complications arise because research into the dietary habits of self-identified vegetarians or vegans suggests that the consumption of animals does not entirely end when these labels are adopted – some self-identified vegetarians (or even vegans) still eat fish.²⁶⁸ Indeed, individuals will sometimes incorrectly identify as vegetarians once they have cut red meat from their diets.²⁶⁹ Other potential ambiguities occur in the possibility that 'freegans' may eat animal products, obtained by skipping/dumpster diving or from road kill. Such activists may understand this as 'politically, if not technically, vegan'.²⁷⁰ Of course, these narrow definitions of veganism focus on the British and western experience of

²⁶⁴ D. Nibert, *Animal Rights/Human Rights*, pp. xiii-xiv.

²⁶⁵ Vegan Society, 'Definition of Veganism' [viewed online, <https://www.vegansociety.com/try-vegan/definition-veganism>, last accessed 13/10/2015].

²⁶⁶ Vegan Society, *Ripened by Human Determination: 70 Years of The Vegan Society* (Birmingham: The Vegan Society, 2014), p. 2.

²⁶⁷ Interview with Carol J. Adams, 24/04/2015. A product that was extremely environmentally damaging which did not obviously harm humans or animals during its production would not meet this definition of veganism.

²⁶⁸ R. Carmichel, 'Becoming vegetarian and vegan: rhetoric, ambivalence and repression in self-narrative' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University, 2002), p. 101.

²⁶⁹ R. Povey, B. Wellens, M. Conner, 'Attitudes towards following meat, vegetarian and vegan diets: An examination of the role of ambivalence', *Appetite*, No. 37. 2001. pp. 15-26.

²⁷⁰ L. J. Miller, M. Harman, 'By the Pinch and the Pound: Less and More Protest in American Vegetarian Cookbooks from the Nineteenth Century to the Present', in J. Baughman, J. Danky, (eds.), *Protest on the Page: Essays on Print and the Culture of Dissent Since 1865* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2015), p. 128.

veganism as defined by the UK Vegan Society; as I have highlighted, one of the limitations of the thesis is that due to time and methodological constraints and the nature of my main arguments, the thesis focused on activism in Britain (indeed, the majority of activists were white). Perhaps a broader definition of veganism that included the Rastafarian understanding of Ital as a 'way of preparing and cooking food that is consistent with Rastafarian beliefs and practices' and, in its strictest form, 'excludes the use of salt, meat (especially pork), preservatives, colourings, flavourings or anything artificial' would help broaden the scope of my research.²⁷¹ Future research, particularly relating to the chapter on vegan outreach, will expand the experience of veganism from the Western centred definition by looking at diets such as Ital.²⁷²

Overview of Thesis

The thesis is split into three parts: the first part provides historical and theoretical information about the movements under consideration, which provides context for the rest of the thesis; the second part considers two themes that are central to leftist and animal rights literature in order to consider important dimensions in the history of animal advocacy in Britain; and the third part, the case studies, help scrutinise the starting hypothesis and framework by analysing how animal activists have dealt with these issues in practice.

The first part provides an introduction to the connections between animal advocacy and anarchism (chapter two) and the parliamentary left (chapter three) as well as providing a brief historical background to these connections. These chapters consider key tactical and theoretical connections, as well as complications that arise whilst analysing these ideological groupings through a CAS framework.

The second part focuses on class (chapter four) and gender (chapter five). Considering the animal advocacy movement in relation to class is particularly

²⁷¹ Ital Cooking, [viewed online, <http://eatjamaican.com/ital-recipes/rastafarian-cooking.html>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

²⁷² R. Jaffe, 'Ital chic: rastafari, resistance, and the politics of consumption in Jamaica', *Small Axe* 14. No. 1. Vol. 31. 2010, pp. 30-45.

important for several reasons. Firstly, the animal welfare movement emerged from middle-class reformists who, Keith Tester argues, believed that ‘cruelty to animals made plebeians less squeamish about decapitating the monarch’.²⁷³ Therefore ‘the working class plays little or no constructive role in the history of animal rights’; until, that is, the mid-1970s and the rise of militant direct action activism.²⁷⁴ Secondly, animal advocacy – particularly in Europe and North America – remains a particularly white and middle class movement. Steven Best believes that animal advocates are elitist:

Predominantly middle class, overwhelmingly white and privileged, insensitive to class oppression and the lack of diversity within their movements, vegans and animal advocates typically are entombed in their elitist enclaves.²⁷⁵

Of course, activists have attempted to challenge this stereotype. For instance, when Philip Windeath tried to set up a ‘socialist group with animals as our major concern’ in 1977 it was because ‘we have to erase all ideas that vegetarians are an elitist group of cranks... [and] break out of the middle class framework’.²⁷⁶ Class is an important theme in leftist analysis, and is therefore likely to be invoked by the parliamentary and anarchistic left when discussing animals. Finally, I argue that CAS scholarship has not attached the same importance to class politics as have other leftists. Therefore, elements of the CAS framework may prove incorrect when one focuses on class.

The focus on gender in chapter five is significant because both the modern animal advocacy movement and CAS were strongly influenced by the early feminist concern for animals.²⁷⁷ Indeed, it was ‘only with the emergence of feminist theory and ecofeminism in the 1970s’ that animal advocates began ‘to theorise the linkages between speciesism, sexism and patriarchy’.²⁷⁸ In particular, the CAS themes of intersectionality and total liberation should be upheld in an ecofeminist analysis that

²⁷³ K. Tester, *Animals and Society*, p. 107.

²⁷⁴ Ibid. p. 119.

²⁷⁵ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation*, p. 85.

²⁷⁶ P. Windeath, ‘Letter’, *New Vegetarian*, January 1977, Revised Series, No. 1, p. 23.

²⁷⁷ C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, ‘Groundwork’, in C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals & The Earth* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), p. 30.

²⁷⁸ A. J. Nocella II, ‘Animal Advocates for Prison and Slave Abolition: A Transformative Justice Approach to Movement Politics to End Racism’, *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2001, pp. 119-126, p. 120.

believes that 'at the heart of the women's movement is an opposition to all forms of hierarchy and oppression'.²⁷⁹ Considering these feminist analyses is fertile ground for considering leftist animal activism because both aim to build a politics which 'consider[s] the perspectives of *all* those who might be oppressed by social institutions'.²⁸⁰

The final part comprises three case studies focusing on key issues for the current animal advocacy movement in Britain; these are hunting (chapter six), vivisection (chapter seven) and vegan outreach (chapter eight). Much has been written about the ethics and history of vivisection and hunting; however, vegan outreach is a recent movement development, and therefore a previously under researched topic and so this thesis will make a particularly original contribution to research about vegan outreach. These chapters are supported by interview material with interviewees who engage with the campaigns under discussion. As CAS focuses on current activism, it seems particularly important to consider the positions, and histories, of anarchists and the parliamentary left in relation to particular issues, rather than in theory alone. Interestingly, it emerges that in relation to particular issues the dichotomy presumed by a CAS framework is not so straightforward, for instance anarchistic activists are often prepared to support legislation, and parliamentarians may utilise or support the wider political campaigns by direct action groups. The case studies will therefore make an original contribution to social movement studies, a discipline which typically draws examples from the animal rights movement. For instance, discussions about the criminalisation of animal activists and the possible shift to outreach work following such repression supports the work of Amory Starr *et al.* who consider the impact of state surveillance on social movements.²⁸¹ The case studies also help contribute to key debates such as efficiency maintenance and motivational framing within social movements.²⁸²

²⁷⁹ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. 11. No. 1. Summer/Fall 1985, p. 4.

²⁸⁰ L. Birke, 'Unnamed Others: How Can Thinking about "Animals" Matter to Feminist Theorizing?' *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 2012, pp. 148-157, pp. 153-154.

²⁸¹ A. A. Starr, L. A. Fernandez, R. Amster, L. Wood, M. J. Caro, 'The impacts of state surveillance on political assembly and association: A socio-legal analysis', *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 31. No. 3. (2008), pp. 251-270.

²⁸² R. L. Einwohner, 'Motivational Framing and Efficacy Maintenance: Animal Rights Activists' Use Of Four Fortifying Strategies', *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 4. pp. 509-526.

Throughout the thesis I establish connections and histories that have up till now been a matter of conjecture and assumption, in particular the relationship between anarchism and animal rights. I undertake significant theoretical work in complicating some of these assumptions, in particular in attention to cross-constituency support for direct action and legislation, limitations to animal activists' class solidarity and the lack of moral interchangeability between domestication and killing. In this thesis I contribute to and extend a CAS framework, not least by considering the relationship between direct action and legislative reform, which is an area which has been largely ignored by CAS scholarship. The thesis also uses a wealth of original data collected from archival work and interviews to make an original contribution to social movement studies.

Concluding Remarks

Quite aside from its contributions to British social, cultural and political history, as well as to anarchist studies and social movement studies, the major aim of this thesis is to make an original contribution to CAS scholarship, and therefore animal advocacy scholarship more broadly, by studying the relationship between the direct action and legislative wings of the movement and by uncovering the history of animal activism since the 1970s. This is significant because whereas CAS typically rejects reformist politics, the reality for British animal activists is that such reforms are seen as a significant stepping stone on the route to social progress and often work as a focal point for public education. This thesis does not simply accept all existing CAS expectations, but seeks to challenge and develop them. For instance, the notion of total liberation is challenged when compared with acts which target individual workers in the animal-industrial complex.²⁸³

In contributing to animal advocacy scholarship, the thesis may also make a useful contribution to contemporary animal activists by showing that ideologically and tactically diverse strands of the animal rights movement can contribute towards the

²⁸³ R. Twine, 'Revealing the "Animal-Industrial Complex" – A Concept and Method for Critical Animal Studies?', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 10. No. 1, 2012, pp. 12-39.

same ultimate goal. The animal advocacy movement, like much leftist politics, is 'notorious for wasting more energy in fighting one another' than in fighting for their cause.²⁸⁴ Indeed, it is often noted that movement infighting means that 'the worst opponents are those in one's own social movement'.²⁸⁵ This thesis considers campaigns that are built on a diversity of tactics. It is not suggested that one particular tactical framework is a superior method for animal activists to pursue, and the thesis is certainly not intended as a tick box exercise in which either anarchistic direct action or parliamentary left legislation emerges as the 'winning' ideology.

The thesis has a wider significance for scholars considering all radical social movements, particularly those engaged in direct action or pursuing a diversity of tactics. Many social movements, particularly the environmental, earth justice and anti/alter-globalisation movements, are forced to operate in a way that encompasses both direct action and legislation, and in which activists may have to work within a system which they fundamentally reject. In particular, future research into anarchistic environmental activists who force governments to make legislative changes through the persistent use of direct action may make use of the case studies in this thesis. For instance, anarchistic hunt saboteurs have encouraged legislative changes without the use of reformist tactics or compromises that many social movement participants reject. Finally, the thesis contributes to recent research that compares different wings of socialist and leftist politics and aids the growing body of work that examines the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary left outside the industrial scope in which it was traditionally considered.

²⁸⁴ S. Blum, 'Some Things Get Better, Some Get Worse: On Being Scared, Being Around and Trying to be Kind', in K. Socha, S. Blum (eds.), *Confronting Animal Exploitation*, p. 261. Quoting Peter Singer.

²⁸⁵ A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, 'The Emergence of Critical Animal Studies', p. xxx.

2. Anarchism and animal advocacy

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide a brief historical and theoretical background to the relationship between anarchism and animal rights/liberation. This chapter aids the comparison between anarchism and the parliamentary left that follows in later chapters. In particular, this chapter scrutinises the relationship between anarchist animal activism and the four key elements of a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework. In the introduction these four key elements were presented, and it was suggested that anarchist animal activists may follow a CAS framework in four ways: firstly, that anarchists would use intrinsic arguments that describe animal abuse as morally wrong in itself and use the concept of speciesism, either to educate the public or as a moral justification for their actions; secondly, that anarchists would be concerned with rights or liberation rather than welfare; thirdly, that anarchists would support the use of direct action; and finally, that anarchists would link animal activism to a wider rejection of hierarchy and connect animal activism to concepts such as total liberation and intersectionality as developed by CAS scholars.

The focus of the chapter, as with the thesis as a whole, will be on activism in Britain since the formation of the ALF in 1976. However, it is interesting to see whether any anarchist animal rights lineage exists in anarchist literature and activism, and so the chapter begins by considering the classical anarchist canon to establish whether the roots of anarchistic animal activism can be found in these early thinkers. The next section considers the work of Tolstoy, Michel, Kropotkin, Élisée Reclus, Brian Dominick and Bob Torres, who all combined anarchist and animal rights theory.

The chapter moves on to looking at significant connections between current anarchist and animal liberation ideologies, in particular the concepts of total liberation, intersectionality, anti-capitalism, opposition to the state and

environmentalism. This is followed by a discussion of the common tactics shared by anarchist and animal liberation groups; this includes the use of affinity groups, the stress on consensus decision-making and most importantly the use of direct action. Finally, the chapter looks at complications in the connection between anarchism and animal advocacy, including the rise of lifestyle activism, the possibility that veganism is a site of cultural elitism in certain subcultures, and the anarchist stress on freedom.

Animals in the Anarchist canon

Bakunin, Proudhon and Goldman

In this section we briefly consider the attitudes towards animals of certain significant anarchist thinkers: Mikhail Bakunin, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Emma Goldman. This allows one to understand whether animal advocacy was included during the development of anarchist thought. This is not to say that the inclusion or exclusion of animal issues amongst these early thinkers would automatically translate into concern or disregard for animals amongst current anarchist activists, but it is interesting to see if a historical connection did exist between anarchism and animal liberation. This is particularly important because it is sometimes argued that these early thinkers held 'generous opinions' towards animals; and that the 'anarchist view that emerges from the nineteenth century anarchists... fits very well with the eco-anarchic projects of a CAS framework'.²⁸⁶ These thinkers are still regarded as influential 'sages' of anarchism by British academics and activists.²⁸⁷ These thinkers provided the 'diverse beginnings of anarchist thought' some of which

²⁸⁶ J. Sanbonmatsu, 'Introduction', in J. Sanbonmatsu, (ed.), *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation* (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011), p. 15; J. Lupinacci, 'Recognising Human-Supremacy: Interrupt, Inspire and Expose', in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation: Essays on Complementary Elements of Total Liberation* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2015), p. 183.

²⁸⁷ R. Kinna, S. Evren, 'Unscientific Survey: 7 Sages of Anarchism', *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies*, Issue I: 'Blasting the Canon'. 2013, pp. 211-241. Bakunin, Proudhon, Goldman and Kropotkin were seen as the most influential 'sages'. Clearly 'anarchist canon' is a disputed concept.

'continues to inspire anarchism to this day, and some of which is no longer relevant'.²⁸⁸

Few of my interviewees who self-identified as anarchists gained their political awakening from reading the classic thinkers. Activists typically became anarchists through social circles, punk music or mainstream campaigning before 'reading works by libertarian writers' after a number of years of activism.²⁸⁹ However, there were those who were convinced by key anarchist texts. For instance, Nicole Vosper, who later became involved in Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) describes her political awakening:

When I was twelve or thirteen I babysat for my mum's friend, and she had this Errico Malatesta book and I read it in one night and it's the first time I really heard or understood anarchism explicitly and I was like 'fuck, this has got to be it. This is, you know, without any authority, self-organising'.²⁹⁰

John Sanbonmatsu has argued that 'Mikhail Bakunin and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, held similarly generous opinions of the cognitive and social capacities of other species'.²⁹¹ However, it would be a stretch to suggest that either of these figures were interested in what would now be called animal rights or liberation. Bakunin believed in the 'decisive inferiority of all animal species, compared to man'.²⁹² For Bakunin, evolution did not mean that humans had a special kinship with animals, but that: 'man's whole historic mission, his dignity and liberty, consist in getting further and further away from that state'.²⁹³ Bakunin recognised that humans are 'part of nature' whilst emphasising 'the uniqueness and separateness of mankind as the only species capable of self-determination'.²⁹⁴ However, in his rhetoric Bakunin routinely linked oppressed humans to other animals. For instance the proletariat were 'a herd of animals, intolerably coerced and united by force', and the

²⁸⁸ M. Wilson, R. Kinna, 'Key Terms', in R. Kinna (ed.), *The Continuum Companion to Anarchism* (London: Continuum, 2012), p. 334.

²⁸⁹ Interview with Paul Gravett, London Animal Action, via e-mail, 07/12/2013.

²⁹⁰ Interview with Nicole Vosper, SHAC, 17/01/2014.

²⁹¹ J. Sanbonmatsu, 'Introduction', p. 15.

²⁹² M. Bakunin, G. P. Maximoff, (ed.), *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism* (London: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 86-87.

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ M. Hall, 'Beyond the human: Extending ecological anarchism', *Environmental Politics*, Vol. 20, No. 3, (2011), pp. 374-390, p. 378.

state itself was 'like a vast slaughterhouse'.²⁹⁵ Bakunin's use of animal metaphors may be interesting to contemporary anarchists who believe that animals and humans are exploited in intersecting ways, but Bakunin's language did not imply a concern for other animals.

It is perhaps more surprising that Proudhon, the first self-declared anarchist, is included by Sanbonmatsu among those sympathetic to animal issues. Proudhon is quoted by George Woodcock as describing his 'vegetarian feeding', this diet actually consisted of 'maize porridge... potatoes... [and] bacon soup'.²⁹⁶ Proudhon was not always interested in raising the status of animals; in fact he evoked the lowly status of animals when degrading other humans. For instance he claimed that 'women is a mean term between man and the rest of the animal realm'.²⁹⁷ Proudhon is also reported as asserting that: 'a woman knows enough if she knows enough to mend our shirts and cook us a steak'.²⁹⁸ Proudhon's attitudes to women, as well as his anti-Semitism, means that he is now rejected by many contemporary anarchists.

Nonetheless, Proudhon made a number of different claims about the status of animals. Firstly, Proudhon praised the abilities of certain species of animal, such as pigs, who, when in danger, 'can be seen aiding, protecting, and warning each other'.²⁹⁹ For Proudhon, this was evidence that 'the social instinct and the moral sense is common' to humans and other animals.³⁰⁰ Despite these cognitive similarities between humans and other animals, Proudhon believed that other species could never be part of human society. Proudhon argued that other animals could have no concept of esteem, generosity, admiration or politeness, which are all key to the functioning of society.³⁰¹ For Proudhon: 'equity, justice, and society, can exist only between individuals of the same species. They cannot exist between... the

²⁹⁵ P. Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (Oakland: PM Press, 2010), p. 269, p. 290.

²⁹⁶ G. Woodcock, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004), p. 94. The term vegetarian was only coined in Britain in the mid-1800s, so there could be some confusion here, and a French Vegetarian Society, and perhaps the use of the term, did not come into being until 1879, so this may be a case of mistranslation. R. Preece, *Sins of the Flesh: A History of Ethical Vegetarian Thought* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008), pp. 12-14.

²⁹⁷ P. Marshall, *Impossible*, p. 256.

²⁹⁸ Ibid.

²⁹⁹ P.-J. Proudhon, D. R. Kelly, B. G. Smith (eds.), *What is Property?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 173.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

³⁰¹ Ibid., p. 183.

wolf and the goat, [or] between the goat and man'.³⁰² This was not to say that humans would not have affection, and even love, for animals, but this will be affection 'as things, as sentient things if you will, but not as persons'.³⁰³

Proudhon recognised the social instinct and moral sense of animals; however, he also believed that there were fundamental differences between humans and other animals. This amounted to the significant difference between instinct and intelligence.³⁰⁴ Proudhon characterised other animals as: 'all doing the same things and having nothing to learn or to remember; they see, feel, and come into contact with each other but never understand each other'.³⁰⁵ In contrast, humans continually exchange 'ideas and feelings, products and services' with each other; so whereas members of any particular (non-human) animal species can all do what other members of their species can do, humans are individually unique but can only reach their full capacity 'through society'.³⁰⁶ Proudhon believed that the human species was 'exclusively endowed' with 'reflective and reasoning powers' which gave humans the ability to know what is injurious to ourselves and others.³⁰⁷ Clearly, neither Bakunin nor Proudhon fits well with a CAS framework.

Emma Goldman, whose anarchist activism in America during the first decades of the twentieth century brought her international fame, used similar language to Bakunin by comparing workers to 'animals in captivity' and arguing that 'even a flock of sheep would resist the chicanery of the state'.³⁰⁸ This language was not just used as a rhetorical device; Goldman saw genuine parallels between the oppression of humans and other animals. In her own experience of patriarchal society Goldman felt that there was a connection between the exploitation of women and animals. From an early age Goldman was told by her father that 'girls do not have to learn much' except how to produce children and prepare satisfactory meat dishes for their husbands.³⁰⁹ Goldman believed that, due to the structure of society, men treated women in the same way that farmers might treat their herd. Goldman remembered

³⁰² Ibid., p. 185.

³⁰³ Ibid.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 170.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 181.

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 174.

³⁰⁸ E. Goldman, *Red Emma Speaks: An Emma Goldman Reader* (OpenMedia, 2012), p. 69, p. 73.

³⁰⁹ E. Goldman, *Living My Life: In Two Volumes, Volume One* (New York: Dover, 1970/ First Published 1931), p. 12.

that, as a child, a relative 'came over and tried to feel my arms. It gave me the sensation of being naked on the market-place'.³¹⁰ Even in later life men would praise her 'as if I were a horse you wanted to sell', and romantic liaisons were often scuppered because Goldman 'would not be bound and kept in a cage' – the fate which befell women after marriage.³¹¹ Both as a nurse working with destitute and ill women, and during her time in prison watching other women parade 'her cell like a caged animal', Goldman seemed to accept that under patriarchy men treated women more like animals than fellow humans.³¹² Of course, Goldman believed that the status of both men and women needed to be raised by anarchism,³¹³ but her recognition of the shared status between women and animals has influenced modern anarcha-feminists who highlight what they see as the parallel between the oppression of these two groups.

Despite this connection, Goldman continued to engage in practices that some would regard as exploitative to animals. Goldman ate meat and wore a fur coat despite 'an idiosyncrasy that made me feel as if the beast were alive and creeping over my neck whenever I put on furs'.³¹⁴ Her comrade Alexander Berkman, who gained notoriety in 1892 after an unsuccessful assassination attempt on the businessman Henry Clay Frick, believed that meat eating was one of the pleasures of life that should not be denied to the workers. Berkman was fond of ordering 'extra-large steak' and could 'eat for three. But he rarely has enough money for much food'.³¹⁵ Meat eating here was associated with celebratory moments of human camaraderie, such as the time Berkman was released from prison after serving 14 years of a 22 year sentence. Moreover, one's dietary habits were a matter of free choice; on one occasion Berkman angrily berated an interfering doctor 'for attempting to keep an anarchist from eating what he likes'.³¹⁶ Goldman was agitated by the poverty she witnessed in both capitalist America and Bolshevik Russia. In the latter Goldman was appalled at the sight of:

³¹⁰ Ibid.

³¹¹ Ibid., p. 205, p. 215.

³¹² Ibid., p. 191.

³¹³ Goldman believed that anarchism would 'guarantee to every human being free access to the earth'. *Red Emma Speaks*, p. 73.

³¹⁴ E. Goldman, *Living My Life: In Two Volumes, Volume Two* (New York: Dover, 1970/ First Published 1931), p. 856.

³¹⁵ E. Goldman, *My Life, Volume One*, p. 5.

³¹⁶ E. Goldman, *My Life, Volume Two*, p. 843.

The workers and their womenfolk standing for long hours in endless queues for the ration of frozen potatoes, wormy cereals, and decayed fish. Groups of women, their faces bloated and blue, accompanied by Red soldiers and bargaining with them for their pitiful wares.³¹⁷

In this environment, in which even Kropotkin was ‘starving to death’, and only managing to survive because the family ‘had a cow and enough produce from [the] garden’, it would have been a vast improvement for the workers to receive fresh fish and adequate portions of meat.³¹⁸ Nonetheless, it was in Lenin’s Russia, after refusing any state sponsorship and witnessing the starvation conditions that prevailed, that Goldman and Berkman decided that as ‘vegetables and fruit were plentiful on the market and much cheaper than meat and fish’, they would live ‘almost entirely on this diet’.³¹⁹

Anarchist concern for animals

The previous section discussed three influential anarchist thinkers whose work does not necessarily show sympathy for other animals. This section briefly introduces the work of anarchist thinkers who did articulate their anarchism in relation to concern for animals: Leo Tolstoy, Louise Michel, Peter Kropotkin, Élisée Reclus, Brian Dominick and Bob Torres. Finally, the work of Murray Bookchin is briefly introduced.

Tolstoy and Michel

Tolstoy believed that the murder of humans and the slaughter of animals were fundamentally linked, and that ‘our killing habit and, consequently, our meat-eating habit merge together’.³²⁰ Tolstoy interpreted the teachings of Christ to imply that

³¹⁷ Ibid., p. 732.

³¹⁸ Ibid., p. 769.

³¹⁹ Ibid., p. 905.

³²⁰ A. R. McDowell, ‘Lev Tolstoy and the Freedom to Choose One’s Own Path’, *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 5. No. 2. (2007), pp. 2-28, p. 3.

humans should show 'true love' to: 'everybody, neighbours and father and mother and brothers and bad men and enemies and dog and horse'.³²¹ To Tolstoy, and his followers, vegetarianism 'was a precondition of the Christian ascetic life to which he aspired'.³²² This was not simply because of the barbarism that Tolstoy saw as inherent in the slaughter of animals, but also in the belief that eating meat 'serves to ... promote fornication and drunkenness'.³²³ Indeed, Tolstoy believed that 'the renunciation of meat and sex' were 'equally important for attaining moral purity'.³²⁴ Clearly, Tolstoy challenges the presumption that anarchists would oppose animal abuse as morally wrong in itself; instead, Tolstoy links his prohibition of meat consumption to extrinsic arguments based on the betterment of the human character that would come from abstaining from meat, alcohol and fornication. Moreover, Tolstoy does not adopt an intersectional position that one would expect from veganarchists, for instance Edwina Cruise and Amy Mandelker highlight that Tolstoy adopts an anti-feminist position and a patriarchal view of 'women's place in society'.³²⁵

More than any other early anarchist, Louise Michel developed animal concern in a manner which fits well with a modern CAS framework. Michel, the French anarchist active during the Paris Commune of 1871, felt an affinity with animals from a young age, and she described how: 'the origin of my revolt against the powerful was my horror at the tortures inflicted on animals'.³²⁶ Michel used to 'wish animals could get revenge... that the horse bleeding under the whip could throw off the man tormenting him', but as she believed that 'mute animals always submit to their fate' it was down to compassionate humans to raise their concerns.³²⁷ Michel, who died in 1905, became a vegetarian as a child but, believing she needed to eat meat to remain healthy, she resumed a conventional diet, but it took 'a strong will' on her part 'and my grandmother's arguments' before she was able to eat meat once again.

³²¹ P. Eltzbacher, *Anarchism: Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy* (London: Freedom Press, 1960), p. 154.

³²² R. Bartlett, *Tolstoy: A Russian Life* (London: Profile Books, 2011), p. 334.

³²³ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

³²⁴ A. R. McDowell, 'Lev Tolstoy', p. 4.

³²⁵ E. Cruise, 'Woman, Sexuality, and the Family in Tolstoy', in D. Y. Orwin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 191-205; A. Mandelker, *Framing Anna Karenina: Tolstoy, the Woman Question, and the Victorian Novel* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993).

³²⁶ L. Michel, B. Lowry, E. E. Gunter, (eds.), *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel* (Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1981), p. 24.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

Even as a meat-eater Michel wished that one day 'science will give us chemical mixtures containing more iron and nutrients than the blood and meat we now absorb'.³²⁸

Michel recognised that it was often oppressed humans who would abuse animals. Michel recalls seeing animal abuse as a child and wishing that the tormentors themselves were harmed, but this does not reflect her more sophisticated approach as an adult. Rather than resorting to the negative attitude towards humanity that some animal advocates hold, Michel recognised that workers and animals are exploited in much the same way: 'heavy work bends both men and oxen over the furrows, keeping the slaughterhouse for worn-out beasts and the beggar's sack for worn-out humans'.³²⁹ Even when Michel witnessed workers abusing animals she recognised that they were trapped in an oppressive and hierarchical system in which the most vulnerable are always abused by those with more power: 'Labour crushes the parents; their fate grips them the way their child grips an animal. All around the globe people moan at the machine they are caught in, and everywhere the strong overwhelm the weak'.³³⁰

For Michel it was clear that 'women are [treated as] intermediate beings, standing between man and beast... we are a separate caste'; this helps explain Michel's affinity with animals, and the long lasting connection between anarcho-feminism and animal concern.³³¹ Michel believed that through both marriage and prostitution men 'trade women with each other, just as farmers trade horses or cattle. Women are just herds of livestock, and this human livestock makes more profit'.³³² Women, like animals, seemed to meekly accept their fate, the difference being that women could and should organise to resist their oppression:

Englishmen have created a race of animals for slaughter. "Civilized" men prepare young girls to be deceived, and then make it a crime for them to fall, but also make it almost an honor for the seducer. What an uproar when men find an unruly animal in the flock! I wonder what would happen if the lamb no longer wanted to be slaughtered. Most likely, men would slaughter them just

³²⁸ Ibid., p. 25, pp. 29-30.

³²⁹ Ibid., p. 27.

³³⁰ Ibid., p. 25.

³³¹ Ibid., p. 139.

³³² Ibid., p. 176.

the same, whether or not they stretched their necks out for the knife. What difference does it make? The difference is that it is better not to stretch your neck out to your murderer.³³³

Louise Michel's activism and writing have much contemporary relevance for anarchists today, not least her belief that rights cannot be gained by asking the current oppressors to grant them, because this legitimises the hierarchical system that denies a subjugated group their rights in the first place. Rather, oppressed groups must organise together to overcome all inequalities. For Michel, the difference between workers and animals was not so great that one should rise at the expense of the other. Indeed, for Michel, 'everything fits together, from the bird whose brood is crushed to humans whose nests are destroyed by war... a beast's heart is like a human heart, its brain like a human brain. It feels and understands'.³³⁴ For Michel, and later anarcho-feminists who recognise the interconnection of oppression, their ultimate hope is that a time will come 'when humanity, free and conscious of its powers, will no longer torture either man or beast. That hope is worth all the suffering we undergo as we move through the horrors of life'.³³⁵

Kropotkin

One theoretical underpinning for the sympathetic outlook towards other animals by many anarchists is the belief that the natural world, including animal societies, provides a model which proves that in a state of freedom humanity would exist by cooperation and solidarity. Indeed, Peter Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid*, published in 1902, was 'a crucial node in the complex historical process' which gave to 'animal welfare a distinctly anarchist provenance'.³³⁶ Kropotkin's essential belief was that in the natural world 'we already find the feature which will also be distinctive of human societies - that is, work in common'.³³⁷ Through Kropotkin's writings anarchists have devised 'a new order based on mutual support in which no man is the master of

³³³ Ibid., p. 141.

³³⁴ Ibid., p. 29.

³³⁵ Ibid., p. 197.

³³⁶ L. Ghandi, 'Ahimsa and other animals: The genealogy of an immature politics', in: D. Ganguly, J. Docker, (eds.), *Rethinking Gandhi and Non-violent Rationality: Global Perspectives* (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), p. 32.

³³⁷ P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (New York, Black Rose Books, 1989), p. 45.

another'.³³⁸ Despite highlighting the cooperative capacities of other species, Kropotkin did not intend his work to imply that animals should not be used or consumed by humans. Kropotkin's work does not fit into the expectation of anarchist animal activism based on a CAS framework because he does not engage in issues such as the rights-liberation-welfare debate or the validity of using direct action to aid animals.

However, Kropotkin challenges the hypothesis that anarchists might campaign against animal abuse as intrinsically morally wrong. Instead, Kropotkin highlighted the human benefits that may come from following a vegetarian diet. Kropotkin stressed the amount of land needed to feed a small population using animal produce, and denounced the situation which left the people of Britain compelled to 'get their food from abroad' because land previously used for growing cereals had been turned into pasture land for cattle. Rather than discussing animal issues, Kropotkin highlights the fact that it was more expensive 'to live on imported food than to grow it ourselves'.³³⁹ Between 1885 and 1910 '2,500,000 acres went out of cultivation... it went to increase that already enormous area... which goes under the head of "permanent pasture", and hardly suffices to feed one cow on each three acres!'.³⁴⁰ Whereas in the twenty first century vegetarians highlighted this wasteful use of land as a reason to adopt a meat-free diet,³⁴¹ in 1912 Kropotkin believed that the most significant problem was that 'meat-makers' had not sufficiently replaced the quantity of food produced by 'wheat-growers'. Therefore, he was able to praise agricultural practice in Jersey where farmers succeeded in keeping one head of horned cattle on fewer acres of land than was traditionally required.³⁴² Kropotkin also believed that 'a population provided with excellent vegetables and fruit consumes less meat' than populations who are forced to 'supplement their poor supply of vegetables by animal food'.³⁴³

Reclus, Torres and Dominick

³³⁸ P. Avrich, *Anarchist Portraits* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 72.

³³⁹ P. Kropotkin, *Fields, Factories and Workshops* (London: Transaction, 1993), p. 140.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

³⁴¹ See *Forks Over Knives* (2011), director: Lee Fulkerson.

³⁴² P. Kropotkin, *Fields*, p. 174.

³⁴³ P. Kropotkin, *The Conquest of Bread*, (London: Elephant Editions, 1990), p. 203.

Although Kropotkin himself did not interpret his research as an argument for animal advocacy, a significant lineage of anarchist interest in animal issues springs from his work. Indeed, it is within the literature of Élisée Reclus, Brian Dominick and Bob Torres that anarchistic animal activism begins to shape itself as one might expect from considering a CAS framework.

Élisée Reclus, the French geographer and anarchist, set out his ideological justification for animal concern in his two essays *The Great Kinship* and *On Vegetarianism*.³⁴⁴ Reclus developed a framework followed by many anarchist animal activists. Reclus believed that it was intrinsically morally wrong, in itself, to harm animals. For Reclus, killing a human or killing other animals was morally equivalent and there was not 'so much difference between the dead body of a bullock and that of a man'.³⁴⁵ Reclus clearly followed what would become a rights or liberation approach; he thought that eating meat was equivalent to 'cannibalism among men', and he believed that domestication was 'enslavement'.³⁴⁶ In tactical terms Reclus favoured educational work. He believed that humans should

take up seriously the educational role which has been claimed by man since prehistoric times. Our share of responsibility in the transformation of the existing order of things does not extend beyond ourselves and immediate neighbourhood. If we do but little, this little will at least be our work.³⁴⁷

This educational role involved both encouraging fellow humans to not exploit animals, and attempting to raise the intellectual and moral powers of other animals.³⁴⁸ Finally, Reclus developed a concept similar to total liberation. He believed that humans exploited 'all Nature' in the same way which they exploited animals; moreover, he believed there was a 'cause and effect' between the exploitation of animals and the waging of wars.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁴ É. Reclus, *On Vegetarianism, The Great Kinship of Humans and Fauna* (Jura Media, 1992).

³⁴⁵ Ibid. p. 3.

³⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 4, p. 7.

³⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 5.

³⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 10.

³⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 3.

Brian Dominick, in his influential pamphlet *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution*, detailed an anarchist approach to animal advocacy that mirrors the CAS model. Dominick, who was writing after Singer and Ryder's work, accepted the concept of speciesism and believed that 'the speciesist machine that is modern society' should be stopped because it was morally wrong to exploit other animals.³⁵⁰ Dominick adopts an animal rights approach; although, in the preface to the pamphlet's third printing Dominick rejects the concept of liberation because it is 'a particularly human concept, based on the subjective process of consciousness-raising and self-empowerment' which he felt may be 'beyond the capabilities' of other animals.³⁵¹ Dominick supports a direct action approach; he argues that 'real change will only be brought about if we add destructive force to our creative transformation of oppressive society'.³⁵² Moreover, Dominick felt that it was not the job of radicals to make 'concessions with victimizers to bring about an alleviation of oppression's resulting misery'.³⁵³ However, twenty years after the publication of his pamphlet, Dominick now believes that legislative progress would be a positive short term strategic goal because 'any headache we can give animal-harming capitalists is a move worth considering'.³⁵⁴ Finally, Dominick embraces the concept of total liberation by arguing that 'each form of oppression has become interdependent upon the others. The infusion of these different oppressive dynamics has served to enhance and complement each other in versatility as well as strength'.³⁵⁵

Bob Torres examined the political economy of animal rights in his 2007 work *Making A Killing*. Torres' work supports the four anarchist positions towards animal advocacy that one might have expected given the connections between anarchism and a CAS perspective. Torres includes the concept of speciesism, not as a 'simple prejudice against animals simply for being animals', but as a structure 'woven into our mental, social and economic machinery, and reproduced through the interaction of these parts – it is a structural aspect of our political-economic order'.³⁵⁶ Torres

³⁵⁰ B. A. Dominick, *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution: A Vegan Perspective on Anarchism or an Anarchist Perspective on Veganism* (Active Distribution, 2008/ First published 1995), p. 3.

³⁵¹ Ibid. p. 16.

³⁵² Ibid. p. 3.

³⁵³ Ibid. p. 6.

³⁵⁴ B. Dominick, 'Anarcho-Veganism Revisited', in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p. 35.

³⁵⁵ B. A. Dominick, *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution*, p. 5.

³⁵⁶ B. Torres, *Making A Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2007), p. 9.

follows a rights or liberation rather than a welfare approach; however, by the term 'rights' Torres means that animals have 'interests that deserve to be respected' rather than merely legal rights which will be upheld by a state.³⁵⁷ Torres believes that the use of 'broad-based activism of a social movement', rather than 'the interventions of a state apparatus that is wedded to business interests' will bring about long-term improvements for animals'.³⁵⁸ Finally, Torres links animal abuse to all forms of socially constructed hierarchy. According to Torres, it does not make sense for those on the left to embrace 'hierarchy of the species, while simultaneously working to reject other hierarchies'.³⁵⁹ Therefore, one needs 'to fight the heart of the economic order that drives these oppressions... capitalism'.³⁶⁰

Torres expands this framework by focusing on the property status of animals who become super-exploited living beings under capitalism. Torres draws on the work of Murray Bookchin to develop 'an approach which challenges hierarchy that we exert not only over animals, but also over one another'.³⁶¹

Bookchin

Murray Bookchin is widely regarded as one of the most influential post-war anarchist thinkers because of his work 'linking anarchism to green social and political thought in the development of "social ecology"'.³⁶² Bookchin analysed the development of social hierarchies: which 'emerge with, first, the oppression of women, proceeding to the exploitation of other groups of humans, socially stratified according to age, "race", class and sexuality'.³⁶³ However, Bookchin did not include animals in his analysis of domination. Bookchin believed that categories such as freedom could not be applied to other animals 'unless by freedom we simply mean

³⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 12.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

³⁵⁹ Ibid. pp. 116-117.

³⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 11.

³⁶¹ Ibid.

³⁶² E. Cudworth, 'Intersectionality, Species and Social Domination', in. A. J. Nocella II, E. Cudworth, R. White, (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p. 96.

³⁶³ Ibid.

the absence of physical confinement'.³⁶⁴ Indeed, Bookchin was proud that, unlike Rachel Carson and other environmentalists, human beings were always his primary concern.³⁶⁵

Bookchin shared Proudhon's belief that 'the differences between humans and other animals are not only essential but really quite staggering'.³⁶⁶ Bookchin was hostile to 'any idea that tries to elevate other beings to the level of human beings, or give them rights or consciousness or feelings equivalent to those of human beings' because such projects would ultimately diminish 'the importance of human uniqueness'.³⁶⁷ Indeed, Bookchin doubted that other animals had consciousness 'especially if we mean anything that resembles that of humans'.³⁶⁸ In this regard Bookchin's views are now out of touch, not just with animal advocates such as Jeffrey Masson, but with the conclusions of mainstream cognitive neuroscientists.³⁶⁹

Bookchin's attitudes to other species may trouble animal advocates; in particular, anarchist animal advocates will reject Bookchin's claim that animals do not deserve equal consideration or similar treatment because only humans are able to do the considering or carry out such equal treatment.³⁷⁰ Although Bookchin's theories do not fit well with a CAS framework, it is still possible that Bookchin's theories can have positive outcomes for other animals. Although Bookchin claimed that 'antihumanists who view human beings merely as another animal are making fools of themselves', this was because if humans are regarded as no different to other animals then 'humans are under no obligation to behave differently from any other animal'.³⁷¹ Therefore, Bookchin argued that it was '*precisely* because of these remarkable abilities ['to bring reason and meaning to the world'] that [humans] are

³⁶⁴ M. Bookchin, *Re-Enchanting Humanity: A Defence of the Human Spirit Against Anti-Humanism, Misanthropy, Mysticism and Primitivism* (London: Cassell, 1995), p. 236.

³⁶⁵ M. Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left: Interviews and Essays, 1993-1998* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1999), p. 54; R. Carson, *Silent Spring* (London: Penguin Books, 2000).

³⁶⁶ M. Bookchin, *Re-Enchanting Humanity*, p. 14.

³⁶⁷ M. Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left*, p. 118.

³⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 206.

³⁶⁹ J. Mason, *The Pig Who Sang to the Moon: The Emotional World of Farm Animals* (London: Vintage, 2005); J. Masson, S. McCarthy, *When Elephants Weep: The Emotional Lives of Animals* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2004); The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness [viewed online, <http://fcmconference.org/img/CambridgeDeclarationOnConsciousness.pdf>, last accessed 11/06/2015].

³⁷⁰ M. Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left*, p. 229.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

ethically obliged to develop a firm sense of responsibility to non-human beings and the planet'.³⁷² For Bookchin, superior human intelligence

[P]laces upon humans the responsibility to do something that no other species in the natural world does: to look out for the needs of other creatures, even at times when it may conflict with their own self-interest.³⁷³

Whilst animal advocates may reject some of Bookchin's conclusions regarding other animals, CAS scholars have developed Bookchin's 'framework of linked domination' to include the 'domination of species'.³⁷⁴ The next section looks at these developments in the connection between anarchism and animal liberation.

Key Links

Having provided a brief discussion on the presence, or otherwise, of animals in key anarchist literature, it is now important to consider the most significant ideological links that underpin the connections between current animal activism and anarchism. This section sets out five key conceptual links: total liberation, intersectionality, anti-capitalism, opposition to the state and environmentalism. These connections are considered in turn before the tactical links between animal rights activism and anarchism are considered.

Total Liberation

One connection between anarchism and animal advocacy is a belief in the politics of 'total liberation': 'which grasps the need for, and the inseparability of, human, nonhuman animal, and Earth liberation and freedom for all in one

³⁷² M. Bookchin, *Re-Enchanting Humanity*, p. 6.

³⁷³ M. Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left*, p. 119.

³⁷⁴ E. Cudworth, 'Intersectionality, Species and Social Domination', p. 97.

comprehensive, though diverse, struggle'.³⁷⁵ Total liberation is strongly influenced by anarchist theory and practice 'in that it is opposed to all forms of oppression and domination and is also not reformist'.³⁷⁶

The politics of total liberation were 'voiced in the 1960s' by a diverse range of 'radical political organisations, and was used to describe an uncompromising multifaceted approach to complete freedom and justice for all suffering from oppression and domination'.³⁷⁷ The CAS use of total liberation was developed by Steven Best to understand that different forms of oppression intersect and must be simultaneously opposed.³⁷⁸ Total liberation is often understood as 'intersectionality in action', and involves the development of 'alternative ways of transforming social, political and economic relationships and systemic structures'.³⁷⁹

Intersectionality

The CAS concept of total liberation argues that different oppressions must be tackled simultaneously. An understanding of intersectionality helps to explain how these various forms of oppression 'intersect and are experienced as simultaneous, as opposed to the additive model of experiencing differences'.³⁸⁰ As Abbey Volcano and J. Rogue explain, an anarchist understanding of intersectionality differs from 'Liberal interpretations' by focusing on the uniqueness of class³⁸¹ and by stressing the practical implications of simultaneously opposing different forms of oppression.³⁸²

³⁷⁵ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5. No. 1. (2007), pp. 4-5.

³⁷⁶ A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth, 'Introduction: The Intersections of Critical Animal Studies and Anarchist Studies for Total Liberation', in. A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p. 13.

³⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 12.

³⁷⁸ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

³⁷⁹ A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth, 'Introduction', pp. 12-13.

³⁸⁰ A. J. Fitzgerald, D. Pellow, 'Ecological Defense for Animal Liberation: A Holistic Understanding of the World' in. A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Approach for Liberation* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014), p. 31. Concepts of intersectionality are explored in chapter five, and it is clear that anarchist conceptions of the term differ from its original use in feminist literature.

³⁸¹ As Rouge and Volcano explain: 'Liberal interpretations of intersectionality miss the uniqueness of class by viewing it as an identity and treating it as though it is the same as racism or sexism by

This connection between current animal activism and anarchism has resulted in both anarchist and animal liberation groups opposing all forms of socially constructed hierarchy. As David Pellow explains, Earth and animal liberation activists believe that there are ‘multiple, interlocking and reinforcing systems of inequality and domination’.³⁸³ This understanding of intersectionality is particularly developed by ecofeminists who explain how various forms of systemic relations ‘influence social life and interrelate in complex and often ambiguous, chaotic and uncertain ways’.³⁸⁴

For anarchist animal activists, this understanding has led to a practical commitment to form solidarity alliances across social justice issues. For instance, a formative CAS conference aimed to ‘explore the commonalities among various types of human and animal oppression. Conference speakers included activists and academics representing animal rights, eco-feminism, the American Indian Movement, the Anarchist Black Cross and feminism in the IRA’.³⁸⁵ These alliances have led to numerous connections between anarchists and animal liberationists. For instance, both groups may reject ‘dichotomous thinking’ which they believe creates arbitrary boundaries such as ‘us vs. them; animals vs. humans; man vs. nature’.³⁸⁶ A rejection of such thinking could lead anarchists and animal advocates to challenge all ‘hierarchical ways of rank ordering and organising individuals into groups’.³⁸⁷

Indeed, many anarchist animal advocates link their animal activism to a rejection of all hierarchies. These activists believe that ‘the simultaneous intersection of hierarchies at all levels’ reminds us that ‘attending to all forms of these interlocking oppressions is really the only way to undermine them and... will constitute the only true form of liberatory politics’.³⁸⁸

tacking an “ism” onto the end. Eradicating capitalism means an end to class society; it means class war’. Which is not to say other forms of oppression are not also ‘unique’. J. Rogue, A. Volcano, ‘Insurrection at the Intersections’, In. Dark Star (ed.), *Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-Feminist Reader, 3rd Edition* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2012), pp. 43-46.

³⁸² Ibid.

³⁸³ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), pp. 10-11. Not all anarchists would accept ‘speciesism’ as an interconnected form of oppression.

³⁸⁴ E. Cudworth, *Developing Ecofeminist Theory: The Complexity of Difference* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 8.

³⁸⁵ The Editorial Board, ‘The History and Philosophy of the Centre on Animal Liberation Affairs’, p. 3.

³⁸⁶ C. L. Glasser, A. Roy, ‘The Ivory Trap: Bridging the Gap between Activism and the Academy’, in. A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies*, p. 106.

³⁸⁷ Ibid.

³⁸⁸ A. J. Fitzgerald, D. Pellow, ‘Ecological Defense’, p. 31, p. 33.

Anti-capitalism

Anarchists are opposed to capitalism, and this creates a connection with animal rights because many, though by no means all, animal rights activists are hostile to capitalist structures. Bob Torres argues that the hegemonic order of capitalism means that society has 'not only come to devalue our fellow humans and animals as mere laboring machines, but we also are led to believe that this is the only option for human survival and happiness'.³⁸⁹

Anarchists and animal activists may combine their conceptual understanding of the animal-industrial complex by considering the theories of alienation and commodity fetishism. Seán Sheehan highlights the anarchist conviction, shared with Marxists, that 'capitalism makes people unhappy and that the cause of alienation is the application of laws of supply and demand to human needs'.³⁹⁰ Alienation here refers to the process through which: 'human beings suffer a loss of control over their interactions with nature and their fellow human beings'.³⁹¹ Commodity fetishism occurs when 'the labour producing these commodities becomes almost hidden from sight and the commodities themselves take on a life of their own that seem devoid of any social content'.³⁹² Bob Torres evokes the concept of 'this ideological veil of the commodity fetish' to argue that capitalism has distanced customers from the products they consume to such an extent that the commodity of meat is rarely connected with the living being who was slaughtered to make the 'product' possible.³⁹³ Carol Adams refers to this process as the 'structure of the absent

³⁸⁹ B. Torres, *Making A Killing*, p. 6.

³⁹⁰ S. Sheehan, *Anarchism* (London: Reaktion, 2003), p. 153.

³⁹¹ I. Fraser, L. Wilde, *Marx Dictionary* (London: Continuum, 2011), p. 23.

³⁹² *Ibid.* p. 39.

³⁹³ B. Torres, *Making A Killing*, p. 37. This interpretation caused Keith Tester to accuse animal rights of itself being 'a fetish': 'prey to exactly the same illusions of grandeur as the commodity'. Tester argues that the concept of animal rights 'is a social and historical invention' and that 'society is worshipping a thing of its own creation' to believe that such rights are natural or intrinsically given. K. Tester, *Animals and Society: The Humanity of Animal Rights* (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 172.

referent'.³⁹⁴ As such, animals do not simply become members of the proletariat in capitalist society, but a different class of 'superexploited living commodities'.³⁹⁵

Opposition to the state

As well as resisting capitalism, anarchists also oppose the state. Anarchists view the state as a complex array of social and political institutions which uphold internalised power relations and also has interests of its own; moreover, the state is a 'psychological phenomenon' which creates a certain 'way of thinking about the world and understanding social organisation'.³⁹⁶ Anarchist opposition to the state does not imply that self-identified anarchists would reduce their ideology to 'any single position'; moreover, anarchists recognise 'the possibility of thinking about resistance within the body of the state'.³⁹⁷ As we shall see, anarchist animal activists are prepared to use bargaining positions created by state structures in order to bring about benefits for animals. For instance, hunt saboteurs may take police forces to court for unlawful arrest. However, anarchist activists will be wary of appealing to the state as the 'arbiter of justice', when it is the same state which enforces many of the injustices they oppose.³⁹⁸ Opposition to the state is clearly one fundamental ideological division between anarchists and parliamentary leftists; in particular, anarchists do not see 'the state as an agent of political change'.³⁹⁹

The anti-state position of anarchism creates a connection with animal rights because many, though by no means all, animal rights activists are hostile to state structures. This is predominantly true of the more 'militant' direct action wing of the animal rights movement, such as activists associated with the ALF, who believe that

³⁹⁴ C. J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2010), p. 51.

³⁹⁵ B. Torres, *Making A Killing*, p. 39.

³⁹⁶ E. Cudworth, 'Anarchism: The Politics of Anti-Statism', in: E. Cudworth, T. Hall, J. McGovern (eds.), *The Modern State: Theories and Ideologies* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), pp. 142-146.

³⁹⁷ R. Kinna, *Anarchism: A Beginners Guide* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005), pp. 54-55.

³⁹⁸ Croatoan 'Who Is Oakland: Anti-Oppression Activism, the Politics of Safety, and State Co-optation', April 2012 [viewed online, <https://escalatingidentity.wordpress.com/2012/04/30/who-is-oakland-anti-oppression-politics-decolonization-and-the-state/>, last accessed 27/10/2015].

³⁹⁹ E. Cudworth, 'Anarchism: The Politics of Anti-Statism', p. 142.

'revolutionary change' is necessary.⁴⁰⁰ David Nibert argues that the oppression of animals is fundamentally linked to the 'capitalist state' because 'the physical, political, economic, ideological, and diversionary powers of the state support and build such entangled oppressions while giving such atrocities legal and social respectability'.⁴⁰¹ Indeed, Nibert and Torres believe that the ideological framework within which oppression operates needs a state to facilitate and enforce the dominant group's exploitation of oppressed groups.⁴⁰²

*One does not have to be anti-statist to believe that 'governments are in league with the dairy and meat industries', in terms of subsidies and preferential treatment to seemingly powerful farmers' unions.*⁴⁰³ *Indeed, Colin Spencer argues that various governments routinely 'dig deep into treasury coffers to propagate the present system of over-production in milk and meat'.*⁴⁰⁴ *Those involved in the animal liberation movement tend to agree that these industries are 'sanctioned, protected, and funded by the state'.*⁴⁰⁵

Environmentalism

Radical environmental politics regularly embrace anarchist elements, including a 'criticism of authoritarian politics and capitalism and an emphasis on collectivism, individual freedom and self-fulfilment'.⁴⁰⁶ There are numerous groups who promote human, animal and earth liberation. For instance, the Oregon collective

⁴⁰⁰ ALF Supporters' Group, April 2009, p. 6. Although even here, the ALF SG are arguing against the current British state, not the concept of states in general.

⁴⁰¹ D. Nibert, *Animal Rights/Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), p. 185.

⁴⁰² B. Torres, *Making A Killing*, p. 8.

⁴⁰³ C. Spencer, *Vegetarianism: A History* (London: Grub Street, 2001) p. 332.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid; R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), p. 110.

⁴⁰⁵ K. Mann, *From Dusk 'til Dawn: An Insider's View of the growth of the Animal Liberation Movement* (London: Puppy Pincher Press, 2007), p. 596.

⁴⁰⁶ E. Aaltola, 'Green Anarchy: Deep Ecology and Primitivism', in B. Franks, M. Wilson, (eds.), *Anarchism and Moral Philosophy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 161.

behind *Green Anarchy*, partly edited by John Zerzan, regularly carried news of ALF-style activities.⁴⁰⁷

In the UK, environmental anarchists and animal liberation activists were forcibly united when editors of the primitivist publication *Green Anarchist* and those at the forefront of the *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter* were arrested for publicising ALF activities.⁴⁰⁸ In 1995 police raided bookshops selling *Green Anarchist*, and ultimately put the six editors on trial for inciting copycat actions. Among those facing trial were Steve Booth, who ran the 'Diary of Community Resistance' in *Green Anarchist* 'listing acts of resistance reported in the press', Noel Molland, who wrote a story 'in which a missile was projected at a shop window', and Saxon Wood who ran the *Green Anarchist* mail order service, which included the book *Urban Attack* 'which describes the manufacture of weapons'.⁴⁰⁹ The ensuing case, known as the GANDALF trial (an acronym for Green Anarchist aND Animal Liberation Front), saw activists from both movements receive custodial sentences of up to three years, but also inspired a grass roots campaign to support the accused. The two movements united around their shared tactical use of direct action and belief in total liberation. The campaign continued until the editors were released following appeal.⁴¹⁰ There is a tendency within the environmental movement to adopt veganism and anarchistic tendencies. Earth First! activist Panagioti Tsolkas believes the 'cross-pollination between anarchism, animal liberation and Earth First!' is partly caused by influential activists, such as Rod Coronado, who adopt these positions.⁴¹¹ Moreover, Tsolkas argues that it was 'the ambitious direct action culture surrounding the ALF' which first lent 'inspiration and courage' to radical environmentalists.⁴¹² Nick Fiddes suggests that veganism has become a central component of the collective identity of these 'new ecological protest groups'.⁴¹³

⁴⁰⁷ *Green Anarchy: An Anti-Civilisation Journal of Theory and Action*, No. 10, Fall 2002; *Green Anarchy*, No. 6, Summer 2001. p. 2.

⁴⁰⁸ N. Molland, 'The Gandalf Trial', *Arkangel*, No. 19, p. 39.

⁴⁰⁹ *Freedom*, Vol. 58. No. 19, 4th October 1997, p. 3.

⁴¹⁰ B. Franks, *Rebel Alliances: The means and ends of contemporary British anarchisms* (Edinburgh: AK Press and Dark Star, 2006), pp. 86-87.

⁴¹¹ P. Tsolkas, 'No System but the Ecosystem: Earth First! and Anarchism', 03/31/2015. [viewed online, <http://anarchiststudies.org/2015/03/31/no-system-but-the-ecosystem-earth-first-and-anarchism-by-panagioti-tsolkas-1/>, last accessed 04/06/2015].

⁴¹² *Ibid.*

⁴¹³ N. Fiddes, 'Declining Meat: Past, Present... and Future Imperfect?', in P. Caplan (ed.), *Food, Health and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 256.

It could even be argued that parliamentary Green Parties present a libertarian perspective to varying degrees. ALF founder Ronnie Lee, once a self-declared anarchist, is now active in the Green Party, and has formed the organisation Greens For Animal Protection to promote animal rights policies within the Party. Lee is not only concerned with the Green's policies on animal protection; he also believes they have 'the best policies on the environment, [and] the best policies on social justice'.⁴¹⁴ Finally, environmental and animal issues interrelate within primitivism, which John Moore explains as 'a shorthand term for a radical current that critiques the totality of civilization from an anarchist perspective, and seeks to initiate a comprehensive transformation of human life'.⁴¹⁵ Primitivism is opposed to the domestication of animals, however it may romanticise a return to a hunter-gatherer way of life.⁴¹⁶

Tactical connections

Having considered some conceptual overlaps between anarchism and animal advocacy, this section briefly considers the tactical connections between the two causes. In particular, both anarchists and animal liberationists may use a consensus decision making structure, they may make use of affinity groups and, most significantly, they engage in various forms of direct action. These tactical similarities cannot be regarded as a mere coincidence; in fact, the tactics used are a central component of the activist's collective identity and political philosophy. As David Pellow explains:

Direct action is a core part of earth and animal liberation movements' tactical and philosophical repertoire, a defining feature of their cultures of resistance – those shared understandings, ideas and knowledge that inform and support individual and collective practices of dissent.⁴¹⁷

⁴¹⁴ Interview with Ronnie Lee, 25/04/2013.

⁴¹⁵ J. Moore, *A Primitivist Primer* (viewed online, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/john-moore-a-primitivist-primer>, last accessed 14/06/2016)

⁴¹⁶ Ibid.

⁴¹⁷ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 127.

It is on account of these tactical overlaps that it is often presumed that the ALF is an anarchist organisation. For instance, one correspondent to the anarchist journal Freedom defended what was seen as a questionable ALF action with the argument that the organisation 'is and I hope will always be an anarchist organisation', his reasoning was that 'there is no power base that select[s] which hell-hole to attack next'.⁴¹⁸ Indeed, the ALF are defined by their non-hierarchical structure and use of affinity groups and consensus decision making.

The affinity group has become an established anarchist approach, through which activists can 'avoid the necessity of coordinating action, relying instead on a small, tightly knit group [typically between 6-12 members] in which consensus is most readily available'.⁴¹⁹ The affinity group is regarded as 'better suited to carrying off daring and decisive actions' which it would not be possible for 'the masses' to 'accomplish spontaneously'.⁴²⁰ In affinity groups 'organization should be voluntary, functional, temporary and small'.⁴²¹ This small group structure lessens 'the chances of internal hierarchies developing' and increases the likelihood of achieving consensus.⁴²² More recently there has been an increased use in operation under 'banners', which are often the wider context in which an affinity group works. Uri Gordon describes these banners as 'even more fluid than networks', with different activists able to operate: 'a free vegan street-kitchen today under the Food Not Bombs banner, meet to design a leaflet against the G8 under the Dissent! banner tomorrow'.⁴²³ Consensus is a method of decision making which is designed to produce 'non-hierarchical and non-authoritarian' outcomes 'because everyone agrees' to decisions.⁴²⁴ Meetings must be facilitated 'to ensure everyone's voice is heard' by using 'tools and procedures' to help groups 'reach decisions in a collective way'.⁴²⁵ The use of consensus has not only 'come to be seen as a fundamental principle of anarchism', but for many anarchists 'consensus and anarchism are all

⁴¹⁸ *Freedom*, 24th March 1984, No. 4, Vol. 45.

⁴¹⁹ J. S. Cohn, *Anarchism and the Crisis of Representation: Hermeneutics, Aesthetics, Politics* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006), p. 205.

⁴²⁰ A. Skirda, *Facing The Enemy: A History of Anarchist Organisation From Proudhon to May 1968* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2001), p. 83.

⁴²¹ J. S. Cohn, *Anarchism and the Crisis*, p. 205.

⁴²² '[I]n theory at least'. M. Wilson, R. Kinna, 'Key Terms', p. 330.

⁴²³ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!: Anti-authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008), p. 15.

⁴²⁴ M. Wilson, R. Kinna, 'Key Terms', p. 335.

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*

but synonymous'.⁴²⁶ Little wonder, then, that the *Freedom* correspondent regarded the ALF to be an 'anarchist organisation'.⁴²⁷

Certainly, long-time activist Keith Mann's description of the ALF's structure seems entirely anarchistic:

The Animal Liberation Front in reality isn't so much an organisation, more like a banner – a title... or a state of mind if you like – under which individuals and groups of people claim responsibility for illegal actions, which are designed to either directly or indirectly help the cause of animals. Anyone can be an ALF activist: there is no membership form to fill in.⁴²⁸

However, a decentralised structure is not enough to label a group as anarchistic, as the correspondent to *Freedom* was willing to do. Instead, a group's structure must reflect their ideological commitment to decentralisation and autonomy as linked to a rejection of social hierarchies. ALF founder Ronnie Lee believes that although 'there were certainly people in the ALF who were anarchists as well as being animal liberationists' most were 'primarily concerned with protecting animals'.⁴²⁹ As such, the non-hierarchical structure was only ever an organisational tool. As Ronnie Lee explains, many activists

recognised that that way of operating was the most effective in terms of doing the most action and also avoiding [arrest]... I think that people understood that it meant that the authorities couldn't destroy what was going on just by arresting one or two people, so people realised what the thinking behind that way of doing things was, even if they might not have been anarchists or had a wider vision of anything apart from wanting to protect animals.⁴³⁰

Moreover, it should also be remembered that whilst ALF cells operated using consensus, it was also recommended that

[o]ne person should be chosen as the leader of the group. This doesn't mean that person has any special power or privileges, and it often won't come into

⁴²⁶ Ibid.

⁴²⁷ Of course, it is not so straightforward. For instance, it is easy to imagine a right wing group operating in an affinity group structure.

⁴²⁸ K. Mann, *Dusk 'Til Dawn*, p. 55.

⁴²⁹ Interview with Ronnie Lee, 25/04/2013.

⁴³⁰ Ibid.

play at all. But if during an action things go wrong, someone will need to make split-second decisions, and in this case there is no time for democracy.⁴³¹

This structure led David Henshaw, in his sensationalised and often factually inaccurate depiction of the ALF, to describe the group as operating as an anarchistic military squadron: 'there was to be no central high command or "army council", or in fact any precisely defined hierarchy'.⁴³² Henshaw argued that Ronnie Lee, 'the central founder of the movement', was the undisputed leader. Indeed, to Henshaw: Lee 'was the ALF'.⁴³³ However, it is clear from interviews with ALF activists and Press Officers that autonomous affinity groups were able to choose, plan and carry out their own actions without the authority of a national leadership.⁴³⁴

Even if the non-hierarchical structure was only an organisational tool, ALF tactics are still significant because they had an effect on both animal rights advocates and the wider anarchist movement. Larry Law, writing for Spectacular Times, argued that a supposed split between animal advocates and the left was not due to a genuine theoretical disagreement, but was because 'the politicians are ashamed' that 'the animal liberation activists have undertaken more direct action and caused more physical and financial damage than the entire British revolutionary left put together'.⁴³⁵ In this context it would be understandable if the anarchist movement looked to animal liberationists for tactical guidance. In fact, animal liberation and anarchist organisational practices often evolved simultaneously. The ALF influenced the organisational approach of subsequent anarchistic groups. For instance, the Earth Liberation Front (ELF), who emerged in the early 1990s, 'wanted to become an eco-ALF that will do whatever is necessary to save the planet and its inhabitants'.⁴³⁶

Although ALF tactics may have emerged from a process of trial and error whilst individuals and groups built up confidence and trust, Ronnie Lee and the ALF founders also possessed 'a good knowledge of the tactics of other revolutionary

⁴³¹ *Animal Liberation Through Direct Action* (ALF, undated), p. 5.

⁴³² D. Henshaw, *Animal Warfare: The Story of the Animal Liberation Front* (London: Fontana, 1989), p. 50.

⁴³³ *Ibid.* pp. 11-12.

⁴³⁴ Interviews with Roger Yates, former ALF regional press officer, via e-mail, 11/12/2013; Robin Lane, former ALF Press Officer, 9/03/2014.

⁴³⁵ *Spectacular Times, Animals*, p. 23.

⁴³⁶ N. Molland, 'A spark that ignited a flame: The evolution of the earth liberation front'. in S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.), *Igniting a revolution: Voices in defence of the Earth* (Oakland: AK Press, 2006), p. 50.

groups', Lee was particularly inspired by the Angry Brigade.⁴³⁷ The Angry Brigade were an urban guerrilla group responsible for a series of politically motivated bombings between 1970 and 1972. Lee describes his interest in Angry Brigade activity which was

*outside of the normal left wing parameters that you had at the time... most left wing stuff was to do with the workplace... but they did things outside of that... And that made me think that... direct action against property could be extended to the animal liberation struggle.*⁴³⁸

The Angry Brigade: 'held a mish-mash of libertarian and militant beliefs strongly influenced by anarchism and the situationists'.⁴³⁹ Like the Situationists, the Angry Brigade hoped that provocation would draw repression from the state, which in turn would rally mass support. Lee may have been particularly drawn to this 'youthful, vaguely anarchistic circle' because they refused to 'accept the confines of legality set by the state'.⁴⁴⁰ The ALF, like the Situationists before them, wanted to offer young people 'brought up in the affluence of Western societies an attractive cause and an opportunity to get out and do something about it'.⁴⁴¹ Animal liberationists were also influenced by Guy Debord's theory of the spectacle. As Larry Law writes: 'in the Society of the Spectacle the world we see is not the real world – it is the world we have been conditioned to see'.⁴⁴² This 'conditioning', underpinned by mass media, allows 'well-conditioned people' to engage in practices as consumers that are harmful to their fellow beings.⁴⁴³ Ronnie Lee and the ALF believed in disrupting the Spectacle, which incorporated 'speciesism', by 'taking action to wake people up' and making people question their relationship to other animals.⁴⁴⁴ Feminist and anarchist groups have been influenced by the Situationists, and this influence feeds into the tactics and theories of animal activists. Carol Ehrlich argues that:

⁴³⁷ K. Mann, *Dusk*, p. 51.

⁴³⁸ Interview with Ronnie Lee, 25/04/2013.

⁴³⁹ M. Mansfield, Y. Vanson, *Memoirs of a Radical Lawyer* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009), p. 32.

⁴⁴⁰ G. Carr, *The Angry Brigade: The Cause and the Case* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1975), p. 20.

⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.17, p. 27, p. 64.

⁴⁴² *Spectacular Times, Animals*, p. 4.

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.* pp. 6-7.

⁴⁴⁴ Interview with Ronnie Lee, 25/04/2013.

The value of Situationism for an anarchist feminist analysis is that it combines a socialist awareness of the primacy of capitalist oppression with an anarchist emphasis upon transforming the whole of public and private life. The point about capitalist oppression is important: All too often anarchists seem to be unaware that this economic system exploits most people. But all too often socialist - especially Marxists - are blind to the fact that people are oppressed in every aspect of life: work, what passes for leisure, culture, personal relationships - all of it. And only anarchists insist that people must transform the conditions of their lives themselves - it cannot be done for them.⁴⁴⁵

Anarchists, feminists and animal activists, inspired by Situationism, therefore call for a revolution in, or a reinvention of, everyday life. Ehrlich believes that 'the societal stage has begun to crumble, and so the possibility exists of constructing another world outside the theatre - this time, a real world, one in which each of us directly participates as subject, not as object'.⁴⁴⁶ Ehrlich explains that daily life can be reinvested:

By creating situations that disrupt what seems to be the natural order of things - situations that jolt people out of customary ways of thinking and behaving. Only then will they be able to act, to destroy the manufactured spectacle and the commodity economy - that is, capitalism in all its forms. Only then will they be able to create free and un-alienated lives.⁴⁴⁷

Complications

This section briefly considers three possible complications in the relationship between anarchism and animal advocacy: firstly, that veganism and animal liberation have been associated with 'lifestyle anarchism'; secondly, that veganism within the

⁴⁴⁵ C. Ehrlich, 'Socialism, anarchism and feminism' [viewed online, <https://libcom.org/library/socialism-anarchism-feminism-carol-ehrich>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid.

UK punk scene has become a symbolic site for cultural elitism; and, finally, that animal activism clashes with the importance that anarchists have placed on individual freedom.

Lifestyle activism

In the final decades of the twentieth century a split, if not an ‘unbridgeable chasm’, emerged within anarchist circles, between those who regarded themselves as social anarchists and those accused of practising ‘lifestyle anarchism’.⁴⁴⁸ This fracture emerged due to new strands of anarchist thought which highlighted individualistic, primitivist and postmodern forms of anarchism. In his 1995 work concerning these developing trends Murray Bookchin dismissed all three as ‘socially irrelevant and morally self-indulgent expressions of capitalist culture’.⁴⁴⁹

The idea of ‘lifestyle anarchism’ will be considered throughout the thesis, particularly in reference to vegan outreach. Certainly Steven Best believes that

[i]n the consumerist and privatized lifestyle form promoted by Franciombes [supposed followers of animal rights theorist Gary Francione], however, veganism is the opiate of the people, and Murray Bookchin’s polemic against apolitical “lifestyle anarchism” can be fruitfully applied to the vaporous lifestyle veganism championed by Franciombes and others.⁴⁵⁰

When veganism and animal liberation are discussed in relation to the perceived split between social and lifestyle activism, they are typically regarded as firmly on the side of the ‘lifestyles’. In what was planned as the final issue of *Class War* in 1997, one writer suggested some common ground with ‘lifestyle anarchists’,

⁴⁴⁸ Recent work by Laura Portwood-Stacer and Matt Wilson has helped to highlight the connections between ‘lifestyle’ and social activism. L. Portwood-Stacer, *Lifestyle Politics and Radical Activism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013); M. Wilson, *Biting the Hand that Feeds Us: In Defence of Lifestyle Politics* (Leeds: Dysopia Open Letter # 2, 2014).

⁴⁴⁹ P. McLaughlin, *Anarchism and Authority: A Philosophical Introduction to Classical Anarchism* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 1988), p. 165; M. Bookchin, *Social Anarchism and Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1995).

⁴⁵⁰ S. Best, ‘Manifesto for Radical Abolitionism: Total Liberation By Any Means Necessary’ [viewed online, <http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Manifesto-TotalLib.htm>, last accessed 29/05/2015].

but maintained that these activists were in a 'ghetto of self-imposed marginalisation', and that 'taking a morally superior stance might make you feel good but won't bring about any significant change'.⁴⁵¹ One of the key features of this derided lifestyle was the dietary habits of activists, which was contrasted to the presumably meat-eating ways of 'ordinary working class people', those with 'jobs, mortgages, families'.⁴⁵²

According to the class struggle anarchists, one's dietary habits were a reflection of activist's class position, and amounted to little more than 'middle class individuals develop[ing] the survivalist ideology of guilt'.⁴⁵³ However, these criticisms of 'lifestyle activism' ignore the positive role of veganism and other 'lifestyle' practices in creating a shared sense of collective identity within radical movements. This is certainly true of the DIY punk scene which combines veganism and anarchism.

Cultural elitism within Punk

One possible complication is that veganism can become 'a symbolic site for the politics of cultural elitism' in certain subcultures.⁴⁵⁴ This criticism is not confined to the punk scene, for instance some anarchists reject the presumption that anarchist book fairs and conferences should use exclusively vegan catering.⁴⁵⁵ Nonetheless, British punk scenes provide an interesting example because veganism is central to the collective identity of many punk scenes. Jim Donaghy's research comparing punk scenes in the UK, Poland and Indonesia shows that veganism is not just significant in the UK and North America, but in punk scenes across the world.⁴⁵⁶

⁴⁵¹ 'Peace Off!', *Class War*, No. 73, 1997.

⁴⁵² Ibid. Emphasis added.

⁴⁵³ Anon. *Animal Liberation: Devastate to Liberate or Devastatingly Liberal* [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/anonymous-animal-liberation-devastate-to-liberate-or-devastatingly-liberal>, last accessed 03/07/2015], paragraph 29.

⁴⁵⁴ A. R. Gordon, 'The Authentic Punk: An Ethnography of DIY Music Ethics' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, *Loughborough University*, 2005), p. 128.

⁴⁵⁵ 'Les animaux, ils sont gentils', *Le Monde Libertaire*, 18th October 2012, p. 18.

⁴⁵⁶ J. Donaghy, 'Punk and Anarchism: UK, Poland and Indonesia' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, *Loughborough University*, 2016).

The tension between subcultural expectations and individual choice is felt particularly sharply in punk because of the importance placed on personal freedom.⁴⁵⁷

Punk music has acted as a site of discourse between anarchism and animal liberation, particularly since the growth of anarcho-punk in the late 1970s and early 1980s, in which bands would often 'include in their records information and images of the horrors of animal use and abuse'.⁴⁵⁸ Like the ALF, some punks were influenced by the Situationists and more recently a growing number of punks have also adopted an environmental concern.⁴⁵⁹ Of course, just as there are as many anarchisms as anarchists, there are as many variants of the punk philosophy as there are people who embrace the label 'punk'. Nevertheless, there is an undeniable link between punk and animal concern.⁴⁶⁰ Alistair Gordon, in his study of the Leeds and Bradford DIY scenes, found that one of the most 'salient demonstrations of commitment' to the punk *lifestyle* was a vegetarian or vegan diet. Indeed, of all Gordon's interviewees: 'the most striking similarity... was that all of them were, or had at some time in their subcultural careers, been either vegetarian or vegan'.⁴⁶¹ Gordon believes that a noticeable amount of peer pressure existed to make so many members of the subculture adopt uniform dietary habits. For Gordon 'the ethics of food... became a symbolic site for the politics of cultural elitism'. For the West Yorkshire punk community this amounted to the accusation that a 'vegan police' were pressurising scenesters to forgo animal products, to the extent of 'going into people's kitchens and looking in people's cupboards'.⁴⁶²

Veganism can be seen as a 'subcultural expectation' in many punk scenes, and these scenes 'reinforce the vegan norm through the cultural reproduction of everyday practices'.⁴⁶³ This expectation certainly appears problematic because the idea of creating some kind of rule or law by which members of these scenes should abide directly infringes on the ideas of personal freedom held by participants in these

⁴⁵⁷ W. Boisseau, J. Donaghey, "'Nailing Descartes to the wall": Animal Rights, Veganism and Punk Culture', in A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation*, p. 80.

⁴⁵⁸ C. O'Hara, *The Philosophy of Punk: More Than Noise!* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1999), p. 134.

⁴⁵⁹ For connection between punk and the situationists see: G. Marcus, *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (London: Faber and Faber, 2001), p. 408-409.

⁴⁶⁰ See: D. Clark, 'The Raw and the Rotten: Punk Cuisine', *Ethnology*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Winter, 2004), pp. 19-31.

⁴⁶¹ A. R. Gordon, 'The Authentic Punk', p. 89.

⁴⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 128.

⁴⁶³ W. Boisseau, J. Donaghey, "'Nailing Descartes to the wall'", p. 80.

scenes, and anarchists in general.⁴⁶⁴ However, when compared to a safer spaces policy, 'a shared commitment to challenge mainstream relations to nonhuman animals appears consistent'.⁴⁶⁵ Moreover, it seems unlikely that such a passionate, independent and global movement would adopt an animal rights perspective to such an extent for fear of these sideboard snoopers. It is clear that veganism is an important element of many punks collective identity.⁴⁶⁶ One should not over-emphasise the importance of animal issues to the subculture, it is perhaps more important for punk scenes to operate their DIY ethic in a sustainable, non-competitive and anti-capitalist framework. Nonetheless, veganism is particularly important to both the lifestyle and political activism of many punks. This can be seen in the fact that Food Not Bombs chapters are routinely operated by punks, and receive funding from benefit gigs.⁴⁶⁷ According to Food Not Bombs activist Len, the fact that punk festivals are typically entirely vegan helps foster a sense of collective identity amongst punks that in turn sustains more radical political activism.⁴⁶⁸

Speciesism and Freedom

A further theoretical complication exists in that the anarchist concept of freedom may hold contradictory implications for animal rights. Among the challenging questions posed are whether people have the freedom to use animals in any way they wish: are the interests of animals included in a communitarian framework, and do animal liberation activists have the right to impose their beliefs on others who do not share them?

Some anarchists have followed the example of Dutch anarchist Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, who abstained from meat but would not dream of suggesting his family and comrades do the same. To Nieuwenhuis, and subsequent activists, it was not just a matter of free will, but also the fact that a libertarian society would be

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 81.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid. Website of the Coalition for Safer Spaces [viewed online, <https://saferspacesnyc.wordpress.com/>, last accessed 29/10/2015].

⁴⁶⁶ C. O'Hara, *Punk*, p. 132.

⁴⁶⁷ Interview with Len, Food Not Bombs Activist, East Midlands, 03/04/2015.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid.

made up of individuals with a variety of different belief systems, dietary choices and priorities, and these differences would make the future society worth living in.⁴⁶⁹ Nieuwenhuis valued the liberty of each individual human above the life of other animals. This conviction can clearly be challenged from a non-anarchist perspective, where the liberty principle 'only applies in so far as those involved are treated with respect and since animals are not treated with respect... it is a practice which ought to be stopped even though... those directly involved in the meat industry and those affected by its collapse are likely to be harmed'.⁴⁷⁰

The issue is clearly problematic for anarchists as they place such emphasis on freedom.⁴⁷¹ However, as Uri Gordon argues, few anarchists would believe this freedom to be 'unqualified'. For instance, no individual has the 'right' to exploit or enslave 'another person': 'and doing so is not part of the anarchist notion of freedom'.⁴⁷² The question remains whether animals are included among the 'other persons' who make up this socialist and communitarian notion of freedom. Although this was traditionally not the case, Matthew Wilson has argued that 'anarchist support for freedom is now frequently being understood to embrace non-human life'. Indeed, liberty is conferred not just on animals, but on the entire natural environment.⁴⁷³

Anarchistic animal advocates typically use the concept of speciesism to justify the equal consideration of all animals.⁴⁷⁴ The concept of speciesism creates a further complication for anarchists and animal advocates, because if the abuse of humans and other animals is morally equivalent, then this widens the scope of tactics deemed legitimate by animal activists. For instance, the campaign movement inspired by SHAC conducted 'psychological warfare' against those accused of animal abuse. Their tactics allegedly included: 'razor blade letters, bomb threats or

⁴⁶⁹ E. Goldman, *Living My Life, Vol. One*, p. 405.

⁴⁷⁰ R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality*, p. 112.

⁴⁷¹ See: W. Price, 'Do Anarchists Believe in Freedom?' [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/wayne-price-do-anarchists-believe-in-freedom>, last accessed 04/06/2015].

⁴⁷² U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!*, p. 97.

⁴⁷³ M. Wilson, 'Freedom Pressed: Anarchism, Liberty and Conflict', in. *Anarchism and Moral Philosophy*, p. 124.

⁴⁷⁴ Interview with JJ, SHAC, 19/06/14.

bomb attacks, arson, harassment, death threats, and physical assaults'.⁴⁷⁵ These groups believed that their actions were justified as they were fighting an enemy comparable to the 'SS einsatzgruppen in eastern Europe', moreover activists believed that conducting nonviolent direct action alone 'in fact is a pro-violence stance' because it tolerates animal abuse 'without taking adequate measures to stop it'.⁴⁷⁶ Some SHAC activists soon became critical of any 'criticism of direct action and... SHAC', which they regarded as a 'speciesist insult to those animals who depend on humans to advocate on their behalf'.⁴⁷⁷

*The concept of speciesism here trumps the notion of universal human freedom. It seems that the anarchist conception of freedom can be reordered to exclude certain groups or individuals who anarchist activists do not deem worthy of freedom.*⁴⁷⁸ *Matthew Wilson highlights the practice in certain anarchist federations of excluding fascists, homophobes, racists, misogynists and capitalists from their conception of freedom. Similarly, the freedom of alleged 'animal abusers' 'is implicitly over-ridden by the rhetoric and practises of many animal rights anarchists.'*⁴⁷⁹ *As Matthew Wilson reasons, the conception of freedom can become 'woefully Orwellian' when it is so easily denied.*⁴⁸⁰

A full discussion of the tactics of anarchistic animal advocates will take place during the case studies. For now it is important to remember that most anarchistic animal advocates make use of the concept of speciesism and this complicates the idea that anarchists embrace a universal notion of human freedom.

Conclusion

⁴⁷⁵ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Behind the Mask: Uncovering the Animal Liberation Front', in *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters*, pp. 34-36.

⁴⁷⁶ W. Churchill, 'Illuminating the philosophy and methods of Animal Liberation', p. 3; S. Best, 'It's War! The Escalating Battle Between Activists and the Corporate-State Complex', p. 301, in *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters*.

⁴⁷⁷ K. Jonas, 'Bricks and Bullhorns', in *ibid.*, p. 270.

⁴⁷⁸ There is certainly a longstanding tradition amongst anarchists to deny a platform for fascist speakers; W. Price, 'Do Anarchists Believe in Freedom?'

⁴⁷⁹ M. Wilson, 'Freedom Pressed', p. 124.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

This chapter has considered animal advocacy in relation to anarchism. It was suggested that animal concern was not included in the literature of the classical anarchist canon. Recent anarchist literature and activism has combined in a CAS framework that embraces total liberation, intersectionality and environmentalism and opposes capitalism and the state. The tactical links between the contemporary anarchist and animal rights/liberation movement was also explored, including the use of affinity groups, consensus decision making and direct action.

It is unsurprising that complications emerge, including debates around lifestyle anarchism, subcultural expectations and notions of freedom. As becomes clear throughout the thesis, particularly from the interview material from animal activists, seeking social progress is a messy process full of competing claims, complications and compromises.

It is therefore unsurprising that the four early assumptions about the relationship between anarchism and animal advocacy, based on the connection between anarchism and a CAS framework, are not so straightforward. With regard to the first aspect, even when anarchistic activists accept the concept of speciesism, they may combine this with extrinsic arguments that ending animal abuse will improve human society.⁴⁸¹ Moreover, there are also those, like Murray Bookchin, who believe that humans are vastly superior to any other animal species, and because of this superiority they are uniquely aware of the interests of other species and duty-bound to protect them.

Concerning the second aspect, anarchistic animal activists, particularly those associated with ALF-style activities, clearly fit into a rights or liberation philosophy in that they aim to prevent animal use altogether rather than reforming the worst cases of 'unnecessary suffering'. However, as we saw in the introduction, certain anarchists have rejected the term rights (because they 'must be guaranteed through law and thus require a state to enforce that law') and liberation (because it is 'beyond the capabilities of any animal').⁴⁸²

⁴⁸¹ É. Reclus, *On Vegetarianism, The Great Kinship of Humans and Fauna*, p. 5.

⁴⁸² K. Watkinson, D. O'Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism: Open Letter #3* (Leeds: Dysophia, 2014), p. 1; B. A. Dominick, *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution*, p. 16.

It is clear that anarchists and contemporary animal activists share a tactical connection because of the importance placed on direct action, hence the third aspect seems validated. As for the final aspect, anarchistic animal activists often combine animal advocacy with other Leftist positions such as opposition to the state and capitalism. Typically this implies an opposition to all forms of socially constructed hierarchy, as articulated by CAS scholar-activists.

3. Animal advocacy and the British parliamentary left

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to consider the historical connection between animal advocacy and the parliamentary left in Britain. The chapter considers the four possible aspects of animal concern that are unique to the parliamentary left (as opposed to the extra-parliamentary left) set out in the introduction with reference to a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework: firstly, it is possible that parliamentarians will relate animal protection to extrinsic arguments about the human character; for instance that human society itself will be morally improved if animals are not abused (rather than relying on intrinsic arguments about the moral worth of animals and the concept of speciesism); secondly, it is probable that animal concern from the parliamentary left has taken on a welfare, rather than rights or liberation, approach; thirdly, and most obviously, it seems likely that the parliamentary left have sought improvements for animals through legislation rather than direct action; finally, it is probable that the parliamentary left have *not* linked animal concern to a rejection of all social hierarchies.

The predominant focus in this chapter is on the Labour Party, which emerged as the principal socialist party in Britain throughout the twentieth century. However, since the 1990s, when the Labour leadership came to 'accept definitively that global capitalism, and the political power of global capital, was a permanent fact of life', an increasing number of Leftists felt unrepresented by Labour.⁴⁸³ As such, the chapter also considers the connections between animal advocacy and the Green Party, who

⁴⁸³ L. Panitch, C. Leys, *The End of Parliamentary Socialism: From New Left to New Labour* (London: Verso, 1997), p. 14. Of course, many socialists, including those associated with the New Left, had rejected the Labour Party for many decades.

are considered by some to occupy ‘the progressive political space once held by left-wing Labour’.⁴⁸⁴

The chapter begins by considering a group of ‘key thinkers’ who did hope to cement concern for animals as an essential ideological issue; this provides context to current activism and shows whether a history of leftist animal advocacy existed in Britain. The chapter therefore considers Henry Salt, Edward Carpenter, George Bernard Shaw and Robert Blatchford. The chapter then considers three ‘key links’ between animal rights and the parliamentary left, these links emerged from interviews with former and current Labour and Green politicians and party activists, as well as from examining activist literature such as *Labour Weekly*: firstly, the importance placed on class politics (in particular when targeting ostensibly upper class pursuits such as fox hunting); secondly, the attempt to build ‘coalitions’ of various left-wing causes; and, finally, the left’s determination to be a compassionate and caring movement will be discussed. The chapter then discusses the tactical connections between the parliamentary left and animal advocates; this section highlights the importance that many animal advocates have placed on achieving legislative reform, and also highlights the reformist inclination of some animal advocates who believe that progressive change will be achieved in small instalments. Finally, the chapter considers three complications: that a welfare agenda has led to the concept of rights being neglected, that Labour’s desire to reduce the cost of living led to their promotion of factory farming, and New Labour’s repression of animal rights activism.

Key Thinkers

This section considers four key thinkers who combined socialism and animal advocacy: Henry Salt, Edward Carpenter, George Bernard Shaw and Robert Blatchford. Interestingly, all four men combined a parliamentary and anarchistic

⁴⁸⁴ P. Tatchell, ‘Why I Joined the Greens’ [viewed online, <https://www.greenparty.org.uk/archive/183.html>, last accessed 19/06/15].

approach to socialism.⁴⁸⁵ Earlier socialists, including Owenites, Chartists and Fabians also occasionally combined socialism with vegetarianism.⁴⁸⁶

Henry Salt

Keith Tester's claim that Henry Salt, who founded the Humanitarian League in 1891, 'more or less invented animal rights' is aimed at dismissing the animal rights movement, rather than praising Salt.⁴⁸⁷ Nonetheless, the claim does hold an element of truth, and after leaving his position as an Eton schoolmaster in 1884, Salt was tireless in propagating the socialist and vegetarian message. Salt's legacy was seemingly forgotten by many on the left, and as the twentieth century progressed a movement 'devoted to the art of being kind' seemed somewhat out of place within the industrial and political labour movement.⁴⁸⁸ The Humanitarian League, which alongside animal rights and anti-vivisection campaigned against capital punishment, the arms trade, enforced vaccination and for colonial freedom, was seemingly open to the charge of sentimentality, which became an insult within the trade union movement.⁴⁸⁹ However, in Salt's life and work one can see the development of the anarchist concept of total liberation. Indeed, Salt believed that 'the emancipation of [humanity] from cruelty and injustice will bring with it in due course the emancipation of animals also... the two reforms are inseparably connected, and neither can be fully realized alone'.⁴⁹⁰

Like many vegetarians, Salt saw countless reasons for his preferred diet, from health benefits, to financial savings: workers would be 'stronger, in health, and much

⁴⁸⁵ H. S. Salt, 'Is Socialism Slavery?', *Pioneer*, Date unknown. Henry Salt Archive [viewed online, <http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/is-socialism-slavery>, last accessed 23/06/15].

⁴⁸⁶ J. Gregory, *Of Victorians and Vegetarians: The Vegetarian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2007); C. Spencer, *Vegetarianism: A History* (London: Grub Street, 2001).

⁴⁸⁷ K. Tester, *Animals and Society: The Humanity of Animal Rights* (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 194.

⁴⁸⁸ S. Winsten, *Salt and His Circle* (London: Hutchinson & Co, 1951), p. 62.

⁴⁸⁹ Certainly, the Butchers' Federation believed that 'the advocates of the humane-killer have captured the sentimentalists in our movement, but the Trade Unions are not sentimental bodies'. Trade Union Congress Report, 1923, p. 394.

⁴⁹⁰ H. Salt, *Seventy Years Among Savages* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1921), p. 122.

better off in pocket'.⁴⁹¹ Salt believed that socialists should instinctively become vegetarians, and vice versa, because 'both are direct offshoots of the great growth of Humanitarianism... *humaneness* is, in both cases, the guiding and paramount principle'.⁴⁹² Salt developed a concept of intersectionality in which he argued that 'all great issues of justice or injustice are crossed and intermingled, so that no one cruelty can be singled out as the source of all other cruelties, nor can any one reform be fully realized apart from the rest'.⁴⁹³

Salt's abilities as a propagandist were diminished because he believed that the connection between social progress and vegetarianism was self-evident: 'it is difficult for any clear-headed man... to resist either conclusion'.⁴⁹⁴ Of course, countless clear-headed men and women came to different conclusions to Salt, who believed that the masses lived lives of 'unremitting toil' in 'much the same' way as 'countless numbers of harmless animals' were 'condemned to torture and death'.⁴⁹⁵ To Salt, 'humanity... must apply, not to mankind alone, but to all sentient life'. Indeed, for Salt, 'A Vegetarian... cannot consistently be an opponent of a system which holds out a prospect of relief to the victims of the sweater's den' and 'a Socialist... ought not to be able to regard with complacency the horrible traffic in flesh'.⁴⁹⁶ The vast majority of socialists believed that they remained consistent in their principles whilst maintaining an animal-based diet.

Responding to criticism made in the Socialist League publication *Commonweal* in 1896, Salt seemed genuinely pained that certain socialists would 'devote their superfluous energies' to an attack on vegetarianism.⁴⁹⁷ Rather than responding to the attack in kind, Salt maintained that vegetarianism could be thought of merely as an 'important accessory consideration' to the fundamental economic and political changes that would be brought about through a social revolution.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹¹ H. S. Salt, 'Socialists and Vegetarians', *To-Day*, November 1896, Henry Salt Archive. [viewed online, <http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/socialists-and-vegetarians>, last accessed 23/06/15].

⁴⁹² H. S. Salt, 'Vegetarianism "As She is Spoke"', *The Vegetarian*, Vol. 11, No. 27, July 6, 1889. Henry Salt Archive. [viewed online, <http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/vegetarianism-as-she-is-spoke>, last accessed 23/06/15].

⁴⁹³ H. Salt, *Seventy Years*, p. 132.

⁴⁹⁴ H. S. Salt, 'Vegetarianism "As She is Spoke"'.
⁴⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁷ H. S. Salt, 'Socialists and Vegetarians'.

⁴⁹⁸ Ibid.

Whilst waiting for the new dawn, Salt felt that socialists should not ignore an argument built upon a consideration of justice and humanity, for those are the very principles which he believed socialists and vegetarians should share:

When a Socialist sets aside the plea for humanity to the lower animals as a mere fad and crotchet, a Vegetarian might well retort that if the promptings of gentleness and mercy are deliberately disregarded in the case of the animals, it cannot surprise us if they are also excluded from consideration in those social questions where the welfare of human beings is concerned.⁴⁹⁹

Salt went further than insisting that the working class should show compassion for animals. Instead he argued that as ‘the labour of animals has been interwoven with the labour of man in the fabric of human society, it seems wiser to claim for animals their due rights, as a part of that organisation’: members of the working class.⁵⁰⁰ To Salt, animals were members of an exploited and oppressed class just like the workers; similarly the bourgeoisie were ‘almost literally cannibals, as devouring the flesh and blood of the higher non-human animals... and indirectly cannibals, as living by the sweat and toil of the classes who do the hard work of the world’.⁵⁰¹ Salt was determined to express this simple belief in any possible way, from lecturing and pamphleteering to writing the poem to ‘The Socialist not a Vegetarian’:

His theme is Exploitation: the rich Few
Battening on labour of the Many. True—
But look within his larder. Will he dine
Himself on limbs of slaughtered sheep and kine?
Are *those* poor sufferers not exploited too?⁵⁰²

Salt did not simply aim to protect the oppressed, but to create a beautiful society where compassion and social justice could flourish. There was simply no room in a ‘community possessed of true refinement’ for the ‘degrading and disgusting institutions as the slaughter-house and the butcher’s shop’.⁵⁰³ Salt’s concept of animal advocacy seems to fit into a traditional anarchist, rather than

⁴⁹⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁰ H. S. Salt, ‘Have Animals Rights?’, *Human Review*, January 1908, Vol. 8. Henry Salt Archive.

⁵⁰¹ H. Salt, *Seventy Years*, p. 64.

⁵⁰² H. S. Salt, ‘The Socialist not a Vegetarian’, *The Vegetarian Messenger and Health Review*, Vol. 25 No. 2, February 1928. Henry Salt Archive.

⁵⁰³ H. S. Salt, ‘Socialists and Vegetarians’.

parliamentary left, approach. Salt developed the concepts of total liberation and intersectionality; he clearly believed in a rights or liberation approach in which animals should be protected because of their own intrinsic moral worth. Salt linked his animal advocacy to a rejection of all social hierarchies, which he saw as interconnected.⁵⁰⁴ Nonetheless, Salt wished to see legislative reform to protect other animals, and was disappointed that ‘the Labour movement... has not cared to widen its outlook even to the extent of demanding better conditions for the more highly domestic animals’.⁵⁰⁵

Edward Carpenter

Born in 1844 and dissatisfied with a middle class upbringing that led to Trinity Hall, Cambridge, Edward Carpenter dedicated his long life to promoting the socialist cause. In Carpenter’s case, this involved leading the relatively-simple-life in Millthorpe, his Derbyshire home where he dedicated his time to poetry, philosophy and sandal making. Millthorpe became a hub for ‘vegetarians, dress reformers, temperance avatars, spiritualists, secularists, anti-vivisectionists, socialists [and] anarchists’.⁵⁰⁶ Carpenter’s promotion of homosexuality, alongside free love and nudism, evidently proved too much for the Clarion socialist Robert Blatchford who wrote that the time was ‘not ripe’ for socialists ‘to meddle with the sexual question...the economic and industrial change’ must be the sole priority for socialists.⁵⁰⁷ Carpenter, however, did not believe in sole priorities. Carpenter was an early proponent of anarchist understandings of intersectionality, and to him these seemingly diverse social questions were fundamentally linked. This was partly due to a deep-rooted opposition to cruelty of any kind, but it was also linked to a ‘concept of mystical or spiritual democracy’.⁵⁰⁸ This was not simply the belief that ‘all creatures

⁵⁰⁴ H. Salt, *Seventy Years*, pp. 243-244.

⁵⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 216. I believe that Salt underestimated the Labour movement’s concern for other animals.

⁵⁰⁶ E. Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams: Being Autobiographical Notes* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1921), p. 167.

⁵⁰⁷ M. Wright, ‘Robert Blatchford, The Clarion Movement, and the Crucial Years of British Socialism, 1891-1900’, in T. Brown, (ed.), *Edward Carpenter and Late Victorian Radicalism* (London: Frank Cass, 1990), p. 95.

⁵⁰⁸ C. Tsuzuki, *Edward Carpenter 1844-1929: Prophet of Human Fellowship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 112.

contained the divine', but also an understanding - shared with Salt, and Shelley before them - that concern for the most vulnerable of animals extended humanity's 'sympathy towards the whole of the cosmos' and vegetarianism could therefore be 'the source of a more intense life of the emotions and the imagination'.⁵⁰⁹

Until his death, at the age of 84 in 1929, Carpenter was at the forefront of the socialist movement. Although Carpenter never took a leadership role, he was connected in some way with the Socialist League, the SDF, the ILP, the Labour Party and a variety of non-parliamentary campaigning organisations. Carpenter donated £300 to the SDF in 1884, which Henry Hyndman, the party's founder, took to be a membership fee.⁵¹⁰ The politics of the poet and philosopher could not be constrained by parliamentary parties; theoretically Carpenter 'was inclined to be in opposition to the state', and many friends believed him to be a 'complete anarchist'.⁵¹¹ In reality, Carpenter sought to unite the increasingly divided anarchist and parliamentary socialist movement, believing that they were following different paths but aiming to reach the same destination. As Carpenter described: 'I worked definitely along the socialist line: with a drift, as was natural, towards anarchism'.⁵¹² In practice this meant supporting the Walsall anarchists who were arrested on explosive making charges in 1892 and sending material to the Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin on the 'petty trades' in Sheffield, which helped both men elaborate their theories on anarchism.⁵¹³

Carpenter's calls for the 'sturdy simplification... [of] daily life by the removal of these things which stand between us and Nature' encouraged the formation of the Norton Socialist Colony by seven people interested in an 'anarchistic "Return to Nature"'.⁵¹⁴ The colony followed Carpenter's calls for 'plain living, friendship with the Animals, open-air habits, fruitarian food, and such a degree of nudity as we can

⁵⁰⁹ M. Bevir, *The Making of British Socialism* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011), p. 252; C. E. Shaw, 'Identified with the One: Edward Carpenter, Henry Salt, and the Ethical Socialist Philosophy of Science', in T. Brown, *Carpenter*, p. 50.

⁵¹⁰ S. Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter: A Life Of Liberty and Love* (London: Verso, 2008), p. 78, p. 84, p. 172. Carpenter joined the Socialist League in 1885, but remained a 'semi-detached sympathiser' to the I.L.P and Labour.

⁵¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 138, p. 417.

⁵¹² E. Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams*, p. 115.

⁵¹³ C. Tsuzuki, *Carpenter*, p. 92.

⁵¹⁴ E. Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams*, p. 208; S. Rowbotham, *Carpenter*, p. 250.

reasonably attain to'.⁵¹⁵ Perhaps it is significant that despite inspiring this action, Carpenter was never inclined to join such a colony himself. Despite his belief in the mystic cosmos, Carpenter 'never made any absolute rule against flesh eating... to avoid giving trouble in philistine households'.⁵¹⁶ Even in 1909, when Carpenter was president of the International Vegetarian Congress, he had 'occasional derelictions from the ideal standard'.⁵¹⁷

Whether or not it was practised consistently throughout his life, Carpenter was continually associated with the vegetarian cause. This undoubtedly had a positive impact, encouraging enthusiastic followers to form colonies or adopt the simple life. Other socialists dismissed Carpenter's animal advocacy and promotion of non-economic social reforms. George Orwell, for instance, was dismissive of middle class socialists who, he believed, did not understand the realities of working class life: 'the socialist-bourgeoisie, most of whom give me the creeps...so many of them are the sort of eunuch type with a vegetarian smell who go about spreading sweetness and light and have at the back of their minds a vision of the working class all... readers of Edward Carpenter or some other pious sodomite'.⁵¹⁸ It is an image which, to some extent, remained with socialist-vegetarians for much of the twentieth century.

As someone who sympathised with anarchism and parliamentary socialism, it is unsurprising that Carpenter combines anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy. Firstly, Carpenter was clearly concerned with improving the human character by combining vegetarianism with moral reforms such as temperance. Carpenter adopted an anarchistic intersectional approach in which different types of hierarchy were interconnected and should be challenged simultaneously. Carpenter adopted the approach of the parliamentary left in believing that legislative reforms were necessary; although interestingly Carpenter believed that such socialist legislation would eventually bring about an anarchist society. Indeed, Carpenter believed that the reformist road to socialism, including public ownership of the land and industry:

⁵¹⁵ E. Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams*, p. 208

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

⁵¹⁸ S. Orwell, I. Angus, (eds.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, Vol. 1: An Age Like This, 1920-1940* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968), p. 216, Letter to Jack Common [16? April 1936].

[I]s the one along which western society will work in the near future; that is, till such a time as the state, qua state, and all efficient Government, are superseded by the voluntary and instinctive consent and mutual helpfulness of the people – when of course the more especially Anarchist ideal would be realised.⁵¹⁹

Finally, it is not clear whether Carpenter is a proponent of animal rights/liberation as opposed to animal welfare. As he championed vegetarianism (at least in theory) one could suggest that Carpenter was a proponent of an animal liberation approach. However, it should also be remembered that Carpenter, and the other key thinkers, were writing at a time when the ‘welfare’ of most farm animals was considerably better than the treatment currently received by millions of animals in factory farms.

George Bernard Shaw

Although Salt and Carpenter were firmer proponents of what may be called the ‘Simple Life’, it was through George Bernard Shaw that vegetarianism came to be seen, ‘in the public eye... more typically as the preserve of the crank and the beard, shorts and sandals brigade’.⁵²⁰ Shaw, whose fame as a playwright greatly increased his notoriety, if not his influence, became vegetarian in 1881 at the age of 25. As biographers are keen to point out, Shaw’s dietary choice was not solely connected with animal advocacy. The Dublin born writer ‘exploded every month or six weeks in a headache... disabling him for a day’, and after a self-diagnosis Shaw decided he must cut down on animal protein.⁵²¹ Moreover, the author ‘grew tired’ of the ‘sameness’ of a flesh based diet.⁵²² Nonetheless, Shaw combined his vegetarianism with opposition to vivisection and campaigned against other instances of animal abuse. Shaw condemned those who fought against only one aspect of

⁵¹⁹ E. Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams*, p. 127.

⁵²⁰ C. Spencer, *Vegetarianism*, p. 264.

⁵²¹ A. Chappelow, *Shaw ~ “The Chucker-Out”: A Biographical Exposition and Critique* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969), pp. 15-16.

⁵²² S. Peters, *Bernard Shaw: The Ascent of the Superman* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), p. 72.

animal cruelty, for instance the anti-vivisectionists who wore 'head-dresses obtained by wholesale murder', killed animals for sport or ate animal flesh 'obtained by revolting methods'.⁵²³ Sally Peters has argued that Shaw campaigned against vivisection not from a 'high-minded love of animals... but from some buried fear that the hand that smote the guinea-pig might smite him'.⁵²⁴ However, Shaw's thinking seems to accept what would now be called speciesism; Shaw also believed that those who harmed animals would also be prepared to harm humans. As Shaw explained in his preface to *The Doctor's Dilemma* in 1911:

The man who once concedes to the vivisector the right to put a dog outside the laws of honour and fellowship, concedes to him also the right to put himself outside them; for he is nothing to the vivisector but a more highly developed, and consequently more interesting-to-experiment-on vertebrate than the dog.⁵²⁵

Rod Preece has elevated Shaw's animal advocacy and socialist vision to a high point of inclusive justice that the British left has subsequently ignored to its detriment. Preece argues that Shaw's vision of socialism relied on his 'abomination of [all] suffering and the desire to create a world without it'.⁵²⁶ To Shaw, and Preece, this was the key to socialist inclusive justice which saw all forms of injustice as interrelated; it was impossible to end one form of oppression, proponents of inclusive justice believed, whilst others continued. As Shaw wrote: 'if we could make the whole world a bird sanctuary, might it not be one of the most important steps towards making it a human-being sanctuary'.⁵²⁷

Shaw's celebrity status assured that until his death in 1950 his actions and public utterances were firmly connected with the vegetarian cause. Other animal advocates must have been aghast that when responding to enquiries about his diet in 1948 the 92 year old responded that he 'has no objection to the slaughter of animals as such. He knows that if we do not kill animals they will kill us'.⁵²⁸ The statement, released on behalf of Shaw, continued that not only did animals 'owe their

⁵²³ Bernard Shaw, *The Doctor's Dilemma* (London: Penguin Books, 1911), p. 45.

⁵²⁴ S. Peters, *Bernard Shaw*, p. 75.

⁵²⁵ Bernard Shaw, *The Doctor's Dilemma*, p. 52.

⁵²⁶ R. Preece, *Animal Sensibility and Inclusive Justice in the Age of Bernard Shaw* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011), p. 38.

⁵²⁷ P. Clodd, *Shooting for Sport* (London: National Society for the Abolition of Cruel Sports, 1937), p. 3.

⁵²⁸ A. Chappelow, *Shaw*, pp. 15-16.

lives' to the meat industry but certain animals: 'must be continually slain even to extermination by vegetarians as ruthlessly as by meat eaters. But he urges humane killing and does not enjoy it as sport'.⁵²⁹ The statement came in response to written requests for information about the playwright's diet, so was not seen by the general public. Nonetheless, those familiar with Shaw's pronouncements throughout the 1930s would not be surprised that alongside the animals that must be 'slain', the author included a list of humans who would meet a similar fate: 'incorrigible criminals, dangerous lunatics and idiots'.⁵³⁰ Indeed, alongside Shaw's professed compassion for animals ran a striking disregard for human life. Shaw was therefore able to praise the Soviet Union after visiting Russia in 1931, arguing not only that the persecution of the intelligentsia in Russia was justified, but that for the success of a similar social revolution in Britain: 'persons with a university education... if not violently exterminated, [should] at least [be] encouraged to die out as soon as possible'.⁵³¹

Shaw combined a parliamentary and anarchistic approach to animal issues. Shaw accepts the concept of speciesism that many current anarchistic animal activists embrace. Despite this, Shaw took a parliamentary approach to other aspects of animal concern. He promoted the welfare of animals rather than opposing all killing, he sought legislative reform on issues such as vivisection; and, despite Rod Preece's arguments, he did not link animal concern to other forms of oppression. Indeed, Shaw disregarded the oppression of other humans to the extent of arguing that certain 'undesirable' humans should be put to death.

Robert Blatchford

One pivotal, although often overlooked, text in the development of British socialism was Robert Blatchford's *Merrie England*. Published in 1893 under the pseudonym Nunquam, the book comprised a series of articles on socialism from *The*

⁵²⁹ Ibid.

⁵³⁰ Ibid., p. 16.

⁵³¹ T. C. Davis, *George Bernard Shaw and the Socialist Theatre* (London: Praeger, 1994), p. 132, p. 134.

Clarion paper.⁵³² Addressed to John Smith, of Oldham, and with a distinctly English approach to socialism, Blatchford's work is said to have converted one hundred readers to socialism: 'for every British convert made by *Das Kapital*'.⁵³³ Although Blatchford advocates state socialism in *Merrie England*, among the writer's extensive journalist and literary portfolio is a work of anarchist utopian fiction: *The Sorcery Shop: An Impossible Romance*.⁵³⁴ In Blatchford's fictional utopia the visionary society is vegetarian and has no alcohol and tobacco. Lyman Tower Sargent dismisses the importance of this, writing that Blatchford: 'presents a long list of the wasteful elements of contemporary English society which have been done away with in anarchist England... these are very minor points and are not important enough to dwell on'.⁵³⁵ However, Blatchford makes constant reference to animal sensibilities in his journalism and propaganda, and he repeatedly emphasises the importance of vegetarianism. Perhaps the issue is central to the uniquely English socialism that Blatchford promotes.

In *The Sorcery Shop* a fictional Conservative M.P, Major-General Sir Frederick Manningtree Storm, and his Liberal equivalent, Mr. Samuel Jorkel, Honourable Member for Shantytown East, are transported in a dreamlike state to post-revolutionary Manchester. Contrary to Lyman Tower Sargent's claim that the treatment of animals is a 'very minor' point, the improved status of animals is the first difference that the time travelling Tory detects. Although the Major-General is initially excited about the number of 'game' animals that dwell in the utopian North, it soon becomes clear that 'in this strange country', 'there is no selling and no killing'.⁵³⁶ In fact, in anarchist Manchester, the description of shooting animals for pleasure 'would be an equally good excuse for shooting babies'.⁵³⁷ As Blatchford, through the voice of the wizard who guides the politicians around the new society, describes:

Since the birds cannot defend themselves, to shoot them is cowardly, and, since they suffer pain, to shoot them is cruel. These people would regard such 'sport' with horror; therefore, they do not feel the loss of it, any more than *you*

⁵³² R. Blatchford, *Merrie England* (London: The Journeyman Press, 1977, First Published 1893).

⁵³³ L. Thompson, *Robert Blatchford: Portrait of an Englishman* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1951), p. 101.

⁵³⁴ R. Blatchford, *The Sorcery Shop: An Impossible Romance*, (London: The Clarion Press, 1907).

⁵³⁵ *Anarchy*, 104, Vol. 9. No. 10. October 1969. p. 318.

⁵³⁶ R. Blatchford, *The Sorcery Shop*, pp. 14-15.

⁵³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

feel the loss of the more ancient sport of throwing Christians to the lions, or baiting Jews, or roasting heretics.⁵³⁸

In this work of utopian fiction, which differs substantially from Blatchford's more literal espousals of socialism, the community are at one with the natural environment. The travellers look in awe as nearby animals are undisturbed by human presence. Although one reason why the revolutionary community avoid meat is because 'it is very much cheaper, and healthier, to live on a vegetable diet', the enhanced connection with nature is an obvious consequence.⁵³⁹ Visiting the stateless society, and faced with the prospect of vegetarian cuisine, the visitors worriedly ask 'will these impossible persons try to force their fads upon *us*?'⁵⁴⁰ In keeping with the non-hierarchical nature of the new society, and perhaps addressing contemporary concerns about the authoritarian nature of dietary reformers, the travellers are reassured that no one will attempt to force their habits upon them, nonetheless: 'these people would be as much shocked to hear you speak of eating roast beef as you would be to hear a Chinaman lamenting the absence of roast dog'.⁵⁴¹

In *Merrie England*, aimed at the straight-talking workingman with a slight hostility to socialism, and clear aversion to any hint of crankishness, Blatchford explains that 'a vegetarian diet is the best, and I am sure that alcoholic liquors are unnecessary'.⁵⁴² Blatchford has been described as transcending the barrier between anarchism and socialism. Laurence Thompson believed that 'Blatchford was not a socialist at all, as [Ramsay] MacDonald understood socialism. He described himself later as an Anarchist-Communist'.⁵⁴³ Nonetheless, *Merrie England*, with its espousal of a vegetarian diet, is clearly state socialist; Blatchford describes 'Practical Socialism' as 'a kind of national scheme of co-operation, managed by the State'.⁵⁴⁴ Blatchford explains that almost any law 'is more or less socialistic, for nearly all law implies the right of the State to control individuals for the benefit of the nation'; and finally this state controlled socialism will be brought about when the country puts 'a

⁵³⁸ Ibid.

⁵³⁹ Ibid., p. 132.

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 26.

⁵⁴¹ Ibid., p. 26.

⁵⁴² R. Blatchford, *Merrie England*, p. 16. It is addressed to the workingman, rather to men and women.

⁵⁴³ L. Thompson, *Blatchford*, p. 102.

⁵⁴⁴ R. Blatchford, *Merrie England*, p. 44.

number of your cleverest organisers and administrators into committee and let them formulate a scheme'.⁵⁴⁵ Despite this authoritarian streak, Blatchford adopted some of his animal sensibilities from Kropotkin. For instance, in *Not Guilty* the Clarion socialist writes that 'even before the coming of man there were the beginnings of morals in the animal world'.⁵⁴⁶ Drawing further from Kropotkin's most famous work Blatchford continues that: 'In union is strength. The gregarious animals - those which live in communities of flocks and herds... gain by mutual aid in the struggle for existence'.⁵⁴⁷ Blatchford believed that the most vulnerable humans could share an empathy with the smallest non-human animals; for instance, when Blatchford visited a workhouse he noted that children often formed bonds with the mice who scuttled about because 'the little fellows want something to love'.⁵⁴⁸ Blatchford lamented that such a fate was 'forced upon innocent and defenceless children' in a country which spent so much money on hunting wild animals.⁵⁴⁹ A country that chose to protect the most vulnerable in society, Blatchford is suggesting, would find no place for killing living creatures for enjoyment. There is a sense in Blatchford's writing that such animal abuse is contrary to the British tradition of fair play. However, it would be wrong to suggest that Blatchford appealed to the British alone; for instance, *Merrie England* was influential amongst the ethical socialist movement in Australia.⁵⁵⁰ Moreover, by the twentieth century, across Western Europe, vegetarianism had become 'linked with a number of radical social movements, including socialism and feminism'.⁵⁵¹

Blatchford clearly sympathises with non-human animals, and in one book he derides Christians for not extending 'their loving-kindness to brute creation'.⁵⁵² Nonetheless, Blatchford's principle concern is for vulnerable humans. He laments that 'it is common also amongst the poor for children to be fed upon improper food': 'salt fish, rancid bacon... badly cooked meat'. Although one future solution might be the adoption of a vegetarian diet, Blatchford would settle for the children having

⁵⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 44, p. 47, p. 48.

⁵⁴⁶ R. Blatchford, *Not Guilty: A Defence of the Bottom Dog* (London: Clarion Press, 1906), p. 40.

⁵⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 41-42.

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 112.

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 112-113.

⁵⁵⁰ F. Bongiorno, 'Love and Friendship: Ethical Socialism in Britain and Australia', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32: 116, pp. 1-19, p. 8.

⁵⁵¹ J. A. Klein, 'Afterword: Comparing Vegetarianisms', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 31: 1, pp. 199-212, p. 202.

⁵⁵² R. Blatchford, *God and My Neighbour* (London: Clarion Press, 1903), p. 137.

properly cooked meals. His desire to appeal to 'ordinary' workers also led him to downplay his own vegetarianism. In *Merrie England* the writer empathises with John Smith's diet of 'the flabby fish, the leathery steak, the juiceless joint', and admits that 'I know them all'.⁵⁵³ Blatchford could have been trying to hide any hint of faddishness, but he does suggest that a 'full grown healthy man' should have a daily ration including 1 lb. of meat.⁵⁵⁴ Just as Blatchford believed that the time was 'not ripe' for socialists to consider sexual questions, vegetarianism and animal rights seem another issue which Blatchford was happy to put on hold until economic and industrial changes had been achieved.⁵⁵⁵ This seems representative of much socialist thought as the twentieth century progressed: those issues that were deemed to be peripheral, which often included animal rights and gender questions, would be neglected at the expense of the class struggle.

Blatchford was another thinker who combined parliamentary and extra-parliamentary approaches. It is interesting that Blatchford's animal concern is presented in two distinct manners depending on whether he is writing as a parliamentary socialist or as a utopian anarchist. In *Merrie England*, his 'state socialist' work, Blatchford combines vegetarianism with improvements for the human character such as temperance; whereas in *The Sorcery Shop*, an anarchist utopia, he explains that it is morally wrong in itself to kill animals, indeed it is seen as the equivalent of murdering humans for entertainment. In *Merrie England* conditions for animals themselves are not considered, whereas in Blatchford's anarchist work a rights/liberation approach is presented. In *Merrie England* Blatchford calls for legislation to change the nature of society, whereas in *The Sorcery Shop* it is made clear that the utopian citizens themselves will directly defend their fellow Earthlings and that abusive practices towards animals are not socially acceptable. Finally, whereas *Merrie England* leaves some hierarchies unchallenged, particularly those issues which it was 'not ripe' for socialists to tackle, *The Sorcery Shop* links animal advocacy directly to the non-hierarchical society in revolutionary Manchester. Moreover, Blatchford linked the end of animal abuse to other social causes; in this way Blatchford's writing fits well with a CAS framework.

⁵⁵³ R. Blatchford, *Merrie England*, p. 16.

⁵⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵⁵⁵ M. Wright, 'Robert Blatchford', p. 95.

As well as these formative thinkers, the thesis also draws on the views of a number of later Labour politicians: firstly, the late Tony Banks, Banks served in the House of Commons between 1983 and 2005, he took a particular interest in animal issues and spearheaded the campaign of support for ALF hunger striker Barry Horne within parliament; secondly, Kerry McCarthy, a vegan and member of parliament since 2005 who briefly served as the Shadow Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; finally, Labour's current leader Jeremy Corbyn is a vegetarian who supported a number of animal rights causes, including opposition to vivisection, whilst on the backbenches.

Key Links

Having set out some of the key historical thinkers who articulated the connection between animal advocacy and the parliamentary left, it is now important to consider possible conceptual links between animal advocacy and the parliamentary left in recent British history. In this section three links between animal advocacy, the Labour Party and the Green Party are explored: class, coalition building and attempts to be a compassionate and caring movement. These connections emerged through interviews and material such as party manifestos. Of course, the fact that these are links between the parliamentary left and animal advocacy is not to say that the connections are not also shared by anarchists and the extra-parliamentary left.

Class

The British parliamentary left, particularly the Labour Party, not only traditionally gained its core electoral support from working-class voters, but the Left's *raison d'être*, as Labour's 1974 election manifesto described, was to bring about 'a fundamental and irreversible shift in the balance of wealth and power in favour of working people'.⁵⁵⁶ Labour's incorporation of animal issues relied on a certain

⁵⁵⁶ L. Panitch, C. Leys, *The End of Parliamentary Socialism*, p. 62.

amount of class antagonism by suggesting it was the upper class that were most likely to abuse animals for pleasure, particularly by fox hunting.

Arguments that centred on the presumed class position of animal abusers were often made by animal advocates hoping to influence the Labour Party. For instance, during the post-war Labour government led by Clement Attlee the League Against Cruel Sports (LACS) campaigned against the Waterloo Cup, a hare coursing event held over three days in Lancashire.⁵⁵⁷ The Labour government, perhaps unwilling to become embroiled in a dispute with yet another vested interest, allowed the competition to proceed throughout its period in office. LACS embraced a moralistic rejection of the Waterloo Cup in which gambling was seen as wasteful and therefore offensive when many workers were unable to afford such a luxury pastime during a period of rationing and austerity. However, it is interesting that the LACS's campaign should be framed in class terms of 'organised labour' opposing animal abusers.⁵⁵⁸

Animal issues continued to be the site of class conflict between Labour and their adversaries in the 1970s and 1980s. In 1979 some Party members were prepared to embrace this conflict. For instance, John Denham reported to Labour's conference that 'we are often accused of doing this [opposing hunting] out of crude ruling-class bashing. So what? It is only symptomatic of all sections of the ruling class that all they can think of to do with their spare time is to chase defenceless animals to cruel death'.⁵⁵⁹ Val Veness, deputy leader of Labour's Islington Council who adopted an Animals' Charter in May 1982, similarly believed that the Conservatives would never make any major reforms in animal welfare because 'it attacks the very class of people they represent'.⁵⁶⁰ Labour's charter for animal protection had included the warning that 'those involved with animals often have a vested interest in keeping the public ignorant'.⁵⁶¹

⁵⁵⁷ League Against Cruel Sports (Nottingham Branch), 'Against the holding of the Waterloo Cup', October 22nd-24th, October 9th 1947. MRC.

⁵⁵⁸ League Against Cruel Sports (Nottingham Branch) to TUC, January 22nd 1948. MRC.

⁵⁵⁹ Labour Party Annual Conference Report, 1979, p. 394.

⁵⁶⁰ P. Windeatt, "'They Clearly Now See the Link": Militant Voices', in P. Singer, (ed.), *In Defence of Animals* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), p. 185.

⁵⁶¹ *Living Without Cruelty: Labour's Charter for Animal Protection* (The Labour Party: Policy Background Paper, 1979), p. 35.

Hunting with hounds became the issue most clearly associated with class disputes, and when the Hunting Act was passed by parliament in 2004 these antagonisms resurfaced. Two former miners, Ronnie Campbell and Dennis Skinner, allegedly supported the Act only as a way of ‘evening the score’ for the defeat of the miners’ strike.⁵⁶² Although these disputes were sometimes about more than the animals involved, it is no coincidence that it should be Labour – and particularly those who identify themselves with the left of the party – who showed the most concern for animals. This could show that these Labour politicians were prepared to link animal abuse to other forms of class hierarchy. From a CAS perspective it also shows that people who have compassion for one oppressed group are also likely to show empathy for other subjugated groups.

However, Labour’s commitment to electoral politics rooted in working-class communities was one reason that the Party never embraced a rights or liberation agenda. By 1979 Labour inserted a brief paragraph dedicated to animal welfare into their manifesto, containing the promise that ‘legislation to end cruelty to animals will include the banning of hare coursing, stag and deer hunting’. However, Labour were wary of alienating working-class supporters, and so the proposals came with the disclaimer that ‘angling and shooting will in no way be affected’.⁵⁶³ Robert Garner argues that Callaghan blocked the inclusion of the abolition of bloodsports in the manifesto by ‘invoking the electoral consequences argument’.⁵⁶⁴ More rigorous animal welfare reform could not be included because it ran counter to Labour’s manifesto commitment to expand the farming industry which, as we shall see, Labour believed was necessary to maintain post-war rises in working-class living standards.

Coalitions

⁵⁶² M. Kite, ‘Hunt ban is revenge for Thatchers’ defeat of the miners, says Labour MP’, Daily Telegraph, 19th September 2004 [viewed online, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1472099/Hunt-ban-is-revenge-for-Thatchers-defeat-of-the-miners-says-Labour-MP.html>, last accessed 24/04/13] The report continued that Labour MPs: ‘Are frustrated that they can’t renationalise the top 100 companies so they say let’s get rid of foxhunting’.

⁵⁶³ *The Labour Way is the Better Way* (Labour Party, 1979).

⁵⁶⁴ R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), p. 110.

Robert Garner highlights the fact that ‘the representation of minority causes’ as part of ‘rainbow coalitions’ in which animal issues were included, ‘was reflected in much of the left’s strategy in local government during the first half of the 1980s’.⁵⁶⁵ This strategy involved building a broad coalition of progressive opinion – from feminists and gay rights activists to trade unionists and the Co-operative movement. Of course, the extra-parliamentary left also attempted to build such coalitions, as seen in the variety of activists supporting the anti-roads movement.⁵⁶⁶ Leslie Pickering Francis and Richard Norman have argued that such connections between animal and human struggles are patronising to human victims of oppression, because they are regarded alongside animals, and trivialise ‘those real [human] liberation movements, putting them on a level with what cannot but appear as a bizarre exaggeration’.⁵⁶⁷ Such arguments can be dismissed from a CAS perspective that recognises the interconnections of different forms of oppression. When different strands of the parliamentary left have built such coalitions it is not for electoral expediency, but because (as explained in the Green Party’s core values) they recognise

that the threats to economic, social and environmental well-being are part of the same problem, and [we] recognise that solving one of these crises cannot be achieved without solving the others.⁵⁶⁸

Val Veness’ attentiveness to animal issues was prompted by her anti-militarism; and she believed that the testing of weapons at Porton Down was an example of ‘animals being used to exploit and keep down another section of humans’.⁵⁶⁹ Moreover, Veness believed that ‘as a woman, I am oppressed, at the bottom of the pile’ and it would not be appropriate to oppress animals who were ‘the next lot down’.⁵⁷⁰ Perhaps this period of left-wing activity during the early 1980s represents the first attempt since the days of Salt, Carpenter and Shaw to formulate a philosophy of inclusive justice in which human and animal liberation was

⁵⁶⁵ R. Garner, ‘Defending Animal Rights’, *Parliamentary Affairs: A Journal of Comparative Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 3, July, 1998, pp. 458-469, p. 465; Interview with Robert Garner, 17/07/14.

⁵⁶⁶ G. McKay, ‘DiY Culture: Notes towards an intro’, in G. McKay (ed.), *DiY Culture: Party & Protest in Nineties Britain* (London: Verso, 1998).

⁵⁶⁷ L. P. Francis, R. Norman, ‘Some Animals are More Equal Than Others’, *Philosophy*, Vol. 53, No. 206, October 1978, pp. 507-527, p. 527.

⁵⁶⁸ ‘The Green Party’s Core Values’, in S. Ali (ed.), *Why Vote Green* (London: Biteback, 2015), p. 165.

⁵⁶⁹ P. Windeatt, ‘They Clearly Now See the Link’, pp.183-184.

⁵⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

fundamentally linked. Veness certainly believed that ‘if you want real socialism, then other species must be liberated’.⁵⁷¹ Clearly these activists adopted the concepts of total liberation and intersectionality that are also tied to anarchistic conceptions of animal advocacy.

Tony Benn, who was seen by many as the figurehead of the Labour left throughout the 1980s, became a vegetarian in 1981. Coalition building was vital to Benn’s socialist vision. Benn believed that through collaborating with progressive causes the Labour Party

have extended our representative function so as to bring ourselves into a more creative relationship with many organisations that stand outside our membership... so that a Labour government will never *rule* again but will try and create the conditions under which it is able to act as the natural partner of [the] people.⁵⁷²

For Auberon Waugh, writing in the mid-1990s, it came ‘as no surprise to see [that] Benn has now jumped on the animal rights bandwagon’.⁵⁷³ Whilst Waugh is attempting to dismiss a loony who will adopt any seemingly progressive cause however disparate, there were those on the left who believed it would be inconsistent for Benn *not* to be a vegetarian. For Benn, animal rights was not one point in a shopping list of progressive causes, but was fundamentally linked to a wide range of issues, including class, the establishment and concern for the environment. Benn believed that Britain’s agricultural policy, under Labour or the Conservatives, was shaped by the fact that the ‘Ministry of Agriculture is doing a deal with the big agri-business’.⁵⁷⁴ It was not only corporate interests, but the political establishment that wished to maintain the status quo with regards to animal issues. For Benn, the courts acted in the interests of profit rather than people or animals, and this attitude was particularly prevalent amongst the British monarchy who, Benn believed, had a ‘great fear of the animal rights movement’ because of the possibility that citizens would be appalled by the Royal family’s practice of killing animals for pleasure.⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁷¹ Ibid.

⁵⁷² L. Panitch, C. Leys, *Parliamentary Socialism*, p. 51.

⁵⁷³ T. Benn, *Free At Last: Diaries 1991-2001* (London: Hutchinson, 2002), p. 308, Saturday 11th March 1995.

⁵⁷⁴ T. Benn, *Free At Last*, p. 665, Wednesday 11th April 2001.

⁵⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 261, Wednesday 27th July 1994, p. 313, Wednesday 12th April 1995.

Finally, Benn was concerned that ‘a powerful commercial lobby’ promotes practices such as animal experimentation, and that the ‘animal welfare movement has been denounced as terrorists by those who benefit financially from animal testing’.⁵⁷⁶

It may seem that Benn took a typically anarchistic approach to animal advocacy. Benn believed in the intrinsic moral worth of animals.⁵⁷⁷ Benn also used the extrinsic argument that animal advocacy would enhance the moral nature of humans.⁵⁷⁸ Benn took an animal rights rather than welfare approach; however, Benn was also prepared to support welfarist aims, such as the promotion of localised farming practices.⁵⁷⁹ Unlike many parliamentarians, Benn was prepared to support extra-parliamentary methods, and he believed that ‘the debate between extra-parliamentary violence versus parliamentarianism... is highly diversionary’.⁵⁸⁰ In April 1999, when Barry Horne was on the verge of death after his fourth hunger strike, Benn sent Horne the message that ‘I greatly value what you have done and want you to live to help advance the cause we share’.⁵⁸¹ Benn’s initial reasons for adopting a vegetarian diet were focused on the understanding that ‘rainforests are being torn down to find areas to grow grain to feed the animals’, alongside the belief that ‘as world population rises and food supplies fall short of human need’ a vegetarian system would be better placed to satisfy the needs of this rising population.⁵⁸²

The inclusion of animal issues in progressive coalitions has continued. Firstly, the Green Party includes animal concern alongside its wider environmentalism and social justice concerns.⁵⁸³ Moreover, in the 1990s, and after Blair became leader in 1994, animal issues were a part of Labour’s ‘Big Tent’ of progressive ideas. Labour’s policy makers may have seen animal protection as an issue which would attract middle class progressives as well as their traditional supporters. Backbench MP Chris Mullin certainly felt that Labour should ‘make more’ of their animal protection

⁵⁷⁶ T. Benn, *Letters to my Grandchildren: Thoughts on the Future* (London: Hutchinson, 2009), pp. 126-127.

⁵⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

⁵⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128.

⁵⁷⁹ T. Benn, *Free At Last*, p. 658, Monday 1st March 2001.

⁵⁸⁰ L. Panitch, C. Leys, *Parliamentary Socialism*, p. 51.

⁵⁸¹ T. Benn, *Free at Last*, p. 533, Friday April 2nd 1999.

⁵⁸² T. Benn, *Letters to my Grandchildren*, p. 126. T. Benn, *More Time For Politics: Diaries 2001-2007* (London: Hutchinson, 2007), p. 189, Tuesday 15th June 2004.

⁵⁸³ S. Ali, ‘Green Values’, in. S. Ali (ed.), *Why Vote Green*, pp. 1-2.

credentials 'given the strong feelings about animal welfare among the better elements of the middle classes. Precisely the vote we are anxious to attract'.⁵⁸⁴ Labour's aim in the mid-1990s was ensuring that 'the party did nothing to put off the voters who were disappointed with the Conservative government' as well as maximizing 'points of linkage with the Liberal Democrats' and their supporters, and evidently animal protection was a component of this policy.⁵⁸⁵

In forming such coalitions, the parliamentary left adopt many of the concepts that one might expect from an anarchistic CAS perspective. In fact the parliamentary left may be particularly well suited to create these 'difference-respecting-coalition[s]' that allow 'as broad a basis as possible for common action, without requiring individual movements to abandon their more far-reaching and particular objectives' because – unlike other strands of the animal rights movement – parliamentarians are less likely to 'demand doctrinal and lifestyle purity as a condition of participation'.⁵⁸⁶

Compassion

Throughout the twentieth century different stands of the parliamentary left aimed to distinguish themselves as caring and compassionate organisations. For instance, the Labour Party appealed to the electorate as 'a humanitarian party, a caring party; the party of social justice'.⁵⁸⁷ Because of this ethic of care and compassion, Ron Hayward, then Labour's General Secretary, believed that Labour must adopt 'a more forceful approach to animal welfare' in order to address 'the great cruelty that is regularly inflicted on the animals in our society'.⁵⁸⁸ Similarly, the Green Party, who believed that Labour had ceased to be a compassionate party

⁵⁸⁴ C. Mullin, *A Walk-On Part: Diaries, 1994-1999* (London: Profile Books, 2011), p. 164, Saturday 18th May 1996.

⁵⁸⁵ A. Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 251-252.

⁵⁸⁶ T. Benton, 'Marxism and the Moral Status of Animals', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 1, No.1 (2003), pp. 73-79, p. 79.

⁵⁸⁷ *Living Without Cruelty*, p. 5.

⁵⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

under Blair, believed that their party 'shows that compassion in its policies and it offers the holistic solutions we need to meet the challenges our society faces'.⁵⁸⁹

The inclusion of animal issues in Labour manifestos became ever more important during the 1980s and 1990s. Labour's 1983 manifesto confirmed the belief that 'all animals – whether in the wild, domesticated or farmed – should be properly treated'.⁵⁹⁰ Evidently this proper treatment included the use of animals for food, experimentation and sport; nevertheless the manifesto went further than any previous commitment and offered a number of pledges to improve the welfare of animals.⁵⁹¹ These policies came within a manifesto that set out a range of interrelated proposals and promised to be 'more compassionate than that of the Tory government'.⁵⁹² It was clear that these commitments would win over the increasing number of voters concerned about animal issues. Surveys carried out before the 1983 election suggested that 'as many as 15% of the population would allow animal issues alone to decide how they voted', which seems unfeasibly high, but a number of MPs in marginal seats did believe that their eventual success was down to the activity of the Animal Protection Alliance.⁵⁹³

In Labour's 1987 appeal to the electorate the party presented itself as 'democratic and just... creative and compassionate'.⁵⁹⁴ This compassion included a commitment to 'end all forms of organised hunting with hounds' and update animal protection legislation 'for example, to eliminate unnecessary experimenting on live animals'.⁵⁹⁵

Under Neil Kinnock Labour attempted to become 'the natural political home of all who are concerned about the welfare of animals'.⁵⁹⁶ Building on the Putting Animals Into Politics campaign, an alliance of animal protection societies which implicitly campaigned for Labour, the Party met annually with relevant interest groups to review progress in animal welfare. Labour appointed Ron Davies as a

⁵⁸⁹ M. Hawkins, 'London Green Party' [viewed online, <http://london.greenparty.org.uk/elected-greens/london-officers/matt-hawkins.html>, last accessed 30/06/2015].

⁵⁹⁰ *The New Hope For Britain: Labour's Manifesto 1983* (Labour Party, 1983).

⁵⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹² *Ibid.*

⁵⁹³ S. Mills, P. Williams, 'Political Animals', *Marxism Today*, pp. 30-33, April 1986, p. 33.

⁵⁹⁴ *Britain Will Win With Labour* (Labour Party, 1987).

⁵⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹⁶ *Who Cares About Animals?* (Labour Party, 1992).

spokesperson on Animal Welfare to introduce their fifteen point programme in 1992. The pledges given in *Who Cares About Animals?* can be divided into four categories: those dealing with the meat and dairy industry, pledges to limit experimentation, pledges to tackle blood sports, and those dealing with the protection of wildlife. Once again these policies were framed as an issue which divided Labour from the Conservatives (who had 'blocked Bills on farm animals and wildlife') and the Liberal Democrats (who 'are no better').⁵⁹⁷ Moreover, Kinnock argued that 'the way in which a society treats animals is a clear indicator of its wider values' and in seeking to 'eliminate cruelty and to protect the welfare of animals' Labour aimed to demonstrate its wider compassionate values.⁵⁹⁸

Labour hoped that its commitment to animal welfare would be 'a clear indicator of its wider values' as a compassionate Party that was prepared to pursue policy not just for economic, environmental and health reasons but because 'it is right to do so'.⁵⁹⁹

Tactical Connections

In this section we briefly consider the tactical connections between animal advocates and the parliamentary left: firstly, animal protection groups who desire legislative change have made substantial donations to the Labour Party; secondly, animal issues may be seen as popular with the electorate; and finally both the parliamentary left and animal protection groups may initially seek reformist changes because of a belief that legislative reform represents the 'art of the possible'. One of the clear differences between parliamentary and extra-parliamentary approaches to animal advocacy is the importance that the parliamentary left place on legislation rather than direct action.

From the late 1970s onwards, as animal protection groups grew in strength and popularity, groups such the LACS donated to the Labour Party in the hope of

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹⁹ Ibid.

seeing progressive legislation. For instance, before the 1979 election the LACS donated £80,000 to Labour.⁶⁰⁰ By 1983 animal welfare organisations including the International Fund For Animals provided ten pages of ‘implicitly pro-Labour advertising’ and it was only by including this publicity that Labour’s advertising space matched that of the Conservatives.⁶⁰¹ The LACS were again active, providing three leaflets on animal welfare in marginal constituencies.⁶⁰² Of course, the connections between Labour and animal welfare were not universal, and animal issues were actually discussed by a higher proportion of Liberal candidates; nonetheless, Richard Course, then executive director of the LACS, viewed the 1983 Labour manifesto as ‘the best we could have hoped for in our wildest dreams’.⁶⁰³

The parliamentary left believed that animal protection would be popular with the electorate, particularly with the progressive voters they hoped to attract. A poll for the General Coordinating Committee for Animal Welfare conducted by MORI and released on May 13th 1983 showed that up to five percent of the electorate ‘would change their party over the issue’ of animal protection, other polls suggested that at least nine percent of the population would swing to Labour following the Party’s animal welfare pledges.⁶⁰⁴ After Labour’s defeat at the 1983 election there were some Labour supporters who questioned the Party’s adoption of animal issues. As C. Cooper, writing to *Labour Weekly*, asked, ‘in a meat eating country this promise seemed somewhat unlikely... what must now be asked is where were the 9 per cent on polling day?’⁶⁰⁵ Despite Foot’s defeat, animal advocates within the Labour Party remained confident; in 1985 the Labour Campaign for Animal Rights sent a circular to MPs in which the group’s secretary, Lesley Garbutt, claimed that it was now 15 percent of votes which could be won by incorporating animal issues. Interestingly, these increased votes were not in the context of Labour’s traditional working-class

⁶⁰⁰ D. Butler, D. Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1979* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 186-187.

⁶⁰¹ D. Butler, D. Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1983* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984), p. 209.

⁶⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 101, p. 250.

⁶⁰³ P. Windeatt, “They Clearly Now See the Link”, p. 187.

⁶⁰⁴ D. Butler, D. Kavanagh, *Election of 1983*, p. 129; *Labour Weekly*, July 8th 1983.

⁶⁰⁵ *Labour Weekly*, July 8th 1983.

supporters, but came ‘at a time when all political parties are attempting to woo the “Green” vote’.⁶⁰⁶

Many animal advocates adopt an abolitionist position. Gary Francione explains the distinction between the ‘new welfarists’ – who wish to use ‘reformist means to achieve abolitionist ends’ – and the abolitionists themselves as morally equivalent to the split between those campaigning against human slavery and those wanting to ‘make slavery more “humane”’.⁶⁰⁷ It is the so-called ‘new welfarists’ who are likely to seek legislative change and form connections with the parliamentary left. Kim Stallwood explains that legislation is significant because although ‘laws are never going to be perfect’ they provide animal advocates with a platform to build on, ‘and it could be that in ten [or] fifteen years from now there’s going to be a further piece of legislation that hopefully will make [animal protection] stronger’.⁶⁰⁸ This certainly ties in with the Labour Party’s conception of gradual social reform. Indeed, the 2007 Animal Welfare Act included an enabling clause which means that the Act can be modified by secondary legislation to bring about future improvements for animals without the necessity of implementing a new Act.⁶⁰⁹

The ‘new welfarist’ approach also ties in with the belief that politics represents the ‘art of the possible’. Former Labour MP Chris Mullin explains why Labour was able to enact legislation against hunting but ignored other animal protection issues:

As to why we didn’t address all forms of animal cruelty simultaneously, politics is about the art of the possible. The point about hunting with hounds is that, among the population at large, there was general support for a ban. In the world of practical politics you can either take the purist road and achieve nothing or you can take your chances when they arise.⁶¹⁰

The tactical connections between animal advocacy and the parliamentary left hinge on the belief that progressive changes can be achieved through legislation.

⁶⁰⁶ Labour Campaign For Animal Rights – ‘Animal Welfare Circular’, 5th November 1985 (Labour History Archive and Study Centre, Hart 13/150).

⁶⁰⁷ G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), p. 41.

⁶⁰⁸ Interview with Kim Stallwood, 25/10/2013.

⁶⁰⁹ Interview with Elliot Morley, former Labour MP, 11/08/14.

⁶¹⁰ Interview with Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, 22/07/14.

Elliot Morley, Labour's former Animal Welfare Spokesperson, explains the reasons that he favours parliamentary reform for animals and rejects direct action:

There's no need for [illegal direct action] because we have a democracy and you can see that with the changes that were made between 1997 and 2010; with the Animal Welfare Act, that was the most significant legislation for 100 years, really, and a range of other measures which improved animal welfare, in particular the rules on live animal transport, egg laying hens for example, so it demonstrates that you can get change through the democratic process and there is no need for illegal activities and those people who pursue them are quite rightly subject to the force of law.⁶¹¹

However, although the parliamentary left have favoured legislation, one should not presume that there is a complete split between parliamentarians and direct action activists. For instance, former Labour MP Chris Williamson began his political activism as a hunt saboteur and he still believes that 'direct action has a really important place in raising awareness and doing something practical'.⁶¹² The Green Party attempt to combine parliamentary politics with direct action more broadly; for instance their opposition to the post-2010 badger culls included activism 'in Parliament, on badger patrols and as part of the wider campaigning movement'.⁶¹³

Complications

This section considers three complications in the relationship between the parliamentary left, particularly the Labour Party, and animal advocacy: firstly, Labour has promoted a welfare agenda; secondly, Labour believes they have raised living standards by increasing the consumption of meat; finally, the New Labour government undertook a 'crackdown' on animal rights activists.

⁶¹¹ Interview with Elliot Morley, former Labour MP, 11/08/14.

⁶¹² Interview with Chris Williamson, former Labour MP, 4/04/2014.

⁶¹³ C. Allen, 'Animals', in. S. Ali (ed.), *Why Vote Green*, p. 162.

Welfare

The fact that the Labour Party has typically pursued a welfare approach to animal issues is a complication in the relationship between the parliamentary left and animal rights activists; however, it is also a confirmation of the expectation that the parliamentary left would focus on welfare rather than rights/liberation and would therefore not fit well with a CAS framework. During the 1960s an increasing number of activists within the Labour Party believed that Britain's archaic animal protection laws should be updated. In the mid-1960s the most important legislation remained the 1911 Protection of Animals Act. As Ruth Harrison explained, the Act was 'hopelessly outdated', 'its drafters could not possibly have envisaged the type of insidious cruelties which are perpetuated in modern animal husbandry'.⁶¹⁴ Moreover, the provisions of the Act ensured that its dictates did not apply 'in the course of the destruction, or the preparation for destruction, of any animal as food for mankind, unless such destruction or such preparation was accompanied by the infliction of unnecessary suffering'.⁶¹⁵ A similar clause was granted for hunting and coursing, but unhelpfully no definition of 'unnecessary suffering' was given, and so no one was prosecuted under the Act. Some Labour MPs, such as Eric Heffer, believed that the practice of hunting foxes with hounds constituted 'unnecessary suffering'.⁶¹⁶

Many progressives, both within the Labour Party and within the extra-parliamentary left, were moved by Ruth Harrison's 1964 study of factory farming: *Animal Machines*. By the mid-1960s there was 'widespread and persistent lobbying by a relentless minority' who opposed the conditions of farm animals.⁶¹⁷ The development and production of new equipment, fertilisers and seeds had also become a political issue, and Labour soon recognised that there were 'sound economic, health and environmental reasons' for reforming agricultural practices.⁶¹⁸ Consequently, soon after Harrison's publication a technical committee was

⁶¹⁴ R. Harrison, *Animal Machines: The New Factory Farming Industry* (London: Vincent Stuart, 1964), p. 143.

⁶¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

⁶¹⁶ E. Heffer, 'Foreword', in V. Sheppard, *My Head Against the Wall: A Decade in the Fight Against Blood Sports* (London: Moonraker, 1979).

⁶¹⁷ B. A. Holderness, *British Agriculture Since 1945* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), p. 160.

⁶¹⁸ C. Spencer, *Vegetarianism*, p. 300; *Living Without Cruelty*, p. 7.

established by the government to be chaired by Professor F. W. R. Brambell, and Harrison was invited to become a member.⁶¹⁹ The committee was tasked with examining the conditions of animals kept under intensive livestock systems and considering ‘whether standards ought to be set in the interests of their welfare, and if so what they should be’.⁶²⁰

The findings and legacy of the Brambell Report have been disputed. Brambell recommended the ‘five freedoms’, which have become a benchmark for animal welfare in the UK, and indeed were followed by many countries in the EU.

Supporters of animal welfare, or indeed those animal rights activists who see welfare reform as a stepping stone to animal rights ends, may praise some of Brambell’s findings; the report recognised that ‘animals suffer pain in the same way as human beings’, and as such there is ‘no justification whatsoever for disregarding’ this suffering.⁶²¹ However, the committee felt that it was possible that the adrenaline produced ‘under conditions of great physical excitement or stress’ could mean that the animals were ‘temporarily insensitive to what would otherwise be acutely painful stimuli’.⁶²² Furthermore, the committee believed that there was ‘no evidence of widespread “cruelty” or neglect of animal welfare’.⁶²³ Indeed, the report indicated that the use of intensive farming ‘should not in itself be regarded as objectionable and may often benefit the animals’.⁶²⁴ Brambell seemed to believe that the fact that an animal was still producing eggs or milk, or still growing, could be regarded as evidence that the animal was not suffering.⁶²⁵

Brambell’s recommendations were unlikely to satisfy all but the most moderate advocates of animal welfare. The battery cage system for poultry was ‘permitted to continue for the time being’, although the report recommended that cages of 20 inches wide, 17 inches deep with a height of 18 inches should contain

⁶¹⁹ R. D. Ryder, ‘Harrison, Ruth, (1920-2000)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; Online edn, May 2005 [viewed online, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/74285>, last accessed 18/04/13].

⁶²⁰ *Report of the technical committee to enquire into the welfare of animals kept under intensive livestock husbandry systems* (London: HMSO, 1965).

⁶²¹ *Report...intensive livestock husbandry systems*, p. 82, p. 78.

⁶²² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁶²³ B. A. Holderness, *British Agriculture Since 1945*, p. 160.

⁶²⁴ *Report...intensive livestock husbandry systems*, p. 63.

⁶²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

no more than three birds.⁶²⁶ It was recommended that debeaking for poultry should be prohibited. Under Brambell's recommendations pigs would be granted a minimum space, adequate light and 'pregnant sows should not be kept without daily exercise in quarters which do not permit them to turn round and... should not be tethered indoors'. The milk substitutes for cattle would be reinforced with iron, pens should be of sufficient size and 'calves should be provided with sufficient clean straw or other bedding on which to lie down'.⁶²⁷ Brambell's findings led to the passage of the Agriculture (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act in 1968, which ensured a framework of regulation in line with the Farm Animal Welfare Advisory Committee which was established in 1966.⁶²⁸ From a CAS perspective the concept of the 'five freedoms' is rejected because they tap 'into a nostalgic vision, one that buries the facts of minimum-wage workers and their mechanized labour in noxious edifices they are forced to call barns'.⁶²⁹

In 1978 Labour produced a charter for animal protection that intended 'to outlaw cruelty to animals wherever it may occur'.⁶³⁰ Labour's charter pledged to introduce a host of recommendations relating to the welfare of both farm animals and those held in laboratories.⁶³¹ The charter even contained the abolitionist hint that 'all this assumes there is no viable alternative to using animals in these experiments, an assumption that an increasing number of people are not prepared to accept'.⁶³² Despite this hint, Labour remained committed to a welfareist approach. The charter stated that it would not be possible 'to completely eliminate the need for animals, at least in the foreseeable future'; of the 5 ½ million experiments on animals in 1976, two million were financed by government departments, and Labour believed that many of these experiments should continue.⁶³³ Labour's policy in relation to animals

⁶²⁶ Ibid., p. 20, p. 63.

⁶²⁷ Ibid.

⁶²⁸ Harrison was invited to serve on the body, which became the Farm Animal Welfare Council. R. D. Ryder, 'Harrison, Ruth, (1920-2000)'.

⁶²⁹ D. Medoro, 'Spinning the Pig: The Language of Industrial Pork Production', in J. Sorenson (ed.), *Critical Animal Studies: Thinking the Unthinkable* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars, 2014), p. 210.

⁶³⁰ *Living Without Cruelty*, p. 48.

⁶³¹ Ibid., p. 10.

⁶³² Ibid.

⁶³³ Ibid., p. 12.

in laboratories continues to focus on the 'Three Rs': reduction, refinement and replacement.⁶³⁴

Labour did not recommend the abolition of battery cages because they were seen as 'the only viable method of keeping egg production in line with national demand'.⁶³⁵ It was easy for Labour to use the Brambell Report as their justification here, at the time of the report 85% of the eggs consumed in Britain were produced via the intensive system, and neither Brambell nor Labour's leadership endorsed a reduction.

The welfareist nature of Labour's charter could never satisfy the growing number of activists demanding animal liberation. This group would be particularly dissatisfied with Labour's pledge that 'animals should be slaughtered at the nearest slaughterhouse to the market at which they were sold'.⁶³⁶ From a CAS perspective one could suggest that Labour's professed commitment to animal welfare had the effect of appeasing the conscience of the electorate whilst leaving in place practices which caused suffering and death to millions of animals. Certainly, an animal liberationist would not be satisfied with the claim that by improving animal welfare 'the UK would also benefit from all the by-products such as offals, hides and skins'.⁶³⁷ Nonetheless, there were those in the Labour movement who did 'feel very strongly' about the plight of animals whilst still believing that it was morally acceptable, and indeed necessary, to use animals for food.⁶³⁸ One instance which stirred the conscience of the Labour movement was the revelation in the early months of 1960 that horses from Southern Ireland were being shipped in appalling conditions to slaughterhouses in France. The cultural status of the horse as a non-food animal, if not a cultural and culinary rivalry with the French, caused indignation amongst the British trade union movement. James Leho, a trade unionist since the 1930s, called for a boycott of Irish and French goods as a result of the scandal, and he called upon the TUC to make sure that 'dockers at the ports concerned... emphatically refuse to have anything to do with these degrading practices'.⁶³⁹

⁶³⁴ *Who Cares About Animals?*

⁶³⁵ *Living Without Cruelty*, p. 24.

⁶³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁶³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁶³⁸ Rhondda Borough Labour Party and Trades Council to TUC, 2nd February 1960. TUC – Cruelty To Animals. 802.5. MRC.

⁶³⁹ J. Leho to TUC, January 19th 1960. 21.1.60/55. TUC – Cruelty To Animals. 802.5. MRC.

Despite the status of horses, the trade union movement did not wish ‘to dictate whether or not horses should be shipped from Ireland to the Continent’ but ‘they do insist that more adequate care should be taken of them during transit’.⁶⁴⁰ North Staffordshire Trades Council were motivated to propose that ‘if horses are needed for consumption on the Continent, then they should be slaughtered before sailing and the use of refrigerated ships be employed’.⁶⁴¹ The Rhondda Borough Labour Party and Trades Council felt very strongly that these ‘dumb animals’ should be relieved of ‘the pain and suffering of a cross channel journey’.⁶⁴² The solution, to the workers from South Wales, was simple: abattoirs should be established in Ireland.

Although this attitude is not adequate from a CAS or animal rights perspective, it is clear that many people in the Labour and trade union movement cared deeply about alleviating the ‘unnecessary suffering’ of animals. Francione may reject such compromises, but Labour’s welfare agenda could make the lives of countless animals a little more tolerable. For instance, in the 1970s over 200,000 ‘head of livestock’ were burnt to death each year in their stalls or cages for want of fire regulations for livestock units.⁶⁴³ Adequate fire regulations would spare the animals this painful death, and as such would have been regarded as an improvement in animal welfare despite the fact that the animals were destined for slaughter. Such a change could be immediately introduced without challenging the status of animals that abolitionists desired.

Cost of living

A further complication is that Labour has aimed to increase working-class living standards by producing cheap meat in alliance with the National Farmers’ Union. Robert Garner has adequately described factory farming, which evolved as

⁶⁴⁰ Kingston & District Trades Council Resolution – ‘Stop the transportation of horses between Southern Ireland and France’, 30th March 1960. North Staffordshire Trades Council to TUC, 21st March 1960. TUC – Cruelty To Animals. 802.5. MRC.

⁶⁴¹ Ibid.

⁶⁴² Rhondda Borough Labour Party and Trades Council to TUC, 2nd February 1960. TUC – Cruelty To Animals. 802.5. MRC.

⁶⁴³ *Living Without Cruelty*, p. 22.

the dominant farming practice in the post-war period as ‘a new dimension in man’s inhumanity to animals’.⁶⁴⁴ The process received the name ‘factory’ farming ‘because it is undertaken in buildings reminiscent of industrial plants and involving standardized and mechanized procedures that are capital, but not labour, intensive’.⁶⁴⁵ The growth of factory farming following the Second World War was deliberately implemented by Labour to promote – as the 1947 Agricultural Act stated – ‘a stable and efficient industry capable of producing such part of the nation’s food... at minimum prices consistent with proper remuneration and living conditions for farmers and workers’.⁶⁴⁶ Whereas before the Second World War net consumption of the upper-income groups was over twice that of the lower-income groups, after 1950 consumption for poorer families ‘followed the rise in consumption of better-off families’.⁶⁴⁷ Labour considered this a triumph of their agricultural policy, and by the 1970s the Party were still cautious that ‘if we were to advocate a return to “free range” food it is quite possible that we would be condemning poorer people to a massive decrease in their standard of living’.⁶⁴⁸

In 1970 Labour had declared, to the detriment of animal concern, that ‘our policies will continue to be devised to the benefit of the farmer as well as the consumer’.⁶⁴⁹ The Party intended to promote an expansion of the farming industry ‘based on the proved system of guaranteed prices and production grants’.⁶⁵⁰ Harold Wilson had been personally embarrassed by a series of demonstrations by ‘militant farmers’ in January 1970; Wilson sympathised with farmers who ‘had suffered two miserable seasons’ which ‘combined with that of rising costs’ meant that they ‘faced a financial crisis such as the post war farming generation had not known’.⁶⁵¹ In 1974, after four years of opposition, Labour once again pledged to ‘encourage the maximum economic production of food by the farming and fishing industries’.⁶⁵² With a ‘long-term objective’ to ‘secure the expansion’ of an already colossal industry, it is

⁶⁴⁴ R. Garner, *Animal Ethics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), p. 105.

⁶⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴⁶ B. A. Holderness, *British Agriculture*, pp. 13-14.

⁶⁴⁷ M. Nelson, ‘Social-Class Trends in British Diet, 1860-1980’, in C. Geissler, D. J. Oddy, (eds.), *Food, Diet and Economic Change Past and Present* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993), p. 106.

⁶⁴⁸ *Living Without Cruelty*, p. 24.

⁶⁴⁹ *Now Britain’s Strong – Let’s Make it Great to Live In* (Labour Party, 1970).

⁶⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵¹ H. Wilson, *The Labour Government 1964-1970: A Personal Record* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), pp. 740-741.

⁶⁵² *Britain Will Win With Labour* (Labour Party, 1974).

clear that Labour's frontbench were not meaningfully contemplating farm animal protection. Indeed, the party intended to meet with the Farmers' Union 'with the dual objective of drawing up a meaningful longer term expansion and of determining the means whereby this can be achieved'.⁶⁵³

Debates surrounding living costs and meat production continue to affect Labour's animal welfare policies. There are those in the Party who believe that Labour should now focus on protecting animals. For instance, Elliot Morley accepts that 'there would be a cost to some of these measures but it's also a matter of morality'.⁶⁵⁴ However, vegan Labour MP Kerry McCarthy explains that Labour

don't want to push up food prices so that people can't afford them. So it's partly about making people aware so they can make the choices. But at the bottom end of the scale people don't have the choice.⁶⁵⁵

McCarthy believes that Labour must aim to increase living standards, because 'it's much healthier and much nicer to buy your own ingredients', whilst targeting 'the likes of Tesco [who] are making very healthy profits' and companies involved in food scams that are 'actually more profitable than the drugs trade'.⁶⁵⁶

Animal rights activism

A final complication is that during the New Labour government, the Party combined their commitment to using 'fewer animals in laboratory testing' with support for the pharmaceutical industry and 'strong action against animal activist raiders'.⁶⁵⁷ In 2004 the government formed the National Extremism Tactical Co-ordination Unit (NETCU) to oversee operations against animal rights groups engaged in direct action. Such state interest in direct action was not new; NETCU in

⁶⁵³ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁴ Interview with Elliot Morley, former Labour MP, 11/08/14.

⁶⁵⁵ Interview with Kerry McCarthy, Labour MP, 02/05/14.

⁶⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁷ P. Toynbee, D. Walker, *The Verdict: Did Labour Change Britain?* (London: Granta, 2011), p. 238.

many ways replaced the Animal Rights National Index (ARNI) which had performed a similar role.⁶⁵⁸ Nonetheless, the Unit was formed at a time when specific legislation was being passed to curb animal rights activism, and was combined with other intelligence groups such as the National Public Order Intelligence Unit, which gathered 'intelligence around the threat to communities from public disorder connected to domestic extremism and single issue campaigning'.⁶⁵⁹ The most controversial of these new laws was an amendment to the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act in 2005 which made it a criminal offence to 'interfere with the contractual relations of an animal research organisation'.⁶⁶⁰ The legislation was particularly detested among activists because the CEO of Sequani research laboratories was 'consulted during the drafting of the act', and the law was subsequently used to imprison members of the Stop Sequani Animal Torture (SSAT) Campaign.⁶⁶¹ For instance, Sean Kirtley was sentenced to four and a half years imprisonment in 2009 for his alleged leadership role in SSAT. A further group of activists, this time operating under the Stop Huntington Animal Cruelty (SHAC) banner were sentenced in January 2009 for 'conspiracy to blackmail'. On this occasion seven 'SHACtivists' received sentences of between four and eleven years. Corporate Watch believed that the charge signalled a worrying development for the future as activists were jailed simply for 'being on demonstrations where threatening statements were uttered'.⁶⁶²

Others believed that police interference was justified. Former Labour MP Chris Williamson believes it was simply a matter of 'public order and protecting people going about what was their lawful business'; and although Williamson wished to change the laws regarding vivisection, he still believed that the government 'can't allow people to be intimidated in that way'.⁶⁶³ Nick Palmer, was similarly 'in favour of preventing intimidation against individual staff, and really it would be hard to find any

⁶⁵⁸ *State Crackdown on Anti Corporate Dissent: The Animal Rights Movement* (Corporate Watch, 2009), p. 4.

⁶⁵⁹ Association of Chief Police Officers, 'National Public Order Intelligence Unit (NPOIU)' [viewed online, <http://www.acpo.police.uk/NationalPolicing/NCDENationalCoordinatorDomesticExtremism/TheNationalPublicOrderIntelligenceUnitNPOIU.aspx>, last accessed 08/05/13].

⁶⁶⁰ *State Crackdown on Anti Corporate Dissent*, p. 4.

⁶⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁶⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶⁶³ Interview with Chris Williamson, former Labour MP, 4/04/2014.

MP who was more anti-vivisection than I was and am'.⁶⁶⁴ Corporate Watch admitted that among the 'autonomous direct actions' against HLS, including 'secondary and tertiary companies and their employees', were the paint-stripping of cars, property damage, threatening letters sent to offices and homes, hoax bombs and 'on one occasion, an incendiary device was placed at the home of a company director of a related company'.⁶⁶⁵ Toynebee and Walker believed that the government was 'somewhat passive' when the University of Cambridge 'abandoned a primate laboratory... despite Cambridgeshire police spending £1m and consuming up to 3,000 officer days a year protecting Huntingdon Life Sciences'.⁶⁶⁶ Throughout the 1990s animal rights activists had successfully closed a number of breeders of animals for laboratories, including Regal Rabbits, Shamrock Farm and Hillgrove Cat Farm.⁶⁶⁷ In this atmosphere many voters across the political spectrum may have believed that the government's actions were justified. By 2007 Keith Mann, who was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment in 1994 for ALF activity, was forced to concede that ALF-style attacks had been reduced by almost half in the few years since the formation of NETCU.⁶⁶⁸

These three complications suggest that in practice the parliamentary left have been unable to fully incorporate the demands of animal advocates. Perhaps a parliamentary party seeking votes from the majority of the electorate will always face these complications. Nonetheless, in theory sections of the parliamentary left have been able to incorporate the demands of animal advocates. Firstly, the Green Party believe that other species have 'value in their own right' and therefore other animals have 'a *prima facie* right to exist'.⁶⁶⁹ This would certainly fit with a rights or liberation, rather than welfare, approach. Secondly, the Green Party's policies in relation to the cost of living crisis involve promoting 'shorter food chains and support for local agriculture'.⁶⁷⁰ The Greens intend to encourage 'a move to a more plant-based diet with a reduction in consumption of meat and dairy products, which would improve

⁶⁶⁴ Interview with Nick Palmer, former Labour MP, Director of Policy, European Coalition to End Animal Experiments, Head of Policy and Government, BUAV, conducted via e-mail 11/04/2014.

⁶⁶⁵ *State Crackdown on Anti Corporate Dissent*, p. 6.

⁶⁶⁶ P. Toynebee, D. Walker, *Better or Worse?: Has Labour Delivered?* (London: Bloomsbury, 2005), p. 268.

⁶⁶⁷ *State Crackdown on Anti Corporate Dissent*, p. 14.

⁶⁶⁸ BBC Hardtalk, 14th June 2007, [viewed online, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nrNd_OSiDuQ, last accessed 08/05/13].

⁶⁶⁹ S. Ali, 'Green Values', p. 8.

⁶⁷⁰ C. Allen, 'Animals', p. 157.

health and enable us to feed a growing global population much more easily'.⁶⁷¹ Finally, although parliamentarians typically favour legislative reform, it is possible that the parliamentary left will also support direct action. For instance, Tony Benn was supportive of many animal rights direct action causes including activists who blocked roads during the campaign against the live export of animals.⁶⁷²

Conclusion

This chapter has considered animal advocacy in relation to the British parliamentary left. The chapter showed that a number of key thinkers, in particular Henry Salt and Edward Carpenter, formulated ideas which can be seen as precursors to the concepts of total liberation and intersectionality that have been adopted by CAS scholar-activists; the early thinkers also seem to take a rights or liberation approach to animals. However, both Salt and Carpenter wished to see legislation to immediately improve the lives of other animals, and Carpenter, in particular, relied on extrinsic arguments about improving human society.

By considering the key links and complications between animal activism and the parliamentary left it is clear that in theory the parliamentary left can adopt a position akin to the CAS approach. Both the Labour left in the 1980s and the Green Party today have argued that animals have intrinsic moral worth and thus a *prima facie* right to exist. Indeed, the Green Party even accept the concept of speciesism.⁶⁷³ Similarly, both the Bennite left and the Green Party have adopted a rights, rather than welfare, approach to animal advocacy; as Caroline Allen explains, the Greens recognise that 'animals – as sentient beings with an innate value of their own – are not ours to be used for any purpose where we might see potential benefit for ourselves'.⁶⁷⁴ However, both groups would support a welfarist approach as an immediate practical step whilst the political ground for further reforms is developed. Although both the Labour left and the Green Party seek legislative reform, it is also

⁶⁷¹ Ibid., p. 157-158.

⁶⁷² T. Benn, *Free At Last*, p. 313, Wednesday 12th April 1995.

⁶⁷³ S. Ali, 'Green Values'.

⁶⁷⁴ C. Allen, 'Animals', p. 152.

possible that the parliamentary left will support direct action. Tony Benn was sympathetic to some ALF actions, and vegan politicians Kerry McCarthy and Chris Williamson also praise the role of nonviolent direct action.⁶⁷⁵ Finally, it is possible for the parliamentary left to promote a concept of total liberation or intersectionality, as seen in the Labour controlled councils during the 1980s and the feminist intersectionality articulated by Val Veness.⁶⁷⁶

However, in practice, and once in high political office, the parliamentary left – as represented by the Labour Party – have not adopted this CAS position: firstly, Labour have not accepted the concept of speciesism or used arguments about the intrinsic moral worth of animals, instead, the parliamentary left have relied on extrinsic arguments about improvements to human society, either by linking vegetarianism to reforms such as temperance or by suggesting that alleviating the unnecessary suffering of animals will make Britain a more caring nation; secondly, it is clear that when in office Labour have taken a welfare, rather than rights or liberation, approach; thirdly, the parliamentary left have clearly favoured legislation over direct action, to the point of criminalising strands of the direct action movement during New Labour; finally, the Labour Party has not linked animal advocacy to concepts of total liberation and a rejection of all social hierarchies.

Perhaps the difference between the parliamentary left's relationship with animal advocacy in theory and in practice represents the assumption that the electorate would be unwilling to vote for anything more than modest welfare demands, or that governments seeking progressive legislation will soon come into conflict with the vested interests of the animal-industrial complex. These issues resurface in the three case studies. The following chapters consider the class and gender dynamics that affect the relationship between animal advocacy, anarchism and the parliamentary left.

⁶⁷⁵ T. Benn, *The End of an Era: Diaries: 1980-1990* (London: Arrow, 1994), p. 385, Monday 19th November 1984; Interview with Kerry McCarthy, Labour MP, 02/05/14; Interview with Chris Williamson, former Labour MP, 4/04/2014.

⁶⁷⁶ P. Windeatt, "They Clearly Now See the Link", p. 184.

4. 'Ordinary Unenlightened People': Class and Animal Advocacy

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is how class has affected the way that anarchists and the parliamentary left in Britain have engaged with animal issues. In particular, the chapter scrutinises the four suggested differences between anarchist and parliamentary left conceptions of animal advocacy based on the connection between anarchism and a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework: firstly, that anarchistic activists would use intrinsic arguments based on the moral worth of animals and the concept of speciesism, whereas animal advocates in the parliamentary left would use extrinsic arguments about improvements to human society; secondly, that anarchists would form a rights/liberation approach and the parliamentary left would focus on animal welfare; thirdly, that anarchistic activists would use direct action whereas parliamentary leftists would focus on legislation; finally, it was suggested that anarchist animal activists, unlike those in the parliamentary left, would link animal abuse to concepts such as total liberation and the intersectionality of oppression.

Focusing on class will prove particularly revealing because whereas many anarchists and parliamentary leftists have prioritised class issues, the field of CAS has not placed the same primacy on class. Steven Best, one of the most influential CAS theorists, has even argued that 'the class struggle is over'.⁶⁷⁷ In both interviews with animal advocates and in published material, animal advocates have discussed class without first having theoretical discussions about the exact meaning of such terminology. Theoretical discussions about anarchist and Marxist understandings of

⁶⁷⁷ S. Best, 'It's War! The Escalating Battle between Activists and the Corporate-State Complex', In S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), p. 302.

class fall outside the scope of this thesis, instead the chapter replicates the animal advocates' broad understanding of class.⁶⁷⁸ CAS scholars have developed an intersectional approach that considers class alongside a range of other interrelated forms of hierarchical domination such as speciesism, patriarchy and racism.⁶⁷⁹ This CAS analysis often includes the notion of 'classism', or prejudice based on social class, as one of a number of intersecting, and equally important, forms of domination that activists should challenge. For instance, Steven Best writes that animal activists must 'remake society without the crushing loadstones of anthropocentrism, speciesism, patriarchy, racism, classism, statism, heterosexism, ableism, and every other pernicious form of hierarchical domination'.⁶⁸⁰ The use of 'classism', particularly in America, falls outside the scope of socialist politics. For instance, the group Class Action is a nonprofit organisation founded in 2004 with the aim of 'inspiring action to end classism'.⁶⁸¹ Class Action explains that classism:

is differential treatment based on social class or perceived social class. Classism is the systematic oppression of subordinated class groups to advantage and strengthen the dominant class groups. It's the systematic assignment of characteristics of worth and ability based on social class.⁶⁸²

Rather than seeking to end class society, as socialists and anarchists do, Class Action sees its aim as 'Building Bridges Across the Class Divide'.⁶⁸³ The notion of classism as used by Class Action might help explain certain elements of lived oppression involving elitism and snobbery, but it does not account for systematic class exploitation. The notion of 'classism' as a matter of prejudice, as described by Best, is inadequate from the perspective of other leftists. Abbey Volcano and J. Rogue explain that using the concept of 'classism' as equivalent to sexism and racism

⁶⁷⁸ I also rely on Mike Savage's work on class in Britain that differentiates economic, social and cultural capital. M. Savage, *Social Class in the 21st Century* (London: Pelican Books, 2015).

⁶⁷⁹ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), pp. 10-11.

⁶⁸⁰ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 163-164.

⁶⁸¹ Class Action, <http://www.classism.org/about-class/what-is-classism/> [viewed online, last accessed 16/06/2016].

⁶⁸² Ibid.

⁶⁸³ Ibid.

can lead to the gravely confused notion that class oppression needs to be rectified by rich people treating poor people “nicer” while still maintaining class society... We don’t wish to “get along” under capitalism by abolishing snobbery and class elitism. Rather, we wish to overthrow capitalism and end class society all together.⁶⁸⁴

Intersectional scholars must therefore consider the relationships between prejudice and exploitation. Volcano and Rogue are exposed to the argument that other forms of oppression are also built on socially constructed concepts. For instance, following the work of Judith Butler, some feminists might want to end gender society altogether rather than democratising gender relations.⁶⁸⁵

Intersectional scholars must recognise that all forms of oppression are unique because they relate to the lived experience of members of the oppressed group(s), and therefore intersectionality should not be used to suggest a blanket equivalence of different oppressive systems.

It is possible that the CAS blind spot towards class has led to theorists overemphasising the connection between a CAS framework and anarchist animal activism because they neglect the class dynamics within the animal-industrial complex. By considering class in relation to animal advocacy this chapter will scrutinise the provisional hypothesis that anarchist animal activists operate in a total liberation framework which accepts the CAS notion of intersectionality. In particular, anarchist animal activists have failed to live up to the concept of total liberation when they use coercive tactics against workers in the animal-industrial complex; these workers should, in a CAS framework, be regarded as subjected to an interrelated form of oppression. The chapter also provides a reassessment of parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy. In particular, it was noted that the parliamentary left rely on extrinsic arguments about the improvements to human society that animal advocacy can bring; in this chapter we consider whether such arguments, which also include the environmental and health benefits of animal advocacy, can fit the CAS concept of total liberation. It is not the purpose of this chapter to show that there is one superior ideological framework that animal advocates must follow. In fact, the

⁶⁸⁴ J. Rogue, A. Volcano, ‘Insurrection at the Intersections’, In. Dark Star (ed.), *Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-Feminist Reader*, 3rd Edition (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2012), pp. 43-46.

⁶⁸⁵ J. Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990).

research shows that anarchists and the parliamentary left often relate to animal issues in similar or overlapping ways.

The chapter begins by briefly examining the argument that leftists should prioritise the class struggle at the expense of supposedly secondary issues such as animal protection. The chapter moves on to highlight the key issues that link class to animal advocacy, including the presumption that animal abuse is connected to the upper class and that animal exploitation is linked to capitalism. The chapter then contemplates the different relationships between anarchists and the parliamentary left to the meat-eating public, before considering the attitudes of animal rights activists to workers in industries that exploit animals. The chapter concludes by looking at the use of coercive or violent action by animal rights groups. This is an important discussion in a chapter about class because these coercive tactics are often directed against exploited workers within the animal-industrial complex, or against perceived upper-class targets such as fox-hunters. Violent and coercive tactics include actions that fall outside of the ALF's non-violent guidelines such as razor blade letters, death threats and physical assaults. Property damage is not understood to constitute violence unless it implies or is experienced as a psychological threat or deliberate endangerment.⁶⁸⁶

'Time and energy happen to be finite'

This section argues that some anarchists and parliamentary leftists have prioritised class issues at the expense of animal advocacy. Nevertheless, this prioritisation has led some parliamentarians to stress the human benefits of animal concern in a way that goes beyond arguments about improving human society and approaches a CAS conception of total liberation.

The belief that human class struggle is of paramount importance and must take precedence before seemingly secondary issues are considered has traditionally influenced both parliamentary and libertarian strands of the British left. Activists

⁶⁸⁶ A. J. Nocella II, 'A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent: Critical pedagogy, critical criminology, and critical animal studies'. *Social Science – Dissertations*. Paper 178. 2011, p. 156.

operating within the broad anarchist tradition have typically understood the world within a class framework. Similarly, Labour is regarded as a 'party steeped in the urban working class'.⁶⁸⁷ The priority given to class issues has meant that some sections of the left have ignored other concerns. These 'lesser' issues do not just include concern for other animals, but account for the rejection of gender equality and LGBT issues. Perhaps this is an outdated view. Most anarchists now accept that systems of oppression are interlocking, and the fact that anarchism highlights class should not be mistaken for an unsophisticated workerism but a framework that recognises that different forms of hierarchy operate in intersecting ways. Moreover, since the 1980s those on the parliamentary left have gradually downgraded a class-based analysis, and this allows other issues to gain greater prominence.⁶⁸⁸

Nonetheless, it is no surprise that Larry Law, writing in the *Spectacular Times*, found that when he confronted those on the left 'with speciesism' he was often met with 'a laugh, or annoyance'.⁶⁸⁹ In the mid-1990s there were still those on the left who believed that animal advocates displayed 'a bizarre sense of priorities' in the context of 'high unemployment, growing polarisation between rich and poor, systematic threats to the welfare state... and so on'.⁶⁹⁰ Moreover, concern for animals, rather than class issues, was seen as a form of middle-class detachment. This belief is expressed in the 1996 film *Brassed Off*, which tells the story of a colliery band who win a national brass band competition as the colliery itself is closed. Danny, the brass band leader, initially refuses the trophy in protest against the Conservative government who had 'systematically destroyed an entire industry. Our industry. And not just our industry - our communities, our homes, our lives'.⁶⁹¹ Danny then tells the audience in the climactic scene that 'if this lot were seals or whales, you'd all be up in bloody arms. But they're not... They're just ordinary... decent human beings'.⁶⁹² The assumption in *Brassed Off* is that individuals who are concerned about animals are more likely to disregard human interests. Joanna

⁶⁸⁷ R. Garner, 'Defending Animal Rights', *Parliamentary Affairs: A Journal of Comparative Politics*, Vol. 51. No. 3, July 1998, pp. 458-469, p. 462.

⁶⁸⁸ Particularly within the Green Party. Green Party 'What we stand for' [viewed online, <https://www.greenparty.org.uk/we-stand-for/>, last accessed 16/11/2015].

⁶⁸⁹ L. Law, *Animals* (Spectacular Times, 1982), p. 5.

⁶⁹⁰ T. Benton, S. Redfean, 'The Politics of Animal Rights – Where is the Left?', *New Left Review*, 215, January-February 1996, pp. 43-58. p. 52.

⁶⁹¹ *Brassed Off*, written and directed by Mark Herman (1996).

⁶⁹² *Ibid.*

Bourke explains this in terms of the belief in an 'economy of sympathy' in which activists who are interested in one particular cause cannot devote emotional energy to other issues.⁶⁹³ In contrast, though, a CAS perspective would argue that people who are concerned about the treatment of animals are more likely to show a parallel empathy when it comes to humans.

Parliamentary left

In 1979, when animal welfare was debated by Labour's conference for the first time, it was done with the understanding that it was not the most important issue; both the mover and seconder of a resolution approached the chair to suggest that they would move the motion formally to allow a later debate more time. It was only because 'we are a few minutes ahead in our timetable' that John Denham was able to present the motion calling for an improvement in the welfare of animals.⁶⁹⁴ Denham began his case by confirming that he was 'very aware this week of the priority that people thought should be given to other motions'; Denham assured the conference that he was 'an unashamed speciesist' and that 'the suffering of the human race is always more important than the suffering of animals'.⁶⁹⁵ However, he argued that Labour should incorporate a concern for animals not only because animal abuse is 'alien to the true spirit of compassion' that the Party held, but also because 'if we are serious about creating a Socialist transformation in our society, a broad range of forces and interests must be on our side', and concern for animals meant a progressive alliance and a subsequent increase in votes.⁶⁹⁶ In this instance, animal concern could only be incorporated because it was understood to be a secondary issue, and would increase Labour's electoral chances and opportunities to solve more serious grievances.

⁶⁹³ J. Bourke, *What it means to be Human: Reflections from 1791 to the present* (London: Virago, 2011), p. 182.

⁶⁹⁴ Labour Party Annual Conference Report, 1979, p. 393. However, Denham maintains that 'this should not be interpreted as a lack of personal or political commitment to the anti-hunting cause'. Correspondence with John Denham, 3/02/2014.

⁶⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 394.

When Labour MPs encouraged vegetarianism after the Second World War it was done in relation to human benefits, rather than because it was ethically right in itself. Peter Freeman, the animal advocate and Labour MP who died in 1956, argued that the Party should promote vegetarianism because it helped end class injustice.⁶⁹⁷ For Freeman, 'everybody who insists on eating meat is depriving many other people of their food supplies somewhere in the world'.⁶⁹⁸ Similarly, vegan and former Labour MP Chris Williamson believes that 'it's right to employ all of the arguments... the fact is there is a health benefit to [veganism] so why not actually tell people about that'.⁶⁹⁹ Williamson believes that when people 'particularly [those] on the left who are not necessarily vegetarian... start thinking there are bigger issues' such as human health, the environment and the power of large agribusinesses, they will be more likely to take animal advocacy seriously.⁷⁰⁰ Interestingly, this approach from the parliamentary left goes beyond discussions about improvements to the human character, and instead it approaches a CAS conception of total liberation. However, sympathetic MPs like Freeman and Williamson still rely on extrinsic arguments about human benefits, whereas a total liberation approach would stress that human, animal and Earth liberation are equally important. Perhaps the parliamentary left have been forced to use extrinsic arguments about benefits to humans - whether health, monetary or environmental, or about the human character – because of their need to appeal to a mass electorate.

Anarchists

It is not just the parliamentary left who have prioritised class issues. Key anarchist thinkers tended to similarly prioritise human concerns. Early anarchists, such as Errico Malatesta, prioritised the dietary standards of workers above the potential treatment of animals.⁷⁰¹ Similarly, the anarchist writer Colin Ward, who died

⁶⁹⁷ M. Bloxsome, *The Green Casanova: An Affectionate Biography of Peter Freeman, Maverick MP* (Aberystwyth: Y Lolfa, 2004).

⁶⁹⁸ P. Freeman, *Great Britain and the World's Food Supply* (London: London Vegetarian Society), p. 5. (TUC Library, HD 9000).

⁶⁹⁹ Interview with Chris Williamson, then Labour MP, 4/04/2014.

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁷⁰¹ E. Malatesta, *At The Café: Conversations on Anarchism* (London: Freedom Press, 2005), p. 15.

in 2010, explained that he supported vivisection because it was of 'greater interest' that 'diarrhoea is the world's second most serious killer of children, but could easily be prevented or cured'.⁷⁰² This is not to say that, once human suffering was resolved, animal issues could not be considered.⁷⁰³ Noam Chomsky is similarly sympathetic about vegetarianism in theory,⁷⁰⁴ believing there to be 'a moral case for it', however: 'there's a moral case for a lot of things... Time and energy happen to be finite. Which means you have to pick and choose'.⁷⁰⁵ Other leftists, who are more likely to dismiss animal issues completely, similarly prioritise human issues. Tariq Ali, whilst he was a member of the International Marxist Group, argued that 'one is just so involved in fighting for a solution to the problems of humanity that to start taking up issues involving animals is not one of our priorities'.⁷⁰⁶ It is no surprise that those who prioritise the struggle for better working and living conditions would reject the seemingly post-materialist value of animal concern. However, it is clear that anarchists such as Chomsky and Ward would not accept the CAS concept of total liberation.

In terms of prioritising class issues, both anarchists and the parliamentary left have neglected animals, if not simply because of a lack of time and energy then because human concerns were prioritised in an economy of sympathy. Perhaps this should not be surprising as many animal activists have similarly prioritised animal rights rather than focusing on intersecting forms of oppression. Indeed, Roger Yates, one time regional ALF press officer, believes that many animal advocates feel that incorporating an analysis of class issues makes their job 'too big and too complicated'.⁷⁰⁷

⁷⁰² C. Ward, D. Goodway, *Talking Anarchy* (Nottingham: Five Leaves, 2003), p. 81.

⁷⁰³ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁴ Noam Chomsky, delivering the 2013 Edward W Said Lecture: Violence and Dignity - Reflections on the Middle East at Friends House in London on 18th March 2013 [viewed online, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=26WRw7jRbnU>, accessed 23rd April 2013].

⁷⁰⁵ N. Chomsky in conversation with M. Albert, October 26, 2011 [viewed online, <http://www.zcommunications.org/chomsky-sessions-4-the-political-system-part-2-by-noam-chomsky>]. Other activists argue that there are only 'very minor' time and energy costs associated with animal activism: R. Llorente, 'Reflections on the Prospects for a Non-Speciesist Marxism', in J. Sanbonmatsu, (ed.), *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation* (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011), p. 125.

⁷⁰⁶ L. Law, *Spectacular Times*, p. 23.

⁷⁰⁷ Interview with Roger Yates, former ALF press officer, conducted via e-mail, received on 11/12/2013. Other activists – including Yates himself – suggest that animal advocacy should be linked to opposition to other forms of oppression

Key issues

Having considered leftists who prioritise class concerns above animal issues, this section briefly sets out the ideas of anarchists and parliamentary leftists who combine animal concern with class issues: firstly, there have been some efforts to describe animals as members of an exploited class, or even as part of the working class; secondly, animal abuse is linked to capitalism; finally, animal activists have acted on the presumption that the upper class are more likely to abuse animals. Of course, some animal activists focus on their 'single issue' and so do not adopt these positions. The fact that animal activists have adopted a class analysis is particularly interesting because animal rights were traditionally dismissed as a middle-class concern. Writing in 1983 Kim Stallwood argued that this accusation might be true of 'the non-fighters of yesteryear who sadly failed to recognise that animal rights is a political issue', however, new activists, seeking radical change, could not be characterised as middle-class 'cranks' because they rejected single issue politics and incorporated a class analysis and critique of capitalism.⁷⁰⁸

Class position

Class has been incorporated into a left-wing animal rights position in various ways. Firstly, leftist animal activists have described animals in class terms; for instance, Henry Salt granted animals the status of members of the working class.⁷⁰⁹ The British class struggle anarchist group Class War made noteworthy use of this tradition by suggesting that blood sports enthusiasts would 'really like to be hunting you and me'.⁷¹⁰ One anonymous writer for *Class War* provided a plausible explanation for this link, arguing that 'animals are the lowest class imaginable' and 'abolition of Class Slavery means freedom for all animals'.⁷¹¹ Kim Stallwood wrote in

⁷⁰⁸ *Labour Weekly*, July 22nd 1983.

⁷⁰⁹ H. S. Salt, 'Have Animals Rights?', *Human Review*, January 1908, Vol. 8 [viewed online, <http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/have-animals-rights>, last accessed 10/02/2014].

⁷¹⁰ *Class War*, Undated, Unnumbered, 'The Working Class Strikes Back', p. 7.

⁷¹¹ *Class War*, Undated, Unnumbered, p. 4.

1983 that to achieve socialism 'the final class barrier of speciesism must fall because the exploitation of humans is inextricably interwoven with that of animals'.⁷¹² For Stallwood, this class analysis works on both a practical and philosophical level; philosophically Stallwood regards all privilege – whether gender, economic or species - as a class issue, and he argues that practically the lives of humans will improve following the liberation of animals.⁷¹³

Both anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocates may include animals as part of a class framework, and this implies a duty to show compassion and solidarity to animals. This inclusion may stem, in part, from Max Horkheimer's description of the hierarchical social structure which included, at the top, 'the feuding tycoons of the various capitalist power constellations' and continued to the bottom:

Below the spaces where the [exploited workers in colonial territories] of the earth perish by the millions, the indescribable, unimaginable suffering of the animals, the animal hell in human society, would have to be depicted, the sweat, blood, despair of the animals. [...] The basement of that house is a slaughterhouse, its roof a cathedral, but from the windows of the upper floors, it affords a really beautiful view of the starry heavens.⁷¹⁴

However, Salt's characterisation of animals as members of the working-class has been challenged by subsequent thinkers. For instance, Bob Torres argues that animals have a different status to human workers because the 'animal is owned outright, and treated as another part of the machinery of production'.⁷¹⁵ As the decentralised anarchist collective CrimethInc explain 'non-humans are still shovelled into the economy without the benefit of a contract', they are not just exploited as producers, they are also the product itself.⁷¹⁶ Animals are rarely afforded the status of workers, but are regarded as machines 'with legs instead of wheels, eyes instead

⁷¹² *Labour Weekly*, July 22nd 1983.

⁷¹³ Interview with Kim Stallwood, 25/10/2013.

⁷¹⁴ M. Horkheimer, M. Shaw, *Dawn & decline: notes 1926-1931 and 1950-1969* (New York: Seabury Press, 1978); M. Maurizi, 'The Dialectical Animal: Nature and Philosophy of History in Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1, (2012), pp. 67-103.

⁷¹⁵ B. Torres, *Making A Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2007), p. 64.

⁷¹⁶ CrimethInc, *Work: Capitalism, Economics, Resistance* (Salem: CrimethInc Workers' Collective, 2011), p. 161.

of headlights and screams instead of grinding gears'.⁷¹⁷ This reality has led some leftist animal activists to focus on the role of capitalism in animal exploitation.

Challenging capitalism

Alongside the inclusion of animals in a class structure is an argument which suggests that capitalism is the principal cause of animal exploitation. In particular, anarchistic animal activists have argued that the alienation of humans is theoretically connected to the commodity and property status of animals under capitalism. CrimethInc argue that 'animals... are treated the same way as we are by the economy. Holding a hamburger in his hand, the worker looks into a mirror and beholds the tremendous potential of another being's life forcibly reduced to a commodity' - although, in this analysis, the 'vegan alternative' is seen as another consumer activity, and therefore, under capitalism, it still contributes to practices which harm people and the environment.⁷¹⁸

Both anarchist and parliamentary left animal activists have argued that animal exploitation is increased by capitalism. At first, one might presume that such a connection is welcome from a CAS perspective. Indeed, the core principles of CAS state that scholars should 'advance an anti-capitalist, and more generally, a radical anti-hierarchical politics'.⁷¹⁹ However, in practice the anti-capitalism of anarchist and parliamentary left groups has taken them away from the CAS ideal.

The priority placed on capitalism and the property status of animals is not necessarily beneficial for animals unless it is also linked with an animal rights perspective and an awareness of the concept of speciesism. The emphasis on opposing capitalism leaves animals open to continued exploitation and suffering in small farms or by hunting animals for food. This is certainly true of parliamentarians who have focused on animal welfare rather than animal rights.

⁷¹⁷ M. Correggia, 'Where Reds Meet Greens – Comrade Animals', *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 2001, pp. 137-140, p. 137.

⁷¹⁸ CrimethInc, *Work*, p. 161.

⁷¹⁹ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5. No. 1. (2007), pp. 4-5.

The attitude of the animal welfare lobby, as supported by animal activists in the Labour Party, was summed up in a letter from Lucy Newman, secretary of the National Society Against Factory Farming (NSAFF), to the TUC in October 1979, in which Newman sought to assure the TUC that ‘we are not opposed to *good* intensive farming methods’.⁷²⁰ Indeed, NSAFF had many farmers amongst their membership. What the group resented was the scale of intensive farming; in 1979 almost the entire ‘broiler’ chicken output of 350 million birds a year was controlled by just eight factory farming food chains, and ‘in dealings of this scale the animals become merely units of profit’.⁷²¹ Newman believed that the problem was that animals had become units of property, rather than living the individually worthwhile lives they would supposedly have on the small family farms run by NSAFF members.

It is not just welfare pressure groups, but anarchists too, who believe that the greatest injustice for animals is their reduction to property status under capitalism. This attitude has meant that animal rights activists and anarchists have adopted overlapping critiques of capitalism. Lawrence Wilde notes that ‘the furious response of corporations and the state’ to pressure from animal rights groups indicates the ‘extent to which the economic and political elites recognize that what is being questioned here are the rights of the owners of the means of production’.⁷²² According to Ryan Gunderson, most animal suffering is caused by ‘capital’s blind drive for self-expansion’, and so it is the questioning of the property status of animals and the challenge to the means of production that makes animal advocacy a radical movement.⁷²³ However, animal advocates who problematize the property status of animals can react in different ways, either linking their movement to other struggles against capital, or in terms which relate solely to other animals, by regarding any ownership of animals as oppressive, with some even going as far as regarding companion animals as political prisoners.⁷²⁴ Moreover, some anarchists who focus

⁷²⁰ Lucy Newman, Secretary National Society against Factory Farming to TUC, 24th October 1979, (Modern Records Centre). Emphasis in original.

⁷²¹ Ibid.

⁷²² L. Wilde, “‘The Creatures, too, must become free’: Marx and the Animal/Human Distinction”, *Capital & Class*, 2000, No. 72, pp. 37-53, p. 50.

⁷²³ Ibid., p. 151. R. Gunderson, ‘From Cattle to Capital: Exchange Value, Animal Commodification, and Barbarism’, *Critical Sociology*, 2011, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 259-275, p. 260, p. 266.

⁷²⁴ Whilst writing about a gorilla in New England, American anarchist Bob Black declares: ‘Free Little Joe and all other political prisoners!’ B. Black, *Apes of Wrath* (The Anarchist Library, retrieved May 21, 2012, originally from *Green Anarchist*, #70, Autumn 2003).

on opposing capitalism have rejected veganism as a consumer activity and even come to believe that hunting wild animals would be progress towards total liberation.

Ryan Gunderson believes that the animal rights movement has allowed itself to be co-opted by cruelty-free capitalism.⁷²⁵ Rather than questioning structures of society and making links between varying forms of oppression, vegan consumers are willing to accept the ‘chocolate laxative’ offered by capitalism.⁷²⁶ For Gunderson, individualist ethical consumerism ‘halts social justice movements from pursuing radical means of altering society because they have been co-opted’.⁷²⁷ Critics of so-called ‘vegan consumerism’ believe that it does not offer a ‘critical assessment of social domination’, that it only challenges one aspect of hierarchical domination whilst allowing for ‘animal-free workhouses’ to continue, and that it adopts the capitalist system’s way of conceptualising change – through consumer power.⁷²⁸ Even CAS scholars have regarded the promotion of vegan education as ‘vague, elitist’ and ‘hopeless’.⁷²⁹ Whilst it is true that capitalism facilitates animal exploitation, the economic system is not the only cause; indeed, animal abuse existed before capitalism. Focusing on capitalism has led some anarchist and parliamentary left activists to neglect other causes of animal abuse and deride efforts to improve the position of animals within capitalist societies.

Linked to the anarchist focus on capitalism and property is the idea that whereas domesticating/‘domeseccrating’ animals in factory farms is morally unjust, hunting and killing wild animals for food is permissible.⁷³⁰ Certainly, the definition of animal liberation given in anarchist journal *Rolling Thunder* that ‘animals should not be domesticated or held in captivity’ seems to allow for animals to be hunted and killed, as long as they are not incarcerated.⁷³¹ Primitivist anarchists are most likely to

⁷²⁵ R. Gunderson, ‘Cattle to Capital’, p. 269.

⁷²⁶ Ibid.

⁷²⁷ Ibid. Emphasis in original.

⁷²⁸ *A Murder of Crows*, Issue 2, March 2007 (The Anarchist Library, retrieved on May 21, 2012), p. 74, p. 78, p. 80; P. Gelderloos, *Veganism: Why Not? An Anarchist Perspective* (2011, The Anarchist Library, retrieved July 13, 2012).

⁷²⁹ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation*, p. 45.

⁷³⁰ Nibert argues that ‘The emergence and continuous practice of capturing, controlling, and genetically manipulating other animals for human use violates the sanctity of life of the sentient beings involved, and their mind and bodies are desecrated to facilitate their exploitation: it can be said that they have been *domeseccrated*’. D. A. Nibert, *Animal Oppression & Human Violence: Domeseccration, Capitalism, and Global Conflict* (New York: Colombia University Press, 2013), p. 12.

⁷³¹ *Rolling Thunder*, Issue 6, Fall 2008, p. 13. The definition of Animal Rights includes the fact that advocates ‘often maintain a vegan diet’.

follow this reasoning; for instance John Zerzan associates traditional hunter gathering with ‘values such as gender equality, non-violence and animal rights’.⁷³² One green anarchist interviewee even argued that it would be preferable to live in a hunter-gatherer society ‘than an industrial capitalist society with veganism’.⁷³³ The CrimethInc ‘field manual’ *Expect Resistance* seems to promote hunting and killing for food as an alternative to the alienation and affluenza of capitalist America, imploring readers to ask: ‘could it be that I had never lived?... I brought food products from the supermarket without any idea what was in them or where they had come from; I didn’t know what it was to hunt and kill an animal or rely on a garden for sustenance’.⁷³⁴ Interestingly, some anarchists have combined this promotion of a hunter-gatherer way of life with support for hunt saboteurs.⁷³⁵

The activist who founded Re-pressed, an anarchist distribution service from Leeds, praised the involvement of anarchists in ‘sabbing and antifascism’ whilst at the same time arguing that there was nothing wrong ‘with hunting and killing animals for food’ because ‘it’s a lot better than going down to the supermarket and buying some processed soya’.⁷³⁶ This activist was against ‘the current system of domination and abuse of animals’ for giving living beings ‘a value or a price’ and making them a product. However he saw ‘animals and humans ideally as part of wild nature and that may often include killing for food’.⁷³⁷ Many animal activists would accept that there is a moral difference between domestication and hunting for food; moreover, animal activists would realise that it is impossible – and undesirable – to prevent animals experiencing pain in every circumstance. Lierre Keith has dismissed the entire animal rights project because she believes that some animal activists are unwilling to accept that in the natural world animals will experience pain and be killed for food. Keith writes that:

[Reading] one post [on a vegan message board] marked a turning point. A vegan flushed out his idea to keep animals from being killed—not by humans,

⁷³² A. Robinson, S. Tormey, ‘Beyond the state: Anthropology and “actually-existing anarchism”’, *Critique of Anthropology*, 2012, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 143-157. p. 149.

⁷³³ Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist, 17/01/2014.

⁷³⁴ *Expect Resistance: A Field Manual* (Salem, Oregon: CrimethInc Workers’ Collective, 2008) p. 24.

⁷³⁵ This also suggests that hunting for food is regarded as fundamentally different from hunting for pleasure.

⁷³⁶ *Cargo Cult: DIY Punk Fanzine*, # 4 (undated, c. 2000).

⁷³⁷ *Ibid.*

but by other animals. Someone should build a fence down the middle of the Serengeti, and divide the predators from the prey. Killing is wrong and no animals should ever have to die, so the big cats and wild canines would go on one side, while the wildebeests and zebras would live on the other. He knew the carnivores would be okay because they didn't need to be carnivores. That was a lie the meat industry told. He'd seen his dog eat grass: therefore, dogs could live on grass.⁷³⁸

Keith seems to be constructing a straw-man argument that is easy to demolish; however, the incident does raise an important question about the nature of liberation. Indeed, animal rights activists must realise that animals have many different relationships with humans and these should be respected. Whilst the term 'animal liberation' is a significant organising banner, it is not possible for vegan activists to 'liberate' prey animals in the Serengeti. Animal activists may feel that such 'wild' animals would be better avoiding humans as they are not dependent on humans for their daily needs. However, these animals are still vulnerable to human activity (such as pollution or climate change) and this could be a focus of animal activism. One activist told me the story of arranging to live in an activist house along with her Labrador companion, this activist was told by the other anarchistic residents that she was not welcome because they did not tolerate 'animal slaves'. Such attitudes to companion animals are not uncommon within animal rights circles, and help to highlight a typical uncertainty about the ways that different animals can experience 'liberation' from human abuse. Animal activists may be opposed to the pet industry and believe that companion species have been bred for docility, but such attitudes raise troubling questions regarding the nature of liberation. Indeed, one might ask how a Labrador companion could meaningfully be liberated; certainly the animal could not be released into the 'wild'. Animal activists may recognise that some animals live in beneficial relationships with human companions and not all animals need liberation. Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka's work *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights* is a groundbreaking study of the nature of liberation, particularly in relation to domesticated and 'wild' animals.⁷³⁹ Donaldson and Kymlicka

⁷³⁸ L. Keith, *The Vegetarian Myth: Food, Justice and Sustainability* (Crescent City, Flashpoint Press, 2009), pp. 6-7.

⁷³⁹ S. Donaldson, W. Kymlicka, *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

categories animals according to their status as either 'domesticated animal citizens', wild animals who deserve 'sovereignty' or 'liminal animal denizens'. Donaldson and Kymlicka believe that domestic animals:

must be seen as members of our community. Having brought such animals into our society, and deprived them of other possible forms of existence (at least for the foreseeable future), we have a duty to include them in our social and political arrangements on fair terms. As such, they have rights of membership - rights that go beyond the universal rights owed to all animals, and which are hence relational and differentiated.⁷⁴⁰

Both anarchistic and parliamentary left animal activists may focus on the connection between animal exploitation and capitalism; this is problematic from a CAS perspective because it suggests that animal abuse outside capitalism (such as hunting for food) is morally less problematic than consuming meat from capitalist industries.

Class hostility

Finally, it is the presumption of some animal activists that the British upper classes engage in practices, such as hunting, in which pleasure is derived from the abuse of animals. Although the presumption is not universally held, or necessarily correct, activists on the left sometimes vilify those who seem to belong to an exploitative class by claiming that one particular class of people is more prone to animal abuse. As Ted Benton explains, animal activists have targeted seemingly 'luxury' goods such as fur and ivory, moreover 'direct action against fox-hunting, a traditional sport of the landed upper-classes, is widely supported, while action against angling, a predominantly working-class pleasure, is relatively rarely contemplated'.⁷⁴¹

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 101.

⁷⁴¹ T. Benton, *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights & Social Justice* (London: Verso, 1993), p. 70.

Anarchistic animal activists, particularly those who engage in direct action, are likely to emphasise these class antagonisms. Hunt saboteurs, for instance, believe that 'hunting is associated with the ruling class' and as such hunt sabbing allowed activists an opportunity of 'confrontation against the upper classes'.⁷⁴² Class War believed that 'the major advantage of being on a hunt sab' was not the opportunity to save lives but 'that you can often find yourself face to face with a bunch of human vermin'.⁷⁴³ The fact that an opportunity to 'bash the rich' is more significant than helping animals is displayed by the willingness of some anti-hunting groups to target events of the hunting fraternity which do not involve blood-sports. For instance, the Ledbury Hunt Ball at Eastnor Castle in Herefordshire was attacked by saboteurs, in which 'several vehicles had their windows smashed in, there were six arrests for criminal damage and one hunter had a heart attack on the ball floor'.⁷⁴⁴

Other animal rights groups, outside the hunting arena, seem to similarly draw on the opportunity to confront the class enemy. SHAC organised a series of home demonstrations, for instance against Andrew Baker, the principal investor in Huntington Life Sciences (HLS). The home demonstrations may have provided an opportunity, like hunt sabotage, to confront the perceived opposition in their own territory; the class nature of such protests was demonstrated by the fact that the chairman of Fortress Investment Group, who granted a loan to HLS in 2009, was the next door neighbour of Andrew Baker.⁷⁴⁵ This class hostility was drawn upon in animal rights magazines, and one ALF activist asked:

Have you ever come across a poor vivisector? Go into the ultra-wealthy areas of either town, city or country, find the most expensive properties... and there you will find the average vivisector.⁷⁴⁶

CrimethInc explain that these home demonstrations draw

on class tensions... Activists from lower middle- and working-class backgrounds can find it gratifying to confront wealthy executives on their own turf. This also exposes single-issue activists to the interconnections of the

⁷⁴² Interview with Steve Llewellyn, hunt saboteur, conducted via e-mail, 31/01/2014.

⁷⁴³ *Class War*, 'The Best Cut of All', p. 3.

⁷⁴⁴ *Arkangel*, No. 16 (undated), p. 18.

⁷⁴⁵ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 53, Winter 2009, p. 1.

⁷⁴⁶ *ALF Supporters' Group Newsletter*, No. 6, August 1983, p. 7.

ruling class. In visiting the houses of executives, one discovers that all the pharmaceutical and investment corporations are intertwined: they all own shares of each other's companies, sit on each other's boards, and live in identical suburban mansions.⁷⁴⁷

However, throughout this campaign, SHAC maintained that 'due to a massive campaign of public education in Baker's neighbourhood, you enjoy the support and respect of the community. Baker's neighbours regularly wave and cheer your group on and many people provide financial support'.⁷⁴⁸ Moreover, SHAC did not link this possible class antagonism to other key issues such as opposition to capitalism. For instance, SHAC newsletters encouraged supporters to target the banks and financial institutions that supported HLS, but there was no analysis of capitalism as an inherently exploitative system. Nicole Vosper explains her concern about SHAC's method of targeting companies until they stopped financing HLS. The company could potentially continue exploiting workers or damaging the environment, but this was not a link that SHAC – who moved swiftly on to their next target – were prepared to make.⁷⁴⁹

As we have seen, some Labour politicians were prepared to embrace these class antagonisms when opposing hunting during the 1970s. Hilary Benn, who orchestrated Labour's 'Back The Ban' campaign believes that 'hunting was never about social class'; however, a number of Labour MPs take a different view.⁷⁵⁰ For instance, former Labour MP, and vegan, Cathy Jamieson believes that 'there is an element of "class" hostility regarding fox hunting'.⁷⁵¹ Labour's emphasis on the class aspect of hunting meant that some activists were troubled by the claim that hunting could be a working-class pastime, because this would possibly lead to the situation in which the Party felt compelled to justify or support the activity, as was the case with fishing. For instance, before the 1983 election 'a coachload of hunt fancying miners' disrupted a meeting of the Socialist Countryside Group, sponsored by the League Against Cruel Sports, in which Michael Foot set out Labour's animal welfare

⁷⁴⁷ CrimethInc, 'The SHAC Model: A Critical Assessment' [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/crimethinc-anonymous-the-shac-model>, last accessed 12/11/2015].

⁷⁴⁸ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 41, May/June 2006.

⁷⁴⁹ Interview with Nicole Vosper.

⁷⁵⁰ Correspondence with Hilary Benn, Labour MP, received 15/04/2014.

⁷⁵¹ Interview with Cathy Jamieson, then Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, received on 23/04/2014.

policies.⁷⁵² The head of the South Wales Banwen Miners Hunt claimed that their 'members are ordinary working class lads who pay an annual subscription of £50 per head'.⁷⁵³ Viewed through a 'way of life' lens it would be possible for some Labourites to support hunting, as they did angling, if the Banwen Miners Hunt's claim of mass support were true.

Moreover, the emphasis on class led to an inconsistency in Labour's animal welfare policy. Labour was varying in its hostility towards cruel sports; for instance, the Party maintained its traditional enthusiasm for angling. As *Labour Weekly* correspondent Cooper wrote: 'our highly selective anti-bloodsports stance left us in the usual ridiculous pig-in-the-middle situation. Not extreme enough for the animal nutters... yet still managing to alienate a substantial part of the 5 million strong shooting, hunting and fishing community'.⁷⁵⁴ Ian Manger, a Labour activist from Birmingham, highlighted this hypocrisy by asking why 'sticking hooks into living sensitive creatures' is regarded as acceptable when 'a party member does it', while 'the sight of a high Tory blasting pheasants out of the sky' is rightly regarded as unacceptable.⁷⁵⁵ As Christine Biggs wrote: 'to the fox who is hunted to exhaustion and a torturous death, it really doesn't matter whether its pursuers are miners or managing directors'.⁷⁵⁶ For Biggs, the argument that 'camaraderie somehow justifies an activity', is irrelevant from an animal rights perspective that adopts the concept of speciesism. Certainly, for Labour animal advocates, the fact that there 'are many Labour supporters in working class areas who are involved in shooting and other activities which are completely contrary to animal welfare principles' would be no reason to support such practices.⁷⁵⁷

Class issues are interesting from a CAS perspective, particularly because of the ways in which these arguments impact the four key differences that it was initially suggested would exist between anarchist and parliamentary left conceptions of animal advocacy. Firstly, the priority given to opposing capitalism could undermine the assumption that anarchistic animal activists would accept the concept of speciesism. As we have seen, anarchistic animal activists may dismiss vegan

⁷⁵² *Labour Weekly*, April 1st 1983.

⁷⁵³ *Labour Weekly*, April 22nd 1983.

⁷⁵⁴ *Labour Weekly*, July 8th 1983.

⁷⁵⁵ *Labour Weekly*, April 1st 1983.

⁷⁵⁶ *Labour Weekly*, April 29th 1983.

⁷⁵⁷ Interview with Cathy Jamieson.

education or justify hunting wild animals. There is also a transformation in the previously presumed split between the parliamentary left who favour welfare and anarchistic animal activists who promote animal rights or liberation. In reality, only an animal rights or liberation position that understands the concept of speciesism, and accepts the intrinsic moral worth of animals, fulfils the duty set out in the CAS core principles to 'dismantle all structures of exploitation, domination, oppression, torture, [and] killing'.⁷⁵⁸ Clearly an animal welfare approach allows for the continued exploitation of animals. However, an approach that focuses on the liberation of animals may still permit the continued killing of animals if the approach is characterised by the belief that animals should 'not be domesticated or held in captivity' rather than on the concept of speciesism.⁷⁵⁹ The dichotomy between anarchist animal activists who support direct action and the parliamentary left who support legislation is not challenged by the inclusion of class issues. Finally, the dichotomy between anarchists who accept total liberation and the parliamentary left who allow hierarchy to remain is also reliant on whether particular activists accept the concept of speciesism, because leftist who focus on challenging capitalism and class injustice could leave species hierarchies in place.

'Meat-eating Public'

This section considers the attitude of animal rights activists to the 'meat-eating public'. In particular, we consider whether the condescending attitude that some animal activists have adopted towards meat eaters is incompatible with a total liberation approach. It is suggested that anarchistic activists are more likely to adopt this condescending attitude.

Animal advocacy, which has traditionally been seen as a 'very white and very middle-class movement', has also been regarded as a post-materialist issue.⁷⁶⁰ Given the relative prosperity of post-war Europe, social movements have ostensibly

⁷⁵⁸ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', pp. 4-5.

⁷⁵⁹ *Rolling Thunder*, Issue 6, Fall 2008, p. 13.

⁷⁶⁰ Interview with Roger Yates, former ALF press officer, conducted via e-mail, received on 11/12/2013.

become less concerned with material goals such as employment, housing and consumer goods, instead groups have 'moved up' 'to another level of needs and desires' in a hierarchy of motivation.⁷⁶¹ Those on the left who do not take for granted that such material needs have been met are likely to prioritise these material concerns above animal issues. Moreover, some anarchists and socialists may reject dietary reform because it makes them appear outside, or above, the rest of society; this is particularly problematic for the left which emerged alongside the working-class movement and so adopting a position that separates activists from this revolutionary base is not advisable. Peter Neville, writing in the anarchist quarterly *The Raven*, rejected vegetarianism because it could alienate potential working-class recruits. Neville felt that 'ramming vegetables down people's throats at the bookfair or anarchist meetings can induce a sense of culture shock' in which potential recruits would say that 'anarchist ideas are fine' but reject 'anarchist lifestyles'.⁷⁶²

Some left-wing vegetarians, weary of distancing themselves from potential comrades, are flexible with their approach. We have seen that Edward Carpenter adopted a 'flexitarian' attitude, and the British comedian and activist Mark Thomas wavered his nineteen year stint as a vegetarian to avoid giving offence when offered camel meat in a Sahrawi refugee camp.⁷⁶³ Such flexibility is also debated within the American Black vegan community.⁷⁶⁴ This is significant for animal advocates who aim to link animal abuse to other forms of oppression, as potentially fraternal social justice campaigners could be alienated due to the lack of inclusion and perhaps the dogmatic image of some animal advocates. One respondent to an online anarchist survey argued that he would not adopt veganism because the emphasis on a seemingly restrictive diet made it difficult to organise with community groups outside of the anarchist scene.⁷⁶⁵ Perhaps animal advocates would attract more recruits if they demonstrated some flexibility, although others would argue that it is inconsistent to allow meat eaters into the animal rights movement. From a CAS perspective it is

⁷⁶¹ P. Byrne, *Social Movements in Britain* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 54.

⁷⁶² P. Neville, 'Anarchism and the Sociology of Food: a figurational approach', *The Raven*, Vo. 11, No. 3, 43, pp. 278-283, p. 281.

⁷⁶³ E. Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams, Being Autobiographical Notes* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1921), p. 100; M. Thomas, *As Used on the famous Nelson Mandela: Underground Adventures in the Arms Trade* (London: Ebury Press, 2006), p. 101-103.

⁷⁶⁴ D. Dunham, 'On Being Black and Vegan', in A. Breeze Harper (ed.), *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, And Society* (New York: Lantern Books, 2010), p. 42.

⁷⁶⁵ 'Anarchist Survey' [viewed online, <http://www.anarchismdocumentary.net/survey/>, last accessed 14/04/2014].

also important that animal advocates do more to show solidarity with other social justice campaigners.

Animal rights groups have often been keen to include all potential supporters, even if they do not share certain fundamental beliefs. For instance, SHAC welcomed meat eaters to their demonstrations, arguing that ‘we’re all fighting for the same cause... no one will have a go at you if you are wearing leather shoes! We all had to start somewhere’.⁷⁶⁶ The organisers of Minnesota’s Animal Rights Coalition (ARC) agree that it is important for animal advocates to be open to recruiting people who are not currently vegan. As Charlotte Cozzetto explains:

I answer the ARC email, and I do get emails that start out with, “Well, I’m not vegetarian but” – they feel like they have to explain – “I’m interested in this or that”. We respond and say, “Well, that’s great”. In the meantime, thinking, “We’ll rope you in”.⁷⁶⁷

Isy Morgenmuffel, an activist at the Cowley Club social centre and Anarchist Teapot in Brighton, argued that:

The anarchist movement should be a wider political movement for all, welcoming people from all walks of life and particularly working class people. This means there may be cultural rifts which should and can be worked on but which shouldn’t mean someone is excluded or even worse subject to suspicion due to their dietary choices.⁷⁶⁸

At the Cowley Club, the prominence of veganism was not exclusionary because it was not seen as a single issue, but was combined with traditional employment, housing and environmental concerns. Indeed, when animal advocates wish to appeal to a wider constituency the rejection of single issue politics is more important than any dietary flexibility. In America the ALF’s Western Wildlife Unit believed that their actions ‘reflect the frustration and oppression felt by various members of America’s citizens who like the animals were victimised by big business’. As a result of this, the ALF attempted to move away from embodying ‘the

⁷⁶⁶ SHAC Newsletter, No. 41, May/June 2006.

⁷⁶⁷ M. Britton Clouse, C. Cozzetto, H. Greger, V. Thomasberg, ‘An Oral History of the Animal Rights Coalition: Thirty Years of Grassroots Activism’, in K. Socha, S. Blum (eds.), *Confronting Animal Exploitation: Grassroots Essays on Liberation and Veganism* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2013), p. 181.

⁷⁶⁸ Interview with Isy Morgenmuffel, Cowley Club activist, conducted via e-mail, received 18/12/2013.

predominantly upper-middle class majority who most represented the animal rights movement' by no longer being 'simply just an "animal" group' but one that was also opposed 'to the entire system' including 'institutions that thrived on human abuse'.⁷⁶⁹

However, such multi-issue campaigning is impeded by the hostile attitude that some animal activists take to the 'meat-eating public'. David Olivier wrote in *Arkangel* that animal advocates should view meat eaters 'with the same indulgence as that which we may view non-humans; to view them as, for example, we view cats'.⁷⁷⁰ For Olivier, who is by no means representative, meat eaters are almost a subspecies: 'they are not fundamentally evil... [Their minds] are full of false ideas, to which they cling'.⁷⁷¹ Dallas Rising, an animal advocate from Minnesota, also has 'trouble reconciling the fact that we are of the same species that perpetuates so much terror and violence'.⁷⁷² For Rising, 'animal people' view the world in a fundamentally different way to 'other people', seeing 'violence when most people see a snack'.⁷⁷³ Rising recalls taking a vacation in which she

tried to enjoy a holiday like other people, but because I don't see the world in the same way as most folks, it's a challenge to let go and enjoy in the same way I imagine they can.⁷⁷⁴

Anarchist animal liberationists can seem dismissive of 'ordinary people'. ALF founder Ronnie Lee wrote an article, whilst he identified as an anarchist, in which he asked: 'what reason for living do ordinary unenlightened people have, dragging out their meaningless lives, changing nothing, achieving nothing, merely taking up space in an already grossly overcrowded world'.⁷⁷⁵ Others believed that the animals being 'murdered in slaughterhouses' would not consider the 'public right to [free] choice', and, moreover, to some it was simply inconceivable to be knowledgeable about the meat and dairy industry and not alter your lifestyle – in this analysis meat eaters are either ignorant or evil.⁷⁷⁶ Although we have seen that not all anarchists use the

⁷⁶⁹ Western Wildlife Unit of the Animal Liberation Front, *Memories of Freedom* (The Anarchist Library, retrieved on May 21st 2012), p. 11.

⁷⁷⁰ *Arkangel*, No. 16, (undated), D. Olivier, 'Humans are Animals Too', p. 30.

⁷⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷² D. Rising, 'Tales of an Animal Liberationist', in K. Socha, S. Blum (eds.), *Confronting Animal Exploitation*, p. 155.

⁷⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷⁴ *Ibid.* p. 167.

⁷⁷⁵ *Arkangel*, No. 5, Spring 1991, p. 40.

⁷⁷⁶ *Arkangel*, No. 7, Spring 1992; *Arkangel*, No. 10, (undated), p. 31.

concept of speciesism; it is still the case that most direct action anarchistic animal liberationists do use the concept of speciesism, and because of this belief they are able to dismiss 'ordinary' people. As Kim Socha explains, the belief that the meat industry is the equivalent of 'slavery and genocide' raises troubling questions for animal activists: 'for this means that some of the people I love and care for are akin to Ku Klux Klaners of early twentieth-century Alabama and Nazis of 1930s Germany'.⁷⁷⁷

The condescending attitude epitomised by Olivier was by no means universal within the animal liberation movement, although it was widespread enough to cause some concern within the movement. One anonymous activist realised that the perception of the public as 'non-thinkers, passive or ignorant' was 'one of the main reasons why working class people are so underrepresented, and why the animal rights movement hasn't developed even the vaguest hint of class analysis'.⁷⁷⁸ Socha believes that one solution is for animal activists to engage in coalition building work with other social justice movements which 'initially appear outside of their purview'.⁷⁷⁹

It is anarchistic activists, including those involved in direct action, who are more likely to make or accept condescending pronouncements; this is because their use of the concept of speciesism implies that violence towards humans and other animals is morally equivalent. Interviewees from the parliamentary left, or those who seek legislative changes, did not adopt condescending attitudes. For instance, vegan Labour MP Kerry McCarthy does feel that 'there's something a bit horrible about sitting next to people eating bacon... and I think I've become less tolerant of being in that situation'; nonetheless, McCarthy's position as a politician seeking votes from her constituents means that she is unlikely to make negative pronouncements about the 'meat-eating public'.⁷⁸⁰ Interestingly, Ronnie Lee has amended his attitude to the public alongside his shift from an anarchist to a parliamentary left approach to animal advocacy.⁷⁸¹ Lee is now active in the Green Party, and far from his earlier

⁷⁷⁷ K. Socha, 'The "Dreaded Comparisons" and Speciesism: Leveling the Hierarchy of Suffering', in K. Socha, S. Blum (eds.), *Confronting Animal Exploitation*, p. 226.

⁷⁷⁸ *Arkangel*, No. 16, p.33.

⁷⁷⁹ K. Socha, 'The "Dreaded Comparisons" and Speciesism', pp. 236-237.

⁷⁸⁰ Interview with Kerry McCarthy, Labour MP, 02/05/14.

⁷⁸¹ Interview with Ronnie Lee, ALF founder, 25/04/2013.

pronouncements he now recognises that 'engagement with ordinary people counts for everything if we are to radically change their attitudes towards other animals'.⁷⁸²

Exploring the attitudes of animal activists to the 'meat-eating public' helps to problematize the presumed differences between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy based on their relationship to a CAS framework. In particular, if anarchistic animal activists hold a condescending attitude to meat eaters then this challenges the assumption that anarchist animal activists will exemplify the CAS concept of total liberation. We have seen in previous sections that the parliamentary left are likely to relate animal activism to improving human society, and perhaps such an attitude fits into a CAS approach which attempts to build intersectional difference-respecting coalitions.

Gas Chamber Workers

If some animal advocates have adopted a hostile attitude to people who consume animal products, then this section asks what approach activists adopt to people who work in industries that abuse animals. Whereas the parliamentary left have traditionally supported low-paid agricultural workers, the attitude of anarchist animal activists has been more complex. Some anarchists regard these workers as oppressors, in some cases even regarding them as legitimate targets of coercive direct action. On the other hand there have been some attempts, most notably the McLibel campaign, to link the exploitation of workers with that of animals in the same industries.

There are numerous reasons to regard workers in fur, leather and meat industries as an exploited group. As Catharine Grant highlights, slaughterhouse workers are habitually paid the minimum wage, they are exposed to dangerous chemicals and high levels of ammonia from livestock manure, and in America the

⁷⁸² R. Lee, 'Preface', in. A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Social Justice Approach for Liberation* (New York: Peter Land, 2014), p. xiv.

injury rate in the meat packing industry is three times the national average.⁷⁸³ Ruth Harrison believed that industry workers themselves may be ‘seriously disturbed by some current farming practices’ but are forced into silence by the fear of losing their livelihoods and the ‘power of vested interests’ who operate the industries.⁷⁸⁴ Indeed, animal liberationists often acknowledge that slaughterhouse workers come from economically deprived groups with few alternative career prospects.⁷⁸⁵

Hamlet plant fire

From the mid-1980s commentators and policy makers consistently warned of the dangers that animal liberationists posed; groups such as the ALF, they believed, aimed to ‘inflict terror upon those who work in laboratories’.⁷⁸⁶ Peter Bruinvels, then Conservative MP for Leicester East, believed that the ALF ran an ‘irresponsible campaign that is corrupted by violence and terror tactics’ which would not just harm those who worked in the meat industry, in fact: ‘defenceless children [are] very much in danger’.⁷⁸⁷ With these regular warnings that a serious incident was likely to occur, coupled with the ALF’s use of arson and property damage, it was not unforeseen when a fire broke out on 3rd September 1991 at a poultry processing plant in North Carolina.

Exceeding the Conservative MP’s worst warnings, twenty five workers at the Hamlet chicken processing plant died and fifty five were injured. The frightened workers tried to flee through the plant’s fire escape but found it padlocked shut from the outside; the employees were trapped in the plant where they suffered burns, blindness and respiratory disease from smoke inhalation.⁷⁸⁸ Rather than causing the

⁷⁸³ C. Grant, *The No-Nonsense Guide To Animal Rights* (Oxford: New Internationalist, 2006), pp. 104-105.

⁷⁸⁴ R. Harrison, *Animal Machines: The New Factory Farming Industry* (London: Vincent Stuart, 1964), p. 7.

⁷⁸⁵ T. Benton, S. Redfearn, ‘The Politics of Animal Rights’, p. 47.

⁷⁸⁶ Confectionery (Poisoning), HC Deb 19 November 1984 vol 68 cc21-8 Mr. Derick Spencer, Conservative, Leicester South [Viewed online, <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1984/nov/19/confectionery-poisoning>, accessed 17/2/2014].

⁷⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸⁸ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. VI, Nos. 3-4, Fall-Winter 1991-92, p. 10.

international outrage that one would predict, the incident received a muted response. This was not an ALF action; it was caused by the company's own cost-cutting measures. The fire was caused by faulty and unchecked equipment; the doors were padlocked to stop workers from stealing chickens.⁷⁸⁹ Had this been an ALF action then one would expect to see a far greater degree of moral outrage from politicians and the media. Imperial Food Products employed more than 200 people, mostly African American women who earned little over five dollars an hour; one survivor recalled that the employers 'didn't talk to us like we were humans', and the workers were treated 'just like they were a dog'.⁷⁹⁰ Two years after the incident businesses and insurance companies successfully lobbied for new state legislation in North Carolina that reduced compensation for injured workers.⁷⁹¹

From a CAS perspective the Hamlet fire can be seen as an example of the interlocking oppression of species, gender, race and class. If animal advocates accept the key CAS concept of total liberation then it is inconsistent and tactically irrational to not be concerned with the related forms of domination that affected the Hamlet workers. From reading anarchist literature which routinely highlights these interconnections, and given the presumed links between anarchism and a CAS approach, one might suppose that anarchists are likely to link the oppression of animals with the exploitation of human workers in the animal-industrial complex. However, the parliamentary left, particularly within the Labour Party, have been more willing to combine support for workers in animal industries with promotion of animal issues.

Exploited workers

Perhaps Labour's combination of highlighting the conditions for agricultural workers alongside animal issues means that they fit well with the CAS concept of

⁷⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁰ *Hamlet: Out of the Ashes* (Director Robert Cotter, 1994).

⁷⁹¹ Ibid.

total liberation. Certainly, Labour consistently oppose the ‘freezing of farm workers wages’, particularly when this related to European directives.⁷⁹² By 1983 Labour had shifted its rhetoric from unproblematically supporting farmers, to supporting the lowest paid agricultural workers.⁷⁹³ Labour did not frame their argument in an intersectional manner; however, the better conditions for trainees would relate to enhanced conditions for animals because if the workers had better training and were working in a less pressurised environment then this would result in what might be termed better husbandry. The Labour Campaign for Animal Rights seemed similarly sympathetic to the conditions for employees in animal industries. The campaign group sent a circular to Labour MPs in 1985 complaining about Gwyneth Dunwoody, Labour MP for Crewe and Nantwich and frontbench spokesperson for transport, who was appointed by the British Fur Trade Association as its parliamentary consultant. The problem here was not just that Labour’s 1983 election manifesto had given a commitment to ban all extreme livestock systems, but that the British Fur Trade Association were ‘unscrupulous employers who discourage membership of unions’.⁷⁹⁴ The Campaign group believed that Dunwoody was particularly hypocritical because she was also sponsored by the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers, and as such should have promoted unionisation, even in an industry that Labour hoped to close down. Although the animal rights movement could learn from the Labour Campaign for Animal Rights’ insistence that workers in the animal-industrial complex should be unionised, it is clear that Labour’s promotion of better conditions for agricultural workers falls far short of a CAS approach because it still accepts animal welfare, and better husbandry, rather than arguing for animal rights or liberation.

Given the connection between anarchism and a CAS approach, it was initially assumed that anarchist animal activists would combine support for exploited workers and animals caught in the animal-industrial complex. However, it is not the case that all anarchists would support all exploited workers and if anarchist groups ‘perceive that person [or group of workers] to be an oppressor they lose our solidarity’; for instance, the police, prison officers and slaughterhouse workers may not be

⁷⁹² Labour Party Annual Conference Report, 1973, p. 73.

⁷⁹³ *Labour Weekly*, February 11th 1983.

⁷⁹⁴ Labour Campaign For Animal Rights, ‘Animal Welfare’, Circular 5th November 1985 (Labour Archive and Study Centre, Hart 13/150).

appropriate candidates for solidarity.⁷⁹⁵ As Nicole Vosper explains: 'we wouldn't really have sympathy for workers in slaughterhouses, just like we wouldn't have sympathy with Nazi officers campaigning for better conditions while they gas people'.⁷⁹⁶ Former SHAC activist JJ links the campaign against HLS and its associates with freedom fighters who resisted the holocaust:

In Germany during the war there were camps for the Jews and you had, there were people not working directly in the camps, but working indirectly with them, supplying food or whatever at the camp or just outside and being paid by the Nazis and my view is the same as that really, I wouldn't support them. The same as I wouldn't support someone working in a slaughterhouse no matter what.⁷⁹⁷

Clearly, Nicole Vosper and JJ both use the concept of speciesism, which suggests that harming an animal and harming a human are morally equivalent. Ronnie Lee, during his time as an anarchist, argued that if resistance fighters during the war had tried to assassinate doctors who experimented on concentration camp prisoners then they would not be called 'lunatics' or 'terrorists' and so neither should animal rights activists if they adopted these tactics.⁷⁹⁸ Perhaps in this instance the concept of speciesism is somewhat contradictory to the concept of total liberation, because it means that activists will deny solidarity to a group of workers who are exploited by an intersecting form of oppression. Dismissing the Hamlet workers as the moral equivalent of Nazi collaborators seems exaggerated, from a tactical if not theoretical point of view. Such an approach would negate the spirit of total liberation which focuses on the intersectionality of oppression and on overarching systems of domination that include the marginalization, exploitation and oppression of dominated groups. Animal activists who dismiss slaughterhouse workers as the moral equivalent of concentration camp guards would contribute to the marginalization of these workers, and it would therefore neglect intersectional issues. Comparing animal slaughter to human genocide also uses the experiences and feelings of genocide survivors as a resource for animal rights campaigns. Finally, if animal activists are willing to make a comparison between slaughterhouse workers

⁷⁹⁵ Interview with Nicole Vosper.

⁷⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁷ Interview with JJ, former SHAC activist, 19/06/14.

⁷⁹⁸ R. Lee, 'Unjustifiable Explosions', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 3, Summer 1990, p. 40.

and concentration camp guards, then they must also accept their own position as the equivalent of Nazi collaborators, because they exist in a society that continuously perpetuates the abuse of animals.

McLibel

Despite the focus on the concept of speciesism, anarchist actions on behalf of animal rights have recognised the interlocking oppression of workers and other animals. Even SHAC were prepared to highlight the poor working conditions at HLS, which included underqualified employees being forced to miss breaks and work overtime.⁷⁹⁹ One of the most significant actions by an anarchist group against animal industries was the McLibel trial, in which two activists from London Greenpeace – an anarchist environmentalist collective with no affiliation to the larger Greenpeace organisation – were taken to court by McDonalds for distributing an allegedly libellous pamphlet. London Greenpeace ran an anti-McDonalds campaign between 1987 and 1990 in which the leaflet *What's Wrong With McDonalds* was distributed at selected London stores. Following the trial – in which Helen Steel and Dave Morris defended themselves against the corporate giants – the pamphlet was read by thousands of activists across the globe.⁸⁰⁰

What is significant here is that the pamphlet did not solely focus on the 'murder of millions of animals', but gave equal consideration to the devastating environmental impact of McDonalds, the dispossession of land 'for cash crops or for cattle ranching' and the exploitation of fast food workers.⁸⁰¹ At the trial Morris and Steel called as witnesses up to 30 ex-employees of McDonalds, including employees who had promoted trade unionism within the workplace.⁸⁰² The 'McLibel Two' proved that an anarchist campaign could gain mass support if it focused on interlocking oppressions rather than concentrating on single issue politics. London Greenpeace was able to combine support for workers in animal industries with the ultimate aim of

⁷⁹⁹ SHAC Newsletter, No. 42, July/August 2006.

⁸⁰⁰ D. Morris, H. Steel, 'McWorld on Trial', *The Raven: Anarchist Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 193-216.

⁸⁰¹ *What's Wrong with McDonalds?*

⁸⁰² *Arkangel*, No. 14, (undated); *Arkangel*, No. 15, (undated).

putting such corporations out of business. However, the McLibel action has not prevented other campaigns supported by anarchists from continuing to deny solidarity to workers in animal industries.

The use of coercive or violent tactics

The final section of this chapter looks at the use of coercive or violent tactics by certain animal rights groups.⁸⁰³ This is significant because such actions typically target either workers within the animal-industrial complex or people that animal activists perceive as legitimate upper-class targets. The discussion of coercive and violent tactics in this section includes actions that fall outside the ALF's non-violent guidelines. For instance, there have been groups, such as the Justice Department, who use tactics including razor blade letters, bomb threats, death threats, and physical assaults.⁸⁰⁴ Property damage is not understood to constitute violence unless it implies or is experienced as a deliberate endangerment or psychological threat.⁸⁰⁵ In particular, it is interesting to see if anarchist animal activists have targeted individual workers in industries which abuse animals, and if this further contradicts the concept of total liberation that it was presumed anarchist activists would hold.

One clear difference between anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocates is that, generally speaking, the former embrace the use of direct action whereas the latter favour legislation. This is significant from a CAS perspective because such scholarship 'openly engages controversial radical politics and militant strategies... such as those that involve economic sabotage and high-pressure direct action tactics'.⁸⁰⁶ Many animal advocates, whether anarchist or not, are unwilling to

⁸⁰³ For the sake of succinctness I sometimes refer to this as 'militant direct action', although I am aware that the phrase encompasses a far greater range of activities than violent or coercive action.

⁸⁰⁴ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Behind the Mask: Uncovering the Animal Liberation Front', In. *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters*, pp. 34-36.

⁸⁰⁵ Tom Regan gives the example of a neo-Nazi group burning down a synagogue to show that property damage can clearly constitute violence in some instances. T. Regan, *Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), p. 188.

⁸⁰⁶ S. Best, 'The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: Putting Theory into Action and Animal Liberation into Higher Education', *State of Nature: An Online Journal of Radical Ideas* [viewed online, <http://www.stateofnature.org/?p=5903>, last accessed 17/07/2015].

rule out the use of all violent tactics on the basis that such tactics would be adopted if humans were being abused, and so it would be speciesist to rule out such tactics to defend animals.⁸⁰⁷ Moreover, animal activists who support a diversity of tactics explain that there is no clear dichotomy between 'violent direct action' and 'legislation', because activists who favour legislation are ultimately relying on the state's ability to implement such laws, by violent force if necessary.⁸⁰⁸ Carol Adams explains the eco-feminist argument that animal activists should not adopt the masculine language of being 'at war' with animal abusers:

Why do we have to use masculine language, there's a war, we've got to be in this war. I was against the Vietnam War, why would I want to be in any war? Why aren't we pacifists, why are we using this language. Which I think is a male privilege language.⁸⁰⁹

For Adams the use of violent or coercive actions is designed to protect male activists' manhood and create heroes and leaders within the movement:

We have a movement that may be at least 60 % women, maybe 70%, and yet the language, the tactics, the leadership is so tilted towards, especially white men and I just question why that group of people get to define how we perceive this movement. Why isn't this movement about expanding compassion, why isn't this movement about saying. 'hey, yes you might be feeling grief when you become involved in learning and acting against what happens to animals, but this grief doesn't kill you, this grief gives you strength'... you can be empowered from this, why do we first of all accept the call to war? I don't, I don't accept that.⁸¹⁰

Parliamentary left

⁸⁰⁷ P. Singer, *Practical Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 307-309.

⁸⁰⁸ T. Elise, 'Anti-Capitalism and Abolitionism', in K. Socha, S. Blum, *Confronting Animal Exploitation*, p. 40.

⁸⁰⁹ Interview with Carol Adams.

⁸¹⁰ Ibid.

It is clear from interview material from activists, both within the parliamentary left and within national animal protection groups seeking legislative change, that parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy do not sit well with militant direct action. Indeed, some interviewees argued that the attitude of the Labour Party towards the entire animal rights movement was tainted by the use of violent or coercive tactics.⁸¹¹ Certainly, New Labour politicians who negated their manifesto commitment to reduce the number of live animal experiments found it convenient to dismiss 'animal rights protestors', particularly those involved in SHAC, 'as terrorists'.⁸¹² Animal Aid director Andrew Tyler argues that such a clampdown did not just have an impact on autonomous activists engaged in militant direct action, but even moderate animal protection organisations were affected by Labour's actions. Tyler argues that Labour's discursive criminalisation of the entire animal rights movement had a chilling effect because media outlets refused to discuss animal rights issues, and instead they wanted to discuss the tactics used by a small group of protestors.⁸¹³ Tyler believes that it was Labour's actions, rather than the use of confrontational tactics, which led to this media blackout.⁸¹⁴

However, this is not to say that animal activists on the parliamentary left would reject all direct action. For instance, we've seen that Tony Benn was able to speak favourably of ALF activist Barry Horne and Ronnie Lee has found a political home in the Green Party without renouncing the legitimacy of animal rights groups using militant direct action. Other parliamentarians take a position in which they disagree with coercive methods whilst recognising the legitimacy of the animal rights cause and continuing to campaign for progressive legislative changes. Michael Meacher, Minister of State for the Environment between 1997 and 2003, responded to a series of ALF actions by arguing that whilst 'nobody will condone the methods used by the Animal Liberation Front... that should not blind us to the fact that they have a point which deserves much more public attention than it has received'.⁸¹⁵ Chris Williamson

⁸¹¹ Interview with Elliot Morley, Former Labour MP, Former Labour Animal Welfare Spokesperson, 11/08/14. One could point out a discrepancy between the rejection of animal rights activism that is seen as 'violent' by former MPs such as Morley and Nick Palmer, whilst they supported the considerably more violent invasion of Iraq.

⁸¹² C. Mullin, *A View From The Foothills* (London: Profile Books, 2010), p. 137, pp. 185-186.

⁸¹³ Interview with Andrew Tyler, director of Animal Aid, 26/02/2014.

⁸¹⁴ Ibid.

⁸¹⁵ M. Meacher, 'Animal Rights We Need A Debate' [viewed online, <http://www.michaelmeacher.info/weblog/2008/12/animal-rights-we-need-a-debate/>, last accessed 6/2/2014].

understood 'where people are coming from' who carried out non-violent direct action, however

where sometimes it crosses over the line is where people start intimidating individuals... I think that's a mistake because it draws attention away from what you're trying to achieve, and focuses attention on those individuals and portrays them as victims.⁸¹⁶

Kerry McCarthy similarly believes that coercive direct action is 'not very helpful':

Well the more extreme forms of direct action isn't helpful in that it gives your enemies ammunition, the people you're fighting against, if you're digging up old ladies from their graves its quite easy for them to portray you as terrorists, and also quite irrational as well... digging up someone's body from a grave is not the right response to animal testing, and there's a danger that it negates your whole [argument], all the rational arguments go out the window... the debate then becomes whether there's a moral equivalence between digging up someone's bones and experimenting on rabbits.⁸¹⁷

Despite her rejection of 'extreme forms of direct action', McCarthy's views were not affected by such actions; and although Williamson is frustrated that animal advocates 'might have achieved more had some of those tactics been less intimidatory... or less perceived as such' these tactics did not change Williamson's mind about the anti-vivisection cause.⁸¹⁸

Indeed, just as the views of animal advocates in the parliamentary left were not altered by the use of coercive tactics, there is no evidence to suggest that the Labour leadership were less willing to implement progressive legislation because of such tactics. Nick Palmer, who served as a Labour MP between 1997 and 2010, argues that 'the impression that sections of the [animal rights] movement were willing to resort to intimidation is likely to have had a chilling effect on the willingness of... political parties to respond to them'.⁸¹⁹ Even the MPs who were most stridently

⁸¹⁶ Interview with Chris Williamson. Interestingly, Williamson said that intimidatory actions are wrong for tactical reasons, rather than because animal rights groups should use prefigurative methods.

⁸¹⁷ Interview with Kerry McCarthy, Labour MP, 02/05/14.

⁸¹⁸ Interviews with Kerry McCarthy and Chris Williamson.

⁸¹⁹ Interview with Dr. Nick Palmer, Director of Policy European Coalition to End Animal Experiments, Head of Policy and Government, BUAV, conducted via e-mail, received on 11/04/2014.

opposed to vivisection were not 'prepared to accept intimidation against individual staff', both from an ethical stand point and because 'it was distracting from discussing the issue itself'.⁸²⁰ Nonetheless, Nick Palmer does not believe that the tactics of certain animal rights groups were the reason for the New Labour leadership's pro-vivisection stance; more significant is the fact that 'Tony Blair in particular was very strongly pro-science and pro-industry, and he interpreted that as meaning that anything perceived to be inconvenient to science and industry was a bad thing'.⁸²¹ The fact that Labour made their initial anti-vivisection pledges in *New Life For Animals* after the Justice Department's violent actions were carried out also shows that the use of aggressive tactics did not mean that Labour discounted animal issues completely.

It is clear from interviews with Labour politicians such as Williamson, McCarthy and Palmer that these parliamentarians were not simply opposed to coercion because they believed such tactics to be morally wrong, instead they believed that such tactics would negatively affect the public's perception of animal rights issues. Indeed, this fits the parliamentary left belief, expressed by Neil Kinnock, that 'violence is alien to the British working class'.⁸²² Conversely, anarchists associated with the ALF press office believe that such political violence is unlikely to alienate most people.⁸²³ Indeed, Ronnie Lee believed that whereas 'the middle class traditionally don't like to get personally involved in violence', the British working class have a long tradition of gaining reforms through political violence.⁸²⁴

Anarchist approaches

The relationship between anarchists and animal rights groups who pursue aggressive tactics is more complex; not least because, as my interviewees demonstrate, direct action animal rights groups are typically composed of self-

⁸²⁰ Ibid.

⁸²¹ Ibid.

⁸²² G. McKay, 'DiY Culture: Notes towards an intro', in G. McKay (ed.), *DiY Culture: Party & Protest in Nineties Britain* (London: Verso, 1998), p. 17.

⁸²³ Interview with Robin Lane, former ALF Press Officer, 9/03/2014.

⁸²⁴ G. McKay, 'DiY Culture', pp. 17-18.

identified anarchists. Firstly, anarchists could see violent actions as isolating and authoritarian, especially when the actions are combined with an absence of consensus or horizontal discussion. However, many anarchistic animal rights activists support the use of militant direct action. CAS scholars have traditionally supported such actions, but it does raise troubling questions regarding the connection between anarchist activists and total liberation.

The use of seemingly violent or coercive action has been critiqued by some anarchists. An anonymous anarchist writing in *Class War* accused the ALF of regarding the working class as too ‘stupid and “wicked” to care about animal rights so the ALF... has decided to abandon “public opinion” and do the job for us’.⁸²⁵ For this activist: ‘there’s a vital difference between a fight that’s based in our communities and workplaces and the hair-brained schemes of the balaclava brigade’.⁸²⁶ The seemingly cavalier attitude towards violent actions by some animal rights supporters is linked to a lack of concern for other oppressed groups, and as such distances these animal advocates from the wider anarchist movement. Whilst anarchists have emphasised solidarity, some animal advocates have focused solely on their single issue. For instance, David Olivier wrote that he ‘felt only annoyance or hostility, or at best indifference towards... exploited workers, deported immigrants and raped women... I saw [them] only as part of the globally privileged category to which the human species belongs’.⁸²⁷ Writing after a car bomb explosion had injured a thirteen-month-old baby, Barry Horne believed that he would have ‘to rack my brains to think of any [action by animal rights groups] that could reasonably be called violent’. Horne also believed that ‘condemning alleged Animal Liberation violence is speciesist’ if the same tactics would be justified if they were used to prevent atrocities against humans.⁸²⁸ To anarchists who have placed emphasis on freedom, autonomy and non-coercion,⁸²⁹ such a ban on criticism is troubling - although, of course, debates did continue within the pages of *Arkangel*. Some anarchists might also place emphasis on prefigurative politics, believing that a society free of hierarchical domination and oppression will never be achieved if the means by which

⁸²⁵ *Class War*, No. 32, 1989.

⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸²⁷ *Arkangel*, No. 16, (undated), D. Olivier, ‘Humans are Animals Too’, p. 30.

⁸²⁸ *Arkangel*, No. 18, (undated, 1990/1991), p. 35.

⁸²⁹ Although, as Uri Gordon explores, anarchist attitudes to coercion are not so simplistic. U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive! Anti-authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008).

such a society is brought about involve coercion and intimidation. This is particularly the case for animal advocates whose position already states that one cannot cause suffering to end suffering in the long term – for instance causing suffering to animals to bring about benefits to human health – and as such animal advocates should not cause short-term suffering through coercive tactics even if this would mean long term benefits for other animals;⁸³⁰ although some anarchists would argue that the morality of causing ‘suffering’ will depend on whether it was perpetrated by those in power, or with the intention of removing power. For instance, violent resistance against a despotic dictator would not be regarded as equally worthy of condemnation as the tyrant’s use of police repression.⁸³¹

Other activists, whilst pointing out that ‘there are many autonomous and incognito groups’ who do not represent the larger campaigns such as SHAC, believe that anarchism is in no way contradicted by the use of aggressive tactics. Max Gastone, SHAC’s legal representative and adviser, argues that ‘if anything, the history of anarchism shows a strand that is willing to use assassination as a political tool. Direct action took many forms from violence to property damage over the 150 years or so of anarchism’.⁸³² In such an interpretation ‘it is one of the stronger points of anarchism that it never elevated the tactic of (non-)violence... into a strategy or identity, refusing to be forced by hegemonic liberalism to conform to a set of norms it never chose’.⁸³³ Anarchists and animal advocates may share the opinion that it is the corporations engaging in industries which harm animals, as well as the state that supports and protects them, who are the real perpetrators of violent and coercive tactics. One must distinguish between different types of tactics and definitions of violence, which could range from intimidating phone calls to planting explosives.⁸³⁴ Certainly, there were few members of the ALF who ‘agreed with the proposition that property can be harmed’, which would make planting a car bomb a non-violent action

⁸³⁰ See: R. D. Ryder, *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Towards Speciesism* (Oxford: Berg, 2000), p. 241.

⁸³¹ V. Richards, *Violence and anarchism: A polemic* (London: Freedom Press, 1993).

⁸³² Interview with Max Gastone, SHAC legal representative and adviser, conducted via e-mail, received on 15/11/2013.

⁸³³ Ibid.

⁸³⁴ For a full discussion of different definitions of violence see: U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!*, pp. 86-95.

as long it was not planted with the intention of causing a deliberate endangerment or psychological threat.⁸³⁵

Nicole Vosper, an anarchist who was jailed for three-and-a-half years for her involvement in SHAC, believes that ‘people have been very naive in the movement if they thought that our tactics hadn’t involved coercion, we should be more proud of that’ and rather than claiming that all ALF actions are non-violent, the movement should ‘own’ the term.⁸³⁶ For Vosper, these tactics are supported by her anarchism, because ‘political violence has been a huge part of anarchist tradition’. Although community and workplace organisation is a larger component of anarchism, and ‘the direct action end of the spectrum in terms of violence and coercion is very small’, this has still been ‘a part of anarchist history and tradition that people have felt proud of – that we’ve got a right to resist oppression by any means necessary’.⁸³⁷ For Vosper the right of the victim is more significant than the right of the oppressor, and therefore there is no contradiction between anarchism and aggressive tactics: ‘we can still be committed to working for the eradication of domination but still using violence as a tactic’.⁸³⁸ Moreover, Vosper argues that animal liberationists, working ‘in solidarity with animals’ have a right to use the same tactics for animals that animals would use themselves if they were able to formulate such tactics. As other oppressed groups have resorted to violent tactics, then this indicates that animals would use violent tactics if they were able to. As a subjugated group ‘might use political violence to defend themselves’ then animal liberationists are justified in using the same tactics to help animals.⁸³⁹

From the literature and actions of the animal rights movement it is clear that anarchistic activists are more likely to be open to the use of militant direct action than other strands of the movement. Anarchists are more likely to agree with Derrick Jensen’s assertion that ‘anybody’s freedom from being exploited will *always* come at

⁸³⁵ Quote from interview with Roger Yates.

⁸³⁶ Interview with Nicole Vosper: ‘Non-violence is a massive privilege for people who haven’t experienced violence’.

⁸³⁷ Ibid.

⁸³⁸ Ibid.

⁸³⁹ Interview with Nicole Vosper. Jason Hribal goes as far as to say that animals do resist their oppression, often violently, for instance when animals attack their captors in zoos and circuses, and so animal rights groups should build their campaigns by supporting these acts of resistance. J. Hribal, *Fear of the Animal Planet: The Hidden History of Animal Resistance* (California: CounterPunch and AK Press, 2010).

the expense of the oppressor's ability to exploit'.⁸⁴⁰ Jensen stipulates that the 'freedom' of animals 'to survive will come at the expense of those who profit' from their destruction; but he does not account for the possibility that an individual may start as an oppressor and in turn become oppressed by more powerful groups, or that someone can simultaneously exploit and be exploited.⁸⁴¹ One SHAC activist suggested that reading Ward Churchill's work would enable one to understand anarchist conceptions of violence. Churchill believes that non-violence is a privileged position because it is held by people living in a 'comfort zone', whereas he contends that the lives of most people are already 'violent' because of the oppressive state action which they face.⁸⁴² Uri Gordon highlights a number of reasons why anarchists may adopt violent tactics.⁸⁴³ Firstly, Gordon believes that it is 'simply untrue that anarchists desire a "non-violent society" and nothing else', instead anarchists are principally concerned with abolishing institutional violence or violent enforcement.⁸⁴⁴ Gordon argues that anarchists seek a model of non-violence that is achieved through universal consent, and since the state is currently prepared 'to resort to violence' then 'the anarchist model of non-violence by mutual consent simply cannot be enacted'.⁸⁴⁵ It has been argued that anarchists should not use violent or coercive tactics because of their stress on prefigurative politics; however, Gordon believes that such prefigurative methods can justify violence: in an 'anarchist society' people would be expected to defend themselves against the imposition of a hierarchical social order, by violent resistance if necessary, and therefore anarchists could prefiguratively use those tactics today.⁸⁴⁶ Moreover, the experience of violence may by itself have a 'self-liberating and radicalising effect'.⁸⁴⁷ Finally, Gordon contends that in choosing legal methods activists are not ruling out the use of violent coercion, they are hoping that state legislation will be introduced and this in turn may be

⁸⁴⁰ D. Jensen, 'Preface', in W. Churchill, M. Ryan, *Pacifism As Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America* (AK Press: Edinburgh, 2007), p. 22.

⁸⁴¹ Ibid.

⁸⁴² W. Churchill, *Pacifism As Pathology*, p. 77. Therefore, Churchill suggests, people are justified in resisting this state oppression - violently if necessary.

⁸⁴³ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!*, p. 93.

⁸⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 98.

⁸⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 104.

implemented by coercive or violent methods: 'we only entrust the decision on whether this will happen to the state'.⁸⁴⁸

Total liberation

Although anarchist animal activists have justified the use of militant direct action in some circumstances, I argue that such tactics fall outside the scope of total liberation if they target people working in animal abusing industries who, according to the total liberation framework, should be regarded as subject to an interrelated form of oppression. In particular, the Justice Department's campaign and the Save the Newchurch Guinea Pigs campaign fall outside the scope of total liberation.

In December 1993 the Justice Department, a British animal rights group who rejected the ALF's non-violent stance, began a 'postal device campaign' in which the group, who allegedly threatened to spread the AIDS virus, sent 'poster tubes said to contain needles packed in explosive material' to selected targets.⁸⁴⁹ *Class War* described the 'campaign' as using 'just about the most stupid tactic in the world'.⁸⁵⁰ As Robin Lane, who was an activist with the ALF Supporters' Group and press office, noted: 'surely postal workers... and secretaries... would be most at risk'.⁸⁵¹ The Justice Department's campaign continued throughout the mid-1990s; one device disguised as a video 'detonated in a Coventry sorting office'; in 1994 rat traps 'primed with razor blades' were sent to Prince Charles and Michael Howard in protest against the Criminal Justice Act, and ALF press officer Robin Webb seemed delighted with the ominous warning that accompanied a device sent to the owner of Wickham Research Laboratories that the package contained 'a little bit extra' – a reference to the previous contamination threats the group had made.⁸⁵² By threatening the safety of workers, not just in animal abusing industries but in the postal service, the Justice Department negate the concept of total liberation which

⁸⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 101.

⁸⁴⁹ *Arkangel*, No. 11, (undated, 1994) R. Lane, 'The Justice Department: A Point of View', p. 39.

⁸⁵⁰ *Class War*, No. 32, 1989.

⁸⁵¹ R. Lane, 'The Justice Department: A Point of View', p. 39.

⁸⁵² *Arkangel*, No. 12, (undated), p. 26; *Arkangel*, No. 13, (undated), p. 6.

should regard workers in the animal-industrial complex as subjected to an interrelated form of oppression to other animals.

The Save the Newchurch Guinea Pigs campaign was partly orchestrated by self-identified anarchists.⁸⁵³ Despite this, the strategies allegedly used by the group fall outside the scope of total liberation because they target workers and therefore fail to recognise an interrelated form of oppression. Alongside the peaceful vigils, the campaign against Christopher and John Hill's farm allegedly

[r]esulted in the Hills' phone lines being jammed by hundreds of calls... the campaign spread out against the whole village, and involved abusive graffiti, bricks thrown through windows, cars paint-stripped, phone lines cut off, and explosives let off at night. Effigies were burned. May Hudson, a cleaner, was warned that her dead husband would be disinterred unless she stopped working.⁸⁵⁴

One worker had 'his name spelled out with shotgun cartridges on his lawn' and eventually quit when death threats were made against his grandmother; another business associate was publically accused of paedophilia; and most famously the bones of Gladys Hammond, Christopher Hill's mother-in-law, were stolen in October 2004.⁸⁵⁵ Unlike the campaigns of hunt saboteurs, and some SHAC actions, which directly target upper class animal abusers, the Save the Newchurch Guinea Pigs campaign targeted workers who had no say in the practices of their employers and so could have been regarded as potential allies, or at least as victims of the same industrial complex and capitalist practice as the animals.

It is clear that anarchist animal activists are fundamentally linked with different forms of direct action; indeed, it is this which makes anarchism consistent with a CAS approach. However, considering the class status of the targets of militant direct action reveals some complications. In particular, anarchist animal rights activism contradicts the concept of total liberation if working-class employees are targeted because such actions do not focus on overarching systems of domination which include the marginalization, exploitation and oppression of dominated groups. Animal

⁸⁵³ *Animal Liberation Front Supporters' Group*, April 2009, p. 8.

⁸⁵⁴ L. Hall, *Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights advocacy in the age of terror* (Connecticut: Nectar Bat Press, 2006), p. 116.

⁸⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

activists who coercively target workers might be relying on their marginalization because the police would be less likely to intervene if a cleaner (for instance) rather than a CEO is targeted. In this situation workers are also used instrumentally, and as a resource and a tactical pawn, because pressure on their own lives is designed to produce an unrelated outcome – benefits for animals, which is ultimately caused by putting pressure on the animal abusing company. Workers in animal abusing industries are often in precarious positions, particularly in America where many slaughterhouses use ‘illegal’ or undocumented workers, and this may prevent such workers from securing support from their employers or the police.⁸⁵⁶ Animal activists should not create a situation in which someone leaving their job is seen as a successful protest outcome, because the workers’ precarious position might make it easier for companies to dismiss workers than to increase their security measures. Animal activists might take inspiration from Earth First! activists who supported the organising rights of workers during the Timber Wars and would give notice of tree spiking in advance to avoid harm to humans.⁸⁵⁷ Although I argue that coercive or violent actions against individual workers are contradictory to the ideals of total liberation, it is still possible that activists will believe that the right of the oppressed is more significant than the right of the oppressor and so believe that contradictions will always exist in activism, but such actions are worth pursuing for the potential benefits for animals.

Part of the problem, as Barry Horne’s quotes suggest, is the strict interpretation of the concept of speciesism by some anarchistic animal activists. The parliamentary left favour legislation, however this does not mean that parliamentarians who support animal rights would alter their opinions on the basis of militant direct action by animal rights groups. Perhaps this suggests that parliamentarians and direct action activists could complement each other on particular animal issues. Although the parliamentary left have not typically adopted a total liberation framework, their attitude towards workers in animal abusing industries means they are well placed to formulate difference-respecting coalitions; for instance, one could imagine parliamentary animal activists supporting the workplace struggles of Newchurch employees.

⁸⁵⁶ Indeed, these workers might also face hostility, coercion or racism from the police and employers.

⁸⁵⁷ J. Bari, *Timber Wars* (Monroe, Common Courage Press, 1994).

Conclusion

Considering the class dynamics of animal advocacy in Britain is important for understanding anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy. CAS has often downplayed the significance of class, and so by including class we have seen that the presumed dichotomy between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches is more complex. Rather than ironing out these complexities, and contradictions, to make one coherent narrative which might be seen as the correct method of animal advocacy for contemporary activists, accepting this antinomy is necessary to understanding the place of animal activism in the British left. As we see throughout this thesis, animal activism is far more complex and multifaceted than the original CAS framework set out by Nocella and Best would suggest. We saw in the introduction that Best claims to reject ‘absolute truths, universal values and reductionist models’, yet the original CAS principles do seem to embrace such truths and values in its blanket rejection of reformist politics.⁸⁵⁸ This chapter, and the thesis as a whole, has helped to show that reform and revolution cannot be understood dichotomously in the case of animal rights activism. The original CAS project is based on research into North American and Western European animal activism, indeed the British nature of this study is one of the limitations set out in the introduction, and this may help explain the dichotomous view of reformist and revolutionary action. In other contexts, welfare reform and social revolution are not held in such stark contrast, for instance the Sarvodaya Movement which followed Gandhi in ‘promoting a non-violent revolution in order to transform India into a society of self-governing village republics’ is an example of the blurred boundary between reform and revolution.⁸⁵⁹

The concept of speciesism is particularly complex; it remains the case that anarchistic activists have embraced the concept more than parliamentarians. The acceptance of the concept of speciesism is typically important from a CAS

⁸⁵⁸ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation*, p. 52.

⁸⁵⁹ P. Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (Oakland: PM Press, 2008), p. 531.

perspective, for instance it insures against arguments in favour of hunting wild animals. However, concepts of speciesism can contradict the CAS notion of total liberation if it means that animal activists deny solidarity to oppressed workers in the animal-industrial complex.

It also became clear that there was not a simple split between animal rights/liberation against animal welfare, because some interpretations of animal liberation can allow for the continued suffering of wild animals.

One clear distinction between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches is that the former favour direct action and the latter hope to implement legislation. The situation becomes more complex when we look at the use of coercive or violent tactics by anarchistic animal rights activists, as this may target individual (and interrelatedly exploited) workers. By using extrinsic arguments about human improvements, including arguments about the conditions of agricultural workers, animal activists on the parliamentary left have approached a total liberation framework, but such a framework has not been met because parliamentary activists still typically prioritise human issues and focus on animal welfare rather than rights.

Animal advocates, particularly those who use the concept of speciesism, passionately disagree with a practice that the vast majority of people, those who they hope to influence, actively engage in. Leftists traditionally believed that it was the middle-class, who had no interest in the revolutionary potential of the working-class, who became animal advocates. Certainly, from the earliest work of the RSPCA to the 'vegan hipsters' today, there is a middle class element to veganism.⁸⁶⁰ The Brighton activist Isy Morgenmuffel believes that 'there is definitely a noticeable, dominant history of animal advocacy from a middle class and privileged movement of do-gooders'; however, this is not 'the main factor' as many animal activists 'have moved away from single-issue-politics and frame their critique of the use of animals within a critique of an exploitative society'.⁸⁶¹ Animal advocacy can be regarded as a post-materialist issue to a certain extent, but as the Cowley Club or McLibel activists did, it can be combined with issues such as health, the environment and better working conditions. Some anarchist and parliamentary leftists have neglected animal

⁸⁶⁰ Interview with Isy Morgenmuffel.

⁸⁶¹ Ibid.

concern because human issues were too pressing; in these cases there seems to be an economy of sympathy in which activists would only have time and energy to focus on one struggle, and working and living conditions were prioritised. From a CAS perspective, which recognises the interconnected oppressions of class, gender and species, this economy of sympathy can be overcome.

5. 'Everything fits together': Gender and Animal Advocacy

Introduction

The previous chapter demonstrated that an awareness of class issues shapes the way that the parliamentary left and anarchistic activist groups interact with animal advocacy; and this was particularly important because Critical Animal Studies (CAS) scholarship has a blind spot with regard to class. This chapter discusses the impact that gender and feminist analyses have on these relationships. This is significant, conversely, because CAS scholarship is particularly inspired by feminist scholarship; and so by considering gender and feminist analyses we would expect to find that the initial connections between anarchism and a CAS framework would be confirmed.

Of course, the term 'feminist analyses' holds numerous diverse theories, many of which are unconcerned with animal advocacy; so for the purpose of this chapter we will limit our discussion to looking at the strands which have shown most interest in justice for animals: ecofeminists and anarcha-feminists.⁸⁶² CAS has 'ecofeminist roots' which have led to the 'foregrounding of intersectional analysis and politics' (which includes species in the case of CAS) and the combination of theory and practice by supporting direct action and radical total liberation politics.⁸⁶³ It is also important to include an understanding of gender and feminist analyses because the majority of British animal advocates are female. This statistic is shared by all the national animal rights groups whose representatives were interviewed: the Vegetarians' International Voice for Animals (Viva!) reported that two-thirds of their supporters are female, the League Against Cruel Sports' membership is made up of 75% women, and at least 60% of VegFestUK vegan outreach festival attendees are

⁸⁶² For a broader discussion see the chapter 'Feminism and Animals' In. A. Cochrane, *An Introduction to Animals and Political Theory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

⁸⁶³ N. Taylor, R. Twine, 'Introduction: Locating the "critical" in critical animal studies', In. N. Taylor, R. Twine (eds.), *The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: From the Margins to the Centre* (London: Routledge, 2014), pp. 4-6.

women, although feedback surveys sometimes put this figure as high as 80%.⁸⁶⁴ This chapter, as with the previous chapter, adds context to the three case studies which follow.

The chapter considers the four presumed differences between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches, based on the connection between anarchism and a CAS framework. Firstly, intrinsic arguments that include the concept of speciesism are considered alongside extrinsic arguments about improvements to human society. This is important because arguments about the concept of speciesism often include the claim that speciesism operates in an overlapping way to sexism, and may therefore include the claim that the oppression of women and animals are theoretically connected.

The next section focuses on the presumed dichotomy between anarchists who favour animal rights or liberation and parliamentary leftists in Labour or the Green Party who wish to improve the welfare of animals. Considering an ecofeminist analysis helps clarify this difference because ecofeminists have critiqued the concept of rights.

The chapter then considers the presumed separation between anarchistic activists who favour direct action and the parliamentary left who seek legislative change. In this section we consider the claim of the late ecofeminist writer Marti Kheel that women may turn away from animal activism because of the use of militant direct action.⁸⁶⁵ This section of the chapter also considers the radical feminist rejection of liberal legalism as articulated by Catharine MacKinnon, which could provide theoretical reasons why anarchistic activists are willing to forgo legislative reform.

Finally, the chapter considers the presumed anarchist stress on total liberation and an intersectional framework as opposed to the parliamentary approach in which human and state hierarchy remain unchallenged. The notion of intersectionality that emerged from critical race studies in the late 1980s and early 1990s highlights that

⁸⁶⁴ Interview with Veronika Powell, Viva! Health Officer, 09/04/2014; Interview with Dawn Varley, Director of Fundraising and Campaigns, League Against Cruel Sports, 20/05/14; Interview with Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14. Of course this demographic breakdown does not take into account people who identify as neither male nor female.

⁸⁶⁵ M. Kheel, 'Direct Action and the Heroic Ideal: An Ecofeminist critique'. In: S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.), *Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defence of the Earth* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2006), p. 307.

'subjectivity is constituted by mutually reinforcing vectors of race, gender, class, and sexuality'.⁸⁶⁶ With this understanding it is difficult to regard other animals as intersectional subjects. Nonetheless, anarchists, CAS scholars and ecofeminists highlight the ways in which the treatment of animals intersect with the oppression of other subjugated groups, and this has also been labelled 'intersectionality'.⁸⁶⁷

Background

The vast majority of animal advocates are women; and according to Marti Kheel women 'are disproportionately represented in the more mundane work entailed in running an organization'.⁸⁶⁸ One interviewee who has been active with Stop Huntington Animal Cruelty (SHAC) agrees that women traditionally do the legwork of the movement often performing thankless backroom tasks without recognition as official leaders or theorists.⁸⁶⁹ A traditional link made by the animal rights movement, which sometimes has differing effects, is that just as society once 'diminished women' because of perceived gender differences, it will soon learn 'how utterly arbitrary and irrational it is for human animals to position themselves over nonhuman animals because of species differences'.⁸⁷⁰ Of course, some feminists reject the link between the oppression of women and that of animals entirely, whilst they would also question the implication that patriarchy is a thing of the past. Many feminists, including anarchy-feminists, would reject the essentialist claim that women are naturally more caring and thus more prone to concern for animals. Instead, ecofeminist scholars have demonstrated that the dominance of female animal advocates has been caused by a complex historical process.⁸⁷¹

⁸⁶⁶ J. C. Nash, 'Re-thinking Intersectionality', *Feminist Review*, 89, (2008), pp. 1-15, p. 2.

⁸⁶⁷ Indeed, the ecofeminist definition of intersectionality coincides with Jen Rogue and Abbey Volcano's understanding of 'anarchist intersectionality'. J. Rogue, A. Volcano, 'Insurrection at the Intersection,' In. *Quiet Rumours: An Anarchy-Feminist Reader*, 3rd edn. (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2012), pp. 43-46.

⁸⁶⁸ M. Kheel, 'Direct Action and the Heroic Ideal', p. 312.

⁸⁶⁹ Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC and animal rights activist, 17/01/2014.

⁸⁷⁰ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Introduction: Behind the Mask: Uncovering the Animal Liberation Front', In. *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?*, p. 13.

⁸⁷¹ C. J. Adams, J. Donovan (eds.), *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

The notion of animal advocacy being a ‘women’s issue’, whilst only true in terms of the current and past demographics of the movement, has affected the relationship that animal advocates have had with the parliamentary left and anarchists. Labour politicians have often regarded animal issues as a matter of conscience, outside the scope of party politics; some anarchists have been influenced by ecofeminists and as such may be more likely to include vegetarian or vegan dietary practices as part of a shared collective identity.⁸⁷² However, some left-leaning parliamentary groups, notably the Green Party, also engage with ecofeminist politics, and may be likely to incorporate a concern for other animals.

The Labour Party has traditionally focused on reducing the price of meat; during the 1970s the Party introduced a subsidy rate for the UK pig industry, the priority here being ‘the price which the housewife had to pay’.⁸⁷³ This traditional role led early vegetarian propaganda to target women, who could ensure that their entire family ate meat-free meals.⁸⁷⁴ Animal welfare, and even vivisection, also became seen to some as women’s issues. Jim Fitzpatrick, a pescatarian who became Minister of State for Farming and the Environment during Gordon Brown’s premiership believes that: ‘there’s probably a number of women who think they care more and are more sensitive creatures, and therefore are more passionate about animal welfare’; nonetheless Fitzpatrick does not believe that Labour’s response to animal welfare issues was ‘gender driven’.⁸⁷⁵ Nick Palmer, who served as an MP throughout the Blair years, believes that the idea that animal welfare was a women’s issue ‘never came up in the discussions’, but it was regarded ‘as a conscience issue like abortion and therefore less appropriate for whipped Government legislation’.⁸⁷⁶ However, Labour was not just concerned with the cost of cheap meat; there were those within the movement who recognised that by the late 1970s ‘Labour are losing

⁸⁷² For instance the Anarchist FAQ Editorial Collective write that ‘eco-anarchists recognise that domination of nature and male domination of women have historically gone hand in hand, so that eco-feminism is yet another aspect of eco-anarchism’. [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/the-anarchist-faq-editorial-collective-an-anarchist-faq-06-17>, last accessed 30/04/15].

⁸⁷³ Labour Party Annual Conference Report, 1974, p. 92.

⁸⁷⁴ Some Christian vegetarian groups similarly believed that ‘women’s influence in such a reform is far greater than man’s. It is she who wields the saucepans and kettle, and if only the ladies could be got to refuse to cook dead carcasses, the butcher’s knife would soon cease its murderous work’. J. M. Gilheany, *Familiar Strangers: The Church and the Vegetarian Movement in Britain (1809-2009)* (Cardiff: Ascendant Press, 2010), pp. 68-69.

⁸⁷⁵ Interview with Jim Fitzpatrick, Labour MP, 01/05/2014.

⁸⁷⁶ Interview with Dr. Nick Palmer, Director of Policy, European Coalition to End Animal Experiments, Head of Policy and Government, BUAV, conducted via e-mail, 11/04/2014.

the women's vote, but thousands of those women are animal lovers'.⁸⁷⁷ Labour's new commitment to animal welfare during the 1979 election could have partly been an attempt to secure the female vote.

Anarcha-feminists, who challenge patriarchy both within anarchist circles and in society, have similarly shown concern for other animals.⁸⁷⁸ Peggy Kornegger explains that these feminists work together 'to expand our empathy and understanding of other living things and to identify with these entities outside of ourselves'.⁸⁷⁹ Indeed, anarchism has had a strong influence in UK feminism from the Second Wave onwards.⁸⁸⁰ Josephine Donovan believes that this influence partly stems from key thinkers such as Emma Goldman and includes the belief in prefigurative politics and 'the integrity of the process of change as part of the change itself'.⁸⁸¹ Carol Ehrlich explains the theoretical and practical roots of this influence in her essay 'Socialism, Anarchism and Feminism'; for Ehrlich there is a strong connection between anarchism and feminism because:

All radical feminists and all social anarchist feminists are concerned with a set of common issues: control over one's own body; alternatives to the nuclear family and to heterosexuality; new methods of child care that will liberate parents and children; economic self-determination; ending sex stereotyping in education, in the media, and in the workplace; the abolition of repressive laws; an end to male authority, ownership, and control over women; providing women with the means to develop skills and positive self-attitudes; an end to oppressive emotional relationships; and what the Situationists have called "the reinvention of everyday life".⁸⁸²

Anarchism has had a particularly strong influence on feminism since the Second Wave because, unlike the first generation of feminists and suffragettes, who saw the 'mass entry by women into the state's structures as the means to transform

⁸⁷⁷ A. Pompa to the TUC, 23rd April 1979 (Modern Records Centre).

⁸⁷⁸ M. Wilson, R. Kinna, 'Key Terms', In: R. Kinna (ed.), *The Continuum Companion to Anarchism* (London: Continuum, 2012), p. 331.

⁸⁷⁹ P. Kornegger, 'Anarchism: The Feminist Connection', In: *Quiet Rumours*, p. 30.

⁸⁸⁰ L. Farrow, *Feminism As Anarchism* [viewed online, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/lynne-farrow-feminism-as-anarchism.pdf>, last accessed 20/06/2016].

⁸⁸¹ J. Donovan, *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions* (New York: Continuum, 2012), p. 84.

⁸⁸² C. Ehrlich, 'Socialism, Anarchism and Feminism' [viewed online, <https://libcom.org/library/socialism-anarchism-feminism-carol-ehrich>, last accessed 20/06/2016].

and reform society', Second Wave feminists began to question the ability of the state to create the society they desired.⁸⁸³ Anarchism has particularly influenced feminist anti-statism; as Sharif Gemie explains:

Feminist anti-statism is based on a perception of a profound difference in political cultures: the state's culture is radically different in its morality and its forms from feminist cultures, and therefore the state is unable to work for feminist causes. Women must rely on their own institutions and powers to achieve such goals. On occasion such arguments have been explicitly linked by feminist writers to anarchism.⁸⁸⁴

Despite the strong anarchist influence on feminism, there nevertheless remains a disappointing response by many anarchists to the developments of feminism. Although 'in theory, all anarchists should be feminists, inasmuch as they ought to reject patriarchy, an insidious and still prevalent form of hierarchy and discrimination', anarcha-feminists challenge sexism which is still prevalent within anarchist movements because 'many anarchists have been unable to shed the cultural baggage of a deeply gendered society'.⁸⁸⁵

For the London based Women's Ecology Group it was not possible to 'understand the present human predicament and mass animal suffering... without realising that it is the systematic crushing of the Feminine Principle by patriarchal power that has resulted in the present imbalance of human affairs and has brought about the damaged ecology of the Earth'.⁸⁸⁶ Vegetarianism or veganism became part of the collective identity for these ecofeminists, and was typically part of an all-embracing philosophy or ethic which suggests that different forms of oppression are interconnected and that in order for positive change to be realised both women and animals will have to be freed from 'patriarchal power'. This was the case for a number of radical feminists at the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp who set up a vegan 'zone' at the peace camp.⁸⁸⁷

⁸⁸³ S. Gemie, 'Anarchism and Feminism: A Historical Survey', *Women's History Review*, Vol. 5. No. 3. 1996. pp. 417-444, p. 420.

⁸⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁸⁵ M. Wilson, R. Kinna, 'Key Terms', p. 331.

⁸⁸⁶ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. 1. No. 4. Spring 1985.

⁸⁸⁷ *Vegan Views*, No. 30, Autumn 1983 [viewed online, <http://www.veganviews.org.uk/vv100/vv100earlyyears.html>, last accessed 20/06/2016].

Speciesism

This section considers the presumed dichotomy between anarchistic activists who use intrinsic arguments about the concept of speciesism and animal advocates in the parliamentary left who do not use the concept of speciesism. A consideration of feminist analyses is particularly significant for understanding this difference because speciesism has been described as operating 'like sexism', as 'a form of self-aggrandizing prejudice' and a type of 'Bigotry [that] requires self-deception'.⁸⁸⁸ However, in formulating the connection between sexism and speciesism, some animal advocates have unintentionally offended or denied solidarity to other women, and this has led to a feminist backlash against animal concern. This section also considers whether anarchist and parliamentary left groups have given priority to gender equality.

PETA

PETA, who seek legislative and consumer changes whilst aiming to educate the public about the concept of speciesism, do not necessarily adopt any non-animal ideological position, let alone identify with anarchists or the parliamentary left. Nonetheless, PETA are the largest animal rights organisation in the world - with over 3 million members and annual revenues of over \$30 million – and therefore their actions have a clear impact on how the wider public view animal advocacy.⁸⁸⁹

It is worrying from a CAS position, then, that rather than highlighting the ways that different forms of oppression operate in an intersectional manner, PETA have been criticised for high profile campaigns 'that use sexually objectified women's bodies to capture attention' and repeatedly rely 'on sexism to advance animal

⁸⁸⁸ It is equally claimed that speciesism operates like racism. J. Dunayer, *Animal Equality: Language and Liberation* (Derwood: Ryce, 2001), p. 1.

⁸⁸⁹ PETA, '2012 financial report' [viewed online, <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/learn-about-peta/financial-report/>, accessed 6/3/2014].

issues'.⁸⁹⁰ PETA's adverts routinely show sexualised images of scantily clad women in the position of animals. PETA's campaign equates 'femininity with a body that is always already amenable to consumption by a masculine gaze' and as such makes a mockery of the interconnection of oppression between women and animals.⁸⁹¹

Some high profile leftist feminists, understandably offended by PETA's advertisements, have not only rejected PETA but dismissed the underlying connection between speciesism and sexism (indeed, activists like Penny would not accept the notion that speciesism is a form of oppression).⁸⁹² Laurie Penny was disgusted with the very idea of 'equating women (not men, just women) with animals; portraying women as, variously, pieces of meat or brood-mares... explicitly phrased as no better than animals'.⁸⁹³ Penny is disgusted that PETA would 'behave with such disrespect towards their fellow humans'.⁸⁹⁴ Helen Lewis believes that PETA employ 'SEXY images of violence against women' and that 'tossing around domestic violence imagery in an effort to persuade me to give up eggs and milk' is not going to work.⁸⁹⁵

Penny and Lewis do not engage with the ecofeminist and CAS theorists who have argued that there is a connection between speciesism and sexism. When Penny reacts to women being portrayed as 'pieces of meat' the implication is that whereas this is oppressive to humans, animals can and rightfully should be seen as 'meat'. Nonetheless, animal rights activists may feel that they can learn from this criticism. Maneesha Deckha argues that feminist-led animal rights groups should promote the solidarity between women and other oppressed groups: such a campaign would 'gesture towards the subversive potential of cross-species identification', this strategy could 'lend these images political value and marks them

⁸⁹⁰ M. Deckha, 'Disturbing Images: Peta and the Feminist Ethics of Animal Advocacy', *Ethics and the Environment*, Vol. 13, No. 2, (Autumn 2008), pp. 35-76, p. 37.

⁸⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁸⁹² J. Hochschartner, 'Laurie Penny's species politics are disappointing', 02/11/2012 [viewed online, <http://speciesandclass.com/2014/11/02/laurie-pennys-species-politics-are-disappointing/>, last accessed 18/11/2015].

⁸⁹³ L. Penny, 'Humourless feminazi *1: fuck the animals', Tuesday, 12 May 2009 [viewed online, <http://pennyred.blogspot.co.uk/2009/05/humourless-feminazi-1-fuck-animals.html>, accessed 15/11/2013].

⁸⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹⁵ H. Lewis, 'Why PETA makes me want to eat a barn owl', 16th February 2012, *New Statesman* [viewed online, <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/helen-lewis-hasteley/2012/02/violence-imagery-domestic-peta>, accessed 6/3/2014].

as part of a strategy of resistance'.⁸⁹⁶ PETA's campaign does not fall into this category, it uses sexualised images of women for titillation, and as such contributes to the oppression of women and leaves hierarchical structures unchallenged. As 'discourses supporting injustices against women are intimately connected... to injustices against animals', and PETA's campaign forgets 'other oppressions and hierarchies', then the group's campaign does nothing to challenge the system of society that allows animal abuse to continue.⁸⁹⁷

PETA have also been accused of inappropriately using holocaust imagery. Whatever the justification of such a connection,⁸⁹⁸ PETA's campaign has alienated potential allies in other social justice movements. From a CAS or a leftist position it is tactically and theoretically important to demonstrate that humans and other animals are oppressed in an interwoven manner; leftist animal activists would therefore avoid using tactics that may add to the oppression of a particular group. PETA's adverts, which dehumanise certain individuals by depicting naked women and holocaust victims, seem to add to this oppression. This is troubling for leftist animal advocates who are attempting to educate the public about the concept of speciesism, because PETA 'is routinely seen as the organization that speaks for the entire animal rights movement'.⁸⁹⁹ PETA have prioritised species exploitation above other interrelated forms of oppression. As we have seen, anarchists are more likely to use arguments relating to the concept of speciesism, and so PETA's misuse of such a concept in their advertisements and educational work may be particularly significant for anarchistic animal activists. However, whilst activists who raise the spectre of speciesism should be wary of how it could potentially affect other forms of exploitation, there is no reason why leftist groups, perhaps using Deckha's framework, could not highlight the connections between speciesism, sexism and racism in a genuinely intersectional manner.⁹⁰⁰ Moreover, anarchistic or parliamentary leftist activists who are already committed to the cause of animal rights are unlikely to be swayed by the unsavoury attitudes of some animal rights groups such as PETA, instead they will condemn PETA's actions whilst continuing to

⁸⁹⁶ M. Deckha, 'Disturbing Images', p. 59.

⁸⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁹⁸ C. Patterson, *Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust* (New York: Lantern Books, 2012).

⁸⁹⁹ B. Torres, *Making A Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2007), p. 107.

⁹⁰⁰ M. Deckha, 'Disturbing Images'.

campaign for animal rights in an intersectional manner. Of course, it is also the case that some feminists, including PETA president Ingrid Newkirk, support PETA's activism from a feminist perspective. Newkirk argues that:

Is it odd that a feminist like me, from back in the bra-burning '60s, champions racy protests featuring women wearing little more than body-paint markings that mimic a butcher's diagram?... I believe that supporting women's rights and stripping for a cause go together...

I relate best now to the third-wave feminists who are sick of second-wave feminists—ever so ironically taking the place of repressive fathers and husbands—demanding that women cover ourselves up and “behave.” How dare we expose our bodies to prying eyes! But dare we do, with more feminists daring to do something more important: to challenge the idea that breasts are to be kept covered like a dirty magazine.⁹⁰¹

In contrast to PETA's advertising campaign, the work of Carol Adams, in particular her *Sexual Politics of Meat Slide Show*, has helped to explain the interconnected oppression of women and other animals. The *Sexual Politics of Meat Slide Show*:

is an evolving one-hour dynamic and challenging presentation that uses images of women and animals in contemporary popular culture to discuss oppressive attitudes...It introduces the concept of the absent referent through autobiography and then systematically applies an analysis of how it functions to explain the animalizing of women in contemporary cultural images and the sexualizing of animals used for food. It draws upon images that have been sent from around the world and is constantly being updated as it tracks changes, regressions, and reiterations of the sexual politics of meat in popular culture.⁹⁰²

⁹⁰¹ I. Newkirk, 'Why this feminist would "Rather Go Naked"', 21st March 2016 [viewed online, <http://prime.peta.org/2016/03/feminist-rather-go-naked>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

⁹⁰² C. Adams, 'Sexual Politics of Meat', [viewed online, <http://caroljadams.com/the-spom-slide-show/>, last accessed 17/06/2016]; C. J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (London: Continuum, 2011).

Adams explains that the animal advocacy movement should avoid tactics that stem from male privilege or misogynistic behaviour. Adams believes that tactics should be formed by groups of animal activists discussing what might constitute oppressive behaviour:

We're going to have a group of people who really care about this issue and we're going to make a list of all the tactics that exist and examine them to see if there's either male privilege or misogynist behaviour. And if there's male privilege or misogynist behaviour then we're going to eliminate it.⁹⁰³

In this meeting of animal rights activists, people would ask:

Does the animal movement actually benefit from women's inequality rather than challenging it? So, if we had this meeting and we made a list of all the male privilege or misogynist things we'd eliminate all the anti-fur campaigns that targeted women, we'd eliminate a great deal of PETA's stuff but also anyone who sexualises women to sell the product of animal rights.⁹⁰⁴

In place of campaigns which stem from male privilege and misogyny, new and inventive tactics would be suggested from the group, such as women meditating or weaving webs around sites of animal abuse.⁹⁰⁵

Priority given to gender

A CAS approach that recognises the intersectionality of oppression 'advances a holistic understanding of the commonality of oppressions' and states that institutions such as speciesism and sexism are interlocking and must be challenged simultaneously.⁹⁰⁶ This has presented a problem to both anarchistic and parliamentary leftist activists because both groups may prioritise gender equality over other concerns. Animal rights may be of interest in a future society, but surely,

⁹⁰³ Interview with Carol Adams.

⁹⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁰⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁰⁶ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5. No. 1. (2007), pp. 4-5.

this argument would go, women should gain equality before it is sought for lesser groups. Anarchists like Emma Goldman prioritised equality for women even above the revolution.⁹⁰⁷ This argument changes the emphasis on a variety of issues. For instance, parliamentary campaign groups discussing agricultural practices in Africa might not emphasise the welfare of animals, but highlight the fact that women produce '80% of the food grown in Africa' and 'in the past, women as farmers have virtually been ignored in aid and development programmes'.⁹⁰⁸ Both anarchists and those in the Labour Party have been prepared to prioritise gender equality. When John Denham offered to move his animal welfare proposals to a later time at the 1979 Labour Party conference it was because he was aware that most party members 'wished to prioritize the abortion resolution' that followed his motion.⁹⁰⁹ This shows that despite the argument for intersectionality, it is nevertheless the case that both anarchist and parliamentary left activists often prioritise gender above animal issues.

Rights, Liberation or Welfare

It was presumed that one key difference between anarchistic and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy would be that anarchists would share with CAS the belief that animal liberation or rights is necessary to prevent animal abuse whilst parliamentarians would be satisfied pursuing a welfare agenda. Considering this dichotomy from feminist viewpoints is interesting because some feminists have critiqued the concept of rights.

For the Feminists for Animal Rights (FAR) rights are 'patriarchal concepts that do not represent women's experiences or a feminist mode of allocating resources and respect in the world'; moreover, the terminology of rights 'represents an ordering

⁹⁰⁷ E. Goldman, *Living My Life: In Two Volumes, Volume One* (New York: Dover, 1970/ First Published 1931), p. 187.

⁹⁰⁸ Foundation for Women's Health Research and Development to Judith Hart, 1st November 1985 (Labour History Archive and Study Centre, Hart/13/146).

⁹⁰⁹ Correspondence with John Denham, 03/02/2014.

of the world that is inherently hierarchical, dualistic and competitive'.⁹¹⁰ A further complication with the concept of rights for animals is that it seems to offer priority to those animals who display the most 'human-like' qualities, and therefore is inherently speciesist. For instance, those animals who display a level of 'intelligence' comparable to humans (such as dolphins or non-human great apes) are offered protection as 'honorary humans', whilst it could be argued that intelligence is less significant than the ability to suffer. Moreover, feminists who believe that 'women understand what it means to be deprived of rights based on biological difference' are unwilling to subscribe to the definition of a moral community based on the 'sameness to humans'.⁹¹¹ This understanding of the limitations of the terminology of rights is significant for both anarchists and the parliamentary left, although the former are more likely to critique the term based on the formation of a hierarchical framework and implied need for political authority to grant and secure such rights.

However, some anarchists do accept the concept of rights and this understanding informs their rejection of animal advocacy. For Noam Chomsky, in moral philosophy rights do not exist in a vacuum but are associated with responsibilities; as animals are not attributed any responsibilities – 'we don't say that a lion has to be sent to the gas chamber if it kills a gazelle' – this undermines their case for rights.⁹¹² Anarchistic activists have often been less concerned with the concept of rights and more interested in the concept of solidarity. John Nightingale sets out the importance of solidarity in the thinking of Bakunin, Kropotkin, Bookchin and Chomsky.⁹¹³ However, because animals cannot return this solidarity, some anarchists have argued that they are not appropriate candidates for support. In anarchist strategies, the oppressed group is typically key to liberating itself, members of the group plan prefigurative methods and outcomes, and anarchists – if they do not themselves belong to this group – play a supportive, non-leadership role.⁹¹⁴

⁹¹⁰ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. V. No. 3-4. Summer/Fall, [1990?], p. 1. The group did debate changing their name to avoid the reference to 'rights' in their title.

⁹¹¹ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. V. No. 3-4, p. 3; J. Seager, 'Peperoni or Broccoli?: On the Cutting Wedge of Feminist Environmentalism', *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 167-174, p. 170.

⁹¹² Noam Chomsky, delivering the 2013 Edward W. Said Lecture. Presumably Chomsky would not want anyone 'to be sent to the gas chamber' even if they were aware of their moral responsibilities.

⁹¹³ J. Nightingale, 'The Concept of Solidarity in Anarchist Thought', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Loughborough University, 2015).

⁹¹⁴ B. Franks, *Rebel Alliances: The means and ends of contemporary British Anarchism* (Edinburgh: AK Press and Dark Star, 2006), pp. 119-120.

Peter Gelderloos argues that ‘animal liberation is an oxymoron’ – ‘unless we mean it in the way George W. Bush’ meant liberation for humans - because oppressed groups must liberate themselves, and animals are incapable of doing so.⁹¹⁵ Of course, individual animals can free themselves from places of exploitation, and so in this sense individual animals can liberate themselves. Numerous examples of such resistance are given in Jason Hribal’s work *Fear of the Animal Planet*.⁹¹⁶ Animals may also be unable to liberate themselves because they are denied agency due to the force and totality of human domination; a free animal in the ‘wild’ has the ability to demonstrate agency and develop life choices. Animal rights lawyer Steven Wise explains his belief that

animals are extraordinarily cognitively complex. They have their own cultures, they’re self-conscious, autonomous and self-determining, they have a theory of mind, so they not only know that they have a mind but they know others have a mind. They understand that they’re individuals who existed yesterday and will exist tomorrow. Because when you imprison a chimpanzee, the chimpanzee understands that tomorrow he’s going to be imprisoned, and as far as he knows it’s not going to end.⁹¹⁷

If one accepts Wise’s view, then the fact that animals cannot liberate themselves should not be given as a reason for anarchists to deny solidarity to other animals, because animals desire liberation but are unable to achieve it due to the totality of their oppressed state. Indeed there are examples of chimpanzees that have been taught sign language asking visitors to release them from their zoo cages, and there have also been efforts to get chimpanzees to speak in court explaining that they do not wish to be imprisoned.⁹¹⁸ The Great Ape Project (GAP) recognises the cognitive capabilities of animals and aims to bring about rights for all great apes:

GAP is an international movement created in 1994. The main purpose is to guarantee the basic rights to life, freedom and non-torture of the non-human

⁹¹⁵ P. Gelderloos, *Veganism Is A Consumer Activity* (The Anarchist Library, 2008, retrieved June 22nd 2012), p. 11.

⁹¹⁶ J. Hribal, *Fear of the Animal Planet: The Hidden History of Animal Resistance* (Oakland: AK Press, 2010).

⁹¹⁷ *Unlocking the Cage*, directed by D. A. Pennebaker, C. Hedgedus, (Pennebaker Hedgedus films, 2016), <http://www.unlockingthecagethefilm.com/> [last accessed 02/07/2016].

⁹¹⁸ *Project Nim*, directed by J. Marsh (BBC Films, Passion Pictures, Redbox Films, 2012).

great apes – Chimpanzees, Gorillas, Orangutans and Bonobos, our closest relatives in the animal kingdom.⁹¹⁹

Given the sheer volume of animal (and human) abuse, focusing on the exploitation and imprisonment of a group of animals who are literally asking for solidarity seems to be a sensible stepping stone for activists seeking total animal liberation.

It is clear that the concept of rights can be critiqued from different leftist positions. However, as we will see in the following section it is still true that anarchistic activists favour a philosophy approaching rights or liberation (which will be achieved through direct action) whereas the parliamentary left seek animal welfare measures through legislation.

Direct action and legislation

This section briefly considers the possible dichotomy between anarchists who engage in direct action and the parliamentary left who seek legislative changes. This section considers three claims relating to the split between direct action and legislation as affected by gender: firstly, that the ‘balaclava image’ of direct action activists has had the effect of alienating female activists; secondly, that coercive tactics have targeted women and thus negated the commitment to total liberation; and, finally, that the radical feminist rejection of liberal legalism applies to animal activists who aim to challenge an anthropocentric standpoint.

‘Balaclava image’

In this section we consider whether the militant direct action of some animal rights groups has caused a gender imbalance, and if this has affected the

⁹¹⁹ The Great Ape Project, ‘History’ [viewed online, <http://www.projeto-gap.org.br/en/> last accessed 02/07/2016].

relationship of parliamentary left and anarchist groups to animal advocacy. This is the belief of some ecofeminists; for instance, Marti Kheel argued that women are wary of supporting direct action because 'the uncritical endorsement of *heroic* acts by some militant animal and environmental advocates' may 'inadvertently replicate the violent worldview that the protesters seek to supplant'.⁹²⁰ Carol Adams argues that animal advocates should adopt a 'trauma centred response' which would be more inclusive of women.⁹²¹

Andrew Tyler, director of Animal Aid, believes that 'women are at home' in the animal rights movement.⁹²² This could be because of the 'calls for compassion' associated with the movement, or because of the 'opposition to all forms of hierarchy and oppression' embodied within an animal liberation framework.⁹²³ Although the number of male leaders and theorists is disproportionate to the animal advocacy movement's overall demographic, the approach of the ALF 'has some key affinities with anarchism and radical feminism' in that 'it is about overcoming hierarchy, patriarchy, passivity, and politics as usual'.⁹²⁴ However, there is also a danger that some actions of the animal liberation movement in which direct action tactics are used run counter to the compassionate image that the FAR activists believe attracts female recruits. Patrice Jones explains that there is a dangerous potential for 'disaffected and potentially violent young men to use the ALF as an excuse to vent their anger in inappropriate ways'.⁹²⁵ These young men could be drawn to 'any extreme movement that will help them feel less powerless and alone'.⁹²⁶ One *Arkangel* correspondent, reacting to news of a car bomb, similarly asked: 'what kind of psychos, gun-fanatics and violent misfits will now be drawn to animal liberation'; evidently this correspondent believed that such actions would repel the movement's traditional female recruits.⁹²⁷ Carol Adams agrees that it is problematic when 'the direct action wing of the movement' portray animal advocacy as a *war* because 'to

⁹²⁰ M. Kheel, 'Direct Action and the Heroic Ideal', p. 307. Emphasis in original.

⁹²¹ Interview with Carol J. Adams, 24/04/2015.

⁹²² Interview with Andrew Tyler, Director of Animal Aid, 26/2/2014.

⁹²³ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. II, No. I, Summer/Fall 1985, p. 4.

⁹²⁴ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Introduction: Behind the Mask', p. 19.

⁹²⁵ P. Jones, 'Mothers with Monkeywrenches: Feminist Imperatives and the ALF', In: S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters*, p. 149.

⁹²⁶ Ibid. Paul Joosee makes a similar argument in relation to the ELF: P. Joosee, 'Leaderless Resistance and Ideological Inclusion: The Case of the Earth Liberation Front', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 2007, pp. 351-368, p. 360.

⁹²⁷ V. Graham, 'Beyond the Pale', *Arkangel*, No. 3, p. 37.

be at war upholds gender dominance within the movement while it protects male activists' "manhood".⁹²⁸ CAS scholars should be particularly aware of such claims because of their commitment to intersectional politics.⁹²⁹

Clearly, the use of actions that are perceived to be violent or illegal will separate anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocates. The former will be more willing to support such illegal or extra-parliamentary activities, whereas the latter will reject them. Law breaking, sabotage and direct action are simply not accepted as legitimate tactics among the parliamentary left; and therefore even if one agreed in principle with the ALF's mission, both female and male parliamentary socialists are unlikely to publicly support their actions. However, as we have seen, this is not to say that parliamentary animal advocates would change their beliefs about wider animal rights issues because of the use of confrontational tactics, these recruits may simply stick to a range of other tactics utilised by animal advocates.⁹³⁰

CAS scholars and animal advocates must take on board the arguments of Kheel, Adams, and Jones; however, it is clear from interviews with female animal liberationists, hunt saboteurs and 'SHAC-tivists' that there is no reason to think that female animal activists, or those who adopt anarchistic politics, would not perform militant direct action tactics. Many anarchistic animal advocates would agree with Peter Gelderloos that 'the idea that fighting back somehow excludes women is absurd'.⁹³¹ Moreover, activists can reject nonviolence whilst challenging masculine cultures that may prevail in militant movements: 'arguing against nonviolence and in favour of a diversity of tactics should not imply a satisfaction with the strategies or cultures of past militant groups'.⁹³² Many female hunt sabs are directly involved in physically confronting hunt supporters. Best and Nocella report that women were often singled out 'by pro-hunt thugs', but these direct confrontations allowed women to 'subvert traditional gender roles' whilst challenging 'both the speciesism of the hunt and the patriarchal identities and authority of the hunters'.⁹³³ One hunt saboteur

⁹²⁸ C. J. Adams, 'After MacKinnon: Sexual Inequality in the Animal Movement', In J. Sanbonmatsu (ed.), *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation* (Plymouth: Rowland and Littlefield, 2011), pp. 263-264.

⁹²⁹ N. Taylor, R. Twine, 'Introduction: Locating the "critical" in critical animal studies', pp. 4-5.

⁹³⁰ Interview with Kerry McCarthy.

⁹³¹ P. Gelderloos, *How Nonviolence Protects the State* [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/peter-gelderloos-how-nonviolence-protects-the-state#fn127>, last accessed 30/03/15].

⁹³² Ibid.

⁹³³ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Introduction: Behind the Mask', p. 19.

responded to the implication that women would be less likely to join anti-hunting expeditions because of the potential for violent confrontation by arguing that:

It is very dangerous, I've been doing it since 1981, that's thirty odd plus years, I've been put in hospital several times in that period, I've had a broken knee cap, numerous bashes round the head, I've been shot once and stabbed once. But - saying that - it's not male dominated, its 50:50 male/female. We do find that that the hunt will focus their violence on the male sabs, but not exclusively.⁹³⁴

Whilst former ALF activist Roger Yates recognises that the 'balaclava image' might have put some people off, 'perhaps reminding them too much of the IRA', this was in no way gender specific: 'some men rejected the balaclava image while a couple of the most iconic ALF images of activists in balaclava masks are females'.⁹³⁵ I interviewed both women and men who engaged in militant direct action, and people from different genders who rejected such tactics, and found no correlation that suggested that women would be more likely to reject direct action than would their male comrades. In fact the animal advocacy movement has been 'credited with challenging social norms and hierarchies' because of the prominence of women in the direct action strands of the movement.⁹³⁶

Coercive tactics

Both anarchist and parliamentary left groups have prioritised gender equality above speciesism. It is therefore problematic that animal rights groups have, inadvertently or otherwise, denied solidarity to women. This is particularly problematic for anarchist activists because of their shared use of direct action tactics. As we saw with class in the previous chapter, anarchists may support instances of direct action and be slow to condemn such action even when it has the effect of alienating a group who should be regarded as struggling against an interrelated form

⁹³⁴ Interview with Simon, HSA chair person, 25/04/14.

⁹³⁵ Interview with Roger Yates, former ALF regional press officer, conducted via e-mail, 11/12/2013.

⁹³⁶ Ibid.

of oppression. In these instances anarchistic groups disregard the concept of total liberation. In this section we consider two cases when anarchistic animal rights groups have neglected total liberation by using coercive tactics against women.

In the Spring 1990 issue of *Arkangel* Ronnie Lee and Vivien Smith rounded up recent acts of 'Direct Action' with the news that

[i]n Surrey a woman had her £3,000 silver fox fur coat ripped from her in Guildford when she stopped to ask for directions. The attackers ordered her back into her car without it and told her to leave town immediately.⁹³⁷

The report moved on to the other actions, including bomb threats received at a laboratory in Germany and an arson attack on a pharmaceutical company in Italy.⁹³⁸ One could take issue with all these intimidation tactics, but it is particularly disturbing that the report of violence against a woman by unknown attackers is included in the list of praiseworthy actions without comment. The mention of a prosperous Home Counties town, and the presumed price tag, is seemingly enough to elevate this incident in to a positive action with a legitimate upper-class target. The experience of the woman who had her coat forcibly removed before receiving further threats is not considered. For a movement that is made up predominantly of women, and indeed we do not know the gender of the attackers, this seems a remarkable action to celebrate.⁹³⁹ Much of the anti-fur campaign focuses on convincing women to amend their habits, and there is much anecdotal evidence which suggests that this is often done by using sexist insults about 'pampered women with more money than compassion' being 'dumb animals'.⁹⁴⁰ Indeed, according to one correspondent in *Alive* it was seen as 'tempting for angry vegetarians to... shout personal remarks at each fur coated lady [they see]'.⁹⁴¹ Self-proclaimed animal rights theorist and celebrity speaker Gary Yourofsky, who was once a paid lecturer for PETA and campaigns for legislative changes, even allegedly declared that '[e]very woman

⁹³⁷ *Arkangel*, Issue 2, Spring 1990, p. 28. Emphasis in original.

⁹³⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹³⁹ For a consideration of the sometimes sexist attitude of anti-fur campaigners see: L. Hall, *Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights advocacy in the age of terror* (Connecticut: Nectar Bat Press, 2006).

⁹⁴⁰ T. Liddle, 'Extending the Circle of Compassion: Socialism and Animal Rights', *What's Next*, No. 29, 2004 [viewed online, <http://www.revolutionaryhistory.co.uk/terry-liddle/marxist-writers/liddle/extending-the-circle-of-compassion-socialism-and-animal-rights.htm>, accessed 6/3/2014]. Taken from the Lynx anti-fur campaign: 'It takes up to 40 dumb animals to make a fur coat. But only one to wear it'.

⁹⁴¹ *Alive: The Official Journal of the Vegetarian Society*, March/April 1980, p. 6.

ensconced in fur should endure a rape so vicious that it scars them forever'.⁹⁴² It should be unbelievable that Yourofsky is still welcomed by large sections of the animal rights movement, but perhaps it is less surprising in a movement that, according to Roger Yates, suggests that 'so long as people "care for other animals", then it matters not if they are sexist, racist, or even fascist'.⁹⁴³

Such coercive anti-fur tactics contradict the politics of total liberation, because such action does not only ignore the intersectionality of oppression but actually relies on other forms of domination for such tactics to work. Such actions rely on the context in Britain in which (in 2004) 21 per cent of British women had experienced non-sexual force or threat at some time in their life (compared to 10 per cent of men) and 24 per cent of women had experienced sexual violence (compared to 5 per cent of men).⁹⁴⁴ Such anti-fur tactics rely on the marginalization of victims of misogynistic violence, and the fact that 90 per cent of violent or sexual assaults against women go unreported and only 6 per cent of reported cases end in conviction.⁹⁴⁵ Female comrades inform me that it is not unusual to receive insulting comments from men about their appearance or clothing when walking in public places, indeed 90 per cent of women in Britain experience street harassment between the ages of 11 and 17.⁹⁴⁶ Animal activists who engage in anti-fur catcalling are simply adding to the existing experience of misogynistic abuse. Of course, the perpetrators of the majority of catcalls and threats of violence in wider society are men;⁹⁴⁷ and as such one might ask if the dynamics differ if female animal activists are the ones threatening or insulting

⁹⁴² N. Darom, 'Is vegan superstar Gary Yourofsky an animal savior or a mad militant?', *Haaretz*, 6/11/2012 [viewed online, <http://www.haaretz.com/weekend/magazine/is-vegan-superstar-gary-yourofsky-an-animal-savior-or-a-mad-militant-1.463267>, accessed 6/3/2014]. Whilst not acknowledging that quote, Yourofsky claims that: 'Exploiting women is one of many stupid, immoral tactics that PETA uses. Exploiting one being to help stop the exploitation of another is backwards, and won't work. I have never used that tactic in 17+ years', Correspondence with Gary Yourofsky, 07/03/2014.

⁹⁴³ Roger Yates Interview; this is not Roger Yates' view, he is commenting on the 'very dangerous' view of some animal advocates that poses 'a major threat to the already difficult business of building alliances with other social justice movements'.

⁹⁴⁴ R. Connell, *Gender: In World Perspectives* (Cambridge: Polity, 2009); no figures were given representing violence against transgender people.

⁹⁴⁵ University of Surrey, 'Between 70-90% of rapes thought to go unreported', [viewed online, http://www.surrey.ac.uk/mediacentre/press/2009/16532_between_7090_rapes_thought_to_go_unreported_and_94_of_reported_cases_dont_end_in_a_conviction.htm, last accessed 17/06/2016].

⁹⁴⁶ R. Sanghani, 'Catcalling happens to most women between the ages of 11 and 17', *Daily Telegraph*, 29th May 2015, [viewed online, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/womens-life/11637697/Catcalling-Women-sexually-harassed-on-the-street-from-puberty.html>, last accessed 17/06/2016].

⁹⁴⁷ Rape Crisis, 'Myths vs Realities' [viewed online, <http://rapecrisis.org.uk/mythsvsrealities.php>, last accessed 03/07/2016].

other women about fur clothing. Such actions strike me as a colossal breach of solidarity. Animal activists should be proud of the fact that they are trying to create a more compassionate world, and this compassion can come through the tactics activists employ. Activists of all genders can take a trauma centred response in which they recognise that almost one in four women in Britain has been the victim of sexual threat or force at some point in their lives and therefore animal activists of all genders would not engage in anti-fur catcalls which could trigger traumatic memories and rely on the existing marginalization of women in patriarchal society.

However, other campaign groups focus solely on the companies producing and selling fur rather than the consumers. For instance, the campaign group CALF (Campaign Against Leather and Fur), founded by ex-ALF press officer Robin Lane, aimed to raise awareness of such products within the animal rights movement, and would not target individual women.⁹⁴⁸

Intimidation tactics seem to continue; as a result of alleged SHAC actions 'female employees of HLS or HLS associates have been threatened with sexual assault and followed home from work'.⁹⁴⁹ American journalist Will Potter records one incident that targeted Theresa Kushner, a senior veterinarian at Huntingdon Life Sciences, in which Kushner's underpants

were advertised for auction on a fetish website, and the communiqué said: "Even if the item gets taken down from bidding, you can be assured, Terry, tonight some pervert will be jacking off to your dirty underwear". It ominously ended with, "Oh and did we forget to mention that all interested buyers will also receive your address and telephone number and an invitation to come over"?⁹⁵⁰

One would expect these examples of intimidation to be singled out and rejected by the animal rights movement, particularly amongst leftist animal advocates who highlight the intersectionality of oppression; however this does not seem to be the case. Indeed, SHAC saw fit to include the last item on their website.

⁹⁴⁸ Interview with Robin Lane, ex-ALF Press Officer, 8/03/2014.

⁹⁴⁹ D. R. Liddick, 'The Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements', In. G. Michael (ed.), *Extremism in America* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2014), p. 262.

⁹⁵⁰ W. Potter, *Green Is The New Red: An Insider's Account of a Social Movement Under Siege* (San Francisco: City Lights, 2011), p. 110.

Such an attitude has complicated the relationship between anarchism and a CAS framework because it goes against the concept of total liberation and anarchistic groups have not universally rejected such sexist tactics. Examples of coercive tactics and coercive sexism are less clearly identified in the animal welfare branches of the parliamentary left. However, as groups such as the Vegan Feminist Network explain, sexism is also prevalent in welfare strands of the movement with gendered role distributions, the objectification of women in activism, and sexual harassment within the movement, and these gender relations are maintained by a coercive social system of oppressive relations.⁹⁵¹

Law

A vital difference between the anarchist and parliamentary conceptions of animal advocacy is the latter's confidence in a state solution to the problem of animal abuse. Anarchist activists look to non-state solutions because they typically believe that 'law and capitalism are intimately connected, that law's basic norm is the protection of private property, that the entire system of laws and courts are built on/to serve this basic notion [of property]'.⁹⁵² A radical feminist approach supports the anarchist belief that legislative solutions will not amend oppressive social relations.⁹⁵³

Recent animal rights theories (those which do not adopt a CAS framework) rely on the conviction that a legislative solution to the abuse of animals is desirable. Alasdair Cochrane believes that states could make their citizens comply with an interest-based rights approach 'where rights serve to protect certain of the most

⁹⁵¹ Vegan Feminist Network, 'Understanding Sexism' [viewed online, <http://veganfeministnetwork.com/resources/what-vegans-should-know-about-patriarchy/>, last accessed 20/11/2015]; C. Wrenn, 'Sexism as a tactic in animal rights advocacy', 18/01/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.onegreenplanet.org/animalsandnature/sexism-as-a-tactic-in-animal-rights-advocacy/>, last accessed, 20/11/2015].

⁹⁵² Interview with anonymous anarchist activist, conducted via e-mail, 25/09/14.

⁹⁵³ For different feminist approaches to the state see: E. Cudworth, 'Feminisms: the Gendering of the State', in: E. Cudworth, T. Hall, J. McGovern, (eds.), *The Modern State: Theories and Ideologies* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007).

important aspects of an entity's well-being'.⁹⁵⁴ Robert Garner develops a 'nonideal theory of justice for animals' in the belief that in the current, and foreseeable, economic, political and social climate such an approach will achieve greater success than the abolitionist animal rights position. Moreover, a theory framed around a notion of *justice* is more likely to influence state legislatures, which is Garner's immediate goal. In fact, Garner argues that all non-justice-based approaches are weak 'because they are less likely to justify state enforcement'.⁹⁵⁵

Most animal advocates, including animal liberation activists engaging in direct action, demand legislation as a realistic victory point. ALF activists in America believed it was 'time for a government by the people for the people... and earth'.⁹⁵⁶ ALF founder Ronnie Lee, who has moved away from anarchism since forming the group, maintains that there must be some legislative coercion to prevent people from abusing animals.⁹⁵⁷

Anarchist animal advocates and CAS scholars would argue that it is misguided to prioritise state legislation as a means of ending animal abuse. Radical feminist theorist Catharine MacKinnon argues that feminists will only make minor gains through laws in 'male supremacist societies'.⁹⁵⁸ The same framework can be applied to animal activists in anthropocentric societies. MacKinnon argues that, in the liberal state, laws appear 'neutral, abstract, elevated, [and] pervasive' and as such institutionalised power of a dominant group over an oppressed group is made to 'seem a feature of life, not a one-sided construct imposed by force for the advantage of a dominant group'.⁹⁵⁹ For MacKinnon, the fact that law is seen as legitimate makes the social dominance that law upholds become invisible:

⁹⁵⁴ A. Cochrane, *Animal Rights Without Liberation: Applied Ethics and Human Obligations* (Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2012), p. 204.

⁹⁵⁵ R. Garner, *A Theory of Justice for Animals: Animal Rights in a Nonideal World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 2.

⁹⁵⁶ R. Coronado, *Flaming Arrows: Collected Writings of Animal Liberation Front Warrior Rod Coronado* (IEF Press, 2007), p. 20.

⁹⁵⁷ Interview with Ronnie Lee, ALF founder, 25/04/2013.

⁹⁵⁸ C. A. MacKinnon, *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 238.

⁹⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p. 238.

Liberal legalism is thus a medium for making male dominance both invisible and legitimate by adapting the male point of view in law at the same time as it enforces that view on society.⁹⁶⁰

Similarly, anarchist animal activists would argue that legal changes in anthropocentric societies will not challenge the speciesist standpoint that liberal legalism legitimises; these anarchists do not regard the state as a neutral tool, instead they believe that the state is inherently opposed to animal rights ends, and as such campaigning for legal changes may further legitimise the liberal state and the animal oppression it upholds. Moreover, anarchist animal activists may point to the continued exploitation and oppression of human groups at the hands of states, and suggest that it is unlikely that states that have been prepared to treat humans instrumentally will be willing to change the status of animals. Even Robert Garner, who believes in legislative changes, highlights cases of states conducting experiments, including vivisection, on human subjects.⁹⁶¹

By considering the dichotomy between direct action and legislation whilst focusing on gender it becomes clear that not all forms of direct action adopted by anarchistic animal activists fit into a CAS framework because some actions do not fit with total liberation and anarchist activists have not universally rejected sexist tactics. Catharine MacKinnon's rejection of legal reforms from a radical feminist standpoint helps explain the anarchist rejection of legislative solutions. However, even direct action activists associated with the ALF do not rule out the possibility of achieving certain legislative reforms.

Total Liberation and Intersectionality

The final section of this chapter considers the CAS concepts of total liberation and intersectionality that we might expect anarchistic activists to hold; the parliamentary left are less likely to accept these concepts. It is particularly interesting to consider these issues in relation to feminist analyses because the concept of

⁹⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 237.

⁹⁶¹ R. Garner, *A Theory of Justice for Animals*, p. 156.

intersectionality has been developed by ecofeminists to include all animals.⁹⁶² The section starts by considering the intersectional approaches to campaigns against the dairy industry before looking at animal advocates who oppose all forms of hierarchy and concluding by considering animal activists who combine animal advocacy with environmentalism.

Intersectional campaigns

One difference between anarchist and parliamentary left conceptions of animal advocacy, as clarified by considering gender, is that the two ideological groupings react differently to the concept of intersectionality. It is clear from my interviews that anarchists are more likely to believe, as Louise Michel did, that ‘everything fits together’, that all systems of domination (including speciesism) are related and must be challenged simultaneously.⁹⁶³ Members of the Green Party and Labour Party who are particularly concerned with animal issues also recognised that that different forms of oppression overlap, for instance they highlighted the environmental dangers of the meat and dairy industry or the impact of world hunger. However, this approach is not typical of the parliamentary left. The Labour Party has campaigned against different forms of oppression, such as racial discrimination and sex discrimination, but has been accused of ‘single-axis thinking’ in failing to recognise intersectionality and therefore creating ‘a sense of hierarchy or competition among marginalized groups’.⁹⁶⁴ For instance, Labour’s attempts to select more women and ethnic minority candidates resulted in ‘debates that frame women and ethnic minorities as competitors’ and benefited only certain sub-groups ‘namely white women and ethnic minority men’.⁹⁶⁵ The Green Party are more likely

⁹⁶² C. J. Adams, L. Gruen (eds.), *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals and the Earth* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

⁹⁶³ L. Michel, B. Lowry, E. E. Gunter, (eds.), *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel* (Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1981), p. 197.

⁹⁶⁴ M. L. Krook, M. K. Nugent, ‘Intersectional Institutions: Representing Women and Ethnic Minorities in the British Labour Party’, European Consortium for Political Research [viewed online, <http://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/efa38872-8271-4dd6-9e15-bb24267dd7d4.pdf>, last accessed 23/11/2015].

⁹⁶⁵ Ibid.

to accept the idea of intersectionality; however this has not been extended to include animals.⁹⁶⁶

The concept of intersectionality relates to Kimberlé Crenshaw's approach which outlines the way that different social categories of power such as gender, race and class function in an overlapping way or rely on the same groundings such as dismissal of the 'other'. Intersectionality could theoretically show how categories such as gender, race and class overlap, or focus on how intersectionality is experienced by an individual who is oppressed in a variety of ways.⁹⁶⁷ Anarchists, often embracing ecofeminism, recognise that the first concept of intersectionality is pivotal to understanding multi-faceted systems of domination and attempting to resist them. Anarcha-feminists would agree 'that all oppression, whether based on race, class, sex or lesbianism, is interrelated and the fights for liberation must be simultaneous and cooperative'.⁹⁶⁸ Significantly, ecofeminists have included species within their understanding of intersectionality. Carol Adams and Josephine Donovan were the first to argue that the power relations of gender and species intersect, although, perhaps unsurprisingly 'much recent feminist work specifically on the concept of intersectionality... makes no references to... the question of the animal'.⁹⁶⁹

Clearly, Crenshaw's first approach, which theoretically shows how categories intersect, can apply to both gender and species. Both forms of oppression rely on hierarchical power systems which reduce the subject's body to a commodity for profit. Correspondents to the *New Vegetarian* certainly believed that 'attitudes required for animal exploitation are the same [as those] required for [the] exploitation of women'.⁹⁷⁰ As feminist-vegetarian Roberta E. Farr argued, to be consistent vegetarianism 'surely demands that all instrumentalization and use as means to an

⁹⁶⁶ M. Arthurs, 'All liberation struggles are important – why the Green Party must embrace intersectionality', 20/11/2015 [viewed online, <http://bright-green.org/2015/11/20/all-liberation-struggles-are-important-why-the-green-party-must-embrace-intersectionality/>, last accessed 23/11/2015].

⁹⁶⁷ R. Twine, 'Intersectonal Disgust? Animals and (eco)feminism', *Feminism & Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 3, 2010, pp. 397-406, p. 398.

⁹⁶⁸ C. Ehrlich, 'Socialism, Anarchism and Feminism', in *Quiet Rumours*, p. 57.

⁹⁶⁹ R. Twine, 'Intersectional Disgust?', p. 400, p. 402.

⁹⁷⁰ *New Vegetarian*, March 1977, p. 11.

alien end of any living being, human or animal, be resolutely opposed'.⁹⁷¹ Of course it is not just gender, but other social categories such as class and race, which rely on the same power systems.⁹⁷² Some feminists, such as Kathryn Paxton George, have rejected the idea that species can relate to the lived experience of intersectionality, which more readily applies to social locations of race, gender and class.⁹⁷³ For many anarchists, or ecofeminists, the connection is clear:

In a patriarchal society women and animals are: beaten, raped, hated, enslaved as pets, exploited as wives, sold for money, used for entertainment, cheap labour, sex, experiments, referred to as chicks, bitches, pussies, foxes, dogs, cows.⁹⁷⁴

Adams and Donovan argue that women are oppressed both *as women*, and because they are verbally lowered to the status of animals through these insults. Many ecofeminists have adopted veganism because of their belief that eating eggs and milk amounts to the exploitation of the feminine, as it is female animals who are exploited for their production.

Erika Cudworth explains that 'farmed animals are disproportionately female' and are 'feminized in terms of their treatment', because they are exploited for their reproductive functions, 'by predominantly male human agricultural workers': 'female and feminized animals are bred, incarcerated, raped, killed and cut into pieces, in gargantuan numbers, by men'.⁹⁷⁵ Animals are 'feminized' in the manner explained by Catherine MacKinnon who writes that to be 'victimized in certain ways may mean to be feminized' because 'gender is an outcome of the social process of subordination that is only ascriptively tied to body... Femininity is a lowering that is imposed; it can be done to anybody and still be what feminine means'.⁹⁷⁶ The most striking symbol

⁹⁷¹ *The Vegetarian*, supplement to *Alive: The Official Journal of the Vegetarian Society*, October 1978, p. 8.

⁹⁷² John Sanbonmatsu highlights the manner in which 'the animal': 'rests at the intersection of race and caste systems' because of the way that human 'others' are degraded to a lower level through use of animal metaphors. J. Sanbonmatsu, 'Introduction', In: J. Sanbonmatsu (ed.), *Critical Theory*, p. 11.

⁹⁷³ K. P. George, *Animal, Vegetable, Or Woman?: A Feminist Critique of Ethical Vegetarianism* (Albany, New York: Suny Press, 2000).

⁹⁷⁴ *Arkangel*, Issue 21, (no date, c. 1999), p. 4.

⁹⁷⁵ E. Cudworth, 'Intersectionality, Species and Social Domination', paper presented to the Anarchism and Other Animals panel at the Anarchist Studies Network 2.0 Conference, University of Loughborough, 3rd-5th September 2012.

⁹⁷⁶ C. J. Adams, 'After MacKinnon', p. 265, quoting from: C. A. MacKinnon, *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State*. Indeed, Cudworth explains that: 'regardless of sex, animals are feminized

of this feminised treatment is the ‘rape rack’, as depicted in the 1982 documentary *The Animals Film*, in which sows are ‘impregnated forcefully either by physical restraint and mounting by a boar, [or] artificial insemination, [whilst] being tethered to a “rape rack” for easy access’.⁹⁷⁷ The ALF have sometimes adopted this intersectional approach; after one raid the group ‘left the ALF calling card accompanied with a mink paw encircled within the female symbol for the mink mothers... whose young the ALF were unable to rescue’.⁹⁷⁸ Another ALF communiqué stated that

[a]s women in the A.L.F., we feel the connection between the infringement of our reproductive freedom and that of the mink... For these reasons we seek to destroy their oppression as well as our own.⁹⁷⁹

This explains the slogan that ‘milk comes from a grieving mother’. It is not just anarchists or ecofeminists who use this argument. For instance, the British animal rights group Viva!, who seek legislative and consumer changes, promote a ‘Mother’s Day Action’ which campaigns on behalf of ‘Britain’s hardest working mothers’: dairy cows.⁹⁸⁰ Veronika Powell, Viva!’s health officer who was responsible for the campaign, explains the rationale of campaigning during the week of Mother’s Day as:

Just pointing out the basic paradox of... celebrating our mothers and obviously paying them all the attention and respect they deserve whilst abusing other mothers that are just of a different species, and it happens on a massive scale... it’s not a particularly new or original idea, but it’s just pointing out that the very base of the dairy farming is just abusing mothers and taking their babies away so we can drink their milk.⁹⁸¹

metaphorically by slaughterhouse staff in terms of the use of gendered terms of abuse (cunt, slag, bitch, dozy cow)’. E. Cudworth, *Social Lives With Other Animals: Tales of Sex, Death and Love* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 132.

⁹⁷⁷ C. J. Adams, *Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the Defence of Animals* (New York: Continuum, 1995), p. 98. *The Animals Film* (Directed by V. Schonfeld, M. Alaux, 1982).

⁹⁷⁸ Western Wildlife Unit of the Animal Liberation Front, *Memories of Freedom* (The Anarchist Library, retrieved on May 21st 2012), p. 11, p.21.

⁹⁷⁹ Quoted in. D. Kuipers, *Operation Bite Back: Rod Coronado’s War to Save American Wilderness* (London: Bloomsbury, 2010), p. 120.

⁹⁸⁰ Viva, ‘White Lies’ [viewed online, <http://www.whitelies.org.uk/take-action/mothers-week-action>, accessed 14/03/14].

⁹⁸¹ Interview with Veronika Powell, Viva! Health Officer, 09/04/2014.

The campaign was not aimed at women more than men, but the group are aware that ‘women are more sensitive to most of our work and what we do as an organisation’.⁹⁸² Perhaps groups who highlight the plight of animals as females are ignoring the situation for male animals, who may be killed at birth or raised for their meat. In this instance Viva! are employing every persuasive weapon they can, whilst simultaneously campaigning against the treatment of calves that are raised for veal.⁹⁸³

Another ‘mother’s day action’ by Viva! focused on the plight of sows in farrowing crates.⁹⁸⁴ To promote the campaign Viva! enlisted the support of celebrities such as Heather Mills and the Labour MP Kerry McCarthy, who held placards in front of replica crates. McCarthy worries about these Mothers’ Day campaigns ‘partly because it appeals to sentimentality, [and] plays into the idea that veganism is all about: “oh those poor cows, we should be nice to them on mother’s day, they’re mothers too”. But the logic, the cold hard arguments get lost in the mix; if people just... equate cows with mothers they don’t necessarily read beyond that and see the way the dairy industry works’.⁹⁸⁵ McCarthy labels this type of campaigning ‘the sentimental approach’, and although such an approach may prove successful, McCarthy is still wary, believing that

you can probably highlight the cruelty [of] sows being kept in crates where they can’t turn around, they can’t get the nutrition they need – I don’t know if tying it in with mother’s day – it might be a bit anthropomorphic – I don’t really like being labelled an animal lover... that sounds a bit like I’m sitting there going “oh those poor little calves, those poor little chicks” or whatever, I’m just more horrified by the cruelty and there’s quite a lot of logical arguments on the environmental side, the health side is really fascinating the extent to which they cover up the impact of diets which are heavy in red meat.⁹⁸⁶

McCarthy does not link her wariness of the ‘sentimental approach’ to gender; however, it could be because such emotional pleas are seen as matters of

⁹⁸² Ibid.

⁹⁸³ Viva, ‘Veal: Babies on the menu’ [viewed online, <http://www.viva.org.uk/what-we-do/condemned-to-a-crate>, accessed 29/04/14].

⁹⁸⁴ Viva, ‘The Farrowing Crate: Factsheet’ [viewed online, <http://www.viva.org.uk/resources/campaign-materials/fact-sheets/farrowing-crate>, accessed 13/05/14].

⁹⁸⁵ Interview with Kerry McCarthy.

⁹⁸⁶ Ibid.

conscience and therefore not legitimate issues for party politics, and this may be linked to the traditional position of animal welfare as a women's issue.

Parliamentarians may also highlight the connections between vegetarianism and health and environmental benefits, which is possibly an easier selling point to the public at large than calls for compassion alone.

The parliamentary left have a different understanding of intersectionality than those offered by anarcho-feminists; certainly few parliamentary interviewees mentioned the ways in which different categories of social power intersect and must be challenged simultaneously. Vegan and former Labour MP Cathy Jamieson, has never 'associated animal rights directly with feminism', but when she worked in child protection she became aware of the links between animal abuse and the neglect or abuse of children.⁹⁸⁷ Similarly, former MP Chris Williamson believes that there are interconnections which are important to highlight, but again this is not in terms of overlapping categories of oppression but because 'some research has been done that suggests that people who are cruel to animals have a propensity to abuse people as well'.⁹⁸⁸ Laura Drew and Niki Taylor believe that to discuss intersections in this manner, in which priority is given to human abuse, is not enough because 'we need to fully rethink our epistemological heritage and framework'.⁹⁸⁹ After such a rethink, Jamieson and Williamson would not frame their arguments in a way that suggests that animal abuse must be restricted to prevent a possible escalation into abuse against humans, but that it must be stopped for its own sake. Williamson also recognises that consuming meat has an impact on the environment and the life of subsistence farmers, so issues are connected in these ways. Of course, parliamentary leftists could accept the intersectionality of human groups, even if individual MPs do not use this terminology, but they may not highlight the ways that different forms of oppression intersect in the context of animals.

Whereas anarchistic activists are likely to use the concept of intersectionality in relation to the concept of total liberation; parliamentary left politicians seem reluctant to do so, either because such arguments seem overly 'sentimental' and

⁹⁸⁷ Interview with Cathy Jamieson, Labour MP, via e-mail, received on 23/04/2014.

⁹⁸⁸ Interview with Chris Williamson, Labour MP, 4/04/2014.

⁹⁸⁹ L. Drew, N. Taylor, 'Engaged Activist Research: Challenging Apolitical Objectivity', In A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Social Justice Approach for Liberation* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014), p. 164.

therefore would not be seen as a suitable party-political issue, or because human abuse is still seen to be of paramount importance, and therefore some form of species hierarchy remains in place.

Against all hierarchy

One related difference between anarchist and parliamentary left conceptions of animal activism is that anarchists are more likely to accept the premise that animal advocacy entails an opposition to all forms of hierarchy. This relates to a clear ideological difference between anarchists and the parliamentary left in that anarchists – following the work of Murray Bookchin and others – are opposed to all systems of hierarchy. Indeed, for Bookchin, hierarchy is the broader notion which helps explain how class and state society function:

By hierarchy, I mean the cultural, traditional, and psychological systems of obedience and command, not merely the economic and political systems to which the terms class and state most appropriately refer.⁹⁹⁰

Bookchin explains that human domination of nature is related to hierarchies within human social relationships. Bob Torres expands Bookchin's work in relation to animals to explain that:

Only by recognising society along radically anti-hierarchical lines, might we live *in* nature rather than *above* nature... if we live in hierarchy and domination over one another, we translate that into our understanding of, and relations with, nature.⁹⁹¹

For Torres, this hierarchy is seen in human domination over other species. Therefore, the inclusion of intersectionality and opposition to hierarchy is built in to anarchist theory. This is one possible ideological difference between anarchist and

⁹⁹⁰ M. Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy* (New York: Black Rose Books, 1991), p. 4.

⁹⁹¹ B. Torres, *Making A Killing*, pp. 80-81.

parliamentary left conceptions of animal advocacy; although the anarchist opposition to hierarchy does not necessarily include species hierarchy.

Feminist animal activists have articulated the opposition to all forms of hierarchy. Feminists for Animal Rights (FAR) activists rejected any hierarchy, including that within the movement which 'produced "stars" or were run by leaders' and seemingly mirrored 'one of the aspects of patriarchy that feminists are fighting against'.⁹⁹² Many feminist groups tied their opposition to hierarchy to the belief in the power of non-violent civil disobedience, because such tactics did not need an institutional leader. Non-violent tactics were important for a non-hierarchical framework because 'for many women [they have] come to symbolise the living enactment of feminist principles' in that such action 'invokes opposition to violence and exploitation and yet it does not employ the violent tactics of those that exploit'.⁹⁹³ Significantly, the use of such direct action tactics led to a shared sense of political affinity and collective identity between feminist animal activists and the wider anarchist movement; because the tactics themselves were a key component of such an identity.⁹⁹⁴ Once these identity links were formed between anarchists and feminist animal activists because of the shared use of tactics, other elements of a shared identity may have increased, for instance vegetarian or vegan dietary habits became a part of this collective identity.⁹⁹⁵

Some feminist animal activists have also rejected 'order' when it is interpreted to mean 'hierarchical dominance', and thus called for a more 'disordered' relational mode 'that does not rearrange the context to fit a master paradigm but sees, accepts, and respects the environment'.⁹⁹⁶ Again, such arguments link feminist animal activists to an anarchistic worldview. The rejection of hierarchy by many feminist animal activists has meant that, for such activists, it would be contradictory to call for tougher laws or state enforcement to end animal abuse, as they believe animal abuse exists because of 'hierarchical dominance' that laws would only strengthen.

⁹⁹² *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, No. 1. Undated, p. 2.

⁹⁹³ *Feminists for Animal Rights Newsletter*, Vol. 1. No. 3, Winter 1984, p. 2. Of course other anarchists, including anarcho-feminists, are prepared to use a diversity of tactics which does not rule out violence.

⁹⁹⁴ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), p. 127.

⁹⁹⁵ N. Fiddes, 'Declining Meat: Past, Present... and Future Imperfect?', In. P. Caplan (ed.), *Food, Health and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 256.

⁹⁹⁶ J. Donovan, 'Animal Rights and Feminist Theory', *Signs*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Winter, 1990), pp. 350-375. p. 370.

This leads to a distinction between anarchistic and parliamentary left conceptions of animal advocacy because for parliamentarians, and for numerous animal rights activists, progressive legislation is the end point which they seek. Many non-anarchist animal advocates would agree with Gary Yourofsky, on this point if little else, that justice can be created whilst hierarchies remain in place because 'People in power don't have to rule like Stalin. They could rule with a loving hand instead of an iron fist'.⁹⁹⁷ For former Labour MP Chris Williamson, the 2004 Hunting Act 'put the people who want to abuse animals on the wrong side of the law' and animal advocates can 'use that law against them'.⁹⁹⁸ Indeed, Williamson believes that animal advocates should 'work to get legislation because ultimately that is the best sabotage of an activity... if you make it illegal you can bring the instruments of the state down against the perpetrators of cruelty'.⁹⁹⁹ Clearly, parliamentary leftists are unlikely to link animal advocacy to ending all forms of hierarchy if it includes the hierarchy of the state. Labour animal activists such as Cathy Jamieson are 'acutely aware of the links between abuse of animals and neglect/abuse of children', and as such it is possible for parliamentary leftists to recognise the hierarchical oppression of women and animals.¹⁰⁰⁰ However, the 'single-axis thinking' of such parliamentarians means that these oppressive social relations are not resisted in an intersectional manner.

Environmentalism

Many strands of anarchism also share with many feminists a concern for nature and respect for all life, indeed these interests are so prominent that they help sustain the shared sense of collective identity between anarchist and radical environmental groups. Certainly this is the case in Brighton where anarchists provide vegan meals for environmental campaigners.¹⁰⁰¹ The ecofeminist vision of 'a world where humans recognise they are part of nature rather than separate from it, and

⁹⁹⁷ Interview with Gary Yourofsky, conducted via e-mail, received on 07/03/2014.

⁹⁹⁸ Interview with Chris Williamson.

⁹⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Interview with Cathy Jamieson, then Labour MP, conducted via e-mail received on 23/04/2014.

¹⁰⁰¹ Interview with Isy Morgenmuffel, Cowley Club activist, received via e-mail, 17/12/2013.

where relations are non-hierarchical and non-competitive' seems to belong to the environmental sub-culture which includes more anarchistic elements than those which fit a traditional parliamentary left worldview.¹⁰⁰² However, Green Party politicians have gained 'begrudging respect from activists' with anarchistic activists sometimes recognising 'that there are similar concerns and sometimes even a shared fight'.¹⁰⁰³ It is still typically anarchists who accept the belief that all things are interconnected and who are more likely to critique corporations who hold an image of 'nature as a female to be dominated'.¹⁰⁰⁴ This can be seen from Emma Goldman's publication of the *Mother Earth* journal to current anarchistic pronouncements from the ELF and ALF describing the spirit of the earth as female, as well as among anarcho-feminist groups who draw parallels between the exploitation of women and nature.¹⁰⁰⁵ Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva explain the ecofeminist role of looking for connections where capitalist patriarchy is engaged: 'those involved look not only at the implications.... for women, but also for animals, plants, for agriculture'.¹⁰⁰⁶

From my interviews and through consulting anarchist, leftist, environmental and animal rights literature, it is the case that anarchists are more likely to make connections between animal liberation and environmental destruction. This is partly due to a shared use of language among some environmentalists and anarchists that is not shared by the traditional parliamentary left (although it is common in the Green Party). However, it would be wrong to say that the parliamentary left do not care about environmental destruction or recognise the connections between climate change and the meat and dairy industry. Of the three vegan MPs who served in the 2010-2015 parliament, all mentioned environmental benefits as a significant reason for maintaining and promoting a vegan diet. Although parliamentarians may reject, or simply not use, the concept of 'nature as a female', this by no means implies that they are less able to incorporate animal rights into their environmental campaigning. Moreover, the Green Party do engage with an ecofeminist and environmental activist

¹⁰⁰² S. J. Scholz, *Feminism: A Beginner's Guide* (Oxford: One World, 2010), p. 124.

¹⁰⁰³ Interview with Isy Morgenmuffel.

¹⁰⁰⁴ J. Donovan, 'Animal Rights and Feminist Theory', p. 364. Some ecofeminists reject this gendering of nature because it 'tends to perpetuate Eurocentric gender stereotypes... and does not improve real material conditions for women or nature'. G. Gaard, 'Toward New EcoMasculinities, EcoGenders, and EcoSexualities', In. C. J. Adams, 'forward', In. L. Kemmerer, (ed.), *Sister Species: Women, Animals and Social Justice* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2011), p. 233.

¹⁰⁰⁵ R. Coronado, *Flaming Arrows*, p. 17.

¹⁰⁰⁶ M. Miles, V. Shira, 'Ecofeminism', In. S. Kemp, J. Squires, (eds.), *Feminisms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 499-500.

worldview. Certainly, Caroline Allen, the Green Party's National Animal Spokesperson, believes that the Greens 'are a campaigning organisation as well [as a political party] and we will often be in campaigns alongside those [more radical] groups'.¹⁰⁰⁷ The Green Party, through their Animal Protection manifesto, seek to show that British citizens must 'improve your environment and reduce animal suffering at the same time'; this concept is part of the Green's 'key philosophy' which stresses that the planet and animals cannot simply be used as disposable resources for human society.¹⁰⁰⁸

Conclusion

Considering the way that gender and feminist analyses shape the relationship between parliamentary left and anarchistic activists with animal advocacy helps confirm that anarchist activists fit broadly into a CAS framework. This is unsurprising, because CAS scholarship is already influenced by and infused with ecofeminism. However, this is not to say that there are not interesting, and complex, ways in which anarchists and parliamentary leftists relate to the four key CAS principles.

Firstly, whilst anarchistic animal activists are more likely to use the concept of speciesism, this is complicated because some non-leftist animal groups aim to educate the public about the concept of speciesism whilst ignoring other interrelated forms of oppression. This has led to leftists such as Laurie Penny rejecting animal activism entirely.

Secondly, the dichotomy between anarchists who favour rights or liberation and parliamentarians who favour welfare is not so clear cut because the terminology of rights can be critiqued from the left. Nonetheless, while the labels are imperfect the terms are still convenient organisational banners; indeed it was the group Feminists for Animal Rights who most persuasively critiqued the concept of rights.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Interview with Caroline Allen, Green Party Animal Protection Spokesperson, 25/06/14.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Ibid.

Thirdly, there is a clear distinction between anarchists who favour direct action and parliamentary leftists who seek legislation. However, the focus on direct action can sometimes contradict the CAS concept of total liberation if the action targets a group subjected by an interrelated form of oppression.

Finally, anarchist animal activists are most likely to accept the CAS principles of intersectionality and total liberation. Indeed, opposition to all forms of hierarchy is a key component of anarchist theory. Parliamentarians, who often rely on 'single-axis thinking', are less likely to discuss the interconnection of different forms of oppression; moreover, the parliamentary left are unable to reject all forms of hierarchy because they accept the state hierarchy which remains in place in order to enact legislative changes. Parliamentary leftists may also reject such concepts because they are not accepted by the electorate or because they are not seen as party political issues; however, this is not to say that parliamentarians in Labour and the Green Party have not related their animal activism to arguments about the environment and human health.

In order to further consider the practical implications of the difference between the anarchist and parliamentary left conceptions of animal advocacy it is important to study how different groups have engaged with particular animal rights campaigns. As such, the next three chapters are case studies, focusing on the issues of hunting, vivisection and vegan outreach. Within each case study we will examine the attitudes of anarchist and parliamentary left groups and evaluate how the different movements either compete or are able to cooperate whilst considering the relationship of anarchists and the parliamentary left to a CAS framework.

6. Case Study 1: Hunting: ‘A “them and us” issue’

Case Studies

In order to understand the relationship between animal advocacy and both the parliamentary left and anarchism in Britain it is important to consider these ideological positions in relation to particular key issues. This allows one to consider whether anarchists or parliamentary leftists in the Labour Party and Green Party were particularly successful at furthering the cause of animal issues, or whether activists committed to a particular ideological strand were unable to cooperate with other groups to further the cause of animal advocacy. As such, the next three chapters are case studies of the three most significant current issues for animal activists in Britain. These case studies enable me to explore the main research questions relating to the relationship between direct action and legislative politics in terms of animal activism; in particular what separates such approaches and how have activists pursuing different overall strategies been able to work together. Through the case studies I explain how these relationships have played out in relation to particular issues: hunting, vivisection and vegan outreach. The case studies drive forward my overarching case that CAS scholarship should take the relationship between direct action and legislative reform more seriously. The case studies also explore the dichotomy between ‘rights’/‘liberation’ and ‘welfare’ as these terms are used and understood in current CAS scholarship. We have seen that Gary Francione is heavily critical of ‘new welfarists’ – animal rights activists who seek animal welfare legislation as a short term tactical goal. Francione regards these ‘new welfarists’ as speciesist sell outs who fail to represent the animals who cannot speak for themselves.¹⁰⁰⁹ Throughout the case studies I argue that the relationship

¹⁰⁰⁹ G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996).

between animal rights activism and welfare reforms is more complex than Francione's blanket dismissal of welfare allows for, in fact welfare reforms can be seen as realistic stepping stones on the way to more thoroughgoing revolutionary change.

This chapter focuses on hunting, followed by chapters looking at vivisection and vegan outreach. As well as exploring the current debates that these three issues stimulate, the four key aspects of a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework that might separate anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal issues are also considered. However, individual activists interviewed for this thesis did not seem so interested in abstract theoretical frameworks, and the connection between anarchists and hunt saboteurs stems from activists' experiences in the field rather than from reading polemics concerning total liberation or intersectionality. For instance, on the more theoretical side Joan Dunayer has argued that:

Often the verbal subterfuge involves speciesist language, which denigrates or discounts nonhuman animals. Conventional pronoun use, for example, terms nonhuman animals "it", erasing their gender and grouping them with inanimate things.¹⁰¹⁰

Numerous hunt saboteurs, however, who regularly risked arrest or physical injury to protect animals, were prepared to use such pronouns and talk about 'saving something's life'.¹⁰¹¹

These three case studies do not aim to show that one ideological grouping is superior in its ability to incorporate or promote animal issues, even if one is more likely to fit into a CAS framework. In fact, anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocates often operate in similar ways and often are able to work together whilst pursuing different overall strategies.

Introduction

¹⁰¹⁰ J. Dunayer, *Animal Equality: Language and Liberation* (Derwood: Ryce Publishing, 2001), p. 1.

¹⁰¹¹ Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

The aim of this case study is to consider the part that anarchists and the parliamentary left have played in opposing hunting and bloodsports in Britain between the 1970s and the present. The case study aims to explore opposition to the practice of hunting, in particular hunting foxes with hounds, which took place legally in Britain until it was banned by the Labour government in 2004. The case study raises particularly significant questions for an examination of the relationship between anarchism, the parliamentary left and animal rights. The case study explores whether self-identified anarchists would ever accept progressive legislation, and whether anarchist activists would feel justified in appealing to the police to prevent unlawful animal abuse. The case study also identifies the significance of direct action in anarchistic activist circles. Perhaps it is the importance of direct action, and the fact that hunt sabotage allows for a practical and relatively safe form of such action, that has contributed to the connection between anarchism and animal rights. The case study focuses solely on activism in Britain. As such, the chapter does not consider the broader possibility that a future ‘anarchist society’ would include hunting, nor does it include debates within the animal rights movement about the hunting practices of indigenous peoples such as the Inuits.¹⁰¹² It is also important to remember that although the case study focuses on anarchists and the parliamentary left who have opposed hunting, by no means all hunt saboteurs or opponents of hunting fall into these ideological categories.

The case study begins by setting out some key differences between anarchists and parliamentary leftists that have already emerged from considering their different relationships to a CAS framework. In particular, we consider the distinction between legislation and direct action. The chapter moves on to consider why opposition to hunting, particularly amongst those involved in the Hunt Saboteurs Association (HSA), is connected to anarchism. This moves beyond the four main aspects of a CAS framework and includes a section on the anti-establishment feelings of hunt saboteurs, which was strengthened after the deaths of Mike Hill and Tom Worby. The possibility that people become anarchists after witnessing what they believe to be unsavoury police behaviour whilst ‘sabbing’ is considered, as well as broader issues involving the police and law enforcement that have increased the

¹⁰¹² For a discussion of the latter topic see C. Grant, *No-Nonsense Guide to Animal Rights* (Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, 2006), p. 93.

connection between anarchism and hunt sabotage. The case study moves on to look at why hunting has been particularly connected to the Labour Party, before looking at attempts to legislate against hunting or curb bloodsports through direct action before 1997. The case study moves on to consider the 2004 Hunting Act, including the success of the Act and why there is a reluctance on the part of hunt saboteurs to accept how successful the Hunting Act could be. The case study concludes by examining the relationship between the police and hunt saboteurs since the ban.

Hunting is a particularly interesting issue to consider for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is the issue relating to animals that has most enthralled the Labour Party. Many on the left of Labour believed hunting to be 'both a symbolic and a practical component of class inequality'.¹⁰¹³ Even Robert Garner, who believes that animal welfare has been 'a cross-party issue', is forced to concede that hunting has been a 'notable exception'.¹⁰¹⁴ Focusing on hunting may thus reveal interesting features of the relationship between the two ideological positions and animal rights because opposition to hunting is seen as a unique issue within animal rights activism. As activist Simon Russell wrote: 'within the animal rights movement there is a strange lack of respect between general animal rights people and hunt saboteurs. Hunt sabbing seems to be looked upon as a marginal activity without a thought for its overall effect on the movement'.¹⁰¹⁵ This has led to the situation in which certain areas in Britain have animal rights groups and groups of hunt saboteurs 'which have few joint members and little contact or support for each other'.¹⁰¹⁶ As one activist who was jailed for anti-vivisection activities argued: 'when you look at an activity like hunt sabotage and the amount of time and resources that go into it to protect a relatively small amount of wildlife, sometimes you question whether it is the most productive use of your time'.¹⁰¹⁷

¹⁰¹³ M. Woods, 'Hunting: New Labour Success or New Labour Failure', in M. Woods (ed.), *New Labour's Countryside: Rural Policy in Britain since 1997* (Bristol: The Policy Press, 2008), p. 96.

¹⁰¹⁴ R. Garner, 'Defending Animal Rights', *Parliamentary Affairs: A Journal of Comparative Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 3, July 1998, pp. 458-469, p. 464.

¹⁰¹⁵ S. Russell, 'Importance of Sabbing', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 2, p. 45. It is also different to many animal rights issues because the focus is on 'wild' rather than 'domesticated' animals.

¹⁰¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁷ L. Pogson, *Inside The Cages: Animal Liberation & Imprisonment* (London: South London Press, 2013), p. 33.

Hunting is also an important issue to consider because there have been two distinct ways of opposing it: through direct action or through legislation. Naturally some crossover did occur. Luke, a hunt saboteur from the South of England, explained that although his activist group largely consists of anarchists, 'quite a few people voted Labour in the run up to the ban' and 'some of the first generation of sabs... going back to 1963, some of them are staunch Labour supporters... they believe in Old Labour'.¹⁰¹⁸ Despite the implementation of the Hunting Act in 2004 there now seems to be less support for Labour amongst hunt saboteurs. When asked if hunt sabs supported Labour, one activist from Swansea replied: 'most of the hunt sabs I've met have held quite anarchist views on politics, I think there's a bit of recognition that [Labour] are the ones who put [the Hunting Act] into place and that they've got some views in favour of animals... but I don't think I'd go as far as to say there's support'.¹⁰¹⁹ Finally, opposition to hunting is significant because the difference between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches cannot be characterised as the more radical anarchists favouring rights and the parliamentarians favouring welfare as might be tempting (although largely inaccurate) from a CAS perspective for other areas of animal abuse. Arguments against hunting are routinely framed in terms of rights rather than welfare, and opposition to hunting usually implies a total ban, rather than calling for better treatment or avoidance of 'unnecessary' suffering.

Legislation and Direct Action

Considering opposition to hunting in Britain is particularly significant for an understanding of anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal rights because activists have typically favoured one of two distinct roads to achieving their aims – either through parliament or through direct action. Benjamin Franks argues that direct action only includes 'practical prefigurative activity carried out by

¹⁰¹⁸ Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

¹⁰¹⁹ Interview with anonymous South Wales Hunt Saboteur, 17/06/14.

subjugated groups in order to lessen or vanquish their oppression'.¹⁰²⁰ Consequently, the inclusion of animals in Franks' definition of direct action may seem contentious - because they are not the subjugated group carrying out activity on their own behalf. Franks' definition of direct action is entirely drawn on left concerns, in particular contemporary British anarchist concerns, and a much wider definition of direct action is possible, including action by right wing groups. We saw in the previous chapter that anarchists are concerned with solidarity and because animals cannot return this solidarity, some anarchists have argued that they are not appropriate candidates for support. In the previous chapter I argued that anarchists should not deny animals solidarity for this reason, partly because animals are denied agency precisely because of their oppressed position, and also because certain animals are able to articulate their desire for liberation and individual animals can provide activists with emotional support needed for continued campaigning. To counter Franks' argument that direct action should be carried out by the subjugated group, one might consider the case of anti-war activism in Britain. Anti-war activism in Britain has involved various forms of direct action including sabotage, blockages, sit-downs and political protests; however, it is not carried out by the targets of British warfare (for instance the people of Iraq) who in Franks' definition would be seen as the subjugated group and therefore the only group responsible for vanquishing their own oppression. If one accepts Donaldson and Kymlicka's claim that groups of animals can be regarded as 'sovereign' peoples,¹⁰²¹ then animal rights activism can fall within the framework of leftist anti-war activism; within such anti-war activism activists are performing solidarity actions to lessen the oppression of a particular group without any expectation that such solidarity will be returned.

Nonetheless, animal rights activists believe that their actions can unproblematically be described as direct action. Anarchist animal liberationists, for instance, believe that the oppression of humans and animals is interconnected and so in performing direct action on behalf of animals they are lessening their own

¹⁰²⁰ B. Franks, *Rebel Alliances: The Means and Ends of Contemporary British Anarchisms* (Edinburgh: AK Press and Dark Star, 2006), p. 115.

¹⁰²¹ S. Donaldson, W. Kymlicka, *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

oppression. Indeed, many animal activists have ‘the ultimate objective of creating a society where animals and humans alike are respected’.¹⁰²²

Since the 1990s, some activists who favour either direct action or legislative reform have felt unable to acknowledge that different strategies may have any validity. Some activists on the direct action wing, for instance, felt that ‘calling for a ban on hunting and asking people to vote Labour to do it is pointless’ because any ban could be reversed by a future Conservative government and legislation ‘hasn’t stopped cockfighting, dog fighting, badger baiting and the like’.¹⁰²³ Gareth Gee, a former editor of the HSA’s magazine *Howl*, felt that some animal activists – those who he identified as ‘middle class liberals’ - had succumbed to the idea of ‘being included’ by parliamentary reform and as such were stalling the progress of direct action.¹⁰²⁴ This tactical disagreement takes the form of a conflict seen in many larger social movements when ‘some people, groups, or organizations are perceived as authentic and “pure”, while others are considered less dedicated to the cause’.¹⁰²⁵ Certainly, those advocates believing that direct action was necessary seem to portray themselves as purer than those seeking legislative changes because their approach involved a greater degree of self-sacrifice or even martyrdom. Of course, many activists did support fellow campaigners who followed divergent tactics and some recognised that ‘the blithe dismissal by direct action campaigners of lobbyists and vice versa only serves to alienate and divide the animal rights movement’.¹⁰²⁶

When direct action is considered in this chapter it refers to the activities of hunt saboteurs who disrupt hunts in order to prevent the targeted animal being killed. Hunt sabs act non-violently but are prepared to use self-defence if necessary. Hunts are often disrupted by activists spraying false scent, perhaps using garlic water, calling off the hounds or otherwise distracting hunters.¹⁰²⁷ This typically takes place under the auspices of the HSA. The HSA ‘exists to promote the concept of Hunt Sabotage’, however ‘each individual sab group is autonomous’ and the HSA are

¹⁰²² Vale & Valley Sabs, *Sabotage* (Cardiff: Vale & Valley Sabs, 1992), p. 3.

¹⁰²³ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 10, November 1992, p. 5.

¹⁰²⁴ *Arkangel*, No. 11, c. 1994, p. 45.

¹⁰²⁵ J. Greenebaum, “I’m Not an Activist!”: Animal Rights vs Animal Welfare in the Purebred Dog Rescue Movement’, *Society and Animals*, 17, (2009), pp. 289-304, p. 290.

¹⁰²⁶ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 11, December 1992, p. 13.

¹⁰²⁷ Hunt Saboteurs Association, *New Members Pack* (Exeter: Hunt Saboteurs Association, 1987).

unable to 'direct the actions of any group or individual sab'.¹⁰²⁸ This type of direct action does not immediately aim to entirely prohibit animal abuse, in the same way that the SHAC campaigners aimed to stop all vivisection, rather it is about saving the individual animal being hunted. This regular cycle of direct action, which the 2004 Hunting Act has not diminished, means that the act of hunt sabotage has become a key part of the activists' identities and social lives. Indeed, the difference between direct action and legislation is clearly not just a tactical disagreement, it is about the ideological position that the activists are likely to hold. Such tactics are vital to understanding the 'philosophical repertoire' of movements because they shape participants' collective identities and 'cultures of resistance'.¹⁰²⁹

Therefore, this case study will consider the direct action tradition of hunt saboteurs which is partly responsible for the connection between anarchism and CAS. The use of direct action leads anarchists and some animal advocates to share a distinct collective identity.

Of course, the picture is not so simple. For instance, there is a divergence between the national HSA and individual activists who sabotage hunts. In fact, most HSA members are 'just supportive members of the public', and the vast majority of actual hunt saboteurs never join the HSA.¹⁰³⁰ Alf Moon, HSA's Information Officer, explains the way that the HSA combine direct action with parliamentary reform:

Whilst the H.S.A. is predominantly a direct action organisation, we are currently in negotiations with other anti-hunt organisations and politicians with a view to improving the anti-hunting legislation. We would, of course, wish to see all forms of hunting outlawed and the ban enforced, but until we achieve that we will continue to use direct action to save the lives of hunted animals.¹⁰³¹

However, many active hunt saboteurs focus entirely on direct action without any faith in the ability of parliamentary parties to bring about reform. There are other forms of direct action against hunting, such as that practiced by the Hunt Retribution

¹⁰²⁸ Interview with Alf Moon, HSA Information Officer, conducted via e-mail, 05/06/14.

¹⁰²⁹ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), p. 127.

¹⁰³⁰ Interview with Simon, H.S.A, 25/04/2014.

¹⁰³¹ Alf Moon, HSA Information Officer, conducted via e-mail, 05/06/14.

Squad who aimed to disrupt a hare coursing competition by claiming that ‘they had planted three stolen landmines’ on the field.¹⁰³² However, these more militant tactics represent such a small part of the anti-hunting movement that they will not be a focus of this case study. It should also be noted that groups associated with parliamentary lobbying, particularly the League Against Cruel Sports (LACS), undertake activity that includes covert filming and other direct and dangerous actions.¹⁰³³ However, these daring undercover operations differ from the anarchistic direct action of hunt saboteurs because they are carried out by paid experts rather than involving an action which anyone can perform.

Another complication is that some parliamentarians see no contradiction between direct action and legislation. For instance, former Labour MP Chris Williamson was a hunt saboteur in his younger days. Williamson explains that: ‘for a young lad like myself, I was able to physically do something rather than wait for the legislative process’.¹⁰³⁴ Williamson recognised that there was a split between ‘hunt sabs who wanted to work through the legislative process and others who... had more of an anarchistic approach’. Williamson favoured legislation and argues that ‘direct action has a really important place in raising awareness and doing something practical, but in the end you need to get legislation in the statute’.¹⁰³⁵ A further complication is that animal rights groups, even those supportive of direct action, consistently lobbied the government to enact legislation against hunting. For instance in 1993 a National Anti-Hunt petition was launched by Herefordshire Animal Rights aiming to put ‘pressure on parliament to introduce legislation outlawing hunting’.¹⁰³⁶ Although it may seem naive to petition a Conservative government to outlaw hunting, some activists believed that slight improvements were possible through legislation and in 1996 a Wild Mammals Protection Bill was passed banning some forms of gratuitous violence such as kicking hedgehogs.¹⁰³⁷ Moreover, other activists may have been disingenuous in supporting such a petition. For instance, the anarchistic Vale and Valley sabs complained that ‘clearly M.P’s are not fairly

¹⁰³² *Arkangel*, No. 11, p. 28.

¹⁰³³ L. Munro, ‘Strategies, Action Repertoires and DIY Activism in the Animal Rights Movement’, *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Process*, Vol. 4. No. 1, 2005, pp. 75-94, p. 83; M. Huskisson, *Outfoxed* (London: Mike Huskisson Associates, 1983).

¹⁰³⁴ Interview with Chris Williamson, then Labour MP, 4/04/2014.

¹⁰³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰³⁶ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 12, February 1993, p. 5.

¹⁰³⁷ *Arkangel*, No. 15, p. 2.

representing the voice of the people' and as such they encouraged those who opposed bloodsports to take a direct action approach.¹⁰³⁸ The Vale and Valley sabs were able to claim that this was due to disillusionment with current politicians, although their analysis fitted in with their existing ideological position.

Anarchists against hunting

In this section we consider the key reasons why self-identified anarchists are particularly likely to become involved in direct action against hunting. Clearly, one of the attractions of hunt sabotage is that it fulfils the desire to personally make a difference and satisfies an impatience and unwillingness to wait for legislative solutions. Direct action also immediately helps individual animals, whereas campaigning for legislation

doesn't help foxes/hares that are being hunted now... the fox knows nothing about laws and different opinions on how to use the Act. All he knows is that he was literally in the jaws of death and someone saved him.¹⁰³⁹

One hunt saboteur compared his approach to groups like LACS who lobby for legislative change; he believed that 'there was [sic] very different agendas' between the two groups.¹⁰⁴⁰ Most hunt saboteurs 'aren't prepared to sit back and wait for a campaign to be successful to get a change in legislation, [or] to get convictions... most people who come to us want to do something there and then. They know on a day out with us they can stop something dying there and then'.¹⁰⁴¹

A desire to achieve social change through collective action without relying on elected representatives is likely to appeal to an anarchistic mind set, although it does not mean that such activities would appeal exclusively to self-identified anarchists. Hunt sabbing enables groups to build trust and solidarity in small groups that typically use a consensus decision making, and a non-hierarchical, framework.

¹⁰³⁸ Vale & Valley Sabs, *Sabotage*, p. 3.

¹⁰³⁹ *Howl: The Magazine of the Hunt Saboteurs Association*, No. 91, Winter 2008/09, p.3.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

¹⁰⁴¹ Ibid.

People who already subscribe to an anarchist philosophy may be attracted to hunt sabotage as a starting point for activism. Hunt sabbing is easy to get involved with; the issue of hunting has been heavily discussed in the media, particularly in relation to a ban, and so people interested in such politics will be aware that such actions are taking place, and potential activists are able to contact the HSA or local groups. Moreover, unlike other forms of direct action associated with the animal rights movement, hunt sabbing is unlikely to have the same legal repercussions and as such may be a good way for activists to get involved in direct action. Hunt sabbing has been described as the 'gateway' to other forms of animal rights activism; it is also a gateway to wider anarchist politics.¹⁰⁴²

Unlike other forms of direct action, for instance campaigns that take place in an industrial setting, hunt sabotage is different because activists feel they have saved an individual life. Many activists highlight the sense of euphoria, or even personal sense of liberation, that such activism brings.¹⁰⁴³ Another activist agrees that the most important aspect of sabbing is that

what you do in that day directly effects something's life, you know, quite often you'll see the animal you saved, you'll see it running away... It's still quite satisfying to know that what you did there and then saved that creature's life.¹⁰⁴⁴

Again, such activities would not necessarily appeal to anarchists alone, but it would appeal to those who believed in a deeper connection to other animal species and the environment. Although such an attitude is not exclusively anarchist, many anarchist animal liberationists, particularly those who identify as green anarchists, believe that a deeper connection is possible between humans and other animals.¹⁰⁴⁵ Other anarchists believe that a sense of compassion and (less universally) non-violence is key to their philosophy. HSA member Alf Moon, for instance, believes that 'if you extend the philosophy of not harming others to embrace all sentient beings, the link between anarchy and veganism/animal rights becomes clear'.¹⁰⁴⁶

¹⁰⁴² Interview with Simon, H.S.A, 25/04/2014.

¹⁰⁴³ *A Pinch of Salt*, No. 7, Summer 1987, p. 6.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

¹⁰⁴⁵ *A Pinch of Salt*, No. 7, Summer 1987, p. 6.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Interview with Alf Moon, HSA Information Officer, conducted via e-mail, 05/06/14.

One possible connection between anarchism and hunt sabotage is that many activists become involved in sabbing through community networks developed in the UK punk scene.¹⁰⁴⁷ Former hunt saboteur Jon Active describes forming a sab group as simply ‘part of the anarcho-punk package’.¹⁰⁴⁸ There has been a frequent overlap between punk culture and animal rights activism/vegan consumption habits in the UK.¹⁰⁴⁹ The connection between punk and animal rights is recognised by animal rights activists who are not punks. For instance, HSA activist Simon acknowledges that ‘there’s always been that push within the punk movement to support animal rights, and because the punk movement is by its very nature anarchist – they push towards organisations like us and not the more [mainstream] organising groups’.¹⁰⁵⁰ Although the connection continues to the present, it emerged at the end of the 1970s when there were ‘anarchists coming out of the punk movement, so there’s always been that sort of angle within hunt sabs, because it doesn’t involve any authority, it doesn’t involve anyone telling you what to do, anybody can get out and do it’.¹⁰⁵¹

Indeed, the non-hierarchical structure of the HSA, and of individual groups of hunt saboteurs who typically operate in groups of about ten members and use a consensus decision-making approach, helps explain the overlap between anarchism and hunt sabotage. Alf Moon explains that some activists will become involved in hunt sabotage and subsequently become anarchists because they are attracted to the possibilities of organising without hierarchical structures.¹⁰⁵² Such an attitude means that the organisational approach of hunt saboteurs and other direct action animal advocates is in stark contrast to the national animal interest groups who lobby for parliamentary changes.

One difference between the HSA and the national animal interest groups is the importance that national groups place on the role of leaders and figureheads. This difference became evident in the summer of 1990 and can be seen in the reaction to the ‘defection’ of Richard Course, former LACS Chief Executive who had

¹⁰⁴⁷ Interview with anonymous South Wales Hunt Saboteur, 17/06/14.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Interview with Jon Active, vegan, ex-hunt sab, punk, Active Distribution, 05/11/14.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Explored in W. Boisseau, J. Donaghey, “‘Nailing Descartes to the Wall’: Animal rights, veganism and punk culture”, in A. J. Nocella II, R. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation: Essays on Complementary Elements of Total Liberation* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2015).

¹⁰⁵⁰ Interview with Simon, H.S.A, 25/04/2014.

¹⁰⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵² Interview with Alf Moon.

allegedly 'gone over to the side of the hunters'.¹⁰⁵³ Indeed, the Countryside Alliance Campaign for Hunting still publish Course's statement, produced after his 'defection', that he had 'come to despise [LACS]... simply because these people know as well as I do that the abolition of hunting will not make any difference to the welfare of foxes, hares or deer'.¹⁰⁵⁴ Course argued that farmers had the right to kill 'pests', that a 'quick death in the jaws of a dog is preferable to hours or even days in a snare' and that 'there could not be any hunting if the quarry species were exterminated. Therefore, hunting people make sure that there is quarry around for the next season... that is what real conservation is all about'.¹⁰⁵⁵ Evidently, Course did not find it a contradiction to argue both that foxes were a 'pest' that needed to be destroyed, and that farmers were doing valuable work in artificially encouraging the fox population to grow.¹⁰⁵⁶

Naturally there were those in the animal rights movement who asked how 'such a character [was] allowed to rise to a supreme position of power and influence within an animal protection society'.¹⁰⁵⁷ For anarchist animal advocates the problem was not with individual turncoats, instead the 'problem lies in the fact that such positions exist at all'.¹⁰⁵⁸ Indeed, to some direct action activists, even the seemingly non-hierarchical HSA represented an unnecessary imposition of authority. One collective believed that

[o]ne of the first positive steps any sab group can take is to disassociate themselves from the HSA. Sabbing is a form of direct action: committees, national officers, bureaucrats and the like are all irrelevant.¹⁰⁵⁹

During the early 1990s, those involved in the anti-hunting movement engaged in debates about the nature of the HSA. Jamie Hepburn, who became chairperson of the HSA in a move that signalled a victory for the radical wing, believed that 'one of

¹⁰⁵³ *Arkangel*, No. 3, Summer 1990, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Countryside Alliance Campaign for Hunting, 'Hunting with dogs: Read what the defectors say' [viewed online, <http://www.supportfoxhunting.co.uk/docs/whatthedefectorssay.pdf>, last accessed 04/02/2015].

¹⁰⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵⁶ P. Harris, 'Hunters 'breeding foxes' to provide for the kill', *The Observer*, 17/02/2002 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2002/feb/17/hunting.ruralaffairs>, last accessed 25/11/15].

¹⁰⁵⁷ *Arkangel*, No. 3, Summer 1990, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵⁹ Men Against Sexist Shit, *It's A Man's Game: Hunt Sabotage and Men* (Leeds, no date), p. 2. Emphasis in original.

the main problems in that [HSA] dispute was that the now-removed members of the Executive Committee consistently refused to listen to the opinions of the active membership. They also tried to expel other committee members who disagreed with them'.¹⁰⁶⁰ Hepburn believed that former members of the Executive Committee had 'indulged in' a 'vast abuse of power', but following the election of activists onto the Committee: 'the HSA is now safely back in the hands of the active sabs, and my only regret is that we didn't chuck [the old Committee] out years ago'.¹⁰⁶¹

Anti-establishment

Another reason why anarchists are attracted to direct action against hunting is because of the opportunity to play out a class conflict with seemingly upper-class hunters. Other activists agree that 'in the 80s and early 90s there probably was a certain element of class war in the anti-hunting movement', however in the present day most people are there 'from a purely animal rights perspective'.¹⁰⁶² Southern Anti-Bloodsports activist Luke believes this is partly because class politics are less prevalent in Britain, but also because not all the hunts they oppose fulfil the stereotype of being ostentatiously upper class, indeed Luke's group regularly oppose groups of bloodsports enthusiasts who are clearly 'not that wealthy'.¹⁰⁶³

Even if joining an anti-bloodsports group is not 'the most suitable way of attacking the rich', the consensus remains that hunting is supported by the political right and as such hunt opponents are likely to take a leftist anti-establishment position.¹⁰⁶⁴ Certainly, in the late 1980s and early 1990s there was contempt within the hunt saboteurs for the Conservative government. Cartoonist Andy Hemingway believed that the reason the Conservative government refused to outlaw bloodsports was 'because most of the participants in this vile pastime, contribute extremely large

¹⁰⁶⁰ J. Hepburn, 'Dream On', *Arkangel*, No. 4. The former Executive Committee also allegedly refused to hand over various items of HSA property and 'tried to convince the membership that the EGM called to remove them was cancelled'.

¹⁰⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶² Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

¹⁰⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Quote from *Class War*, 'The Best Cut of All', p. 3.

sums of money to the Conservative Party'.¹⁰⁶⁵ In particular, hunt opponents remembered 'the glee of the bloodsports fraternity' in the run up to the introduction of the Public Order Act in 1986 when 'Douglas Hurd told the Tory Party conference that the Public Order Act would give police much wider powers to deal with sabs'.¹⁰⁶⁶ Animal rights activists believed that the Public Order Act was introduced with the dual purpose of attacking striking workers and hunt saboteurs.¹⁰⁶⁷ Similarly, the Criminal Justice Bill, announced by the Home Secretary Michael Howard in 1993, aimed to 'make sabbing illegal, on public and private land' by tightening trespass laws and introducing penalties of three months' imprisonment or fines of £2,500 for sections of the Act likely to relate to hunt sabotage.¹⁰⁶⁸ Police officers also gained the right to 'stop sabs' vehicles within 5 miles of a meet' and the ability to 'arrest those who refuse to turn away'.¹⁰⁶⁹ The Act 'provided the government with the opportunity to introduce a statutory power [for the police] to turn back pickets', an action frequently taken during the UK miners' strike of 1984-85.¹⁰⁷⁰

A critique of these laws often tied in with a belief that the government was undertaking a wider clampdown on civil liberties, and even contributed to a hostility to the state and cemented the left-leaning and anti-authoritarian attitude of anti-bloodsports activists. Moreover, when animal rights activists came to oppose these laws, they found themselves protesting alongside other radical protest groups, including those involved in the environmental movement and anti-roads protests.¹⁰⁷¹ This shared sense of purpose and solidarity helped forged connections between different movements and led, in part, to a shared sense of identity between animal rights activists and other protest groups. Part of this collective identity was an awareness, if not acceptance, of anarchist politics which included prefigurative direct action and non-hierarchical consensus decision-making structures.

Hunt sabs had a clear sense of being an oppositional movement, plainly hostile to politicians, the media, law courts and ostensibly upper-class hunters. This

¹⁰⁶⁵ Vale & Valley Sabs, *Sabotage*, p. 5.

¹⁰⁶⁶ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 4. October 1991, p. 5.

¹⁰⁶⁷ J. J. Roberts, *Up Against The Law: Animal Rights and the 1986 Public Order Act* (London: ARC Print, 1986), p. 3.

¹⁰⁶⁸ *Arkangel*, No. 11, c.1994, p. 23.

¹⁰⁶⁹ *Arkangel*, No. 12, 1994, p. 21.

¹⁰⁷⁰ J. J. Roberts, *Up Against The Law*, p. 3. In 2008 sabs were still arrested under the Trade Union Act. *Howl: The Magazine of the Hunt Saboteurs Association*, No. 89. Summer 2008, p. 16.

¹⁰⁷¹ *Arkangel*, No. 12, 1994, p. 21.

collective identity was strengthened after the tragic events of February 9th 1991 when Mike Hill, a young hunt saboteur, died whilst disrupting a hare hunt. Hill, an eighteen year old who worked at Freshfields Animal Rescue Centre was 'quiet, passionate and committed to making life better for the animals'.¹⁰⁷² Whilst sabbing the Cheshire hare hunt Mike Hill, along with two other activists, had climbed onto the back of huntsman Alan Summersgill's truck believing that this would prevent the hunters from moving off; instead Summersgill 'took off at speed' allegedly driving 'at speeds of up to 80mph' until Hill attempted to dismount the truck and fell under the wheels.¹⁰⁷³ Summersgill, who allegedly failed to stop at the scene of the accident, was later arrested before being released without charge. To hunt sabs, the reaction to Hill's death was proof of the connected interests of the police, the media, the law courts and hunters.¹⁰⁷⁴

Many animal rights activists believed that there was no justice in Summersgill's release without charge, and some decided to seek retribution outside the law. Two days after Hill's death a vigil was organised outside the hunt kennels at Dodleston, near Cheshire, where Summersgill lived. Although the demonstration started peacefully, activists soon broke the undermanned police barrier and caused some damage to the property and kennels. 38 people were later arrested for riot, 31 people were ultimately charged.¹⁰⁷⁵ A week after Hill's death, Summersgill's home 'was gutted by an ALF fire'.¹⁰⁷⁶ In the months following Hill's death the antagonism between animal rights activists and various elements of 'the establishment' escalated. The case of the 'Dodleston 31' reached court 14 months after Hill's death; five activists were sent to prison for 12 months for Violent Disorder and Dave Blenkinsop, 'who held Mike Hill in his arms as he died', was sentenced to 15 months.¹⁰⁷⁷ In the months following Hill's death animal rights activists believed that there was an increase in charges brought against hunt sabs.¹⁰⁷⁸ Anti-bloodsports activists were also disturbed that following Mike Hill's death the number of people attending the Cheshire Beagle Hunt 'actually rose', one activist believed that 'the sick scum

¹⁰⁷² K. Mann, *From Dusk 'til Dawn: An Insider's View of the growth of the Animal Liberation Movement* (London: Puppy Pincher Press, 2007), p. 250.

¹⁰⁷³ *Ibid.* p. 253.

¹⁰⁷⁴ *Ibid.* p. 254.

¹⁰⁷⁵ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 2. August 1991, p. 7.

¹⁰⁷⁶ K. Mann, *From Dusk*, p. 258.

¹⁰⁷⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 258-259.

¹⁰⁷⁸ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 3. September 1991, p. 5.

obviously think it is prestigious to go out with a hunt that has recently murdered a sab'.¹⁰⁷⁹

Mike Hill's death was not the last time that a hunt saboteur was killed whilst taking direct action. On the 3rd April 1993 a 15 year old activist, who was sabotaging a hunt for the first time, was dragged under the truck of huntsman Tony Ball.¹⁰⁸⁰ Tom Worby died instantly. Although Ball was arrested and questioned, he was promptly released without charge. Once again animal advocates were disturbed that 'there was no major inquiry, no breaking down of doors, no media hysteria'.¹⁰⁸¹ Another fatality was narrowly avoided in 2000 when Steve Christmas was hit by a car when sabotaging a hunt.¹⁰⁸² The deaths of Mike Hill and Tom Worby cemented the anti-establishment and anti-state attitudes of many hunt saboteurs, and as such fostered the connection between anti-bloodsports activists and anarchism. This shows that the connection between anarchism and animal rights – or a CAS framework – is often practical rather than theoretical, with hunt saboteurs becoming anarchists after personal experiences of activism.

The oppositional relationship between hunt saboteurs and the state is most clearly demonstrated by the regular confrontations with the police. This relationship has altered over time. This section deals with the relationship prior to the 2004 Hunting Act, and the relationship between hunt sabs and the police after 2004 is considered later in this case study. It is also important to remember that the relationship varied in different regions. For instance, in South Wales 'the Police have not shown too much concern with... sabotage' and as such the local HSA group believed that when the police were present 'it is better for us to try and create positive relations with them'.¹⁰⁸³ However, the situation in South Wales was not typical.

By the early 1990s HSA groups were expecting 'at least one arrest every time they go out to sabotage a hunt'; moreover, activists believed that violence against them by hunt supporters often resulted in their own arrest or further aggression from

¹⁰⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 9.

¹⁰⁸⁰ S.A.R.P Newsletter, No. 14, May 1993, p. 19.

¹⁰⁸¹ K. Mann, *From Dusk*, p. 264.

¹⁰⁸² J. Vidal, 'Out for blood', *The Guardian*, December 1st 2001 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2001/dec/01/weekend.johnvidal>, last accessed 18/02/2015]. Newspapers reported that the car was driven by a 'man unconnected to the hunt'.

¹⁰⁸³ Vale & Valley Sabs, *Sabotage*, p. 20.

the police.¹⁰⁸⁴ One activist explained that ‘saboteurs have been viciously attacked and when they have complained to the police [they] have found themselves being arrested for an offence’.¹⁰⁸⁵ For instance in 1991 anti-bloodsports activist Patrick Kelly was allegedly ‘whipped and head butted’ by Mark Evans from the Hampshire Hunt, however ‘when Mr Kelly went to complain to the police about the incident he was immediately arrested’.¹⁰⁸⁶

The hostility continued throughout the decade. In 1993 the HSA reacted to violent attacks by hunt supporters against saboteurs in the Essex area by organising a mass sabotage of a hunt on the 23rd January. A report of the event, attended by ‘around 200 hunt sabs’, from the *S.A.R.P* [Support Animal Rights Prisoners] *Newsletter* typifies the way that animal activists perceived the relationship between the police, hunt supporters and themselves:

The stewards from the Estate Management Services proceeded to launch an unprovoked attack on the sabs during which injuries were sustained on both sides, it ended when the stewards were forced to withdraw, beaten. On seeing this the impartial police present then proceeded to attack the sabs and in the melee that followed 26 sabs were arrested and charged... During this textbook exercise in impartial policing a sab vehicle had its windows smashed by a police officer with his truncheon.¹⁰⁸⁷

Anarchist animal activists could straightforwardly explain that the police behaved in this manner because they are ‘cruel, misguided puppets of an oppressive state’.¹⁰⁸⁸ Similarly, in the late 1980s, J. J. Roberts argued that the police had become a ‘paramilitary force’.¹⁰⁸⁹ For other HSA supporters the relationship with the state was more complex; for instance the HSA advised activists to take the police to court for their actions. Some may have believed that individual police officers had acted unlawfully, and the courts would redress this, whilst others sought to embarrass the state by using their own structures against them. By the early 1990s the HSA had over one hundred cases against the police for unlawful arrest and

¹⁰⁸⁴ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 4. October 1991, p. 4. Emphasis in original.

¹⁰⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸⁶ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 3. September 1991, p. 6.

¹⁰⁸⁷ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 12, February 1993, p. 9.

¹⁰⁸⁸ *Arkangel*, No. 12, c. 1994, p. 46, written by ‘A. Anarchist’.

¹⁰⁸⁹ J. J. Roberts, *Up Against The Law*, p 4.

detention.¹⁰⁹⁰ Following incidents at the Chiddingfold, Leconfield and Cowdray Hunt in 1990 Sussex police faced 'a bill of up to £60,000' after 28 activists sued the police for unlawful arrest.¹⁰⁹¹

Animal activists believed that their treatment at the hands of police and the courts mirrored the oppression of other groups seeking social justice, and this led to feelings of solidarity. In particular, many animal activists believed that the police's treatment of hunt saboteurs was similar to the police violence witnessed on picket lines during the UK miners' strike of 1984-85. One activist explained that the similar use of oppressive police tactics was deliberately put in place because 'the ruling class, who have spent centuries building up a system to profit and protect themselves, are not going to allow the smallest threat to rise against them'.¹⁰⁹²

Although some activists are anarchists first (possibly through involvement in the punk scene) and then become involved in hunt sabbing (possibly because it is easy to join and has relatively minor legal repercussions) others will become anarchists after involvement in hunt sabotage. This is partly because activists gain 'first-hand experience of seeing that politicians and laws don't really protect humans or animals' but also because activists 'see a lot of bias towards the hunt with the police... it sort of feels like that system, it doesn't do anything to help you'.¹⁰⁹³

Before considering the relationship between the parliamentary left, particularly the Labour Party, and an opposition to hunting it is worth remembering that although there is a strong connection between hunt sabotage and anarchism, it is by no means universal. One group of anarchist sabs believed that other members of their group wanted to 'follow the leaders' and that 'sabs are divided into generals and cannon-fodder'.¹⁰⁹⁴ The same group believed that 'the nature of sabbing seems to bring out the worst in every man', and that 'sexual harassment by the male sabs' against female activists was common.¹⁰⁹⁵ An anonymous interviewee from the North East of England was annoyed that some fellow activists in his group 'rant on with

¹⁰⁹⁰ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 4. October 1991, p. 4.

¹⁰⁹¹ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 13. April 1993, p. 19.

¹⁰⁹² *Arkangel*, No. 11. c. 1994, p. 40; written by 'Annie Lib'.

¹⁰⁹³ Anonymous South Wales, Hunt Saboteur, 17/06/14.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Men Against Sexist Shit, *It's A Man's Game*, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

these left-wing rants and are obsessed with fascists'.¹⁰⁹⁶ The hunt saboteur believed that radical left-wing activists were damaging to the image of the HSA, and that such activists were more likely to discuss their radicalism on social media than get up early to take part in direct action:

They're not the kind of people that go sabbing in the field and you wouldn't want them neither, they're just a hazard they're the kind of people that the Countryside Alliance loves, you know, left-wing anarchists – this is what hunt saboteurs are, and it's just damaging.¹⁰⁹⁷

Whereas some activists highlight the concepts of intersectionality and total liberation, this activist argued that:

We're not here for politics we're here for the animals it's as simple as that. And I don't like the association HSA has made with these people ['left-wing anarchists']... we're supposed to be here for the wildlife, it's not about politics or any other thing.¹⁰⁹⁸

Parliamentary left against hunting

This section focuses on the reasons why the Labour Party has traditionally been opposed to hunting and (most) bloodsports: firstly, Labour's historic opposition to hunting has strengthened since the 1970s as it was seen as part of the Party's tradition; secondly, there may be class reasons for opposing hunting; thirdly, there is a traditional connection between the Conservatives and the hunting fraternity which may have led to Labour's opposition to the bloodsport;¹⁰⁹⁹ fourth, Labour politicians argue that as a 'compassionate' party they must extend this consideration to non-human animals; fifth, through opposing hunting, Labour were able to build alliances with other left-leaning causes: this was particularly the case in the early 1980s; finally,

¹⁰⁹⁶ Interview with anonymous Northumberland Hunt Saboteur, 29/05/14.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Ibid. The HSA is affiliated to the Anti-Fascist Network. HSA, 'Press Release' [viewed online, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/index.php/news/press-releases/526-anti-fascist-network-hsa-announce-affiliation>, last accessed 06/02/2015].

¹⁰⁹⁹ D. Toke, 'Foxhunting and the Conservatives', *The Political Quarterly*, Vol. 81, No. 2. (April-June 2010), pp. 205-212.

hunting with hounds was opposed by the majority of the electorate and as such Labour's opposition to hunting was likely to attract voters.

The section focuses on the Labour Party as the vehicle through which attempts to ban hunting through parliament were made. This is not to say that other left-leaning groupings outside the Labour Party do not also oppose hunting. For instance, the Green Party opposes 'the killing of, or infliction of pain or suffering upon, animals in the name of sport or leisure, and will work to end all such practices'.¹¹⁰⁰ Indeed, the Greens aim to 'prohibit hunting with hounds, shooting, snaring, coursing and various other abuses of our animal population'.¹¹⁰¹ Nonetheless, only Labour was realistically able to ensure that an anti-hunting Act reached the statute, something which they achieved in 2004.

Labour has had a long history of opposing hunting. In *Labour and the Nation*, a pamphlet produced during the 1930s, the Party stated that:

In common with most persons of humanity, [the Labour Party] regards the infliction of cruelty upon them (animals), whether under the name of sport or for purposes of profit, as barbarous and repulsive, and it will welcome the extension of protective legislation designed to prevent it.¹¹⁰²

Despite these reassurances, a ban on hunting was not achieved under Attlee. In 1949 two Hunting Bills were introduced in parliament. The first, introduced by Seymour Cocks and seconded by the Conservative Edward Carson,¹¹⁰³ dealt with stag hunting, hare coursing, otter hunting and badger digging. The National Society for the Abolition of Cruel Sports believed Cocks' proposals to be extremely moderate. Nonetheless, the Labour leadership decided not to support the Bill and it was ultimately defeated by 214 votes to 101.¹¹⁰⁴ The second Bill, specifically targeting foxhunting, was to have been introduced by Frank Fairhurst but was withdrawn after

¹¹⁰⁰ Green Party, 'Policy Statements: Animal Rights', [viewed online, <http://policy.greenparty.org.uk/ar.html>, last accessed 06/02/2015].

¹¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰² J. C. Sharp (LACS) to General Secretary's Office, Labour Party, 22nd August 1945. Labour History Archive and Study Centre, GS/BLO/1.

¹¹⁰³ Carson was 'the only Tory who voted for the Bill'. S. Ball (ed.), *Parliament and Politics in the Age of Churchill and Attlee: The Headlam Diaries: 1935-1951* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 574.

¹¹⁰⁴ National Society for the Abolition of Cruel Sports, *Bulletin*, February 1950. Labour History Archive and Study Centre, GS/BLO/6.

assurances that the government would appoint a committee of inquiry into cruelty to wild animals. 200 MPs had signed a motion calling for such an inquiry and although it initially seemed like a small victory for the animal welfare lobby, the National Society for the Abolition of Cruel Sports soon came to believe that the inquiry was stacked in favour of hunting interests. For instance, one of the committee's members, Miss Frances Pitt, was a master of hounds, and another was a veterinary assistant to two hunts.¹¹⁰⁵

Perhaps these early attempts to ban hunting, however unsuccessful, help explain Labour's continued opposition to (most) bloodsports from the 1970s onwards. Because Labour had opposed hunting in its formative years, it built a strong relationship with organisations such as LACS which lasted throughout the twentieth century.¹¹⁰⁶ Although 'as a registered charity' LACS 'are politically neutral so we do not support any particular party or align ourselves with a particular party', League representative Dawn Varley agrees that 'traditionally the Labour Party obviously have been more receptive to campaigns that we work on'.¹¹⁰⁷ This historic relationship included a series of donations from the League to Labour. For instance, in 1979 the League's chief executive reported to the media that 'we've got millions to spend if we need it. Money is no object... we've certainly got a lot more to spend on politics than the Labour Party has'.¹¹⁰⁸ Although, of course, the relationship was formed because of Labour's anti-hunting stance, the fact of its existence might have helped Labour continue to promote their anti-hunting position. In 1992 the International Fund for Animal Welfare recruited 66,000 electors nationally who pledged to only vote for anti-hunting candidates.¹¹⁰⁹

Class and Party

¹¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁶ League Against Cruel Sports, *90 years of protecting wildlife* (Godalming: League Against Cruel Sports, 2014).

¹¹⁰⁷ Interview with Dawn Varley, League Against Cruel Sports Director of Fundraising and Campaigns, 20/05/14.

¹¹⁰⁸ *Daily Telegraph*, 4th October 1979 (Press cuttings, Hull History Centre, DBV/11/4).

¹¹⁰⁹ A. G. Hoare, 'Hunting for Votes: the Geography of Free Votes and Electoral Advantage in the British House of Commons', *Geoforum*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (1995), pp. 459-478, p. 474.

The most evident reason why Labour have been hostile to hunting is the ‘perception that it is the preserve of wealthy rural people’.¹¹¹⁰ Although New Labour discarded the traditional importance of class politics, many Labour activists and politicians welcomed the opportunity to play out this class conflict in the Punch-and-Judy Westminster arena. Perhaps this became particularly important at a time when traditional ideological differences between Labour and the Conservatives had faded. Indeed, Alison Plumb and David Marsh calculate that debates about hunting became ‘more politicised, that is more party political, over time’.¹¹¹¹ Labour Animal Welfare Society (LAWS) president Walter Burley was frustrated that many Labour MPs did not take the issue of animal welfare seriously. Instead ‘a lot of people in the Labour Party saw it as a them and us issue... the posh people going round killing foxes on the back of horses’.¹¹¹² Certainly, many Labour politicians were prepared to admit that they were opposed to hunting because they did not ‘wish to allow the country set to get their titillation and arousal from the screams of animals being torn apart and the sight of blood spurting over a muddy field’.¹¹¹³

The significance of class is also revealed in Labour’s policy towards angling. Although one could argue that there are morally relevant differences between fishing and foxhunting,¹¹¹⁴ it is still interesting that throughout the 1980s and beyond ‘the Labour Party not only specifically excludes angling from any possible future legislation, but also actively supports angling as the largest participant outdoor sport’.¹¹¹⁵ This demonstrates that Labour would not oppose a ‘sport’ involving the pain and death of animals if it was practised by a broad section of the population. Interestingly, the Green Party also finds angling harder to oppose than other bloodsports. For instance, although the Greens pledged to ‘work actively to bring about an end to angling through public education programmes’ in 2004, by 2013 the Party had dropped this policy, although they still intend to ‘extend the Animal Welfare

¹¹¹⁰ R. Garner, ‘Defending Animal Rights’, p. 462.

¹¹¹¹ A. Plumb, D. Marsh, ‘Beyond party discipline: UK Parliamentary voting on fox hunting’, *British Politics*, Vol. 8. No. 3, (2013), pp. 313-332, p. 318. Firstly, the ‘index of party unity’ – the percentage of each party entering the same voting lobby – increased over time, and secondly more party political points were raised during debates.

¹¹¹² Interview with Wally Burley, Chair, Labour Animal Welfare Society, 29/07/14.

¹¹¹³ *Labour Weekly*, 23rd March 1979, p. 14.

¹¹¹⁴ For instance, some may argue that cognition is lower in fish than in foxes or that the more developed social lives of foxes makes it less acceptable to hunt them for pleasure. For debates about animal sentience and cognition see: H. Proctor. ‘Animal Sentience: Where Are We and Where Are We Heading?’, *Animals*, Vol. 2. 2012, pp. 628-639.

¹¹¹⁵ *Labour Weekly*, 11th February 1983.

Act to cover all fishing activities'.¹¹¹⁶ However, the class element of the Hunting Act can be overemphasised. As Chris Mullin highlights, the Act 'was about banning hunting with hounds – which applied to other sports like deer and hare coursing' and although foxhunting was associated with 'the old ruling class', hare coursing was regarded as 'a working class sport'.¹¹¹⁷

Whereas Labour had historically built up a positive relationship with anti-hunting groups, the Conservative Party traditionally favoured hunting because of 'the strong support for hunting among a large proportion of the Conservatives' natural supporters'.¹¹¹⁸ Anthony Hoare characterises this demographic as 'the traditional Tory squirearchy'.¹¹¹⁹ The pro-hunting Countryside Alliance contributed to the link between the Conservatives and hunt supporters by relying 'on anti-Labour feeling among traditionally Conservative rural voters for its core support'.¹¹²⁰ Indeed, to pro-hunting politicians and activists the 'countryside' could often be used 'as a surrogate for the Conservatives'.¹¹²¹ Perhaps party, rather than class, differences help explain Labour's traditional opposition to hunting. It was the Conservatives, rather than Labour, who became entrenched in their views about hunting and this in turn entrenched Labour's position.¹¹²² Jeff Rooker explained that it was particularly important for Labour to oppose hunting because 'the Conservative Party... is tied to the hunting lobby in the shires'.¹¹²³ Even though hunting appeared before the Commons as a free vote, voting was divided fairly clearly along party lines.¹¹²⁴ However, this was not a simple party dispute, but became a 'them and us issue' with two sets of politicians seeking to represent 'our people'. In simple terms, for Labour this group included urban progressives whereas the Conservatives appealed to a 'traditional' middle-class rural constituency. For instance, although Labour consistently attempted to maintain a positive relationship with the National Farmers' Union, it was not prepared to accept the advances of the British Field Sports Society

¹¹¹⁶ Green Party of England and Wales, 'Animal rights report', June 2004 [viewed online, <http://www.greenparty.org.uk/files/reports/2004/1ANIMAL%20RIGHTS%20REPORT%20fn.htm>, last accessed 09/02/2015]. Green Party, 'Policy Statements: Animal Rights'.

¹¹¹⁷ Interview with Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, 22/07/14.

¹¹¹⁸ A. Plumb, D. Marsh, 'Beyond party discipline', p. 327.

¹¹¹⁹ A. G. Hoare, 'Hunting for Votes', p. 475.

¹¹²⁰ A. Anderson, 'Spinning the Rural Agenda: The Countryside Alliance, Fox Hunting and Social Policy', *Social Policy & Administration*, Vol. 4. No. 6, December 2006, pp. 722-738, p. 725.

¹¹²¹ *Ibid.* p. 735.

¹¹²² D. Toke, 'Foxhunting and the Conservatives', p. 209.

¹¹²³ *Labour Weekly*, 11th February 1983.

¹¹²⁴ A. Plumb, D. Marsh, 'Beyond party discipline', p. 316.

(BFSS).¹¹²⁵ If hunting did become a ‘them and us issue’, as Walter Burley believes, then clearly the BFSS were part of the ‘them’ that Labour would not be prepared to work with.

Animal rights activists have also argued that far right groups such as the British National Party (BNP) have supported bloodsports in an attempt to bolster their appeal to traditional Conservative voters. For instance the BNP were seen ‘distributing pro-bloodsports leaflets’ at Countryside Alliance backed demonstrations in 1998.¹¹²⁶ Indeed, it is not difficult to see why the far right party felt they might find supporters amongst Countryside Alliance marchers.¹¹²⁷ The Countryside Alliance found ‘nationalistic rhetoric appealing’ and their characterisation of their supporters as ‘aboriginal countrymen’ who ‘were there first’ mirrors the BNP’s appeal to indigenous Britons.¹¹²⁸ Whilst it might be that the actions of a small fascistic group such as the BNP did not enter the radar of the Labour Party, it may have added to the sense that support for hunting was associated with all sections of the political right and opposition to bloodsports was associated with all sections of the left. For instance, when trade unionists and animal activists found themselves on adjacent demonstrations outside a Conservative Party conference, it was the ‘trade union[s] protesting about hedge fund billionaires [who] started up a chorus of “same old Tories, always hunting”’.¹¹²⁹ Green MP Caroline Lucas opposes hunting and believes that the Conservatives’ support for bloodsports is in part an attempt ‘to make political capital from it and use fox hunting to attract rural voters away from UKIP’.¹¹³⁰

The antagonistic attitude of the *Daily Telegraph* contributed to the elevation of hunting to a key ideological battleground between left and right. For instance, in the run up to the 1998 Countryside March a leader article in the *Telegraph*, assessing Labour’s proposed hunting ban, complained that ‘something that has worked and

¹¹²⁵ R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), p. 192; *Arkangel*, No. 16, p. 17.

¹¹²⁶ *Arkangel*, No. 19. (no date), p. 17.

¹¹²⁷ It comes as no surprise, then, that UKIP leader Nigel Farage has shown his support for hunting by attending Boxing Day hunts. [viewed online, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/index.php/news/press-releases/552-nigel-farage-attends-boxing-day-meet-of-violent-huntsman-again>, last accessed 26/02/2015].

¹¹²⁸ J. Wallwork, J. A. Dixon, ‘Foxes, green fields and Britishness: On the rhetorical construction of place and national identity’, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, (2004), No. 43, pp. 21-39, p. 27, p. 30.

¹¹²⁹ *Howl: The Magazine of the Hunt Saboteurs Association*, No. 90, Autumn 2008, p. 5.

¹¹³⁰ C. Lucas, ‘Standing Firm Against Fox Hunting’, 25/03/2014 [viewed online, <http://www.carolinelucas.com/latest/standing-firm-against-fox-hunting>, last accessed 26/11/2015].

been much loved for centuries is told that it must now be abolished because of an urban, anti-Christian ideology'.¹¹³¹ Interestingly, the division between the parliamentary left and right has been explained by the fact that the 'Conservatives by inclination are less likely to favour state intervention of any sort' whereas Labour would support such intervention on behalf of progressive causes.¹¹³² Of course, the explanation is not quite accurate because the Conservatives are more than willing to use state intervention in a number of circumstances. Even within the Labour Party there was a division between the left and right with regards to hunting. As Elliot Morley explains: 'the more right wing of the party regarded things like a ban on bloodsports as low priority... whereas the more left wing of the party thought that it was a high priority issue'.¹¹³³ The issue was more important to party activists and backbench MPs than it was to the leadership. Indeed, the 2004 Hunting Act is 'likely to go down as one of the clearest examples of backbench power in the postwar period'.¹¹³⁴

Chris Mullin sums up two key reasons why Labour were likely to oppose hunting: 'My view was (a) this is the right thing to do and (b) there are votes in it'.¹¹³⁵ Regardless of the class and party implications, numerous Labour MPs believed that hunting should be abolished simply because it is morally wrong to torment and kill a sentient creature for pleasure. Of course, an abolitionist animal advocate would say that slaughtering animals for food amounts to killing for pleasure. These animal advocates might suggest that non-vegetarian MPs who opposed hunting were slightly contradictory. Nonetheless, it is easy to differentiate between practices like hunting in which pleasure is seemingly derived from the suffering of another creature and no 'use' is made of the animal after death, and eating meat where no joy is derived from the suffering, indeed the meat industry attempts to hide the suffering from view. Labour, with varying degrees of success, aimed to be a compassionate party, a party which aimed to protect vulnerable groups in society. Perhaps animals could fit into this category. Labour MP Robin Corbett certainly believed that

¹¹³¹ J. Wallwork, J. A. Dixon, 'Foxes, green fields and Britishness', p. 27.

¹¹³² A. G. Hoare, 'Hunting for Votes', p. 465.

¹¹³³ Interview with Elliot Morley, Former Labour MP, Former Labour Animal Welfare Spokesperson, 11/08/14.

¹¹³⁴ P. Cowley, M. Stuart, 'Parliament: Hunting for Votes', *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 58. No. 2, (2005), pp. 258-271, p. 271.

¹¹³⁵ Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, 22/07/14.

‘compassion is indivisible’ across the species barrier.¹¹³⁶ Indeed, Corbett believed that Labour had a significant duty to represent other animals because ‘people can speak for themselves, animals can’t’.¹¹³⁷ Roger Scruton reacted to the left’s concern for other animals by mockingly noting that ‘animals are now perceived as a victim class’.¹¹³⁸ It is unlikely that Labour activists would universally accept that animals are a ‘victim class’. Nonetheless, in the 1980s the Labour left did incorporate animal concern alongside a range of leftist causes (for instance LGBT rights and their longstanding commitment to nuclear disarmament) in an attempt to build a progressive alliance. As the 1990s progressed and voting along traditional class lines decreased, Labour aimed to attract a progressive majority with compassionate causes. As Anthony Hoare explains ‘a ban on hunting is precisely the sort of high profile, emotive liberal concern that makes it a prime candidate for “issue voting”’.¹¹³⁹ In Hoare’s analysis hunting appears as a post-materialist issue and is emphasised by Labour, alongside other environmental concerns, at a time when it seemed that economic standards had risen; this explains the ‘dramatic rise in public salience [of animal welfare and broader environmental concerns] over time in Britain since the mid 1980s compared to other economic and social problems’.¹¹⁴⁰

Chris Mullin’s intuition that opposition to hunting was popular with the electorate is undoubtedly true. Even after ten years of aggressive campaigning against the ban by the Countryside Alliance, opinion polls show that ‘only a relatively small proportion of electors are clearly in support of a repeal of the ban on fox hunting, and that much larger numbers oppose repeal’.¹¹⁴¹ Elliot Morley explains that ‘animal welfare has always been a popular issue with the public’:

It always commanded quite widespread support in this country and in particular with young people who in many instances were not particularly engaged in the political process but were quite passionate in some instances about animal welfare issues and their desire for change.¹¹⁴²

¹¹³⁶ *Labour Weekly*, March 16th 1979, p. 6.

¹¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹³⁸ R. Scruton, *Animal Rights and Wrongs* (London: Demos, 1996), p. 8.

¹¹³⁹ A. G. Hoare, ‘Hunting for Votes’, p. 462.

¹¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴¹ D. Toke, ‘Foxhunting and the Conservatives’, p. 205.

¹¹⁴² Interview with Elliot Morley.

As a party seeking electoral success, particularly amongst young voters who may be more progressive, it is easy to see why Labour would adopt an anti-bloodsports position. The Green Party also argued that '80% of the public agree' that there is 'no place for the return of this cruel and barbaric activity in our countryside'.¹¹⁴³ However, if the Labour Party believed that banning hunting would be a relatively easy or uncontentious issue then they were proved wrong after coming to power in 1997.

Labour's response to hunting does not necessarily fit into the approach expected from a CAS framework because, in relation to hunting, legislation is usually framed in terms of rights rather than welfare. Labour politicians have also claimed that 'compassion is indivisible' and linked hunting to other progressive causes in ways which mirror CAS concepts of speciesism, intersectionality and total liberation. Nonetheless, the claim in previous chapters that animal activists in the Labour Party fall short of these CAS approaches holds true. Labour activists did not use the concept of speciesism in their arguments; indeed the Party often accepted that fox populations would have to be controlled using 'humane' methods. Moreover, although Labour sought to build progressive alliances, this does not mean that the Party expressed the belief that different forms of oppression were fundamentally interconnected.¹¹⁴⁴ As expected, the parliamentary left favoured a legislative approach to animal advocacy.

2004 Hunting Act

It is not the purpose of this case study to give a full and detailed account of the legislative process that led to the 2004 Hunting Act reaching the statute book. The various stages, votes, and political manoeuvring that lead to the passing of the Hunting Act have been described elsewhere.¹¹⁴⁵ Nonetheless, it is important for the

¹¹⁴³ 'Green Party calls on government to maintain and strengthen anti-hunting legislation', 13/07/2015 [viewed online, <https://www.greenparty.org.uk/news/2015/07/13/green-party-calls-on-government-to-maintain-and-strengthen-anti-hunting-legislation/>, last accessed 26/11/2015].

¹¹⁴⁴ *Living Without Cruelty: Labour's Charter for Animal Protection* (The Labour Party: Policy Background Paper, 1979).

¹¹⁴⁵ For instance in M. Wood, 'Hunting: New Labour Success or New Labour Failure'.

discussion that follows to briefly outline the legislative development of the 2004 Act which has been described as ‘one of the truly historic achievements of the New Labour Government’, and which some have placed only behind the Iraq War as the ‘defining Blair moment’.¹¹⁴⁶

As we have seen, hunting became more of a party political issue during the 1990s as other ideological disputes faded.¹¹⁴⁷ Nonetheless, attempts to ban hunting typically came from the back benches through Private Members’ measures or Ten Minute Rule Bills and included cross-party sponsorship. In November 1991 Kevin McNamara, the Labour MP for Kingston-Upon-Hull, introduced his Wild Mammals (Protection) Bill which aimed to outlaw the hunting of wild mammals with dogs and snares. The Bill came before the House of Commons on the 14th February 1992 when it was narrowly defeated by 187 votes to 175, with 288 MPs not voting.¹¹⁴⁸ The HSA regarded the failure of McNamara’s Bill to secure a second reading to be ‘the big disappointment of the season’, although ‘some enjoyment was at least gained from watching the other side cough up their usual guff to justify their fun, and then squirm under the verbal onslaught from the Bill’s supporters’.¹¹⁴⁹ Further Private Members Bills were introduced; the Fox Hunting (Abolition) Bill introduced by Tony Banks in 1993 was followed by another Wild Mammals (Protection) Bill introduced by John McFall in 1995. Both Bills were defeated and it became clear to both hunt supporters and opponents that a Bill to ban hunting would not be introduced unless Labour had a majority in parliament, and that once in office Labour would come under increasing pressure from their backbenchers to introduce such legislation.

The first Private Member’s Bill put before Blair’s government was the attempt by Michael Foster (Labour MP for Worcester) to ‘introduce a Bill to ban the hunting of wild mammals with hounds’.¹¹⁵⁰ The pro-hunt supporters within the Conservative Party were easily able to ‘talk the Bill out’, angering Labour backbenchers who believed that Labour’s promise of a free vote on hunting clearly implied ‘that if the

¹¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

¹¹⁴⁷ Which is not to say there were not Conservatives who wished to outlaw foxhunting, Although the group of anti-hunting Tories did not formalise into ‘Blue Fox’ until 2010. ‘Conservatives against fox hunting: don’t run with the pack’ [viewed online, <http://www.conservativesagainstfoxhunting.com/>, last accessed 19/02/2015].

¹¹⁴⁸ A. G. Hoare, ‘Hunting for votes’, pp.463-464.

¹¹⁴⁹ *Arkangel*, ‘HSA News’, No. 8, Summer 1992, p. 3.

¹¹⁵⁰ M. Woods, ‘Hunting’, p. 99.

House wanted a Bill, they would find time for the Bill to go through'.¹¹⁵¹ Many animal rights activists had initially been enthused by Labour's election victory. One group in *Arkangel* initiated a letter writing campaign to 'Tony Blair (who has stated his personal support for the Bill) sharing your solidarity with him'.¹¹⁵²

However, activists were soon frustrated when the Labour cabinet declared itself 'neutral' and suggested that its pledge to allow a free vote had been honoured by Mike Foster's filibustered Bill. It soon became clear that Tony Blair did not support a strict ban on hunting, and he was joined by Jack Straw, Peter Mandelson, Robin Cook, David Blunkett and Peter Hain as prominent opponents of the ban.¹¹⁵³ Many Labour supporters felt betrayed that the Labour leadership had not allowed government time for a vote and Tony Benn considered not voting for any government motion until time was found for a hunting Bill.¹¹⁵⁴ Indeed, Benn was so disillusioned by New Labour's failure to implement legislation against hunting that he questioned the whole validity of a parliamentary system that could not deliver a basic reform that was supported by the majority of the population because it was seen as a challenge to the traditional ruling elite.¹¹⁵⁵

Labour's leadership responded to growing frustration on the backbenches by setting up the Burns Inquiry into hunting, through which they reaffirmed their long-standing commitment to phase out hunting whilst 'effectively ruling out legislation for at least a year'.¹¹⁵⁶ The debates continued and Blair's suggestion of local referenda was rapidly dismissed by his advisory team.¹¹⁵⁷ During Blair's second term a weak government Bill was introduced, but a backbench Labour amendment proposed by Tony Banks 'converting the Bill into a complete ban was passed in the House of Commons with a majority of 208'.¹¹⁵⁸ On March 18th 2002 MPs voted for the

¹¹⁵¹ T. Benn, *Free At Last: Diaries 1991-2001* (London: Hutchinson, 2002), p. 468, Friday 6th March 1998.

¹¹⁵² *Arkangel*, No. 18, 1997, p. 2.

¹¹⁵³ M. Woods, 'Hunting', p. 101, p. 111. A. Campbell, B. Hagerty, (eds.), *The Alastair Campbell Diaries, Volume Two: Power & People, 1997-1999* (London: Arrow Books, 2011), p. 317, March 9th 1998.

¹¹⁵⁴ T. Benn, *Free At Last*, p. 469. Of course, the split was not so clear-cut between 'Labour's leadership' and backbenchers; there were members of the cabinet who supported a hunting ban, and backbenchers who were neutral, or even supportive of bloodsports.

¹¹⁵⁵ T. Benn, *Free At Last*, p. 469.

¹¹⁵⁶ M. Woods, 'Hunting' p. 102.

¹¹⁵⁷ A. Campbell, B. Hagerty, (eds.), *The Alastair Campbell Diaries, Volume Three, Power & Responsibility, 1999-2001* (London: Arrow Books, 2012), p. 418, October 10th 2000.

¹¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

complete ban on hunting with dogs when presented with ‘three options: a complete ban..., the preservation of the status quo, and the compromise of licensed hunting’.¹¹⁵⁹

The Bill was halted by House of Lords opposition, despite the House of Commons accepting an eighteen-month delay, and it was not until November 2004 that Labour used the Parliament Act to force through the Hunting Bill; Chris Mullin was jubilant that: ‘we have taken on the mightiest vested interest in the land and one with infinite resources at its disposal’.¹¹⁶⁰ Perhaps Mullin’s joy was unwarranted, as Blair believed that he had secured a ‘masterly compromise’ in which hunting ‘was banned in such a way that, provided certain steps are taken to avoid cruelty when the fox is killed, it isn’t banned’.¹¹⁶¹ Having briefly considered how the Hunting Act reached the statute book, the following section considers the success of the Act. This provokes questions about the extent to which anarchistic hunt saboteurs would favour strong legislation. The case study then looks at policing of hunting since the ban. The ban put anarchist animal advocates in the uncomfortable position of being on the same side as the police, and the case study considers whether direct action activists remain in opposition to the police or whether they demand stricter enforcement of the ban.

The Hunting Act: Success or failure?

In February 2015 national animal welfare groups and the Labour Party united to celebrate the ten year anniversary of the Hunting Act coming into effect. LACS described the Act as ‘an effective and popular piece of legislation’; and Labour saw the ban as ‘a testament to the progress made since the days of bear baiting and other such barbaric blood sports’.¹¹⁶² However, there is a split within the animal protection movement between those who view the Act as a triumph (typically the

¹¹⁵⁹ A. Campbell, B. Hagerty, (eds.), *The Alastair Campbell Diaries, Volume 4: The Burden of Power, Countdown to Iraq* (London: Hutchinson, 2012), p. 191, March 18th 2002.

¹¹⁶⁰ C. Mullin, *A View From The Foothills* (London: Profile Books, 2010), pp. 511-512, Thursday 18th November 2004.

¹¹⁶¹ T. Blair, *A Journey* (London: Arrow Books, 2011), p. 306.

¹¹⁶² League Against Cruel Sports, *The Hunting Act: the most successful wild animal welfare legislation* (Godalming: LACS, 2015); *Labour: Protecting Animals* (London: The Labour Party, 2015), p. 2.

national organisations and Labour politicians) and those who do not believe the Act has stopped hunting (a view held by hunt saboteurs engaged in direct action). This section of the case study considers whether the Act has been a success or a failure and then asks why certain groups of animal advocates would take a particular view of the Act. It could be that groups favouring a parliamentary road to reform would not want to admit that a piece of legislation eighty years in the making had been unsuccessful; alternatively anarchist hunt saboteurs who reject representative democracy may be reluctant to accept that the legislative process has worked.

As we have seen, Tony Blair believed that despite the 2004 Act hunting 'isn't banned' because of the exemptions and concessions written into the legislation.¹¹⁶³ Clearly, the view of most hunt saboteurs is that hunting is continuing. After the Act hunt saboteurs amended their tactics and began 'passive filming' of illegal actions, but hunt sab groups soon recognised the need to return to 'traditional sabbing'.¹¹⁶⁴ However, hunting practiced since 2005 is often described as 'illegal hunting' by the HSA, which means that the hunters are breaking the law rather than using the existing loopholes to hunt legally.¹¹⁶⁵ One anarchistic hunt saboteur summed up the view of her group when she explained that although a lot of people assume that hunting has stopped, the reality is that the practice continues and in four years sabbing the group had never witnessed a hunt act within the new law: 'so I don't feel it's made a difference in that way'.¹¹⁶⁶

Another activist believes that although 'in theory the Hunting Act itself should prevent hunting', the reality is that the exemptions make the legislation unenforceable and 'can hide the face of what's really going on':

Like this, for instance, this thing about you're only allowed to use two hounds to flush the fox to the gun... they're out with a whole pack so the minute they're on a live scent it's illegal... there's things written into the Act... that doesn't hinder the hunting industry too much.¹¹⁶⁷

¹¹⁶³ T. Blair, *Journey*, p. 306.

¹¹⁶⁴ *Howl*, No. 89, Summer 2008, p. 18.

¹¹⁶⁵ HSA, 'Hunt Saboteurs Retrieve Body of Illegally Hunted Fox' [viewed online, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/index.php/news/press-releases/550-hunt-saboteurs-retrieve-body-of-illegally-hunted-fox>, last accessed 23/04/2015].

¹¹⁶⁶ Anonymous South Wales Hunt Saboteur, 17/06/14.

¹¹⁶⁷ Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

David Toke agrees that ‘there are some widely different interpretations as to whether the Hunting Act has “worked” or not’.¹¹⁶⁸ One LACS representative argued that ‘it is the chase and the kill which is cruel, it is allowing the dogs to run across the country sometimes for miles chasing a fox to the point that it is terrified, exhausted and then the dogs ripping up the fox’.¹¹⁶⁹ However, the Act is seen as successful because ‘now they cannot allow the dogs to actually chase the fox, they can use two dogs to flush the fox from cover and they can shoot it if it is safe to do so’.¹¹⁷⁰ Despite the assurances of LACS, HSA activists report that they routinely see hunters flout these laws after the animal is flushed. For instance, one HSA report of a hunt in Suffolk reads:

Despite initially claiming they had laid an artificial trail, they [the hunters] then ignored this completely and set about trying to flush a fox. The hunt is allowed only to use [two] hounds to flush a fox, and as soon as it breaks cover they must be stopped and the bird released to catch and kill the animal. This did not happen - the hounds were allowed to flush, chase and ultimately kill the poor fox, by disembowelling it rather than the oft-quoted mythical *quick nip to the back of the neck*.¹¹⁷¹

The mention of ‘the bird’ relates to a bizarre exemption in which ‘Flushing a wild mammal from cover is [an] exempt [form of] hunting if [it is] undertaken for the purpose of enabling a bird of prey to hunt the wild mammal’.¹¹⁷²

Clearly there are some exemptions within the legislation that make the Hunting Act difficult to enforce. Moreover, hunts can claim to be following an artificial trail before the hounds catch a scent and set upon an animal. Hunters may also claim to be legally hunting a rat or rabbit before the hounds set upon an animal which provides more of a chase. Before considering the success of prosecutions against illegal hunts it is worth briefly considering the attitude of the pro-hunt lobby towards the ban. Perhaps their determination to repeal the ban suggests that the

¹¹⁶⁸ D. Toke, ‘Foxhunting and the Conservatives’, p. 207.

¹¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹¹⁷¹ HSA, ‘Blatant illegal hunting ignored by Suffolk Police’, 16th September 2006 [viewed online, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/index.php/news/press-archive/158-news-release-16-sept-2006>, last accessed 20/02/2015]. Italics in original.

¹¹⁷² S. Moss, ‘The banned rode on’, *The Guardian*, 7th November 2006 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/nov/07/hunting.ethicalliving>, last accessed 20/02/2015].

legislation is working. Even if the practice of hunting has not stopped, groups like the Countryside Alliance remain affronted that it is them, and not the hunt sabs, who are on the wrong side of the law. Indeed, for longtime activist Jon the success of the Act can be measured in the fact that ‘it certainly pissed off the hunters which was quite nice’.¹¹⁷³

LACS representative Dawn Varley believes that the Hunting Act has been a success – with ‘one prosecution a week under the Hunting Act and two thirds of those result[ing] in prosecution’.¹¹⁷⁴ However, Varley is aware that certain pro-hunting groups seek to undermine the legislation by portraying the Act as unenforceable; in particular the ‘Countryside Alliance like to portray the Hunting Act as a failure’.¹¹⁷⁵ Certainly, the Countryside Alliance is keen to repeat the line that ‘the Act has failed through unenforceability against the very hunts those prejudiced MPs who railroaded it through Parliament sought to punish’.¹¹⁷⁶ Indeed, such arguments are repeated by the Conservative Party leadership and in the right wing media.¹¹⁷⁷ However, David Toke has demonstrated the lengths that the pro-hunting lobby were willing to go not just in their attempts to prevent the Act, but also in their desire to repeal the legislation. For instance, in the run up to the 2005 general election the Countryside Alliance initiated the ‘Vote OK’ scheme to campaign in marginal seats in which there was a candidate wishing to repeal the Hunting Act and another candidate supporting the ban. The Vote OK organisers, recognising that hunting does not have popular support, suggested that ‘it would be much cleverer if we never mentioned hunting at all’, and instead the group focused on health, education and crime.¹¹⁷⁸ It is estimated that ‘on average’ the activity of Vote OK influenced ‘1.2% of the electorate’ in some marginal constituencies.¹¹⁷⁹ One could argue that the hunting lobby would not waste colossal resources of time and money if the Hunting Act was so unenforceable that it really had no detrimental effect on their ability to hunt.

¹¹⁷³ Interview with Jon Active, ex-hunt sab, Active Distribution, 05/11/14.

¹¹⁷⁴ Dawn Varley, League Against Cruel Sports, 20/05/14.

¹¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁷⁶ A. Barnard, ‘The Hunting Act in 2010’ [viewed online, <http://www.countryside-alliance.org/ca/campaigns-hunting/the-hunting-act-in-2010>, last accessed 23/02/2015].

¹¹⁷⁷ P. Dominiczak, J. Kirkup, ‘Hunting Act “unenforceable” and encouraging anti-social behaviour says senior MP’, *Daily Telegraph*, 25th December 2013 [viewed online, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/10537821/Hunting-Act-unenforceable-and-encouraging-anti-social-behaviour-says-senior-MP.html>, last accessed 26/02/15].

¹¹⁷⁸ D. Toke, ‘Foxhunting and the Conservatives’, pp.209-210.

¹¹⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 209.

In order to consider how successful the Hunting Act has been one can consider the number of prosecutions the Act has secured. Using this criterion the Act initially appears successful. As of September 2014 there were over 340 successful prosecutions under the Hunting Act.¹¹⁸⁰ In 2008, a typical year of the Act's implementation, 44 defendants were proceeded against and 33 were found guilty.¹¹⁸¹ Certainly, Dawn Varley from LACS is satisfied that the legislation works and is proud of the League's involvement in bringing about prosecutions:

We've invested a million pounds over three years into our investigations team, so we are out there catching evidence, working with the prosecution and enforcement agencies, and actually helping get the hunters to court.¹¹⁸²

However, the Countryside Alliance argue that the large number of prosecutions is misleading because such trials are not against hunts, but against poaching offences that are also covered under the Act. Indeed, the Countryside Alliance argues that only a single conviction in 2010 involved a hunt, whilst others related to poaching.¹¹⁸³ For Countryside Alliance executive Alice Barnard, this is evidence that 'the Act is being used by the Police to tackle poaching, lending a veneer of success-through-numbers to an Act that is a dismal failure'.¹¹⁸⁴ The Countryside Alliance's claim that prosecutions do not typically involve hunts does not alter Dawn Varley's view that the Act has been a success. Varley explains that although it is true that the typical upper-class hunter is not always the target of the Act, the legislation still goes some way to stopping unnecessary cruelty:

The Hunting Act was never about bringing to court just red coats, just the master huntsman, what it was about was shedding a light on the abuse of animals through bloodsports so it doesn't matter if you're the terrier man, who's likely to be working-class, who's digging up the fox or going out with his dogs at night to chase foxes, or whether you are the lord of the manor in a red coat on horseback ... it doesn't matter who you are, you're breaking the law

¹¹⁸⁰ The Hunting Act: A website for enforcement professionals, 'Prosecutions' [viewed online, <http://huntingact.org/?q=node/18>, last accessed 23/02/2015].

¹¹⁸¹ 'Hunting Act 2004: Prosecutions, Justice written question – answered on 4th February 2010' [viewed online, <http://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2010-02-04a.315013.h&s=speaker%3A10444#g315013.q0>, last accessed 23/02/2015].

¹¹⁸² Dawn Varley, League Against Cruel Sports, 20/05/14.

¹¹⁸³ A. Barnard, 'The Hunting Act in 2010'.

¹¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

regardless of which class you're from, regardless of which political party you're from, and the law needs to respect that and prosecute you.¹¹⁸⁵

Although LACS are satisfied with the level of prosecutions, the HSA are worried about the class implications surrounding the prosecutions. HSA activist Simon argues that there is 'certainly a class aspect in the way the police use the law'. For instance the police 'are very active in [arresting] those using lurcher dogs and hare coursing', activities that are crudely associated with working-class participants, whilst hunts are rarely prosecuted.¹¹⁸⁶ Even when a huntsman is brought to court, penalties are often lenient. Simon recalls the case of a huntsman who was caught hunting illegally and fined £120, even though his hunt had been caught hunting illegally on three previous occasions. Simon also alleges that the magistrate was a neighbour of the offending hunter but refused to withdraw from the case.¹¹⁸⁷

Direct Action activists and the Hunting Act

Before considering the relationship between hunt saboteurs and the police after 2004, it is interesting to briefly consider whether anarchistic animal activists would be willing to support a progressive piece of legislation such as the Hunting Act. This is particularly interesting from a CAS perspective because it calls into question the presumed dichotomy between direct action and legislation and as such suggests broader conclusions for the ability for different sections of the animal advocacy movement to work together. One might at first presume that self-identified anarchists would not support legislation, although as we shall see it is not quite so simple for anarchist animal advocates.

Clearly some self-identified anarchists reject all legislation. The anarchist group Crimethinc reject even the most progressive legislation because:

The most liberal democracy shares the same principle as the most despotic autocracy: the centralization of power and legitimacy in a structure intended to

¹¹⁸⁵ Dawn Varley, League Against Cruel Sports, 20/05/14.

¹¹⁸⁶ Interview with Simon, H.S.A, 25/04/2014.

¹¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

monopolize the use of force. Whether the bureaucrats who operate this structure answer to a king, a president, or an electorate is beside the point. Laws, bureaucracy and police... function the same way in a democracy as in a dictatorship.¹¹⁸⁸

Some anarchist animal advocates reject all laws as hierarchical. Indeed, Kevin Watkinson and Donal O'Driscoll argue that beneficial changes will never be achieved through legislation because:

Capitalism and the state work in tandem, so legislation will always enforce the primacy of property... including reforms in the guise of helping animals. This is the reason why legislation designed to protect animals from cruelty often ends up making things worse in the long run.¹¹⁸⁹

This is not an exclusively anarchist position. The criminologist Piers Beirne highlights two significant aspects of most animal cruelty legislation. Firstly, that such legislation should never be taken at its 'self-stated face value' because 'more often than not, humans' concern with animal abuse is motivated by human interests'.¹¹⁹⁰ This certainly applies to the Hunting Act, with the class and party considerations that arose. Secondly, Beirne agrees with the anarchistic proposition that:

It does seem pure folly to believe that animals' interests and rights can ever be adequately secured through legislative reform while their master status continues to be that of property.¹¹⁹¹

Although foxes and other wild mammals were not regarded as property, they were regarded as pests who could damage property. Beirne is correct that if legislation does not change the status of animals then prohibitions against cruelty can never been entirely successful. The Hunting Act did not change the status of the fox or other wild mammals, which can still be killed as pests. However, where Beirne might differ from Kevin Watkinson and Donal O'Driscoll is with regard to whether legislation could ever successfully change the status of animals.

¹¹⁸⁸ Crimethinc, *To Change Everything: An Anarchist Appeal* (Crimethinc, 2015), p. 33.

¹¹⁸⁹ K. Watkinson, D. O'Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism: Open Letter #3* (Leeds: Dysophia, 2014), p. 12.

¹¹⁹⁰ P. Beirne, *Confronting Animal Abuse: Law, Criminology, And Human-Animal Relationships* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009), pp. 196-197.

¹¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

Some hunt saboteurs who self-identify as anarchists would see no problem in promoting animal rights legislation. One saboteur believed that 'legislation itself is a very good thing and it can work so long as it's enforced properly'.¹¹⁹² This activist believed that the problem was not the legislation, but the fact that 'the CPS [Crown Prosecution Service] aren't interested in enforcing the ban... but it's still a law that's being broken, and as all things like that it's meant to go punished'.¹¹⁹³

There may be a paradox in a self-identified anarchist promoting tougher punishments, including jail sentences, from a state whose legitimacy is not accepted. Anthony Nocella argues that anarchist animal advocates should never support 'the conviction, sentencing and incarceration of those who abuse nonhuman animals', in part because of attempts to build solidarity with other oppressed groups who are disproportionately likely to face the 'prison industrial complex'.¹¹⁹⁴ Nonetheless, it is not necessarily a contradiction for anarchist hunt saboteurs to support rigorous anti-hunting legislation. Uri Gordon offers four ways in which anarchists can 'deal with the dilemma of support for a Palestinian state' whilst showing solidarity with Palestinians.¹¹⁹⁵ I argue that the same four reasons can explain why self-identified anarchists would support animal rights legislation.

Firstly, anarchists might acknowledge that 'there is indeed a contradiction here' but still believe that support for legislation is worthwhile 'even if it comes at the price of inconsistency'.¹¹⁹⁶ Gordon pictures anarchist activists saying to the Palestinians: 'sorry, we'll let you remain non-citizens of a brutal occupation until after we're done abolishing capitalism'.¹¹⁹⁷ In a similar way anarchist animal advocates should not expect animals facing immediate abuse to wait until after the revolution when basic improvements can immediately be brought about through legislation. Anarchists here must be prepared to sacrifice their 'otherwise fully uncompromising

¹¹⁹² Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

¹¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁹⁴ A. J. Nocella II, 'Animal advocates for prison and slave abolition: A transformative justice approach to movement politics for an end to racism', *Journal For Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2012, pp. 119-126, p. 124.

¹¹⁹⁵ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive! Anti-authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008), p. 154.

¹¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁹⁷ Ibid, p. 155.

anti-statism' because their animal rights commitments (or humanitarian commitments in the Palestinian case) are seen to take precedence.¹¹⁹⁸

Secondly, anarchists can support new legislation without contradiction because, even before the Hunting Act, it was existing laws that allowed wild animals to be hunted for pleasure. In Gordon's example 'Palestinians are already living under a state' so a new state 'creates only a quantitative change, not a qualitative one'.¹¹⁹⁹ So from a purely anti-statist anarchist perspective the Hunting Act may be objectionable, but it wouldn't be a qualitative change because existing laws already affect wild mammals. Gordon also explains that 'anarchists object to the state as a general scheme of social relations – not to this or the other state, but to the principle behind them all'. Indeed, it would be wrong to reduce this objection to quantitative terms, believing that having one state more or less in the world relates to how close anarchists are to achieving their objectives. Similarly, having one more piece of legislation – this time one committed to the protection of wild mammals – would not amount to one step back for a future anarchist society.

Thirdly, such legislation may even help bring about positive social change. Gordon's third reason why anarchists may support Palestinian statehood is as a 'strategic choice, a desirable stage in a longer-term struggle'.¹²⁰⁰ Similarly, it would not be difficult for anarchist animal advocates to argue that animal rights legislation is a 'positive development on the way to more radical changes'.

Finally, whether anarchists support a particular piece of legislation or not may be 'an entirely insignificant matter' and would therefore constitute a 'false debate'.¹²⁰¹ After all, the Labour leadership were not asking anarchist animal advocates for their opinion before implementing the Hunting Act. Using this rationale, anarchist animal advocates have no obligation to oppose legislative change, although they may have recognized that direct action would still be necessary, even after legislation is implemented, in order to achieve more positive developments.

¹¹⁹⁸ U. Gordon, 'Anarchism and Political Theory: Contemporary Problems', (PhD Thesis, Mansfield College, University of Oxford, 2007), Chapter 8: Unholy Land. [available online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/uri-gordon-anarchism-and-political-theory-contemporary-problems>].

¹¹⁹⁹ U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!*, p. 155.

¹²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

One longstanding animal rights slogan states that animal liberation will be achieved 'by any means necessary'. Typically, this refers to support for militant, and even violent, forms of direct action.¹²⁰² Interestingly, HSA activist Simon, who identifies as an anarchist, justifies legislative action by evoking the slogan: 'we will do whatever it takes to oppose hunting – be that talking to politicians or getting in the field'.¹²⁰³ In this instance it is parliamentary politics, not violent action, which is seen as a slightly contentious form of action that animal advocates are prepared to justify in order to bring about benefits for other animals. Finally, it is not just anarchist animal advocates who are wary of parliamentary reform. For instance, the Campaign to Strengthen the Hunting Act (CSHA), an initiative by Protect Our Wild Animals and endorsed by the Hunt Monitors Association, believes that legislation should play a small role alongside a wider aim of changing social attitudes. The CSHA website contains a quote from Martin Luther King: 'You can't legislate to change the heart, but you can legislate to restrain the heartless'.¹²⁰⁴ Perhaps this sums up the attitude of the majority of the animal rights movement: legislation is sometimes necessary as a restraining device, but a fundamental shift in the status of other animals is necessary to bring about long lasting change.

In this section I argued that it is not necessarily inconsistent for anarchist animal advocates to support progressive animal rights legislation. This challenges the CAS dichotomy between direct action and legislation. Indeed, it is not just hunt sabs who use direct action to uphold existing legislation. For instance, the actions of the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, who use direct action including the threat of sinking ships, is aimed 'at forcing various governments to simply obey existing endangered species protection laws'.¹²⁰⁵ In the following section the relationship between the police and hunt saboteurs since the 2004 Act is scrutinized.

Hunt Saboteurs and the Police since 2005

¹²⁰² J. Grubbs, M. Loadenthal, 'From the Classroom to the Slaughterhouse: Animal Liberation by Any Means Necessary', in A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Social Justice Approach for Liberation* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014).

¹²⁰³ Interview with Simon, H.S.A, 25/04/2014.

¹²⁰⁴ Campaign to Strengthen the Hunting Act [viewed online, <http://campaigntostrengthenthehuntingact.com/>, last accessed 24/02/2015].

¹²⁰⁵ D. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 51.

We have already seen that hunt saboteurs have traditionally had a hostile relationship with the police. In this section we consider the relationship between hunt saboteurs and the police since the ban came into force in February 2005. This is significant for understanding different ideological approaches to animal rights because in theory we would not expect anarchists to appeal to a hierarchical structure of law enforcement to implement animal protection measures, whereas animal activists within the parliamentary left would unproblematically be able to appeal to the police.

Anarchist support for the police, if it exists, cannot be justified in the same way as support for legislation has been. Firstly, cooperating with the police may be perceived as a weakening of solidarity between animal activists and other groups, such as striking workers or protesting environmentalists, who are still feeling the force of alleged police repression. Secondly, giving the police more powers might not be a sensible strategic choice for anarchists seeking positive developments on the way to deeper revolutionary changes; it might be regarded as a step backwards. Finally, it is not a 'false debate'; politicians may be unaware of the opinions of anarchist animal activists but the police in the hunting fields are certainly aware of direct action activists and the actions of campaigners can affect the police response.

There are variables in the relationship between hunt saboteurs and the police, both in the attitudes of activists and the mentality of police in different areas. One saboteur explains the different attitudes that activists may take towards the police:

I think there are some who feel very strongly against the police and some will not speak to them at all, and some are not against [the police] but don't have a lot of faith in them doing anything that will help them, but you do have some who will be quite willing if a police officer is being reasonable to them they'll be reasonable to the police officer and they would be quite willing to tell them what's going on.¹²⁰⁶

¹²⁰⁶ Anonymous South Wales Hunt Saboteur, 17/06/14.

Some hunt saboteurs put this varying relationship with the police down to the class position of individual activists.¹²⁰⁷ Another activist explains that the attitude of the police has been varied in different counties since the ban.¹²⁰⁸ Despite these variations, most hunt saboteurs do not report improvements in their relationship with the police since 2005. One saboteur, who does not identify with anarchism, reported that his group had only had one encounter with the police, in which his entire group were threatened with arrest. This activist believes that police 'all have connections with the hunts or the game shoots or whatever', and although he rejected anarchism or any ideological position, the activist believed that the police 'are some kind of battering ram for the state'.¹²⁰⁹ The relationship between Southern Anti-Bloodsports activists and the police has not improved since the ban. Luke reports circumstances in which hunt saboteurs have been forced to phone the police, either because they've spotted illegal hunting or because of abusive behaviour from hunt supporters only for the police to 'turn up and harass us'. Although the attitude of the police can vary it is not unusual for the police to 'stop us, they'll take our drivers details, sometimes they'll search sabs'.¹²¹⁰ Violence against saboteurs from hunt supporters has continued since the ban. Luke reports that:

Sometimes it will be quite a violent day with hunt saboteurs being assaulted, things thrown at them, we've had tyres slashed, windows broken, as well as in the past we've had dead animals thrown at us... it's quite obviously illegal and the police don't even respond.¹²¹¹

New activists joining a sab group for the first time are often shocked by the level of police violence: 'people will come out with us who've never seen this sort of thing before and be amazed, it's like something off the TV sometimes'.¹²¹² However, despite this hostile relationship, some anarchist animal activists do appeal to the police, and there are some hunt saboteurs 'who have been happy to see the role that the police play change and [want to] help them be more effective and help them police hunts'.¹²¹³ One anarchistic hunt saboteur believes that legislation could be

¹²⁰⁷ *Arkangel*, # 11.

¹²⁰⁸ Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

¹²⁰⁹ Anonymous Northumberland Hunt Saboteur, 29/05/14.

¹²¹⁰ Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

¹²¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹²¹² *Ibid.*

¹²¹³ Anonymous South Wales Hunt Saboteur, 17/06/14.

successful but it needs ‘much, much more policing’.¹²¹⁴ This activist argues that it is the police, rather than hunt saboteurs, who should take on the role of monitors. Ultimately, this activist believes that hunting could be banned if a specialist police force was set up to focus on hunting, this force would be able to spot and stop illegal activity.¹²¹⁵

It is clearly problematic for anarchist animal activists to support tougher law enforcement. However, some anarchists may be being disingenuous with their support. For instance, activists may want to embarrass the state by appealing to its own structures – as was the case when the HSA took rogue police forces to court. Activists in *Howl* magazine encourage sabs who experience mistreatment from the police to ‘get those official complaints submitted and seek damages through the courts. Embarrass them through the local media’.¹²¹⁶ Moreover, appealing to the police can allow activists to restate the importance of direct action by arguing that they have attempted to stop hunting through legal channels and the only option open is direct action. Nonetheless the willingness to appeal to hierarchical authorities to protect animals is one key difference between anarchist and parliamentary left attitudes to animal rights.

Conclusion

This case study has highlighted some key reasons why anarchists and the parliamentary left are likely to have been opposed to bloodsports. The distinction cannot be framed in terms of the typical CAS distinction between a welfare versus rights debate because opposition to hunting has typically implied a total ban, rather than an attempt to improve the welfare of the hunted animal. Of course, one significant CAS difference that is upheld is the shared tactical and philosophical identity between animal rights activists and other anarchist groups because of the use of direct action as opposed to the parliamentary approach which favours legislation. However, this is not so simple because Labour activists such as Chris

¹²¹⁴ Ibid.

¹²¹⁵ Ibid.

¹²¹⁶ *Howl*, No. 89, Summer 2008, p. 18.

Williamson also believe in the importance of direct action. The chapter has also challenged the dichotomy between direct action and legislation because anarchistic activists could logically favour strong animal protection legislation. Anarchistic activists are more likely to use the concept of speciesism in their campaigning, although this is sometimes done whilst using 'speciesist language' such as referring to animals as 'it'. Anarchistic activists are also more likely to accept the concept of total liberation, in part because anti-establishment attitudes and solidarity with other campaign groups is fostered by the experience of direct action. Although the parliamentary left might not accept total liberation, the Labour Party did include opposition to hunting as part of their progressive alliance during the 1980s when the issue was linked to class hostility.

The case study has emphasised six reasons why anarchists and animal activists within the parliamentary left may be particularly opposed to hunting. For anarchists we saw that participating in hunt sabotage allowed activists the chance to personally make a difference without appealing to elected representatives. Moreover, activists feel a sense of personal euphoria from saving an individual's life. Anarchists and hunt saboteurs share a collective identity, often enhanced by participation in the UK punk scene, which includes preference for a non-hierarchical structure, an anti-establishment attitude and the belief that police have reacted oppressively as puppets of the state. For the parliamentary left we saw that there was a historic connection between Labour and LACS which was strengthened by issues involving class, party and alliance politics. We also saw that Labour aimed to be a compassionate party and believed that opposing hunting would attract electoral support.

The case study highlighted the conflicting attitude that anarchists may hold to the implementation of legislation. One activist summed up the position that:

Seeing more legislation is always problematic from an anarchist point of view, but... if you said was it a good thing or not, I guess it's all part of a movement towards getting people to stop doing things... it would be nice to see legislation that put an end to animal exploitation.¹²¹⁷

¹²¹⁷ Interview with Jon Active, ex-hunt sab, 05/11/14.

Indeed, many anarchist animal advocates are prepared to support legislation as a step towards deeper revolutionary changes, even if they are not prepared to accept tougher police enforcement. Moreover, these activists still believe that ‘when it comes to real change it’s not laws and regulations and impositions from above [that are] going to change attitudes or... the way animals are treated’.¹²¹⁸ HSA activist Simon, who also wants to see progressive legislation, believes that direct action and legislation can work together as part of the same movement:

The two work side by side, obviously if we’ve got people out there saving animals that gets publicity and we can then highlight the wider aspects of what’s happening in hunting and put pressure on politicians and the press to oppose hunting.¹²¹⁹

However, even if anarchist activists and left of centre politicians are working towards the same end, the case study has found little evidence of the two groups working together. The oppositional and anti-establishment attitude of anarchist animal advocates extends towards all parliamentary parties so partly explains the unwillingness to work with those wishing to legislate against hunting. The fact that direct action activists are unconvinced that the Hunting Act has been successful also explains why anarchist animal advocates are not more supportive of parliamentary reform. Nonetheless, both the HSA and LACS approve of action to stop hunting in the field and through legislative action, although the two groups attach central importance to different tactical aspects.

Although the 2004 Hunting Act is imperfect, it is a rare example of abolitionist legislation becoming law. Indeed, in the coming years animal advocates of all persuasions may find themselves having to campaign against the Conservative Party’s ongoing desire to repeal the Act. We have seen that HSA activists have adapted the animal rights slogan ‘by any means necessary’ to talk about achieving progress for animals by doing ‘whatever it takes’. As anarchist animal advocates can theoretically and practically support legislation to protect animals, there is no reason why animal advocates with different left-wing ideologies would not find ways to work

¹²¹⁸ Ibid.

¹²¹⁹ Interview with Simon, H.S.A., 25/04/2014.

together in the future to protect and strengthen the legislation and complement the work of activists directly saving animals.

7. Case Study 2: Vivisection: ‘We are up against big business’

Introduction

This case study focuses on the relationship of anarchist and parliamentary left (particularly Labour Party) animal advocates in Britain to the issue of vivisection since 1976. In the previous case study we saw that presumed differences based on a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework are more complex when related to the realities of activism, particularly in relation to the dichotomy between legislation and direct action. This case study once again scrutinises the differences between anarchistic and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy based on a CAS framework; in particular we consider the contrast between rights/liberation as opposed to welfare, and direct action contrasted with legislation, as well as comparing philosophies that include concepts of speciesism and total liberation as opposed to the approach of activists who rely on extrinsic arguments about human improvement and allow hierarchy to remain unchallenged. This case study once again drives forward my overarching claim that CAS scholarship should take the relationship between direct action and legislative reform more seriously. It is important to consider vivisection because the issue has attracted more attention from animal advocates, both through parliamentary reform and direct action, than almost any other animal issue.

The case study reveals a number of points and themes which impact the way that parliamentary and anarchistic activists relate to vivisection. Although both anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocates aimed to show that their ideological position was key to promoting animal rights, it is clear that these two factions were unable to convince the entirety of the animal rights movement to combine animal advocacy with either anarchism or the Labour Party. In the

parliamentary left section we see that politicians in the Labour Party were unable to coordinate with the animal advocacy movement to effectively oppose the Conservatives' 1986 Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act. In the anarchist section it is revealed that despite having many anarchist supporters the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) did not solely adopt anarchistic tactics.

In order to examine the ability of anarchists and the parliamentary left to promote animal issues it is important to consider the alleged repression of animal advocates which occurred at the hands of New Labour and the preceding Conservative governments. This will help one understand if the anarchist focus on militant direct action was detrimental to the cause of animal rights, or if parliamentarians in the Labour Party were more concerned with curbing protest than with legislating to improve the conditions for animals in laboratories. This case study follows a different structure to the previous case study. The chapter does not set out reasons why anarchists and parliamentary leftists may be opposed to vivisection, because these largely overlap with reasons for opposing hunting. Instead, Labour's reaction to the 1986 Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act and the relationship of anarchists to the ALF and SHAC are considered in some detail.

This case study does not aim to show that one ideological grouping was superior in its ability to incorporate or promote animal rights. In fact, anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocates proved flexible in their ability to work within animal rights groups that did not accept their ideological framework. This is certainly the case for self-identified anarchists active within the ALF or SHAC. Often anarchist activists were prepared to accept progressive legislation as a stepping stone towards total liberation. It is also the case for some parliamentarians who raised Early Day Motions in the House of Commons in support of ALF activists whose actions they would not necessarily support.

Legislation or Liberation

For many activists who have felt compelled to take part in clandestine direct action ‘there is something about vivisection that strikes a deeper chord’ than other animal issues.¹²²⁰ It is not just activists, but theorists as well, who believe that vivisection is somewhat unique within animal advocacy. For Gary Francione ‘it is the use of animals in medical research, *above all other uses*, that compels us to think carefully about the moral status of animals’.¹²²¹ For the Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals campaigners, who sought change for animals through parliamentary legislation, ‘vivisection is, in scale and intensity, a particularly obnoxious area of animal abuse, and thus a priority for the attentions of the animal welfare movement’.¹²²² Indeed, within international anarchist circles it can seem that ‘the intense focus on this single issue can contribute to an insular mind set, if not outright myopia’.¹²²³ Mark Rowlands argues that the issue of animal experimentation seems unique because ‘the moral case for vivisection seems much stronger than the case for animal husbandry. With animal husbandry then it is pretty clear that only trivial human interests are at stake. But with vivisection, it could be argued that the human interests involved are genuinely vital ones’.¹²²⁴ It is also important to remember that one can not necessarily draw conclusions from the treatment of animals in vivisection laboratories and relate this to every single human relationship with other animals. As we see throughout the thesis, animals can have countless different relationships with groups of humans, including, on occasion, mutually beneficial relationships.

It is not the purpose of this chapter to argue about the moral rights and wrongs of vivisection – a subject that has been amply dealt with elsewhere.¹²²⁵ Similarly, it is not the place of this chapter to consider differing theoretical cases against vivisection. Singer, Regan and Ryder, for instance, all come to the same

¹²²⁰ K. Mann, ‘Psycho Analysis’, *Arkangel*, No. 13. Undated, p. 58-59.

¹²²¹ G. Francione, R. Garner, *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), p. 4. Emphasis added.

¹²²² Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, ‘An Outline Plan of Campaign Against Vivisection’, 28th Jan 1986. Hull History Centre, DBV/14/1.

¹²²³ *Rolling Thunder*, No. 6, 2006, p. 13.

¹²²⁴ M. Rowlands, *Animals Like Us* (London: Verso, 2002), p. 126. Rowlands only says it *seems* like there is a stronger moral case, before arguing that humans have no vital interest in vivisection.

¹²²⁵ A. Cochrane, *Animal Rights Without Liberation: Applied ethics and human obligations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); R. Ryder, *Victims of Science: The Use of Animals in Research* (London: David-Poynter, 1975); M. Rowlands, *Animals Like Us*. Cochrane would theoretically allow animal experimentation that caused no harm to animals, and in which the animal subjects were not killed.

conclusion that animal experimentation is an unnecessary evil but for different theoretical reasons.¹²²⁶ From interviewing a number of animal activists and reading material written by activists, it is clear that these theoretical arguments may be utilised when necessary, but the theoretical disputes do not motivate campaigners to take action. Many people are drawn to animal advocacy through personal life events, social circles or wider political and social beliefs and therefore many never engage with the swathes of animal rights material produced by philosophers and political theorists.

Many anarchists have been involved in direct action groups such as the ALF and SHAC. However, whereas anarchist involvement in the former led to the group adopting an anarchistic framework, no such decentralised or consensus decision-making structure existed in the latter group. Indeed, despite the involvement of anarchists in both the ALF and SHAC, I will argue that the impact that anarchist activists were able to make in the latter group greatly diminished.

This chapter considers why the anarchist presence within SHAC was not enough to push the group in an anarchistic direction or encourage them to embrace a wider anti-capitalist worldview.¹²²⁷ However, once SHAC activists started facing arrest and prison sentences, anarchists within the animal rights movement did push an agenda which linked animal liberation to a society 'without the state'.¹²²⁸

Politicians in the parliamentary left have a complex relationship to vivisection.¹²²⁹ During Tony Blair's term in office, although many backbenchers actively campaigned against vivisection, Labour's leadership was thoroughly supportive of the pharmaceutical industry. Indeed, anarchistic activists and the Labour Party clashed after 1997 when Labour implemented what some saw as a 'state crackdown' against animal rights protestors.

¹²²⁶ P. Singer, *Animal Liberation* (London: Pimlico, 1995); T. Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights* (California: University of California Press, 2004); R. Ryder, *Victims of Science*.

¹²²⁷ Accounts of SHAC in America do suggest that the group was anarchistic. D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

¹²²⁸ Red Black Green, 'The End of SHAC and what we can learn from it', August 29, 2014 [viewed online, <https://network23.org/redblackgreen/>, last accessed 03/09/14].

¹²²⁹ E. Hopley, *Campaigning Against Cruelty: The Hundred Year History of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection* (London: British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 1998), p. 36.

Although this chapter considers the parliamentary left and anarchists groups in turn, this is not to say that there is not a strong overlap between animal advocacy groups following different methods. Indeed, the relationship between the anarchistic ALF and the Putting Animals Into Politics movement, which aimed to raise awareness of animal issues in the 1979 and 1983 British elections, was not static. The ALF were represented at a 1982 meeting of the General Election Coordinating Committee for Animal Protection (GECCAP).¹²³⁰ By 1986 most animal advocates who were not predisposed towards anarchism favoured parliamentary action to try and limit the Conservatives' plans for an Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill. Kim Stallwood summed up the mood of many animal advocates in 1986 when he wrote that 'threatened electoral pressure is a far more effective method of inducing governments to do one's bidding than are marches, rallies, demonstrations and leafleting or for that matter vandalism and rumours of poisoned confectionery'.¹²³¹

The most significant piece of legislation that one must consider in terms of vivisection is the Conservatives' Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act which reached the statute book in the summer of 1986. The Labour Party did not resist the Act despite some leftist arguments against vivisection. Labour were willing to oppose 'unnecessary suffering' caused to animals in experiments such as the LD50 test; however, they were unwilling to actively oppose the Conservatives' measure which the Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals argued allowed for the worst and most unnecessary animal experiments to continue.¹²³² The animal welfare groups themselves were woefully outplayed. It was the GECCAP parliamentary campaign to 'put animals into politics' of 1979 and 1983 that campaigned for *any* future government to replace the 1876 Cruelty to Animals Act. Even in 1982, with the possibility of Margaret Thatcher's government securing a second term, GECCAP argued that the 'government must introduce meaningful legislation to replace the present Act'.¹²³³ So it is somewhat ironic that growing demands from the animal

¹²³⁰ Minutes of NCCAP meeting, 2nd June 1982. Hull History Centre, DBV/12/4.

¹²³¹ K. Stallwood, 'An Outline Plan of Campaign Against Vivisection', 28th January 1986. Hull History Centre, DBV/14/1.

¹²³² The LD50 test aims to discover the dose of particular substances required to kill half the members of the trial group.

¹²³³ GGCCAP, *Animals And Politics* (London: GECCAP, 1982).

advocacy movement prompted a hostile government to bring forward legislation that ultimately had little benefit for animals.¹²³⁴

By the early 1980s 445,723 animals were used annually in acute toxicity tests, half of which were LD50 tests. 75,049 animals were annually subjected to behavioural and psychological experiments, 19,124 experiments were carried out annually in which substances were applied to animals' eyes and 18,864 animals were used annually to test toiletries and cosmetics.¹²³⁵ Overall, by the early 1980s about four and a half million animals were used annually in experiments in Britain; this figure was a million less than the highpoint in 1970.¹²³⁶

Legislate to Liberate? The Labour Party and animal welfare

One of the key hypotheses was that the parliamentary left do not fit a CAS framework because politicians who are interested in animal issues have prioritised animal welfare over concepts of rights or liberation. In the case of vivisection, politicians in the Labour Party have typically promoted the welfare of animals used in experiments rather than attempting to stop such practices completely. Since the early 1970s certain individuals in the Labour Party were increasingly concerned with reducing, refining and replacing animals used in experimentation. These 'Three R's' mirrored recommendations in the 1965 Littlewood Committee which 'contained over 80 recommendations for the better treatment of animals in research laboratories'.¹²³⁷ Chief among the individuals concerned with vivisection was Douglas Houghton, who became Baron Houghton of Sowerby in 1974. In May 1973 Houghton attempted to pass a Cruelty to Animals Bill through the Commons. The Bill aimed to amend the 1876 Act by 'stipulating that licences granted to persons in research establishments

¹²³⁴ For a full discussion of the 1986 Act see: D. Lyons, *The Politics of Animal Experimentation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). I also draw on interviews with Robert Garner, 17/07/14, Kim Stallwood, 25/10/2013 and Dan Lyons 28/07/14.

¹²³⁵ Mobilisation For Laboratory Animals, Minutes, Monday 16th Jan 1984, Hull History Centre, DBV/14/1.

¹²³⁶ R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 128-129. The equivalent figure in America in the mid-1980s is estimated to be over 70 million animals used in experiments annually. L. Green, P. Singer, D. Hine, *Animal Liberation: A Graphic Guide* (London: Camden Press, 1987), p. 66.

¹²³⁷ Labour Party Annual Conference Report, 1973. p. 88.

and laboratories to carry out experiments on live animals should be conditioned upon the fullest use of alternative methods not involving the use of live animals'.¹²³⁸

Houghton's Bill passed its second reading unopposed on May 11th and got through the committee stage unopposed, but it was scuppered in its final stages 'owing to last minute amendments tabled by Tory doctors in order to kill the bill'.¹²³⁹

By 1979 Labour were presenting themselves as the only party concerned with animal welfare. Most often this took the form of campaigning against 'unnecessary suffering' such as that caused by the live export of animals.¹²⁴⁰ There were also calls to simultaneously oppose different forms of animal abuse, including vivisection. For instance, Jeff Rooker, then MP for Birmingham Perry Barr, suggested that the party should establish 'permanent independent machinery' to monitor key developments in animal welfare, to highlight abuses and to give advice on legislative changes.¹²⁴¹ This 'independent machinery' was to take the form of a Royal Commission which ultimately would have endorsed many of Labour's proposals including 'a complete ban on the use of live animals for military purposes'.¹²⁴² In the parliamentary debate Rooker highlighted 'the most gory types of animal experiments', including experiments involving scalding and burning and exposure to electric shocks and freezing, in which 25,398 of 25,888 such experiments carried out in 1977 were conducted without anaesthetic.¹²⁴³

Of course, Labour were defeated in 1979 and so were unable to implement their planned legislation. Instead, under increased pressure to take legislative action, the Conservative government published the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill on the 12th November 1985.¹²⁴⁴ The proposed Bill was heralded by some sections of the media as an 'Animal Rights Charter', although the campaign group Writers Against Experiments on Animals believed that this was an 'insidious misrepresentation of what the new law... will mean for laboratory animals'.¹²⁴⁵ Some commentators

¹²³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴⁰ D. Skinner, *Sailing close to the wind: Reminiscences* (London: Quercus, 2014), p. 168.

¹²⁴¹ *Labour Weekly*, March 16th 1979.

¹²⁴² *Labour Weekly*, March 23rd 1979.

¹²⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴⁴ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, 'Discussion paper prior to the introduction of the Bill on animal experiments'. Hull History Centre, DBV/14/3.

¹²⁴⁵ Writers' Against Experiments on Animals to Judith Hart MP, 23rd January 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

argued that the Bill was an advancement because it gave power to the Home Secretary over animal experimentation. In fact, in section 8 of the 1876 Act the secretary of state already had the power to refuse or revoke licenses.¹²⁴⁶ Some support for the Bill was unsurprising, for instance the Chemical Industries Association believed that the Bill ‘strikes the necessary balance to ensure that the welfare of animals used in experimentation is safeguarded while at the same time allowing the essential research necessary for the health and safety of the people living in the UK’.¹²⁴⁷ Some animal advocates regarded the endorsement of the Bill from those engaged in animal experimentation as evidence that the Bill would do little to halt vivisection. Indeed, the executive director of the Research Defence Society had purportedly claimed that he could not ‘think of a single experiment allowed now [before the Act] that won’t be allowed in the future’.¹²⁴⁸

Rights and legislation

There is clearly a split between animal advocates who promote a welfare versus a rights/liberation agenda, there is also a split between legislative and direct action approaches. A CAS perspective combines rights/liberation with direct action, and as such one may presume that a welfare approach is neatly tied with support for legislation. However, the picture is not so simple and many non-anarchistic animal advocates wish to see animal rights achieved through legislation.

The campaign against the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill saw a split within the animal advocacy movement, not simply between individuals (including anarchists) who favoured direct action and advocates (including those who appealed to the Labour Party) who favoured parliamentary reform, but between two factions of those seeking legislative action. In 1979 a moderate animal advocacy movement – campaigning for animal welfare - was united under Lord Houghton’s ‘putting animals into politics’ campaign. However, by 1982, when the campaign was relaunched

¹²⁴⁶ International Fund for Animal Welfare to MPs, 13th February 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

¹²⁴⁷ Chemical Industries Association to MPs, 11th February 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

¹²⁴⁸ Mobilisation’s Analysis of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill. Hull History Centre, DBV/14/4.

ahead of the anticipated general election, it was clear that the animal advocacy movement would no longer be able to work as one body because new activists favoured animal rights rather than welfare.¹²⁴⁹

By the time the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill was announced, the split was complete. Lord Houghton and other 'moderates' including Clive Hollands who had been instrumental in founding the 1976 Animal Welfare Year supported the Committee for the Reform of Animal Experimentation (CRAE) who, together with the Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME) and the British Veterinary Association (BVA) 'quickly gained access to the Home Office providing (largely ignored) written and oral evidence'.¹²⁵⁰ The CRAE/FRAME/BVA alliance welcomed the Bill, whereas Stallwood and the 'radicals' opposed it under the banner of Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals Against the Government's Proposals.¹²⁵¹ The split was hostile, with the Mobilisation campaign accusing the CRAE/FRAME/BVA alliance of having a 'background, interests and links to the vivisection industry'.¹²⁵²

Both the Mobilisation campaign and the CRAE/FRAME/BVA alliance lobbied intensely to either promote or prevent the Bill. This section of the case study examines the role of politicians within the Labour Party who either campaigned against vivisection or gave a critical welcome to the Bill. As such it is important to briefly explain the key arguments used by both sides in relation to the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill as this is the context in which debates about vivisection took place within the Labour Party. Of course, debates were not divided neatly into two opposing camps and other groups such as the International Fund for Animal Welfare gave their own reasons for opposing the Bill and did not join the Mobilisation campaign.¹²⁵³ Once we understand the broad arguments of animal advocates for and against the Bill, it is then possible to consider why attempts by the Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals campaign, who aimed to improve the treatment for animals

¹²⁴⁹ GECCAP Minutes, 20th September 1982, Hull History Centre, DBV/12/2.

¹²⁵⁰ R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality*, p. 224. 'CRAE had been formed in 1975 in order to impress upon the (then Labour) government the need to provide a replacement for the 1876 Cruelty to Animals Act'.

¹²⁵¹ Interview with Kim Stallwood, 25/10/2013.

¹²⁵² Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, Minutes 16th January 1984. Hull History Centre, DBV/14/1.

¹²⁵³ International Fund for Animal Welfare, letter to MPs, 13th February 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

via parliament, were not explicitly pro-Labour. The case study also considers Labour politicians who did campaign against all animal experiments as well as those who campaigned solely against the most controversial aspects of vivisection such as cosmetic or warfare experiments. This parliamentary left section concludes by considering what may be regarded as leftist arguments against vivisection, which caused some in the Labour Party to campaign against animal experimentation.

The Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals campaign was unwavering in their hostility to the Bill. The Mobilisation campaign produced ten key reasons why they opposed the Bill which they sent to MPs in February 1986 and highlighted in their literature.¹²⁵⁴ firstly, the Mobilisation campaign was disappointed that the Bill contained no commitment to the eventual elimination of *all* experiments; secondly, the Bill did not commit the Animal Procedures Committee to ensure an annual reduction in the number of animals used; thirdly, the Bill did not prohibit some of the most controversial experiments such as those to test cosmetics, alcohol and tobacco, nor did it prohibit the Draize eye irritancy test or the LD50 test. Warfare research and behavioural and psychological research would also be permitted under the Bill. The Mobilisation campaign raised concerns about the Animals Procedures Committee, which they felt would include those with a vested interest in animal experimentation. The Mobilisation campaign raised other shortcomings with the Bill: the secrecy of experiments would continue and the disclosure of information would be illegal, the Bill would not scrutinise all projected licences by a body of independent referees and the Bill would not ensure that experiments are policed by an independent body which is open to public scrutiny.¹²⁵⁵ Further shortcomings the Mobilisation campaign envisaged related to the likelihood of a reduction in the number of animals used in experiments. The Bill would not consider duplication of products, a factor which would lead to reduction, and the Bill relaxed the prohibition on the use of live animals by students and trainees to gain dexterity skills. Finally, the Mobilisation campaign believed that the attempt to link pain to likely benefit – in a so-called cost/benefit analysis - would be unworkable, particularly if it was the experimenters themselves who calculated the potential benefit.

¹²⁵⁴ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals Against The Government's Proposals, 'Ten Reasons Why We Oppose the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill' to MPs, 25th February 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

¹²⁵⁵ Inspectors could be ex-license holders 'as most of them are at present [in 1986]'. Ibid.

The arguments of the CRAE/FRAME/BVA Alliance were more diverse as they were defending the Bill ostensibly from an animal welfare position. The Alliance also wrote to MPs before the Bill was debated in parliament to outline the reasons for their support.¹²⁵⁶ Firstly, the Alliance offered support to the Bill because licenses would be subjected to new restrictions. The Alliance applauded the fact that premises performing experiments would have to be registered and open for inspection. The Alliance had faith in a new committee that would have the statutory right to initiate its own investigations, and would advise the Secretary of State, who would in turn be responsible for Parliament and therefore publicly accountable. Ultimately, the Alliance believed that the Bill provided a framework for progress, even if a reduction in the number of animals used in experiments was not achieved straight away, successive Secretaries of State would be able to respond to public concern and initiate further improvements. The final reason the Alliance supported the Bill is intriguing; the Alliance praised the fact that the source of animals was to be tightened so there was no question of stolen pets being used. This is interesting because animal rights groups had consistently maintained that companion animals were stolen and sold to vivisection laboratories, an allegation which was strenuously denied by the vivisection industry until the 1986 debates when it was implicitly accepted.¹²⁵⁷

It is not the purpose of this case study to examine the success of the 1986 legislation because a thorough examination has recently been published by Dan Lyons.¹²⁵⁸ Gary Francione highlights the fact that compared to most countries' laws the 1986 Act 'imposed more rigorous requirements on researchers... leaving the American legislation significantly less rigorous than the British counterpart',¹²⁵⁹ although animal advocates would argue that this says more about the situation in America than it does about the British legislation. Robert Garner accepts that the legislation 'did offer improvements on what had gone before', particularly with regards to the potentially beneficial cost benefits clause which meant that

¹²⁵⁶ CRAE/FRAME/BVA, joint leaflet to MPs, undated, c. 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

¹²⁵⁷ Activists who closed down Hill Grove cat farm maintained that domestic cats were stolen for vivisection. A. Malle (ed.), *A Cat in Hell's chance: The story of the campaign against Hill Grove cat farm* (London: Slingshot, 2002).

¹²⁵⁸ D. Lyons, *Animal Experimentation*.

¹²⁵⁹ G. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), p. 93.

experimenters had to prove that ‘the benefits of their research carried more weight than the cost for the animals’.¹²⁶⁰ Although it remained all too easy for experimenters to win such arguments, Garner believes that a future government would be able to dramatically reduce animal experiments on the basis of the 1986 act. Lyons argues that the legislation itself could theoretically perform a useful function, but the ‘legislation is so vague’ that its implementation could range from a genuine reduction in experiments to a situation in which there is virtually no regulation.¹²⁶¹ Indeed, Lyons argues that even in 2014 Britain had a ‘shame regulation’ which is only in place to reassure the public ‘that all is well within the research industry’.¹²⁶²

One might ask whether the disappointing results of the 1986 legislation changed the way that future animal advocacy groups operated. Many SHAC activists were too young to have engaged with debates in the 1980s, but that is not to say that the legacy of these events did not affect the movement in which they participated. Indeed, the reluctance of many animal activists to engage in the ‘politics of demand’ and appeal to the government could be partly due to earlier failures to achieve progressive legislation. However, even before the 1986 Act the ALF Supporters’ Group suggested that only direct action could achieve favourable results. For instance, they argued that animals ‘are ABOVE party politics and to suggest otherwise is to lower their status’.¹²⁶³ Moreover, many activists operating under the ALF and SHAC banners did still support the possibility of progressive legislation. For instance, SHAC regularly urged their supporters to write to MPs asking them to sign favourable Early Day Motions.

Having considered the various arguments for and against the Bill, one might look at the CRAE/FRAME/BVA alliance and recall Gary Francione’s warning that some animal advocates are indistinguishable from those who profit from the use of animals.¹²⁶⁴ One does not have to be as cynical as Francione to suggest that the animal advocacy groups were politically unsophisticated to petition a right-wing government to implement progressive legislation. There is a case for combining

¹²⁶⁰ Interview with Robert Garner, 17/07/14.

¹²⁶¹ Interview with Dan Lyons, Centre for Animals and Social Justice and former Green Party councillor, 28/07/14.

¹²⁶² Ibid.

¹²⁶³ *ALF Supporters’ Group*, No. 7, October 1983, p. 4; *ALF Supporters’ Group*, No. 9, February 1984, p. 2.

¹²⁶⁴ G. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder*.

animal advocacy with a leftist position because animal advocates argued that vested interests are entrenched within policy-making structures, and this prevented the legislation from being beneficial to animals; and as such leftist animal activists could highlight the perceived flaws of liberal legalism or even question the legitimacy of the state.

Dan Lyons, who formed the Centre For Animals and Social Justice to help ensure legislative achievements for animals and is also active in the Green Party, believes that these advocacy groups have failed to recognise that the interests of powerful industry lobbyists 'are entrenched within the policy processes... the policy area for research is completely dominated by research interests'.¹²⁶⁵ Therefore animal advocates must first challenge this tightly knit policy structure and seek 'broader, deeper change in the structure of government' before any progressive legislation becomes possible.¹²⁶⁶ Robert Garner argues that British policy networks are 'much more pluralistic and open' than those in America.¹²⁶⁷ In fact, in Garner's analysis the problem was that too many 'anti-vivisection groups wanted nothing to do with [the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill]'. As such, Garner is left wondering: 'what if all these groups had stayed together in a united way, would that have made any difference to the legislation in 1986?'. Garner's intuition is that the legislation in 1986 would have been more progressive had the anti-vivisection groups in the Mobilisation campaign not ruled out any involvement.¹²⁶⁸ Animal advocacy groups have consistently failed to recognise that they are not 'insiders' in these policy networks and so have never wielded more than a small level of influence.¹²⁶⁹ Nonetheless, the belief of Garner, Lyons, and much of the animal welfare movement is that legislative reform is fundamentally necessary to improve the lives of animals.¹²⁷⁰

Garner's view represents the opinion that most mainstream animal advocates share that legislation is beneficial for improving conditions for animals. In this sense

¹²⁶⁵ Interview with Dan Lyons, Centre for Animals and Social Justice and former Green Party councillor, 28/07/14.

¹²⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁶⁷ Interview with Robert Garner, 17/07/14.

¹²⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁶⁹ D. Lyons, *Animal Experimentation*.

¹²⁷⁰ Interview with Robert Garner, 17/07/14. R. Garner, *A Theory of Justice for Animals: Animal Rights in a Nonideal World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). Garner believes that 'the state must be involved, the state must compel people to behave in certain ways'.

both anarchists and CAS scholars are out of touch with the mainstream British animal advocacy movement's view because they question the ultimate benefit of such legislation. Garner challenges the dichotomy which suggests that anarchistic activists link animal abuse to ending all forms of hierarchy whereas parliamentary activists are not concerned with ending hierarchy. Instead, Garner explains that animal advocates in the parliamentary left seek to end moral hierarchy, although the political and social hierarchy fostered by the state must remain in place to ensure the successful implementation of reforms. Garner's argument seems to connect animal advocates to parliamentary leftists who would challenge moral hierarchy whilst allowing a political hierarchy to remain in place:

An animal rights ideology must get rid of moral hierarchy – because at the moment animals are regarded as morally inferior, so from a purely ethical point of view the ending of moral hierarchy is essential. I'm not so sure about the hierarchy in the sense that you mean which I think is more political and social than ethical.¹²⁷¹

Labour and the Mobilisation campaign

In this section we consider why the Mobilisation campaign against the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act was not exclusively connected to the Labour Party. This does not disprove the premise that animal advocates have typically combined with the left in parliament to achieve legislative change; it remains the case that animal advocates received more support from the political left than any other parliamentary faction. However, this does demonstrate how little support the concept of rights for animals has received from any mainstream British political party. In fact, despite suggesting moderate improvements to the 1986 Act, Labour 'decided it would give its backing to the government'.¹²⁷² As we will see in the following section, backbench Labour MPs were the most enthusiastic in challenging the Bill and supporting the Mobilisation campaign. Even though Labour's front bench gave a

¹²⁷¹ Interview with Robert Garner, 17/07/14.

¹²⁷² M. Gold, *Animal Century: A Celebration of Changing Attitudes to Animals* (Charlbury: Jon Carpenter, 1998), p. 159.

'critical welcome' to the Bill, many animal advocates still looked 'to a future Labour Government to take effective action to give the animals the protection they deserve'.¹²⁷³

The first reason why the Mobilisation campaign was not exclusively united with the Labour Party was that, unsurprisingly, politicians and activists in other parties also campaigned against vivisection. As we saw in the introduction, the Liberals and Social Democratic Party (SDP) also gave some support to animal advocates. Peter Hills from the SDP's Animal Protection Group told Kim Stallwood that the Mobilisation campaign's requirements were 'the minimum demand by our group for government legislation'.¹²⁷⁴ The Scottish Liberal Party ostensibly went further at a conference in 1983 where they called for the 'total abolition of all vivisection', but this demand was immediately retracted with the stipulation that animal experimentation could continue in 'limited and controlled experiments for use in medical science where no other proven method can be used'.¹²⁷⁵ Even some Conservatives supported the Mobilisation campaign, although they were not always outspoken in this support. Harry Greenway, the Conservative MP for Ealing North gave support to the Mobilisation campaign with the understanding that he 'supports us but does not want his name publicised'.¹²⁷⁶

The second reason why the Mobilisation campaign did not aim to build exclusive links with the Labour Party was because the animal advocacy groups needed to remain non-party political. This was partly due to a genuine desire to appeal to a wider public, for instance making sure to include statements in campaign material that Mobilisation is 'supported by MPs from all parties', but it was also for legal reasons.¹²⁷⁷ Both Mobilisation and the earlier GECCAP campaign knew that 'no suggestion must be made that a particular political party should be supported as a result of that party's attitude on animal welfare since this is an offence against the Representation of the People Act 1949'.¹²⁷⁸ So desperate were Animal Aid to

¹²⁷³ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals to MPs, 23rd February 1986.

¹²⁷⁴ Peter Hills, SDP Animals Protection Group to Kim Stallwood, 13th March 1984. Hull History Centre, DBV/14/1.

¹²⁷⁵ Scottish Liberal Party Conference, 'Animal Welfare', 26th March 1983.

¹²⁷⁶ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals Against the Government's Proposals. Hull History Centre, DBV/14/1.

¹²⁷⁷ Mobilisation For Laboratory Animals, Minutes, 1st August 1984. Hull, DBV/14/1.

¹²⁷⁸ *GECCAP Newsletter* (Edinburgh: 1979), DBV/11/3.

'comply with its non-political policy' that they refused to put their name to a Mobilisation document that criticised the action of 'this Conservative government': 'as opposed to "the Government"'.¹²⁷⁹

The third reason is that in the mid-1980s Labour were not as supportive towards animal advocates in terms of opposing vivisection as they were with other issues. This is because Labour adopted a welfare approach to vivisection, whereas they were able to accept an animal rights position in relation to hunting. Vivisection is often regarded as a uniquely complex or justifiable issue, and this may have contributed to Labour's reluctance to oppose animal experimentation. During a GECCAP meeting in 1982 this disparity was highlighted. The League Against Cruel Sports, for instance, recognised that Labour's proposals 'appeared to be more advanced than those of other parties' but Fay Funnell, representing the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV), was concerned that 'the Labour Party appeared weak on animal experimentation'.¹²⁸⁰ Kim Stallwood and the Mobilisation campaign began to suspect that the Home Office had successfully managed to 'strike a deal' with Labour 'so that they do not oppose the Bill'.¹²⁸¹ For Stallwood, it was not difficult to imagine 'Neil Kinnock saying: "... Let's not oppose this boys. They've done all the work. It's far better that [the Conservatives] deal with this thorny issue than we do"'.¹²⁸² Mark Gold's account of the period confirms that Labour 'reached private agreement with the Conservative government' to allow the Bill to pass in order to 'avoid responsibility for introducing its own legislation' should Labour win the following election.¹²⁸³ However, despite the claim that a secret compromise was reached, there was a fundamental belief that Labour would improve the situation for animals. Stallwood has Kinnock end his fictional speech by promising that 'When we take power at the next election we can, in time, tighten up on what the Government of today decides'.¹²⁸⁴

Labour opposition to the 1986 Act

¹²⁷⁹ Jean Pink (Animal Aid) to Kim Stallwood, 21st November 1983. DBV/14/5.

¹²⁸⁰ GECCAP Steering Committee Minutes, 20th July 1982. DBV/12/3.

¹²⁸¹ Discussion Paper, Kim Stallwood, 15th September 1985. DBV/14/3.

¹²⁸² Ibid.

¹²⁸³ M. Gold, *Animal Century*, p. 205.

¹²⁸⁴ Discussion Paper, Kim Stallwood, 15th September 1985. DBV/14/3.

Certain Labour politicians became increasingly concerned about the use of animals in medical experiments from the late-1970s and this was reflected in the pages of the Party newspaper *Labour Weekly*. In 1979 Robin Corbett, then MP for Hemel Hempstead, was concerned that ‘more than 5 million live animals a year [are] mutilated and pulled to pieces in the name of science’.¹²⁸⁵ Moreover, it was clear that the existing legislation was in need of substantial reform. The Home Secretary’s advisory committee on the Act only met twice in 1978, and even this committee was stacked 6:1 in favour of the pro-experiment lobby.¹²⁸⁶ As the existing legislation was so flawed it would be understandable that the 1986 Bill received a ‘critical welcome’ from some in the Labour Party who genuinely believed that the situation for animals would improve. Nonetheless, the majority of support for the Mobilisation campaign came from Labour politicians. In fact, of the 73 MPs who endorsed the Mobilisation campaign’s demands, 55 of them were from Labour.¹²⁸⁷

Although the majority of support came from the Labour Party, this support was never as beneficial as the animal advocates hoped. The Mobilisation campaign funded a parliamentary lobbyist and set up an all-party group of MPs, in which Labour members such as Jeremy Corbyn coordinated sessions to provide MPs with information about the Bill.¹²⁸⁸ A public petition was collected which was to be handed in by the supportive MPs. Ideas circulated including sending the petition to Downing Street in a hearse, but perhaps the idea never had the enthusiastic backing of Labour politicians and the petition came to a sad anti-climax:

Kim Stallwood explained that he had arranged with Jeremy Corbyn MP to refer to the petition in the Third Reading and then it was to be handed in at a subsequent date. Regrettably, Jeremy Corbyn failed to mention the petition in his speech and it was now being stored in the BUAV office.¹²⁸⁹

BUAV’s use of the petition here is interesting because it pre-empts the role of online petitions in activism which has been used to great effect by the animal rights

¹²⁸⁵ *Labour Weekly*, March 16th 1979, p. 6.

¹²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁸⁷ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, to MPs, March 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

¹²⁸⁸ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, Agenda, 12th December 1983. DBV/14/1.

¹²⁸⁹ Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, 21st July 1986. DBV/14/1.

movement in recent years. For instance, in April 2016 the Conservative government were forced to announce a humiliating U-turn, abandoning their plans to repeal farm animal welfare codes and effectively put the poultry industry in charge of the guidance on the welfare of chickens, after an online petition received thousands of signatures.¹²⁹⁰ The petition – ‘Stop the repeal of Animal Welfare Codes’ – on the 38 Degrees e-activism site received 136,965 signatures before the government agreed to the activists demands.¹²⁹¹ Jennifer Earl and Katrina Kimport believe that the ‘affordances of reduced costs for participation, reduced costs for organising, [and] reduced need for physical togetherness in order to participate in collective action’ has led to a new digital repertoire of contention in which ‘e-tactics’ and ‘flash activism’ has taken the place of traditional social movement tactics.¹²⁹² Recent animal activist successes show that e-tactics can rapidly mobilise thousands of sympathisers to quietly dissent against certain aspects of government policy. However, the mass petition is clearly not a new social movement tactic; indeed, before the Slavery Abolition Act in 1833, one in every seven adults in Britain had signed petitions in favour of the emancipation of slaves.¹²⁹³

It was not just Labour politicians that the Mobilisation campaign hoped to gain support from, but a wide section of the left including ‘CND and other peace groups, Socialist Health Association and other similar groups and trade unions’.¹²⁹⁴ Indeed, this in part helps explain Labour’s support for animal issues because the left in the 1980s were keen to build alliance politics and form a ‘rainbow coalition’.¹²⁹⁵

Practical politics

¹²⁹⁰ R. Mason, ‘Ministers abandon plan to scrap farm animal welfare codes’, *The Guardian*, 07/04/2016 [viewed online, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/apr/07/ministers-abandon-plan-to-scrap-farm-animal-welfare-codes-chicken-farming>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

¹²⁹¹ 38 Degrees, ‘Stop the repeal of Animal Welfare Codes’, [viewed online, <https://you.38degrees.org.uk/petitions/stop-the-repeal-of-animal-welfare-codes>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

¹²⁹² J. Earl, K. Kimport, *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Modern Age* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2011), p. 177.

¹²⁹³ M. E. Keck, K. Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), p. 44.

¹²⁹⁴ DBV/14/1.

¹²⁹⁵ Interview with Robert Garner, 17/07/14.

In terms of vivisection it is clear that Labour politicians supported animal welfare rather than rights, and to this extent the dichotomy between anarchists and the parliamentary left based on a CAS framework is upheld. This section briefly considers why the Labour Party were not more enthusiastic about opposing vivisection, before establishing that the Party were more likely to contest seemingly controversial experiments such as those for cosmetic products or the testing of tobacco and alcohol. Firstly, it must be remembered that the research industry was an extremely united and well organised lobby group, and their members were entrenched within policy making networks. The Laboratory Animal Science Association, for instance, wrote to all MPs in 1986 arguing in favour of the Bill because 'good science and animal welfare go hand in hand'.¹²⁹⁶ The association had four hundred members including 'scientific and veterinary curators of university and commercial animal facilities, laboratory animal breeding units and scientific experts in husbandry, welfare and breeding'.¹²⁹⁷ The research lobby were not content with their entrenched position within the Home Office, but actively sought to spread their message by targeting the Labour Party. For instance, the Research Defence Fund placed adverts in *Labour Weekly* with the supposed intention of 'promoting a balanced view'. One advert read 'DEAD OR ALIVE?' and asked the readers: 'would you deny an infant, suffering from congenital heart disease, open heart surgery... these advances... have only been made possible through animal experimentation'.¹²⁹⁸ Although the paper continued to print the adverts, some Party activists, for instance Muriel Williams from Cornwall, wrote in saying that she was:

Disturbed and surprised by your continuing inclusion in *Labour Weekly* of a propaganda report by the Research Defence Society. Surely you realise you are helping to promote a big business apart from anything else.¹²⁹⁹

Given the context of intense lobbying from the research industry, Labour MPs who opposed vivisection believed that it was politically more feasible to target one aspect of animal experimentation rather than challenging the entire practice. For instance, whilst the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill was being debated, Labour

¹²⁹⁶ Laboratory Animals Science Association, to MPs 10th January 1986. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

¹²⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁹⁸ *Labour Weekly*, April 15th 1983.

¹²⁹⁹ *Labour Weekly*, April 29th 1983, p. 18.

MPs such as Ronald Boyes, Ann Clwyd and Terry Patchett launched their own campaigns, through Early Day Motions, to target 'animals in warfare experiments' and 'Gillette's use of animals'.¹³⁰⁰ Even in 1992 Labour's *Who Cares About Animals* pamphlet promised to stop the most unnecessary types of experiments. For instance, Labour aimed to ban the testing of beauty aids and cosmetics on animals, as well as refusing to license the testing of tobacco and alcohol and forbid the use of animals in testing and development of weapons.¹³⁰¹ The Party's policy did not just appeal to those who favoured animal welfare: even those who ultimately sought the total abolition of animal exploitation sometimes favoured the approach where the worst practices would be outlawed first before moving on to other aspects of vivisection. Indeed, such tactics can be recommended from a CAS perspective because it does not necessitate accepting animal exploitation or making welfarist compromises, instead legislative changes are made on the basis that an activity will be banned in its entirety, even if the banned practice only amounts to a small part of ongoing animal abuse.

Labour believed that there would be votes in campaigning against the worst excesses of animal experimentation when opposing vivisection entirely would not be a vote winner. In fact, a poll conducted by the BUAV in 1983 showed that more people wanted to see 'legislation introduced to replace animal experiments' (81% of those asked) than disapproved of the testing of tobacco and alcohol (77%) or cosmetics (75%).¹³⁰²

One should not underestimate the gulf between animal welfare and animal rights. Although it is not necessarily a split between anarchists and parliamentarians, when Labour campaigned on animal issues in the 1980s and 1990s it was almost exclusively in terms of improving the welfare of animals whilst not challenging their ultimate use. For instance, in 1992 Labour aimed to significantly increase the level of inspections for laboratory animals whilst giving formal training to people licensed to carry out experiments. Labour aimed to insist on the highest possible standards of

¹³⁰⁰ H. E. Hardy to J. Hart, 23rd February 1987. Labour History Archive and Study Centre.

¹³⁰¹ *Who Cares About Animals...* (Labour Party, 1992) Labour also intended to ban the LD50 test.

¹³⁰² GECCAP Campaign, General Correspondence, Brian Gunn (NAVS) to Margaret Manzoni (BUAV) 25th April 1983. DBV/12/1. Interestingly, GECCAP and the Mobilisation campaign had some difficulty conducting such opinion polls. The Mobilisation campaign asked Gallop to conduct a poll but received the response that 'Gallop would only be prepared to accept wording for questions approved by the Home Office'. Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals, minutes, 7th March 1985. DBV/14/1.

welfare for animals whilst allowing any experiments that were deemed necessary to continue. Ultimately, the party aimed to follow the three R's of reduction, refinement and replacement to ensure that animals were only used when it was thought to be essential for 'medical or other scientific purposes'.¹³⁰³

In the final part of the parliamentary left section I argue that certain 'left-wing arguments', particularly the fact that the research industry represented a large vested interest, caused increased support for animal advocacy among Labour activists.

Leftist arguments against vivisection

The animal advocacy movement was deeply divided in terms of political campaigning, so it is no surprise that the groups involved in the GECCAP campaign were similarly divided on whether to use arguments that would particularly resonate with the left. One debate within the GECCAP campaign focused on an introduction to a pamphlet which Lord Houghton was unhappy with; in fact Houghton refused to put his name to the pamphlet if it included the following words:

A growing number of people believe... that material gain is not the only prerequisite of society and that the needs of commerce and industry should not ride rough shod over moral and ethical considerations.¹³⁰⁴

Nonetheless, numerous Labour politicians adopted this theme and in campaigning against vivisection they consistently contrasted 'commerce and industry' with morality. For instance, speaking at Labour's conference in 1979 John Denham called for the establishment of a centre to study alternative forms of experimentation not involving animals whilst arguing that 'the primary reason for the widespread pain inflicted on animals stems directly... from the pursuit of profit'.¹³⁰⁵ Denham calculated that 'of the 5 ½ million experiments' nearly '70 per cent are [carried out] for purely

¹³⁰³ *Who Cares About Animals...*

¹³⁰⁴ GECCAP, General Information on campaign and aims, DBV/12/6.

¹³⁰⁵ Labour Party Conference Report 1979, p. 393.

commercial reasons'.¹³⁰⁶ NEC member Alan Hadden agreed that 'we are up against big business in this situation... [and] big business is often very uncaring'.¹³⁰⁷

Alongside these arguments about the 'powerful commercial lobby behind animal experimentation', Labour politicians used other arguments that were likely to appeal to the left.¹³⁰⁸ Firstly, leftists may have highlighted the problems with the creation of 'transgenic animals' which posed broader ethical concerns 'because it has opened the door for the patenting of animals'.¹³⁰⁹ This tied in with the left's wider environmental concerns and may help explain the Green Party's opposition to vivisection.¹³¹⁰ Secondly, animal advocates could link vivisection to the oppression of other groups. For instance, writing in *Arkangel*, David Lane argued that 'vivisection is a self-evident evil. It falls into the same category as human slavery'.¹³¹¹ Recent feminist work has linked 'laboratory abuse of animals with a broader critique of the culture and institutions of contemporary science'.¹³¹² Finally, Christian socialists have suggested their own reasons for opposing vivisection, for instance Lord Houghton argued that the practice must end because 'both people and animals are God's creatures'.¹³¹³

Despite these arguments that would resonate with the left, there was only a modest attempt to find solutions that may have appealed to the parliamentary left apart from an outright ban on vivisection. One possible stepping-stone appeared in a proposed questionnaire to the public which included the question 'do you favour the taking into the public ownership of the entire pharmaceutical industry?'.¹³¹⁴ Such a step, if accepted by the parliamentary left, would have prevented the widespread duplication of experiments to produce identical drugs.

¹³⁰⁶ Ibid. p. 394.

¹³⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 396.

¹³⁰⁸ T. Benn, *Letters to my Grandchildren: Thoughts on the future* (London: Hutchinson, 2009), p. 127.

¹³⁰⁹ C. Grant, *The No-Nonsense Guide To Animal Rights* (Oxford: New Internationalist, 2006), p. 83.

¹³¹⁰ Green Party of England and Wales, *Animal Rights Report 2004* [viewed online, <http://www.greenparty.org.uk/files/reports/2004/1ANIMAL%20RIGHTS%20REPORT%20fn.htm>, last accessed 23/10/2014].

¹³¹¹ D. Lane, 'Who Cares if Vivisection Works', *Arkangel*, No. 9, Spring 1993, p. 31.

¹³¹² T. Benton, *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights & Social Justice* (London: Verso, 1993), p. 151.

¹³¹³ 'Peer in Fresh Drive For Animal Welfare', *Evening News*, 4th November 1978. This echoes Edward Carpenter's belief that 'vivisection was immoral because all creatures contain the divine'. M. Bevir, *The Making of British Socialism* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011), p. 252.

¹³¹⁴ Richard Course to Mr. M. Moon, 20th January 1983. DBV/12/1.

In relation to vivisection, the Labour Party broadly fit the approach expected from the parliamentary left according to a CAS framework: firstly, Labour did not campaign against vivisection by using the concept of speciesism, in fact some forms of vivisection would continue under Labour's proposals; secondly, Labour relied on a welfare rather than a rights/liberation approach; thirdly, the Party favoured achieving reform through legislation rather than direct action; finally, they did not argue against social and political hierarchy. Interestingly, Labour politicians rarely used the extrinsic argument that developing other forms of (non-animal) medical research would have long-term benefits for human health.

Devastate to Liberate? Anarchists against vivisection

In the second half of this case study we consider anarchist opposition to vivisection in Britain since the 1970s. CAS shares with anarchism a political scepticism towards legislative reform. As Kim Socha explains, whilst CAS scholars are 'not asserting that all activists should abandon every legal option in the course of their advocacy, especially when faced with immediate instances of animal mistreatment', from a CAS perspective activists should recognise 'the law's inadequate potential to challenge widespread, institutionalized cultural standards that give human beings the natural, and by extension legal, right to use animals'.¹³¹⁵ This section starts by considering the ALF, and moves on to consider SHAC. Although both groups had many anarchist activists and used a range of direct action tactics, it is argued that neither group sits easily with the contemporary 'anarchist common sense'.¹³¹⁶ The chapter develops into a consideration of the perceived 'state crackdown' on animal rights activism and the impact this had on anarchist animal advocates. Finally, we consider whether the actions of anarchist animal advocates

¹³¹⁵ K. Socha, "Just tell the truth": A Polemic on the Value of Radical Activism', In. K. Socha, S. Blum, (eds.), *Confronting Animal Exploitation: Grassroots Essays on Liberation and Veganism* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2013), p. 53.

¹³¹⁶ 'Anarchist common sense' is Matt Wilson's term following his philosophical ethnography of the contemporary anarchist movement and is used here simply to show that there are contradictions between the ALF and SHAC and the wider anarchist movement. M. Wilson, 'Rules without rulers: the possibilities and limits of anarchism', (PhD thesis, Loughborough University, 2011); subsequently published as M. Wilson, *Rules without rulers: the possibilities and limits of anarchism* (London: Zero Press, 2014).

had a negative impact on New Labour's willingness to implement progressive anti-vivisection legislation.

Animal Liberation Front

Firstly we will consider the ALF, which was formed in 1976 by self-identified anarchists including Ronnie Lee. The ALF has been described as anarchistic in both its structure and activities. In a previous chapter I argued that a non-hierarchical structure is not enough to label the ALF as anarchistic; however, former ALF Press Officer Robin Lane argues that the ALF are anarchistic:

You look at the Animal Liberation Front logo and it's an A in a circle... non-hierarchical, not affiliated to any kind of government... the Animal Liberation Front doesn't actually exist as a body, the Animal Liberation Front is/are people who go out and carry out direct action... there's no members of the ALF, there's no hierarchy, no structure, I think Ronnie Lee once said it's more of an idea. It's somebody who feels strongly enough about taking up direct action against animal abuse and maybe [they] go out at night and do that and the next day they're just who they were the day before, it's never been an organisation and I would say it's definitely against hierarchy.¹³¹⁷

In this section it is argued that although many ALF activists were self-identified anarchists, the ALF can sometimes seem in opposition to other anarchist views: firstly, the anti-speciesism of the ALF may not have resonated with wider anarchist groups; secondly, the more controversial forms of direct action including the use of bombs and incendiary devices (which can fall outside the ALF's guidelines and so are not necessarily ALF actions) may seem to be too reliant on coercion to be accepted by some anarchists; and finally the hunger strike of ALF arsonist Barry Horne, although supported by many anarchists, had as its main demand legislative action from the Labour government. Interestingly, the first two points contribute to the connection between anarchism and CAS whilst simultaneously separating

¹³¹⁷ Interview with Robin Lane, former ALF Press Officer, 9/03/2014.

anarchistic animal activists from the wider anarchist movement. This part of the case study concludes by linking ALF activism with Labour politicians who either supported some ALF actions or began to clamp down on militant activism.

Although a range of economic damage has been attributed to the ALF, the group are most clearly associated with the first aim of their guidelines: 'To liberate animals from places of abuse, i.e., laboratories, factory farms, fur farms, etc., and place them in good homes where they may live out their natural lives, free from suffering'.¹³¹⁸ When Robin Lane was press officer, during the mid-1980s, 'there was something like five ALF actions every single day', although after 'the long prison sentences' from the late-1990s onwards this figure has dropped to 'one or two a month if that'.¹³¹⁹ During the mid-1980s ALF actions seemed to correlate with activities of other anarchistic groups, as one activist who was not directly connected to animal activism explained:

I thought it was quite exciting in the 1980s when the radical animal rights groups and all sorts of other radical groups like... Greenham Common [Women's Peace Camp] – they all seemed to be part of a wide spectrum of dissent and revolt.¹³²⁰

The actions carried out in one day in 1997 epitomise the various types of action that animal liberationists, not necessarily working under the ALF banner, may take. On the 18th January 1997, 150 activists demonstrated outside Bullingdon prison where Barry Horne was jailed, and after an hour a smaller group of activists went to Harlan-Olaz laboratory in Blackthorn where they caused thousands of pounds worth of damage by smashing windows. Finally, a group of activists travelled to Hill Grove Farm near Witney where they again caused damage by smashing windows, this time liberating, rescuing or stealing ten cats from the breeders.¹³²¹

Although the ALF had many anarchist members, and ALF actions can be seen as part of the same 'spectrum of dissent' as other radical groups, not all

¹³¹⁸ Animal Liberation Front Guidelines, in S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters: Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), p. 8.

¹³¹⁹ Interview with Robin Lane, former ALF Press Officer, 9/03/2014. Peter Singer and Lori Gruen suggest that in 1987 'ALF actions occur daily in Britain, ranging from raids on research laboratories to smashing the windows of fur shops'. L. Green, P. Singer, D. Hine, *Animal Liberation*, pp. 25-26.

¹³²⁰ Interview with Robb Johnson, libertarian socialist and vegan, 1/10/2014.

¹³²¹ *Arkangel*, No. 17, Spring 1997.

anarchists would unproblematically accept the ALF as allies. Firstly, as we have seen, one reason for the ALF's activities is their emphasis on the concept of speciesism. This has led animal liberationists to equate their struggle against animal abuse with liberation struggles against slavery or the holocaust. As we have seen, Ronnie Lee believed that there was little distinction between the ALF and resistance fighters who targeted Nazi scientists carrying out experiments on Jewish people and political prisoners.¹³²² Some ALF adherents seem to embrace this view to the extent that they fail to distinguish between the life of a human and that of an arthropod.¹³²³ Disturbingly, some anarchists have even argued that, as there is no legitimate moral difference between humans and other animals, then experiments on unconsenting humans can be contemplated in some circumstances. For instance, anarchist punks Bickle's Cab suggested that 'paedophiles and rapists should be tested on instead of animals'.¹³²⁴ This use of the concept of speciesism might be rejected by a range of anarchists. The focus on speciesism has led animal liberationists to believe that destroying capitalism or the state is not enough to end the exploitation of animals:

Even if capitalism was destroyed tomorrow I'd still believe that animals would still be abused because the biggest problem for the animals is not capitalism but is speciesism. Just like racism that would still exist if capitalism ended tomorrow.¹³²⁵

This comment may seem to challenge the anarchist focus on opposing the state and capitalism, but in fact most anarchists, perhaps encouraged by post-anarchists, would accept that hierarchical power structures exist (and would remain in place) beyond the state.¹³²⁶

The second reason why the ALF may clash with some anarchists is due to the use of violent tactics, most controversially the use of car bombs to target scientists engaged in animal experimentation. Although the bombs that detonated in June 1990 were claimed by the ALF, they clearly breach the ALF guidelines, and as Ronnie Lee explained: 'just because someone purportedly "claimed responsibility" in

¹³²² R. Lee, 'Unjustifiable Explosions', *Arkangel*, No. 3, Summer 1990, p. 39.

¹³²³ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Behind the Mask: Uncovering the Animal Liberation Front', in: S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters*, p. 37.

¹³²⁴ Interview with Bickle's Cab, *Head Wound*, No. 14, Spring 2003, p. 7.

¹³²⁵ Interview with JJ, Former SHAC activist, 19/06/14.

¹³²⁶ See: M. Wilson, 'Rules without rulers', Chapter 4, 'The Unavoidable Consequences of Power', pp. 101-121.

the name of the ALF [does not mean it is an ALF action]... had the “caller” claimed they were from the RSPCA that wouldn’t mean that the RSPCA is responsible for the explosions and the same applies to the ALF’.¹³²⁷ Lee, himself an anarchist at the time, believed that ‘the June “car bomb” attacks against vivisectors in Wiltshire and Bristol were both tactically and morally wrong’.¹³²⁸ Other activists believed the bombings were ‘sick, indefensible and crassly stupid’ and had the effect of sinking animal activists ‘to the same level as the vivisector who distorts the truth to justify the means used’.¹³²⁹ This activist believed that: ‘it would be comforting to think that the recent car bombs have been a devilish plot by vivisectors hoping to totally discredit the animal rights movement, but I fear that would be clutching at straws’.¹³³⁰ A discussion of these tactics took place in chapter three, at this point it is enough to recall that these ALF actions (or, indeed, militant actions not claimed by the ALF) can put animal advocates at odds with other anarchists if they target individual workers and therefore do not follow the concept of total liberation.

One of the most famous ‘ALF actions’ against vivisection was Barry Horne’s series of hunger strikes in 1997 and 1998 whilst he was serving an 18 year prison sentence for activities associated with the Animal Rights Militia. Many anarchist animal advocates would not support any legislative action; as Socha argues:

When the government establishes guidelines for how humans may use animals, even in the spirit of social evolution, they are more firmly establishing control over animals, albeit in the guise of compassion. It is troubling that animal activists, as representatives of nonhumans, are giving that control to those who have financial stakes in the continued use of animals as machines.¹³³¹

¹³²⁷ R. Lee, ‘Unjustifiable Explosions’, p. 39.

¹³²⁸ Ibid.

¹³²⁹ V. Graham, ‘Beyond The Pale’, *Arkangel*, No. 3. Summer 1990, p. 37.

¹³³⁰ Ibid. Far-fetched this may be, but activists have since learned of the use of police agent provocateurs, and the alleged involvement of undercover officers in actually planting incendiary devices: R. Evans, P. Lewis, ‘Call for police links to animal rights firebombing to be investigated’, *Guardian*, 13 June 2012, [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2012/jun/13/police>, last accessed 28/10/14].

¹³³¹ K. Socha, ‘Just tell the truth’, p. 53.

Although we have seen in the hunting case study that it is not inconsistent and many anarchistic activists do support legislation. One activist who opposes legislation argued:

Law exists to enable capitalism and... legal outcomes will always follow the logic of capitalism... law and anarchism are absolutely incompatible... law has no emancipatory potential, one may make some minor gains in law, but they only serve to make capitalism more palatable, more legitimate, and ultimately function more smoothly.¹³³²

Because of the anarchist rejection of legislative reform, Barry Horne's action, which aimed to put pressure on the New Labour government, may be rejected as a suitable anarchist tactic. Horne's first hunger strike began on the 6th January 1997 and ended after 35 days on the 9th February. The ALF Supporters' Group believed that the action had been a success because 'vivisection [is] firmly back on the agenda, actions [are] taking place not just in Britain but across the world, [there is] a mood of determined anger within the grassroots movement, [and] questions [have been] asked in Parliament'.¹³³³ Horne's first hunger strike was met with strong support from a minority of parliamentarians. The ALF Supporters' Group highlighted the fact that 'only the Green Party, through its animal rights group, gave its full support'. Nonetheless, Tony Benn 'gave moral support' and Tony Banks 'did more than any other MP to spotlight Barry's demands and treatment'.¹³³⁴ Tony Banks' efforts included tabling an Early Day Motion calling upon 'Her Majesty's Government to give a pledge that they will end animal vivisection, thus enabling Mr Horne to end his hunger strike'.¹³³⁵ Jeremy Corbyn and Scottish Labour MP Thomas Graham were the only two signatories alongside Banks. The hunger strike ended

[f]ollowing promises by the Labour Party, then in opposition... [to introduce a] ban on cosmetic and weapons testing, a stricter inspections procedure, a review of the 1986 Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act and a Royal

¹³³² Interview with anonymous anarchist activist, conducted via e-mail, 25/09/2014.

¹³³³ *Arkangel*, No. 17. 1997.

¹³³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³³⁵ Early Day Motion 426. [viewed online, www.parliament.uk/edm/1996-1997/426].

Commission to examine the validity of the claim that animal experiments for medical reasons are necessary.¹³³⁶

Elliot Morley, Labour's animal welfare spokesperson at the time, believes that it was only the 'more extreme wing of the animal rights world really who criticised Labour for not fulfilling every dot and comma'.¹³³⁷ Nonetheless, Morley believes that Labour's *New Life For Animals* document 'was achievable and in fact I think everything in it has been achieved'.¹³³⁸ The dispute, then, was partly a matter of interpretation. For instance, although animal liberationists would later claim that Labour had promised to abolish vivisection, Morley maintains that

A New Life For Animals never said that there wouldn't be any vivisection, what it wanted to see was an end to cosmetic testing which was achieved... and the development of non-animal testing. Now that has been slow, admittedly, but some progress has been made... But it was entirely consistent with *New Life For Animals*. You will always get some groups who ... unless they get absolutely everything, and including sometimes some things that were never promised, then it's not good enough. You'll always get people like that, but the mainstream groups, the vast majority of animal welfare organisations warmly welcomed *New Life For Animals* and they, in their view the Labour government from 1997 on did more for animal welfare than any government before or since.¹³³⁹

It is unclear whether the anarchistic ALF genuinely believed that Labour would immediately implement the entirety of their *New Life For Animals* election commitment. Nonetheless, there was genuine disappointment a month into the Labour government when Lord Williams announced that the government did 'not believe that a Royal Commission [into vivisection] is necessary at this time'.¹³⁴⁰ After this announcement, at midnight on August 11th 1997, Horne began his second hunger strike 'because he believes the government has reneged on a pre-election

¹³³⁶ *Arkangel*, No. 18. 1997, p. 36.

¹³³⁷ Interview with Elliot Morley, Former Labour MP, Former Labour Animal Welfare Spokesperson, 11/08/14.

¹³³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴⁰ *Arkangel*, No. 18. 1997, p. 48.

promise regarding animal experimentation'.¹³⁴¹ The ALF Supporters' Group argued that Labour had 'persistently refused to implement a single one of [their] promises', although one could suggest that it was disingenuous to expect Labour to have implemented such legislation after three months in office.¹³⁴² Horne, who was joined by other animal rights prisoners such as Geoff Sheppard who undertook a three week hunger strike in solidarity, now demanded that the Government 'withdraw all Home Office licenses to experiment on animals, within an agreed time period'.¹³⁴³ Horne ended his second hunger strike after 46 days 'because the Labour government agreed to meet with representatives of the Barry Horne Support Campaign [BHSC]'.¹³⁴⁴ For the ALF Supporters' Group this was a sign of the government 'affording the Animal Liberation movement official recognition, and as a precedent that could not be undone'.¹³⁴⁵ Horne 'felt he had achieved his aim' after such recognition was granted.¹³⁴⁶

Barry Horne began his third hunger strike on October 6th 1998 after the previous 'deadline for the Government to respond elapsed'.¹³⁴⁷ Anarchist animal liberationists such as Keith Mann began to question whether another hunger strike was wise. Some in the movement thought that 'it [was] a futile gesture that would reap few, if any, rewards in the political arena'.¹³⁴⁸ Even during the secret negotiations between the BHSC and the Home Office the animal liberationists 'widely agreed it was pointless talking to these people'.¹³⁴⁹ Nonetheless, during his third hunger strike Horne produced a list of six key demands, including ending the issuing of all new licenses to vivisect and refusing to renew all currently held licenses. Privately, Horne and the BHSC were willing to call off the action if Labour agreed to ban LD50 testing and set up an independent inquiry into vivisection. After 68 days without food, Horne - who was 'hallucinating and his memory was... so bad that he couldn't even remember why he was on hunger strike' - called off the action.¹³⁵⁰

¹³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹³⁴² *Ibid.*

¹³⁴³ *Ibid.* p. 36, p. 47.

¹³⁴⁴ *Arkangel*, No. 20. 1998, p. 6.

¹³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴⁶ K. Mann, *From Dusk 'til Dawn: An Insider's View of the growth of the Animal Liberation Movement* (London: Puppy Pincher Press, 2007), p. 540.

¹³⁴⁷ *Arkangel*, No. 20, 1998, p. 6.

¹³⁴⁸ K. Mann, *From Dusk 'til Dawn*, p. 543.

¹³⁴⁹ *Ibid.* p. 546.

¹³⁵⁰ *Ibid.* p. 551.

Horne went on to carry out 'countless hunger strikes... where no one but prison staff knew whether he was eating or not' until his death of liver failure in November 2001.¹³⁵¹

The importance, for this case study, of the hunger strike tactic is that it shows that once again, despite the large number of anarchists within the ALF, the tactics they followed were not necessarily anarchistic. Moreover, such tactics challenge the hypothesis that a clear distinction exists between direct action and legislation. The BHSC hoped that official recognition from the Labour government would bring rewards but this proved not to be the case. Throughout the hunger strike campaign animal liberationists had targeted the Labour Party. Supporters in *Arkangel* were advised to 'organise pickets and demonstrations outside your local Labour Party offices... Demonstrations outside Labour MPs homes... is another possibility'.¹³⁵² Jack Straw, then Home Secretary, was a particular target of these home demonstrations.¹³⁵³ This atmosphere led to the confrontation between anarchist animal advocates and the Labour government that will be discussed below. Indeed, it was a turning point. As one SHAC activist explained, whereas before the 1997 election 'a lot of animal rights people had thought that [attitudes towards animal rights] would be slightly different from Labour simply from a class point of view', after Horne's death 'the movement was even more "fuck the state" if you know what I mean, it was like there was this level of betrayal'.¹³⁵⁴

SHAC

One of the key hypotheses was that anarchistic activists shared the belief with CAS that confronting animal exploitation necessitated an opposition to all forms of hierarchy. It is therefore interesting to consider the SHAC campaign, because SHAC included many anarchistic activists whilst maintaining a hierarchical structure. This section therefore considers whether SHAC represents an anarchist anti-vivisection

¹³⁵¹ Ibid. p. 554.

¹³⁵² *Arkangel*, No. 18. 1997, p. 48.

¹³⁵³ A. Malle (ed.), *A Cat in Hell's Chance*, p. 91.

¹³⁵⁴ Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist, 17/01/2014.

campaign, or a hierarchical campaign with anarchist members. David Naguib Pellow has argued that SHAC 'demonstrated how anarchist and anticapitalist politics, combined with antispeciesist philosophy, can be applied through direct action'.¹³⁵⁵ Although Pellow's analysis may be true of 'SHACTivism' in America, his conclusions are contradicted by this case study where it is argued that SHAC in the UK were not necessarily anti-capitalist. Moreover, Pellow believes that 'SHAC is anarchist in that it is decentralized, with no official leaders'.¹³⁵⁶ Firstly, a decentralised or leaderless structure is not enough to label a group 'anarchist', and secondly it is argued in this case study that SHAC UK did not have a decentralised structure and did have certain key activists who clearly qualified as leaders.

SHAC was formed in November 1999 by campaigners who had been responsible for closing the Hill Grove Cat farm in August 1999 after a two year campaign of pickets, property damage and liberations.¹³⁵⁷ SHAC's emergence 'brought a greater focus and professionalized approach to the movement'. The campaign group set a three year target to close down Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS), and eventually caused over 270 companies to end their links with HLS and encouraged over 10,000 activists to subscribe to SHAC's online newsletter.¹³⁵⁸ During its heyday SHAC went global; SHAC activists 'were going to different countries and organizing workshops' and in 2006 a day of action was held in 18 countries.¹³⁵⁹ SHAC activists received lengthy prison sentences and this caused the group to disband in August 2014.¹³⁶⁰

Although SHAC were not necessarily anarchistic, anarchists were immediately attracted to the campaign. Nicole Vosper recalls that

when SHAC started it was very clearly a direct action grassroots movement, it was like: we're not asking the government to stop testing, we're not asking the

¹³⁵⁵ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 151.

¹³⁵⁶ *Ibid.* p. 152.

¹³⁵⁷ A. Malle (ed.), *A Cat in Hell's Chance*.

¹³⁵⁸ A. Upton, 'In Testing Times: Conducting an Ethnographic Study of UK Animal Rights Protesters', *Sociological Research Online*, 16 (4) 1,3.2, 4.1. <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/4/1.html>.

¹³⁵⁹ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 43. September/October 2006; Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist, 17/01/2014.

¹³⁶⁰ 'SHAC ENDS: We made history... The future is ours'. [viewed online, <http://www.shac.net/>, last accessed 12/08/14].

government nothing, we're closing this company down ourselves. And so the grassroots movement then was very vibrant and alive and kicking.¹³⁶¹

Unlike the ALF who had a non-hierarchical structure, with SHAC there were clearly 'people who led the campaigns and were founders of the campaign and worked on it 24/7 so people might call them a leader'.¹³⁶² Of course, one should not forget the 'patriarchal press that wants to find this male leader' and as with Ronnie Lee being labelled a General of the ALF, the media may have overemphasised the role of 'leaders' within SHAC.¹³⁶³ Nonetheless, consensus decision making, which is typical of the contemporary anarchist movement, was rejected by SHAC as unnecessary. Nicole Vosper compares the consensus decision making of the environmental movement to the action orientated decision making of SHAC:

I realise in the environmental groups I've been working with over the last couple of years, actually how horizontal decision making is and there's this obsession with consensus decision-making and there probably was an absence of that in the animal rights movement, like we would sort of laugh at a lot of the environmentalists with 'oh, we're too busy, we don't have to have constant meetings' sort of thing. And I can see that logic, that AR was really action orientated, [on the other hand] I can see how it could have potentially been a bit exclusive of who's involved, who trusts who and with groups like SHAC there maybe was a bit of a hierarchy of kind of power dynamics based on a few people having really dodgy politics to begin with and not identifying with anarchism and actually being a little bit right wing and that was harmful to the rest of us.¹³⁶⁴

As well as not following a consensus decision making structure, there are three other reasons why SHAC were not clearly aligned with the wider anarchist movement. Firstly, they used violent or coercive tactics (although, as we have seen, this is by no means necessarily rejected by all self-identified anarchists). The CrimethInc Collective's journal *Rolling Thunder* problematized the fact that SHAC's

¹³⁶¹ Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist, 17/01/2014.

¹³⁶² Interview with JJ, former SHAC activist, 19/06/14.

¹³⁶³ Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist, 17/01/2014.

¹³⁶⁴ Ibid. The description of SHAC mirror's Jo Freeman's warning that 'As long as the structure of the group is informal, the rules of how decisions are made are known only to a few and awareness of power is limited to those who know the rules'. J. Freeman, 'The Tyranny of Structurelessness', in. Dark Star (ed.), *Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-Feminist Reader* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2012), p. 69.

goal was ‘to terrify corporations out of doing business with HLS, not to win converts to the animal rights movement’.¹³⁶⁵ According to Steven Best and Anthony Nocella, who support the group from a CAS perspective, SHAC ‘is a vivid example of liberation soldiers using psychological warfare or “psychological terrorism”’.¹³⁶⁶ Such tactics included harassment and persecution ‘ranging from a hailstorm of faxes, emails and phone calls to home demonstrations’.¹³⁶⁷ As the *Rolling Thunder* authors observed: ‘for SHAC, the more dangerous and extreme they appeared, the better’.¹³⁶⁸ If SHAC really can be characterised as a non-horizontal group who wished to appear as ‘dangerous and extreme’ as possible then there would be some discrepancy between SHAC and the wider anarchist movement.

The second reason why SHAC were not aligned to the wider anarchist movement was because they did not challenge capitalism. For instance, during 2008 the group focused on the place of HLS within the New York Stock Exchange and campaigned for the NYSE to discard HLS’ share index. Nonetheless, within the pages of the *SHAC Newsletter* there was surprisingly little challenge to the validity of the capitalist system.¹³⁶⁹ Anarchist ‘SHACTivists’ believed that there were ‘big anti-capitalist elements’ in SHAC, especially when targeting the larger pharmaceutical companies, but it was ironic that SHAC ‘would target companies until the point when they said they would stop working with Huntingdon’ and when the agreement to disinvest came ‘that company could still be doing harm all over the world but on a tactical level we’d just stop [targeting them]’.¹³⁷⁰ Perhaps individual activists did formulate a wider anti-capitalist view but this was not incorporated into the *SHAC Newsletter* from a desire to be as inclusive as possible. Moreover, from 2004 onwards, with the threat of arrests, SHAC went out of their way to *appear* polite and non-threatening to the companies that were targeted. One SHAC editorial stated that: ‘there’s no need to be rude to these people: the facts exposed yet again at HLS should be enough for any right-minded person to make an ethical decision to not deal with cruel, incompetent, fraudulent HLS’.¹³⁷¹ The *Newsletter* carried constant reminders that company details were listed ‘for the purpose of readers making

¹³⁶⁵ *Rolling Thunder: A Journal of Dangerous Living*, No. 6. 2006, p. 15.

¹³⁶⁶ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, ‘Behind the mask’, p. 34.

¹³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶⁸ *Rolling Thunder*, No. 6, p. 15.

¹³⁶⁹ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 49. Summer 2008.

¹³⁷⁰ Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist, 17/01/2014.

¹³⁷¹ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 42.

informative and polite communications with the companies listed. The details are not intended for repetitive, rude or threatening calls'.¹³⁷² Despite this level of sophisticated campaigning, there were still hints of coercion. For instance, a protest outside 'long standing HLS supplier' Vetway was reported in the December 2006 *Newsletter* with the information that Vetway staff had 'covered up the name plates in the car park'. 'Paranoid or what', the author asked, but activists would know that such caution was justified.¹³⁷³

The final element separating SHAC from the 'anarchist common sense' is their failure to challenge parliamentary politics. For instance, even in 2006, when the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act had allegedly curbed animal rights activism, SHAC still believed that an Early Day Motion requesting 'an Independent and open Inquiry into the medical relevance of vivisection' offered a 'rare chance to make a historic stand against vivisection'.¹³⁷⁴ SHAC urged supporters to 'be polite. Most MPs are supportive'.¹³⁷⁵ Indeed, the motion was signed by 250 MPs, including 193 Labour politicians, 41 Liberal Democrats and 51 Conservatives.¹³⁷⁶ It seems remarkable that both the ALF and SHAC had so much belief in this demand for an inquiry. Surely, two groups made up of many anarchist activists would have questioned the value of such an 'independent' or royal inquiry. However, even anarchists within SHAC recognised that vivisection needed 'to be tackled on all corners, like any sort of campaign, [it] should be fought where and whenever you can, involving all different types of people doing what you're best at' and this included legislation.¹³⁷⁷ It should also be remembered that 'when Operation Achilles took out the [SHAC] leadership in May 2007, no mention was made of it on the group's website', and similarly SHAC may have not wanted to publicise their dispute with politicians in 2006.¹³⁷⁸

Anarchists in the ALF and SHAC

¹³⁷² *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 40. April 2006, p. 2.

¹³⁷³ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 44. December 2006.

¹³⁷⁴ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 40. April 2006, p. 5.

¹³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷⁶ Early Day Motion 92, 'Animal Testing of Drugs', [viewed online, www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/92].

¹³⁷⁷ Interview with JJ, former SHAC activist, 19/06/14.

¹³⁷⁸ Red Black Green, 'The End of SHAC and what we can learn from it', August 29, 2014. [Viewed online, <https://network23.org/redblackgreen/>, last accessed 03/09/14].

Before looking at the perceived ‘state crackdown’ on animal rights activism it is interesting to ask why so many anarchists were involved in these anti-vivisection campaigns if anarchistic tactics were not used and there ‘was not much talk about decentralisation or horizontality as a strength or political position’.¹³⁷⁹ Firstly, it is clear that individual anarchists would be attracted to a movement who ostensibly refused to make appeals to elected representatives but instead aimed to make progressive changes themselves. Such activism could feel self-empowering and take the form of prefigurative politics. Indeed, as we have seen, the ALF’s structure, which ‘emerged from the politics of the underground of the time’ was decentralised and although there was ‘less emphasis on the wider politics’ during SHAC there was still an emphasis on grassroots activism that would appeal to anarchists.¹³⁸⁰ The *Rolling Thunder* authors, who were critical of SHAC, explain that ‘whereas an individual might feel insignificant at an anti-war march of thousands, if she was one of a dozen people that caused an investor to pull out, she could feel that she had personally accomplished something’; and for ‘direct action enthusiasts... simply bored with being treated as a number in a crowd estimate – it must have been seductive by comparison’.¹³⁸¹ Nicole Vosper recalls her first SHAC events where she ‘just felt like I belonged.... animal rights was just ‘wow, you’re really valued’ and everyone was super welcoming and empowering’.¹³⁸²

It is opportune to recall here how varied and often contradictory the animal rights movement can appear. We have seen that anti-vivisection groups with many anarchist members did not necessarily challenge capitalism or the state, however that is not to say that there were not opportunities to challenge these structures within animal rights activism. Indeed, anarchist anti-vivisection activists targeting the City of London or the New York Stock Exchange could highlight their belief that ‘the City conceals all of the money-grabbing and heartless companies that are currently the main reason for HLS being open today’.¹³⁸³ Although SHAC publications often shied away from critiquing the entire capitalist system, there were opportunities for

¹³⁷⁹ Interview with Max Gastone, SHAC activist and legal adviser, conducted via e-mail, 15/11/2013.

¹³⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹³⁸¹ *Rolling Thunder*, No. 6, p. 13, p. 17.

¹³⁸² Interview with Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist, 17/01/2014.

¹³⁸³ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 51. Spring 2009, p. 13.

anarchist activists to do so. Moreover, it was easy to link the power of global pharmaceutical companies with the government's response to animal rights activism.¹³⁸⁴ The ALF, who were always more politically vocal than SHAC, continued to highlight the links between vivisection, capitalism and the state. For instance the ALF Supporters' Group wrote that

[t]he British Government has made it very clear that they are the friends of animal research institutes and multinational pharmaceutical companies. This can be seen in the way they have waived the rules and regulations in planning procedures, company law and banking rules, amongst others, in the favour of these wealthy and powerful institutions.¹³⁸⁵

Occasionally, this was combined with calls not just to end animal exploitation, but for a social revolution. For instance an ALF Supporters' Group editorial in 2009 argued that

[a]nimal rights activists are well aware of the violence, lies and injustice of the lawmakers. We have reached the state where we need revolutionary change. We have to sweep out the old order of corrupt politics and corporations whose one guiding principle is to keep their pockets full.¹³⁸⁶

These imprecise calls for 'revolutionary change' were combined with a critique of the New Labour government. For instance, it was accepted amongst many anarchistic anti-vivisectionists that 'SHAC repeatedly brought HLS to the brink of collapse, and it has taken direct assistance from the British government... to keep the corporation afloat'.¹³⁸⁷ In January 2000 activists published a list of the largest shareholders in HLS. These included those who held shares through third parties for anonymity and interestingly revealed that the Labour Party's staff pension fund included 75,000 shares in HLS.¹³⁸⁸ For many radical animal rights activists this was evidence of the entwined interests of large pharmaceutical companies and the government. It may be convenient to see evidence of a conspiracy in Labour's shares in HLS, but former Labour MP and BUAV activist Nick Palmer argues that:

¹³⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁸⁵ *ALF Supporters' Group*, August 2010, p. 6.

¹³⁸⁶ *ALF Supporters' Group*, April 2009, p. 6.

¹³⁸⁷ *Rolling Thunder*, No. 6, p. 11.

¹³⁸⁸ Ibid.

I wasn't aware of that, and doubt if any decision-makers were. It would have been trivial for the pension fund to sell the shares and buy something else if they'd thought it wise, but anyway the whole investment of pension funds is so divorced from everyday life that I don't think it affects decisions in most cases.¹³⁸⁹

The involvement of many anarchist animal advocates within SHAC and the ALF complicates the connection between anarchism and a CAS framework. Although it is true that these groups used the concept of speciesism and adopted a rights or liberation approach, the groups differed from a CAS framework because they also campaigned for legislative changes and, in the case of SHAC, did not reject a hierarchical organising structure.

'State Crackdown'

In this section we consider Labour's legislation that had the effect of curbing militant animal rights protests. Most notably, the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act (SOCPA) in 2005, which made it illegal to 'interfere with the contractual relations of an animal research organisation' or to 'intimidate' employees of such organisations.¹³⁹⁰ Firstly, we consider why animal liberationists felt that such laws were implemented, before briefly considering the key police operations and concluding by looking at the impact on anarchist animal advocates.

When anarchist animal advocates asked 'why Labour reacted so strongly' the answer was often simple: 'basically we were winning'.¹³⁹¹ SHAC legal representative Max Gastone believes the animal rights movement was 'putting so much pressure on big pharma and financial industries' that the companies 'threatened to withdraw billions of pounds worth of research from the UK' unless the British government

¹³⁸⁹ Interview with Nick Palmer, Former Labour MP, currently Director of Policy, European Coalition to End Animal Experiments, Head of Policy and Government, BUAV, conducted via e-mail, 11/04/2014.

¹³⁹⁰ Corporate Watch, *State crackdown on anti-corporate dissent: The animal rights movement* (Corporate Watch: 2009), p. 4.

¹³⁹¹ Interview with Max Gastone, SHAC activist and legal adviser, conducted via e-mail, 15/11/2013.

acted.¹³⁹² The ALF Supporters' Group agreed that 'mighty pharma' was influencing the government, but not just because of the potential effect on the British economy, but because Blair's government 'long ago sold out in return for millions of pounds in donations to New Labour's party coffers'.¹³⁹³ Best and Nocella are inclined to agree that 'repression by a state that supposedly protects democracy and free speech is unavoidable whenever a political movement becomes effective and seriously threatens the "rule of law" and corporate hegemony'.¹³⁹⁴ However, Labour justified their legislation with more prosaic proscriptions against criminal behaviour. Some ALF supporters also made the interesting claim that both in Britain and America governments were frustrated that they were unable to catch underground animal liberationists, so 'they take the easier option of targeting above-ground activists who demonstrate against animal abuse industries'.¹³⁹⁵ Policy makers would counter this suggestion with the argument that the relevant section of SOCPA targeted intimidation, which SHAC were associated with to the extent that they published addresses on their website which were then often the sites of direct action.

It is not the purpose of this case study to give a detailed description of the long sequence of arrests and trials of animal rights activists in the mid-2000s. Nonetheless, it is interesting to consider the two largest police actions: Operations Tornado and Achilles. Both Operations were carried out with the support of the National Extremism Tactical Coordination Unit (NETCU). Operation Tornado, which targeted the Stop Sequani Animal Torture Campaign (SSAT), culminated in dawn raids, arrests and property seizures on 9th May 2006.¹³⁹⁶ 120 police officers were involved in the raids and 14 people were arrested. No one was charged at the time although later 12 activists were charged with offences under section 145 of SOCPA.¹³⁹⁷ The 12 defendants were split into two groups, with two separate court cases.¹³⁹⁸ Animal rights activists believed that the judge, allegedly a 'bloodsports enthusiast', had done everything possible to ensure a heavy sentence, including taking the jury to and from court 'under guard by bus' and allowing witnesses to give

¹³⁹² Ibid.

¹³⁹³ *Animal Liberation Front Supporters' Group*, August 2008, p. 1.

¹³⁹⁴ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, 'Behind the mask', p. 41.

¹³⁹⁵ *Animal Liberation Front Supporters' Group*, April 2009, p. 5.

¹³⁹⁶ Corporate Watch, *State crackdown on anti-corporate dissent*, p. 4.

¹³⁹⁷ *Animal Liberation Front Supporters' Group*, August 2008, p. 6.

¹³⁹⁸ Ibid.

evidence from behind a screen. Ultimately Sean Kirtley, who the judge and media had labelled the leader of SSAT, was given a four and a half year sentence.¹³⁹⁹

The second series of raids – Operation Achilles – occurred on May 1st 2007 when 32 people were arrested and 15 activists were later charged with ‘conspiracy to blackmail’. The raids were allegedly carried out by 700 police officers accompanied by TV crews and reporters.¹⁴⁰⁰ One group of defendants, described as the leadership, became known as the ‘SHAC 7’.¹⁴⁰¹ Sentencing of the UK SHAC 7 ended on 23rd December 2008 after a three month trial. The activists were jailed for a combined total of over fifty years. Three ‘leaders’ received sentences of nine to eleven years, and lifelong Antisocial Behaviour Orders were handed out: ‘which effectively stops them ever again campaigning against vivisection’.¹⁴⁰²

The anarchistic animal rights movement reacted to these laws in a number of ways. As we have seen, SHAC attempted to carry on with their protests whilst stressing that such legislations did not mean that ‘demonstrations, phone calls and e-mails are now illegal’, but that it was illegal ‘to ring a company up and say they should stop dealing with HLS “or else”’.¹⁴⁰³ SHAC continually portrayed themselves as growing in strength, getting ever closer to achieving their target of closing HLS down; the group said to HLS that ‘no matter what their government lackeys try to do to stop us, we will not... have our voices silenced by their draconian laws’.¹⁴⁰⁴ Although this may seem like mere posturing, some animal advocates still believe that

[i]n terms of NETCU and the law curbing protest; it would not be clear to me how much it curbed things. It forced tactic changes and ruled out some of the early, simple and effective tactics that had been very successful in getting victories. But actions and protests still happened... I suspect that the laws and police units were more put in place in order to be seen to be doing something. With the animal rights movements and the pressure coming from the likes of

¹³⁹⁹ Corporate Watch, *State crackdown*, p. 5. Three activists were acquitted and the second trial, with five remaining defendants, was dropped.

¹⁴⁰⁰ Ibid. *Animal Liberation Front Supporters’ Group*, August 2008, p. 6.

¹⁴⁰¹ Corporate Watch, *State crackdown*, p. 6.

¹⁴⁰² *Animal Liberation Front Supporters’ Group*, April 2009, p. 3.

¹⁴⁰³ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 50. Winter 2008, p. 21.

¹⁴⁰⁴ *SHAC Newsletter*, No. 49. Summer 2008, p. 51.

Novartis, AstraZeneca and the like, they had to actually do something and that translated into a serious amount of forces on the ground.¹⁴⁰⁵

Other anarchist activists believe that the effect was significant. Nicole Vosper believes that ‘the repression in totality has been extremely effective’ and, as we shall see in the final case study, she argues that the current focus on vegan outreach by animal advocates is a direct result of the fear and unwillingness to engage in more militant forms of direct action.¹⁴⁰⁶

Did militant direct action prevent legislation?

This section briefly asks if the actions of militant animal rights activists had the effect of dissuading Labour from implementing legislation against animal experiments. It is argued that this is not the case. Although the Corporate Watch authors believe that the convictions of animal rights activists were ‘one of the worst injustices in the recent history of the UK’s political prosecutions’, they still acknowledge that activities associated with animal rights protestors – though not necessarily with individual defendants – included:

Cars have been paint-stripped, company property damaged and letters threatening more damage have been sent to company offices and, sometimes, to directors’ homes. Hoax bombs have been sent and, on one occasion, an incendiary device was placed at the home of a company director of a related company.¹⁴⁰⁷

Certainly, Elliot Morley, Labour’s animal welfare spokesperson in 1997, believes that ‘any form of coercion or violence would have made legislation and policies almost impossible to promote really, because no party, including the Labour Party, would want to be seen to be influenced by any kind of illegal or violent act’.¹⁴⁰⁸

¹⁴⁰⁵ Interview with Max Gastone.

¹⁴⁰⁶ Interview with Nicole Vosper.

¹⁴⁰⁷ Corporate Watch, *State crackdown*, p. 6-7.

¹⁴⁰⁸ Interview with Elliot Morley, Former Labour MP, Former Labour Animal Welfare Spokesperson, 11/08/14.

Former MP Nick Palmer agrees that such actions ‘tended to make it harder to get a serious hearing for change’:

Quite apart from the ethics of it, I felt it was distracting from discussing the issue itself, since the important issue is not “Is Jane Smith evil for working at company X?” but “Should company X be allowed/required to do what they do?”¹⁴⁰⁹

Moreover, there were some ‘genuine concerns about extremist attacks on and abuse of staff’, although Nick Palmer argues that legislation such as SOCPA was ‘a massive over-reaction which actually impedes a well-informed dialogue about what happens in laboratories’.¹⁴¹⁰ Chris Mullin, who was somewhat supportive of animal advocates, argues that such militant activism could only have a negative effect:

Whether you like it or not burning down laboratories, firebombing shops and posting death threats to company directors is criminal activity – and what’s more it has the effect of fatally narrowing your political base.¹⁴¹¹

Of course, it is not just Labour politicians, but anarchists too, who may reject coercive tactics. For instance, Colin Ward believed that ‘the zealots have brought discredit on the whole movement by issuing death threats to certain pharmacological researchers’.¹⁴¹²

Nonetheless, it is not conclusive that such direct action halted legislation that would otherwise have been introduced. Firstly, Nick Palmer argues that Tony Blair ‘was very strongly pro-science and pro-industry’ and never planned to reduce animal experimentation.¹⁴¹³ Labour MP Jim Fitzpatrick agrees that ‘the Labour leadership is pro scientific progress and if animal experimentation can be demonstrated to play a role in that, and I think we’re persuaded that it has played a role, then it is not anti-vivisection’.¹⁴¹⁴ Secondly, unlike the Hunting Act, which had overwhelming public approval, Labour MP’s believed that there ‘was not the same political or popular support for banning the testing of medicines on animals’ and so such legislation was

¹⁴⁰⁹ Interview with Nick Palmer, Director of Policy, European Coalition to End Animal Experiments, Head of Policy and Government, BUAV, conducted via e-mail, 11/04/2014.

¹⁴¹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹¹ Interview with Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, 22/07/14.

¹⁴¹² C. Ward, D. Goodway, *Talking Anarchy* (Nottingham: Five Leaves, 2003), p. 81.

¹⁴¹³ Interview with Nick Palmer.

¹⁴¹⁴ Interview with Jim Fitzpatrick, Labour MP, 01/05/2014.

not on the political agenda.¹⁴¹⁵ Finally, Elliot Morley argues that such direct action tactics came from 'such a tiny group of people who are involved in that, that they were almost irrelevant to that actual [democratic] process'.¹⁴¹⁶ For Morley:

Even though there were some incidents, at the time of the Labour government there were some violent incidents, but they were so small and so insignificant and the groups behind them were so insignificant it was not regarded or taken into account really, however if it had been more widespread then actually the effect would have been negative in terms of promoting any kind of policy.¹⁴¹⁷

Some animal advocates, even those not associated with direct action, believe that the militant groups did have some positive consequences. David Thomas, legal advisor to the BUAV, believes that non-coercive direct action 'puts animal experiments [and] animal rights on the agenda... [They] create the climate for having a more serious political debate'.¹⁴¹⁸ For Thomas, the problem has been that the 'animal industry' 'have been very successful in making that link, if you oppose what they do you must be... an extremist on the edges of society'.¹⁴¹⁹ Although it is not clear that militant direct action prevented legislation that may otherwise have been implemented, it does not seem to have brought abolitionist legislation nearer either.

Conclusion

This case study has been divided into parliamentary left and anarchist sections; however, in terms of vivisection these different groups of animal advocates have operated as diverse wings of the same movement and sought to achieve broadly the same end. For instance, Labour politicians used Barry Horne's hunger strikes as a justification for raising the issue of vivisection in parliament. Although anarchistic groups and the parliamentary left had different, perhaps incompatible, overall strategies they still aimed to achieve the same goal and sometimes had

¹⁴¹⁵ Interview with Chris Mullin.

¹⁴¹⁶ Interview with Elliot Morley.

¹⁴¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴¹⁸ Interview with David Thomas, Legal Consultant, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 16/04/14.

¹⁴¹⁹ Ibid.

overlapping short-term tactics. Kim Stallwood wrote of the split between the BUAV and the ALF in the mid-1980s that occurred partly because there was ‘a disagreement over strategy’; whereas ‘BUAV’s leadership believed in a dual strategy of political action and direct action; the ALF leadership, who were anarchists, believed all political action was a waste of time’.¹⁴²⁰ As we have seen, the anarchist activists in the ALF may have called for revolutionary changes, but ALF and SHAC actions were regularly geared towards achieving parliamentary reform or even an independent inquiry into vivisection.

This is particularly significant from a CAS perspective because CAS, which was founded to provide a theoretical basis for animal liberation, has often dismissed legislative changes as irrelevant to the aims of the movement. However, it is clear that legislative change is seen as a positive development and worthwhile strategy to movement participants. As such, CAS scholars should begin to focus on the legislative process to analyse how animal advocates can best achieve legislative progress. For anarchist animal advocates it may be that militant direct action will force governments to implement reforms, which in turn will strengthen the animal liberation movement; or it may involve cooperating with animal advocates in the parliamentary left.

One feature that has affected both anarchist and parliamentary efforts is the powerful interest groups of the vivisection industry. This has proved to be a barrier whether animal advocates sought change through parliamentary or by extra-parliamentary methods. For instance, the Laboratory Animal Science Association were effective in promoting the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act and Sequani executives helped give advice on the SOCPA legislation.

No conclusive evidence has been found in this case study that one or other aspect of campaigning against vivisection has proved most effective. The case study supports patrice jones’ claim that there is ‘simply no evidence to support the idea that either ALF actions or welfare reforms in any way inhibit the long-term struggle for animal liberation. Both ALF actions and welfare reforms seek to improve the lives

¹⁴²⁰ K. Stallwood, ‘A Personal Overview of Direct Action in the United Kingdom and the United States’, in. S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters*, p. 84.

of actual animals right now'.¹⁴²¹ It was debated whether militant animal rights activism had the negative effect of discouraging Labour from implementing anti-vivisection legislation, and this was found not to be the case. As such one might take on board David Naguib Pellow's advice for 'all wings.... to work together because none has a monopoly on the most effective approach – the more people working together, the more powerful the movement might become'.¹⁴²² This is not to say that different tactics cannot be heavily criticised or even ruled out. Coercion, including the threat of violence, can be, and has been, ruled out by both parliamentarians and anarchists if it targets individual workers and therefore contradicts the concept of total liberation. One may also question the wisdom of petitioning hostile governments to implement progressive reform. As Gary Francione highlights, advocates that say of any action that 'if it helps animals, it's acceptable' are using the same instrumental thinking as those that think that 'animal exploitation can be morally justified by claiming that "if it helps... humans, it's acceptable"'.¹⁴²³

¹⁴²¹ p. Jones, 'Mothers with Monkeywrenches: Feminist imperatives and the ALF', in S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters*, pp. 151-152.

¹⁴²² Echoing David Brower of the Sierra Club's call to environmentalists. D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 38.

¹⁴²³ Francione was condemning the sexist adverts of PETA. G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder*, p. 75.

8. Case Study 3: Vegan Outreach: ‘A philosophy and not a diet’

Introduction

The purpose of the final case study is to consider the relationship that anarchists and the parliamentary left have with the current vegan outreach movement in Britain and how this relates to a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework. Vegan outreach means encouraging people to adopt a vegan diet by providing sample vegan food, often at ‘vegan festivals’ but also as part of wider political campaigns such as Food Not Bombs.¹⁴²⁴ Encouraging people to become vegan or vegetarian has always been a significant part of the animal advocacy movement and since the mid-2000s activists have placed great significance on this side of their campaigning. Indeed, promotion of vegan outreach seems to take up more of the time, energy and enthusiasm of activists than campaigning for farm animal welfare. When compared to the multitude of books and articles focusing on vivisection and hunting, the practice of vegan outreach is a relatively unscrutinised aspect of animal advocacy; and as such this chapter contributes to the originality of this thesis by exploring a little scrutinised aspect of animal advocacy. It is significant to study vegan outreach not only because animal activists gain opportunities to build alliances with other social justice issues through these campaigns, but also because vegan outreach is seen by many activists as increasingly important. For instance, Gary Francione believes that ‘such education, whether sought directly in the class

¹⁴²⁴ By ‘vegan outreach’ I refer to a wide range of animal advocacy groups working to promote veganism; this should not be confused with the American organisation ‘Vegan Outreach’ who are just one small part of this movement. [<http://veganoutreach.org/>, last accessed 24/03/15]; Food Not Bombs [www.foodnotbombs.net/, last accessed 24/08/15].

room or as part of a militant campaign, is... probably the best thing that the animal rights advocate can do at this stage of history'.¹⁴²⁵

The case study thus focuses on the practice of vegan outreach and why anarchists or parliamentary leftists might be particularly concerned with such campaigns. Perhaps it is unsurprising that animal advocates have focused on dietary reform because far more animals are involved in the meat and dairy industry than are affected by vivisection or hunting. Eating animals is the most common relationship that most humans have with other species, and 'globally, 99 per cent of all domesticates are commodities in animal agriculture... caught in relations of human domination that involve their exploitation and oppression'.¹⁴²⁶ Animal advocates may argue that encouraging more people to adopt a vegan diet will result in a reduction of the billions of animals killed to be consumed, whilst others will emphasise that vegan outreach encourages a fundamental shift in attitudes until animals are no longer regarded as commodities. Some activists believe that 'mass conversion to vegetarianism [or more typically veganism] would mark the ultimate success of their crusade'.¹⁴²⁷ Interestingly, it is not just animal activists who have shifted to outreach work; a study of 71 social movement organisations in America found that 46% of those organisations' energy was spent on educational work.¹⁴²⁸ The authors of the survey suggested that this shift to education was partly caused by increased surveillance and the criminalisation of social movements, which could certainly apply to the animal rights movement in Britain.

The case study considers the promotion of veganism through legislative and extra-parliamentary means whilst considering why anarchists and the parliamentary left might engage in vegan outreach campaigns. The parliamentary side will consider the Labour Party and the Green Party, as both parties attempt to engage with vegan

¹⁴²⁵ G. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), p. 211.

¹⁴²⁶ E. Cudworth, *Social Lives With Other Animals: Tales of Sex, Death and Love* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 106.

¹⁴²⁷ J. M. Jasper, D. Nelkin, *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest* (New York: The Free Press, 1992), p. 149.

¹⁴²⁸ A. Starr, L. A. Fernandez, R. Amster, L. Wood, M. J. Caro, 'The impacts of state surveillance on political assembly and association: A socio-legal analysis', *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 31. No. 3. (2008), pp. 251-270, p. 257.

outreach events.¹⁴²⁹ The case study moves on to consider leftist critiques of vegan outreach, before considering versions of vegan outreach that emphasise solidarity with other social justice issues and therefore would fit into an anarchist and leftist approach to animal rights.

Throughout the thesis I have problematized the four key points that potentially separate anarchist and parliamentary left approaches based on a CAS framework. Vegan outreach provides a particularly interesting and original case study for such work, because unlike other forms of animal activism the direct action versus legislation dichotomy does not exactly apply to vegan outreach. As such we can see that reformist and revolutionary lines in contemporary animal activism are not divided solely by the use or rejection of direct action. Other differences between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal activism clearly remain; indeed, because we do not see a clear divide between legislation and direct action in vegan outreach, this enables one to fully scrutinise other divisions between parliamentary and anarchist approaches. The case study therefore drives forward my overarching argument that CAS scholarship should take the relationship between legislative reform and direct action more seriously. Whereas anarchists may use vegan outreach to educate the public about the concept of speciesism, parliamentarians may raise human-centred concerns such as the health or environmental benefits of a vegan diet. Vegan outreach typically implies a rights or liberation approach, because it is about eliminating the consumption of animals entirely rather than changing the conditions in which animals are raised. However, the Labour Animal Welfare Society, who encourage vegan catering in public buildings, combine these efforts with calls to ensure that these institutions 'use food ingredients that have been produced to high health, animal welfare and environmental standards'.¹⁴³⁰ Finally, it is true that anarchist animal activists link vegan outreach to solidarity campaigns involving total liberation, whereas parliamentarians in the Green Party and Labour Party are willing to utilise state hierarchy to promote a reduction in meat consumption. In the introduction I explained my hope that the thesis would be of use or interest to animal activists, and that these activists will 'get something' out of this thesis, which may contribute to activists' discussion and analysis of recent campaigns. This section

¹⁴²⁹ Interview with Roddy, Northern Vegan Festival, 08/07/14; Interview with Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14.

¹⁴³⁰ Labour Animal Welfare Society, *Animal Welfare Policy* (LAWS: 2014), p. 6.

aims to contribute to such discussions, in particular by looking at the criticisms of vegan outreach and the explanation of vegan outreach as a more invitational approach to animal rights activism.

Key debates: world hunger, lifestyle politics and direct action

The left have always been interested in food production issues. Its principal concern has typically been arguing for an egalitarian distribution of resources and ensuring that nobody is forced to live without the basic necessities of life.¹⁴³¹ These concerns do not imply that vegan outreach sits uneasily with an awareness of global and local poverty. Instead, left-wing animal advocates highlight the damaging effect that they believe the meat and dairy industry has upon global food distribution and the environment. This can either be done by raising the concept of total liberation, or with the implication that human concerns are of principal concern. For example, as the 1983–85 famine in Ethiopia was drawing to a close the anarchist paper *Freedom* published a cartoon highlighting the fact that grain is used to feed livestock animals rather than combating world hunger.¹⁴³² The *Freedom* cartoonist was not necessarily making the point that activists should adopt a vegan diet, but animal advocates have embraced these arguments to further their cause. David Nibert argues that people should ‘go vegan’ because at a time when half of the world’s population are living in water stressed areas, most of the fresh water of the world is being used for animal feed.¹⁴³³ Nibert also explains that 70% of all agricultural land on the planet is being used to produce animal products, whereas a widespread move to a non-meat and dairy system would be more efficient.¹⁴³⁴

¹⁴³¹ *Direct Action*, Spring 1997, No. 2, p. 20. The website poverty.com, who gather their information from United Nations World Food Program, Oxfam and UNICEF, calculate that in 2015 about 21,000 people die every day from hunger or hunger-related causes [viewed online, www.poverty.com, last accessed 26/03/15].

¹⁴³² *Freedom*, Vol. 46. No. 7, July 1985.

¹⁴³³ ‘David Nibert: Entangled Up in Blue’, podcast interview with Roger Yates [viewed online, <http://human-nonhuman.blogspot.com/2013/05/david-nibert-entangled-up-in-blue.html>, last accessed 26/03/15].

¹⁴³⁴ *Ibid.*

This case study will consider whether these arguments have enabled animal advocates to form connections with other social justice groups. One way of testing this is to examine the different groups who set up stalls at vegan festivals across the country. Vegan festival organisers report difficulty in encouraging ‘non-animal’ groups to attend the festivals.¹⁴³⁵ However, according to the Northern Vegan Festival organisers, left-leaning political parties are more likely than other ‘non-animal’ groups to attend these events.¹⁴³⁶ Indeed, it is common for the larger festivals such as VegFest to organise political hustings where different parties display their pro-animal credentials.¹⁴³⁷

Another issue this case study will consider is whether veganism has become part of the shift to lifestyle politics of once radical movements. As Murray Bookchin famously argued, at a time when ‘even respectable forms of socialism are in pell-mell retreat from principles that might in any way be constructed as radical, issues of lifestyle are once again supplanting social action and revolutionary politics’.¹⁴³⁸ In this context ‘lifestyle politics’ appears as a negative retreat from radical activism. However, this case study presents the views of activists who argue that an advantage of veganism is that it can strengthen the collective and oppositional identity of radical social movements as they continue to engage in the forms of ‘social action and revolutionary politics’ that Bookchin desired. Within the animal advocacy movement there are parallel criticisms of those who adopt a vegan diet for lifestyle reasons. The *Direct Action* authors argue that lifestyle vegans ‘have no real thought out ideas and tend to be incredibly judgemental, short sighted and self-obsessed’.¹⁴³⁹ Although this opinion seems unduly harsh, other animal activists agree that ‘evangelical veganism’ can seem exclusionary, counterproductive and elitist and has the effect of preventing animal advocates forging links with other

¹⁴³⁵ Interview with Robin Lane, former ALF Press Officer, London Vegan Festival co-organiser, 9/03/2014. The only ‘non-animal’ organisation who did participate were Road Peace, a national charity for road crash victims [<http://www.roadpeace.org/>, last accessed 26/03/15].

¹⁴³⁶ Interview with Roddy, Northern Vegan Festival, 08/07/14.

¹⁴³⁷ K. Stallwood, ‘Party Political Conference at Vegfest UK Brighton’ [viewed online, <http://www.kinstallwood.com/2015/03/30/party-political-conference-at-vegfest-uk-brighton/>, last accessed 24/08/15].

¹⁴³⁸ M. Bookchin, *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (Oakland/Edinburgh: AK Press, 1995), p. 8.

¹⁴³⁹ *Direct Action*, Winter 1998, No. 5.

social justice movements.¹⁴⁴⁰ References to ‘vegan activists’ in this case study denote ethical vegans who combine their dietary habits with at least some wider critique of capitalism, and as such ‘health vegans’ are not necessarily included.

Before considering the connections between vegan outreach and our two ideological positions it is important to remember that vegan outreach should not be seen in opposition to, or as a retreat from, other forms of direct action. Indeed, London activists Phoebe and Jane refer to their campaigns, which combine veganism with boycotts and demonstrations, as vegan action rather than vegan outreach.¹⁴⁴¹ Activists rarely believe that one is of importance at the expense of other forms of action. For instance, Robin Lane argues that:

I don’t think direct action is more important than vegan outreach and I don’t think that vegan outreach is more important than direct action. I think the fight against animal exploitation... has to be fought on numerous fronts and I think direct action is as important as vegan outreach.¹⁴⁴²

Former ALF Press Officer and current Vegan Information Project activist Roger Yates agrees that direct action and vegan outreach can complement each other. Yates argues that ‘since veganism is a philosophy and not a diet... ALF-style, and other types, of liberation can have an educational role and therefore they are compatible with one another’.¹⁴⁴³ Nonetheless, there is clearly a substantial difference between the current desire of animal advocates to build alliances with other progressive causes and earlier more threatening ALF pronouncements that ‘it would be nice if we could educate people, but some people just cannot be educated – the only way they can be “educated” is to teach them their behaviour will not be tolerated and allowed’.¹⁴⁴⁴

Vegan outreach is an interesting case study because the difference between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches cannot simply be divided into support

¹⁴⁴⁰ ‘Growling with Kim Stallwood’, podcast, interview with Roger Yates [viewed online, <http://human-nonhuman.blogspot.ie/2013/07/growling-with-kim-stallwood.html>, last accessed 26/03/15].

¹⁴⁴¹ Interview with Jane, London Animal Action, 18/06/15; Interview with Phoebe, London Animal Action, 18/06/15.

¹⁴⁴² Interview with Robin Lane, former ALF Press Officer, London Vegan Festival co-organiser, 9/03/2014.

¹⁴⁴³ Interview with Roger Yates, former ALF regional press officer, Vegan Information Project, conducted via e-mail, 11/12/2013.

¹⁴⁴⁴ *Animal Liberation Front Supporters’ Group*, No. 2. December 1982. p. 2.

for direct action or legislation according to the different ideologies relationship to a CAS framework. Vegan outreach marks a shift from more militant forms of direct action for animals, although as Yates suggests it can certainly be combined with such action. Vegan outreach could be seen as seeking individual or consumer changes rather than legislation. However, we shall see that most animal advocates promoting vegan outreach recognise that institutional changes, and not just lifestyle changes, are needed to alter the status of animals.¹⁴⁴⁵ This could indicate that legislative changes are needed. The *Direct Action* authors argued that ‘what we need is health and safety checks at every stage of food production’, which implies that this anarchist group recognised the need for immediate reforms before more fundamental shifts occurred.¹⁴⁴⁶ However, vegan outreach activists are wary of seeking welfare reforms for farm animals believing that supposedly ‘humane’ methods of meat and dairy production are in reality ‘kinder to humans in absolving negative feelings and thoughts about the exploitation of animals, whilst continuing to legitimate the process of commodification and exploitation in which billions of agricultural animals are caught’.¹⁴⁴⁷

Finally, before we consider why anarchists and the parliamentary left might be particularly concerned with vegan outreach, it is important to remember that (as with vivisection and hunting) by no means all vegan activists identify with these ideologies. As Jessica Greenebaum explains:

There are many animal rights activists who promote an “effective advocacy” stance... to animal rights, veganism in particular. Bruce Friedrich, director of the vegetarian and farmed animals campaigns of PETA, argues that activists need to “sell animal rights” to the mainstream and should use strategies from corporate America to do so. These strategies include mainstreaming appearances and attitudes so activists don’t stand out as extreme.¹⁴⁴⁸

This attitude has led some vegan activists to embrace a ‘cruelty free’ capitalist position, or even (in the case of PETA) to adopt ‘mainstream’ terminology and values condemned by some as sexist and racist.

¹⁴⁴⁵ ‘Growling with Kim Stallwood’.

¹⁴⁴⁶ *Direct Action*, Spring 1997. No. 2.

¹⁴⁴⁷ E. Cudworth, *Social Lives*, p. 74.

¹⁴⁴⁸ J. Greenebaum, “‘I’m Not an Activist!’: Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare in the Purebred Dog Rescue Movement”, *Society & Animals*, 2009, Vol.17. No. 4. pp. 289-304, p. 292.

Anarchists and Vegan Outreach

In this section we consider why self-identified anarchists may engage in vegan outreach campaigns. Of course, these themes are not a concern for anarchists alone, but would motivate all leftists. As we see, parliamentary leftists are willing to challenge the power of large agribusinesses and build progressive alliances. One reason why anarchist animal advocates might favour vegan outreach is because it is not reformist, it is not asking for slightly better conditions or 'bigger cages' and as such it might appeal to those who believe that revolutionary change is necessary. Like other forms of direct action associated with hunting and vivisection, vegan outreach can be situated in anarchist approaches because there is no appeal to elected representatives; instead activists themselves are immediately making positive changes. This is certainly the case for groups operating under the Food Not Bombs banner, who do not simply aim to share free food with protesters and 'the hungry', but also practice prefigurative ways of 'working together using consensus and implementing their visions independent of government or corporate control'.¹⁴⁴⁹

This way of thinking ties in with the Gandhian notion that activists can 'be the change you want to see', which has been used to explain prefigurative anarchist projects.¹⁴⁵⁰ If anarchists wish to create a society in which sentient beings are not exploited for profit, and in which citizens do not rely on those with authority to dictate their cultural and consumption habits, then vegan outreach may be seen as a positive strategy. Some anarchists, such as Peter Gelderloos, criticise the idea that activists can 'be the change' they wish to see as self-congratulatory, elitist and impossible within the capitalist state.¹⁴⁵¹ Nonetheless, the idea that activists can make immediate changes, both to their own diet and to the opinions of the wider public, rather than waiting for government legislation, is a key feature of vegan outreach.

¹⁴⁴⁹ K. McHenry, *Hungry for Peace: How you can help end poverty and war with Food Not Bombs* (Tucson: See Sharp Press, 2012), p. 12.

¹⁴⁵⁰ J. Clark, 'Foreword', in R. Amster, *Anarchism Today* (California: Praeger, 2012), p. xi.

¹⁴⁵¹ P. Gelderloos, *How Nonviolence Protects the State* [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/peter-gelderloos-how-nonviolence-protects-the-state#fn127>, last accessed 30/03/15].

The desire to make immediate changes is not limited to anarchist, or even leftist, animal advocates. Matt Ball, the co-founder of the North American campaign group Vegan Outreach, argues that one of the advantages of outreach work is that

[y]ou don't need to start a group. You don't need to pass a law. You just have to make the simple but profound and life-changing choice to be part of this vital work.¹⁴⁵²

Whilst many activists are seeking to build the new vegan world in the shell of the old, others recognise that it is more effective to appeal to consumers rather than politicians as legislation banning animal products is unlikely to be implemented. This is the attitude of Viva! (Vegetarians International Voice for Animals) who 'mostly do grass roots campaigning, trying to get people to change their habits and basically reduce their demand, so consumption of animal products is reduced'.¹⁴⁵³ Nonetheless, as Viva!'s health officer Veronika Powell explains, the group are willing to appeal to elected representatives when they feel that success is possible; for instance in campaigns against foie gras.¹⁴⁵⁴

In the next section we consider the ways in which anarchists can discuss their wider ideology through vegan outreach. Veganism can be seen as a good starting point for questioning a capitalist practice (the exploitation and commodification of animals) that individuals may have once taken for granted. This may then lead to challenging other previously accepted economic and social practices. Vegan activists 'expect the general public to question everything they assume and have ever been told about food, traditions, health'.¹⁴⁵⁵ Indeed, the imperative for people becoming vegan to 'question everything' is a link between anarchism and vegan outreach. As Laura Portwood-Stacer explains:

¹⁴⁵² M. Ball, *The Accidental Activist: Stories, Speeches, Articles, and Interviews by Vegan Outreach's Cofounder* (New York: Lantern Books, 2014), pp. 14-15.

¹⁴⁵³ Interview with Veronika Powell, Viva! Health Officer, 09/04/2014. Whilst Viva! is not necessarily a left-wing group, Powell believes that their support 'tends to be on the left because it just goes against so many traditional values that are on the right'.

¹⁴⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵⁵ M. Ball, 'Activism and Veganism Reconsidered' [viewed online, <http://www.veganoutreach.org/advocacy/path.html>, last accessed 30/03/15].

To constitute oneself as a radical, in particular, is to question the received order or truth, to throw into question the very rules by which one has been accustomed to living and seeing the world.¹⁴⁵⁶

Links to critique of capitalism

Another reason why anarchists might be attracted to vegan outreach is that through these educational campaigns anarchists are able to discuss their wider political philosophy with members of the public who might not usually engage with anarchist issues. In particular, anarchist vegan activists have highlighted the fact that animals have become commodities under capitalism, they have linked veganism with a deeper opposition to private property, they have explained connections between government and big agribusiness and they have suggested positive alternatives such as community gardening. Of course, concern for the suffering of animals is an overriding interest for vegan activists. Anarchist activists who simply want a way to speak to the public about their wider philosophy have chosen to raise these issues by engaging in anti-sweatshop campaigns or other solidarity initiatives.¹⁴⁵⁷

It is not just anarchistic vegans who recognise that ‘because most people eat animals, the commonplace view remains that animals are tools and commodities’.¹⁴⁵⁸ However, explaining to the general public that meat eating is ‘alienation par excellence’ allows anarchist activists to link their critique of the meat and dairy industry with an attack on the entire capitalist system.¹⁴⁵⁹ Writing in *Vindication of A Vegan Diet*, Gerfried Ambrosch argues that the way animals are currently treated should be no surprise because ‘that’s what capitalism inherently

¹⁴⁵⁶ L. Portwood-Stacer, *Lifestyle Politics and Radical Activism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), p. 153.

¹⁴⁵⁷ Veganism has been a supporting part of such outreach through the Food Sovereignty campaign, War on Want, ‘Time for Food Sovereignty in the UK!’ [viewed online, <http://www.waronwant.org/news/latest-news/17602-time-for-food-sovereignty-in-the-uk-join-the-movement>, last accessed 31/03/15].

¹⁴⁵⁸ M. Ball, ‘Activism and Veganism’.

¹⁴⁵⁹ G. Ambrosch, *Vindication of a Vegan Diet* (London: Active Distribution, 2013), p. 16.

does; it turns creatures with flesh and blood into commodities'.¹⁴⁶⁰ Anarchists can then suggest that the way animals are treated mirrors the way humans are exploited.

Although vegan activists are typically concerned with the way animals suffer in modern agricultural systems, those activists who seek systemic changes (and who believe that animal abuse is fundamentally connected with western capitalism) do not focus on suffering alone. Instead these activists argue that it is the property status of animals which allows them to be exploited. As Gary Francione explains, it is clearly not enough for animal activists to focus on suffering because 'animals in the wild may be injured, or become diseased, or may be attacked by other animals' and vegans could not prevent this even if they wanted to.¹⁴⁶¹ Focusing on the property status of animals allows anarchist animal advocates to discuss private property more broadly. Animal activists may also make links between animals and oppressed humans who were enslaved as property, although the importance that anarchist animal advocates place on building alliances of solidarity with other social justice groups has made them cautious of drawing such simple parallels.¹⁴⁶²

Anarchist vegan activists have linked animal abuse to a drive for profit and the greed that they see as inherent in the current system. Activists have used these opportunities to challenge the primacy of free market economics. Anarchist vegans have also highlighted the fact that governments provide subsidies to farmers and through this they have explained their belief that political parties are connected to big business. Food Not Bombs organisers believe that the 'meat and dairy industries control government policies that primarily serve their own financial interests and not those of the public'.¹⁴⁶³

Vegan outreach also provides anarchists with the opportunity to suggest sustainable, non-hierarchical alternatives to the existing system. For instance, Food Not Bombs activists believe that

¹⁴⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶¹ G. L. Francione, 'Animals – Property or Persons?', in C. R. Sunstein, M. C. Nussbaum (eds.), *Animal Rights: Current Debates and New Directions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 125.

¹⁴⁶² Although, as we have seen, People For the Ethical Treatment of Animals are prepared to do so: "Slavery is slavery, and it does not depend on the species of the slave any more than it depends on gender, race, or religion," says general counsel to PETA, Jeffrey Kerr'. PETA, 'PETA Sues SeaWorld for Violating Orcas' Constitutional Rights' [viewed online, <http://www.peta.org/blog/peta-sues-seaworld-violating-orcas-constitutional-rights/>, 31/03/15].

¹⁴⁶³ K. McHenry, *Hungry for Peace*, p. 21.

[t]he skills required to collect and share food can be translated into the growing of food, providing safe fresh water, providing shelter, healthcare, education, entertainment and all the things a healthy, free community would desire.¹⁴⁶⁴

Although anarchists use vegan outreach work to critique capitalism, there is an unavoidable contradiction in that unless activists are growing their own food, or perhaps dumpster diving, then they are still supporting the capitalist system. There is a balancing act in which activists try and be as ethical as possible whilst recognising that complete purity will not be possible within the current system.

Shift to outreach following repression

We have seen in previous chapters that successive British governments sought to tackle what they saw as ‘animal rights extremism’ and that many activists saw New Labour’s legislation as the highpoint of this repression.¹⁴⁶⁵ In this section it is argued that anarchist animal advocates may shift to vegan outreach as a result of this perceived repression, either from a fear of surveillance and imprisonment, as a sensible tactical switch, or because vegan outreach enables activists to feel like they are making a difference. This follows Kris Forkasiewicz’s claims that radicalism is neutralised by ‘financial/bureaucratic incorporation into the mainstream above ground and state repression underground’.¹⁴⁶⁶ It is notable that all former ALF interviewees now focus on vegan outreach. This is partly due to a tactical shift in focus, but understandably these activists have no wish to return to prison because of their involvement in direct action.

As many activists have noticed, in the mid-2010s: ‘there’s a lot less ALF type action, and there’s a lot less on the street demos and there’s a lot less leafleting

¹⁴⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 12.

¹⁴⁶⁵ Almost every interviewee engaged in direct action believed that the legislation brought in under Labour had a negative effect on the animal rights movement. Interview with JJ, former SHAC activist, 19/06/14.

¹⁴⁶⁶ K. Forkasiewicz, ‘Fragments of an Animalist Politics: Veganism and Liberation’, in J. Sorenson (ed.), *Critical Animal Studies: Thinking the Unthinkable* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars’ Press, 2014), p. 56.

outside fur shops'.¹⁴⁶⁷ As anarchist animal advocate Jon Active notices, it is intriguing that this lull in militant animal rights activity has occurred alongside a heightened interest in veganism:

Now it's very much a wave [of veganism] as it were, and it's very interesting that the increased wave...of veganism [has come] at the same time that the animal rights movement is in a trough... Whether or not they're linked in anyway, whether or not all the animal rights activities of the past... fifteen years have helped produce a situation where veganism is bigger.¹⁴⁶⁸

For Jon Active, the continued militancy of animal activists over the past fifteen years has led to more people becoming vegan; although this does not explain why the presumed increase in veganism has occurred alongside a decline in the animal rights movement. Others may argue that the two are linked and because direct action has declined people are no longer put off by the militant activism of the past and so feel free to embrace a vegan diet. In fact, activists have turned their attention from more militant forms of direct action to vegan outreach, and this might partly explain the recent trend in veganism. However, as Jon Active notes, the increase in veganism is often linked to health and lifestyle issues and is therefore not 'that much of a political thing' or even related to animal rights.¹⁴⁶⁹

Nicole Vosper, former SHAC activist who now focuses on permaculture gardening, believes that New Labour's clampdown on activism had the effect of dividing the movement between those who 'looked more radical' and the groups who were made to 'look more peaceful and reformist and legitimate'.¹⁴⁷⁰ In Vosper's opinion, the 'wedge' that divided the animal rights movement actually benefited these moderate groups, including those who focused on vegan outreach. Vosper also argues that the growth in vegan outreach is caused by the fear that potential activists have of being criminalised:

I think a lot of vegan outreach strategies... come out of repression and people are scared of more militant activities because they are generally scared of prison which I think is a totally legitimate fear. So I think... people are trying to

¹⁴⁶⁷ Interview with Jon Active, ex-hunt saboteur, 05/11/14.

¹⁴⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷⁰ Interview with Nicole Vosper, 17/01/2014.

liberalise our movement to dilute the threat which was this radical movement taking direct action that other movements were learning from.¹⁴⁷¹

Vosper's opinion is supported by the evidence collected by Amory Starr *et al.* who found that 'knowledge (or fear) of surveillance and infiltration forces organisations to direct their energies towards defensive maintenance and away from the pursuit of broader goals'.¹⁴⁷² The study of 71 North American social movement organisations found a rise in educational work and a decline in militant forms of direct action that mirrors the situation within the British animal rights movement:

[R]ather than finding the customary dualism in which hardcore activists become more militant while others become more moderate... we found signs of pervasive pacification... organisations are abandoning "grey area" civil disobedience activities and moving towards exclusively educational and permitted activities.¹⁴⁷³

This trend relates to all sections of the British animal rights movement. For instance, the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV) moved to educational work and promoting cruelty-free cosmetics rather than supporting more militant anti-vivisection activities.¹⁴⁷⁴ Perhaps this is a sensible tactical switch for the animal advocacy movement. After feeling repressed by government legislation, activists recognised that they needed much wider public support for future campaigns to have any chance of success. A key argument of vegan outreach is that activists should 'gain strength in numbers by first focusing the bulk of our energies into persuading people who are willing to listen to our message'.¹⁴⁷⁵ If large numbers are convinced of the animal rights message then more militant actions will be possible in the future.

However, Nicole Vosper does not regard the shift to vegan outreach as a sensible tactical choice for anarchist animal advocates. Vosper believes that the best

¹⁴⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷² A. Starr, L. A. Fernandez, R. Amster, L. Wood, M. J. Caro, 'The impacts of state surveillance on political assembly and association', p. 255.

¹⁴⁷³ Ibid. p. 267.

¹⁴⁷⁴ E. Hopley, *Campaigning Against Cruelty: The Hundred Year History of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection* (London: British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 1998), p. 91. This also represents a shift away from seeking legislation after 1986 because 'three years of intense campaign from the national societies... had failed to extract a single concession' from the government.

¹⁴⁷⁵ M. Ball, 'Veganism and Activism Reconsidered'.

way for the government to 'liberalise' the animal rights movement is 'to make us feel like we're doing something that's still really useful and that's selling vegan cupcakes or whatever'.¹⁴⁷⁶ According to Vosper, vegan outreach *seems* like a successful tactic because it is able to gain mainstream support; however, the reason it is able to get this support is because it does not present a challenge to capitalism or hierarchical authority. Indeed, for Vosper, vegan outreach relies on a misunderstanding of 'how capitalism works' in that it suggest that 'if we just turn 100 more people vegan then we'll save this many lives', whilst in reality capitalism is willing to waste food and resources by overproducing and discarding unwanted 'waste' products.¹⁴⁷⁷ Vosper believes that this 'conversion strategy' is better suited to religious missionaries than anarchists.¹⁴⁷⁸

Even if one accepts that vegan outreach only 'make[s] us feel like we're doing something', the feeling of success is still vital for a social movement. Indeed, as well as attempting to recruit new activists, vegan festivals also have the effect of maintaining activists' morale by celebrating animal rights activism more generally and keeping activists 'relaxed and happy'.¹⁴⁷⁹ Activists need to feel as though some progress is being made to prevent burnout or disillusionment. Rachel Einwohner, who studied animal rights groups in North America, argued that 'perceived efficiency is necessary not only for initial participation in protest but must also be maintained for long-term activism'.¹⁴⁸⁰ A sense of efficacy requires that movement participants 'feel able to make a difference'; it also requires that tactical goals be 'plausibly winnable' and 'linked to achieving a larger objective'.¹⁴⁸¹ Clearly, vegan outreach activists feel like they are making a difference, that the goal of encouraging more people to try vegan products is 'winnable' and that this is linked to a larger objective of ending animal abuse.

Of course there is a danger that activists will lower the bar of perceived success or knowingly focus on less controversial topics. For instance, Einwohner

¹⁴⁷⁶ Interview with Nicole Vosper, 17/01/2014.

¹⁴⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷⁹ R. L. Einwohner, 'Motivational Framing and Efficacy Maintenance: Animal Rights Activists' Use Of Four Fortifying Strategies', *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 4. pp. 509-526, p. 519. The role fulfilled by vegan festivals is accomplished in other movements by arranging social activities for activists.

¹⁴⁸⁰ Ibid. p. 509.

¹⁴⁸¹ Ibid. p. 511.

spoke to activists who suggested that campaigns against vivisection were dwindling because 'it seems less likely that we'll ever get rid of it'.¹⁴⁸² Some outreach activists have reduced the measure of success to include encouraging just one person to become vegan or try a vegan product.¹⁴⁸³

Vegan Outreach founder Matt Ball agrees that convincing just one person to become vegan is a success because 'for every single person inspired to change their habits, the impact we have on the world doubles'.¹⁴⁸⁴ This has become a 'fortifying strategy', perhaps based on a 'fortifying myth', in which the ways of assessing protest outcomes 'highlight positive consequences', such as reforming a single person's dietary habits.¹⁴⁸⁵ Some anarchist animal advocates, including Nicole Vosper, suggest that these goals are too modest for a movement that once aimed to bring down entire industries. Nonetheless, anarchist animal activists believe that they cannot ignore the importance of helping people 'unlearn' oppressive practices and of attempting to build a strong movement based on anarchist principles.¹⁴⁸⁶ However, these anarchist vegan activists also argue that it is important that they ensure that in lowering the bar of success they do not accept the arguments of some vegan outreach activists who believe that 'being vegan doesn't equal deserting capitalism'.¹⁴⁸⁷

Collective Identity

Another reason why anarchists might be attracted to vegan outreach is because embracing veganism can help sustain a sense of collective identity within radical movements. Veganism has often been connected with 'lifestyle anarchism', which is a term, 'often used pejoratively', to describe a form of activism which

¹⁴⁸² Ibid. p. 515.

¹⁴⁸³ Interview with Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14.

¹⁴⁸⁴ M. Ball, *The Accidental Activist*, p. 65. This attitude is not confined to vegan outreach activists. Paul Watson of the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society argues that convincing just one whaler that they are wrong would be a significant success. 'Defenders of the Wild: Sea Shepherd – 1994'. in. *Animal Liberation: History in the Making* (Compassion Media, 2005).

¹⁴⁸⁵ R. L. Einwohner, 'Motivational Framing and Efficacy Maintenance', p. 516.

¹⁴⁸⁶ Interview with Nicole Vosper, 17/01/2014.

¹⁴⁸⁷ G. Ambrosch, *Vindication of a Vegan Diet*, p. 22.

highlights 'self-identifying, consuming, and styling oneself in particular ways that differ from the mainstream and mark one's membership in an activist subculture'.¹⁴⁸⁸

Veganism is sometimes included as a sign that activists are practising 'lifestyle politics', rather than genuine revolutionary politics. The *Direct Action* authors believe that these vegans 'practise their faith with evangelical flair, and in a heavy cloud of superiority'.¹⁴⁸⁹ However, other vegan anarchists argue that 'fundamental changes in our lifestyle are ultimately going to be necessary' and the sooner such changes, including dietary changes, are brought about 'the better our chances will be of creating and defending a transition to a just, peaceful and sustainable world'.¹⁴⁹⁰ For Matt Wilson:

If we oppose state capitalism, and seek its ultimate destruction, then we are going to need to accept that we must give up a great many of the luxuries (and banalities) that it currently provides.¹⁴⁹¹

Moreover, there is no reason why anarchists will not combine vegan outreach with class struggle or revolutionary politics. Murray Bookchin at one time believed that

a tremendous potential existed for creating a rich cross-cultural, visionary, utopian, even communistic movement, one with a radical anarchist political ideology and countercultural lifeways marked by unconstrained relations and emancipatory visions.¹⁴⁹²

As Laura Portwood-Stacer explains, Bookchin, in his early writings, argued that activists have a responsibility 'both to live according to their political ideals and to visibly demonstrate the viability of radically different ways of life'.¹⁴⁹³ Certainly, there is nothing that prevents activists from simultaneously participating in lifestyle activism and radical dissent.¹⁴⁹⁴ Indeed, there are numerous examples of anarchist

¹⁴⁸⁸ L. Portwood-Stacer, *Lifestyle Politics*, p. 131.

¹⁴⁸⁹ *Direct Action*, Winter 1998, No. 5, p. 22.

¹⁴⁹⁰ M. Wilson, *Biting the Hand that Feeds Us: In Defence of Lifestyle Politics* (Leeds: Dysopia Open Letter # 2, 2014), p. 2.

¹⁴⁹¹ *Ibid*, p. 3.

¹⁴⁹² M. Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left: Interviews and Essays, 1993-1998* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1999), p. 71.

¹⁴⁹³ L. Portwood-Stacer, *Lifestyle Politics*, p. 2.

¹⁴⁹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 6.

groups who fulfil Bookchin's vision, such as the Anarchist Teapot collective who aim to build a 'movement infrastructure' by setting up a mobile kitchen which provides vegan meals at various sites of resistance, particularly those connected with anti-globalisation protests.¹⁴⁹⁵

Other activists believe that making veganism a shared part of a movement's collective identity helps strengthen that movement – and enables movement participants to gain a sense of 'who we are' and 'who we are against' – and this strength will sustain future actions.¹⁴⁹⁶ Using veganism in this way, like other forms of lifestyle activism, enables activist communities to 'encourage collective shifts in ways of living that both align with radical ideas and establish more just relations in the here and now'.¹⁴⁹⁷ Of course, it could be argued that anarchists should promote individual choice, and not limit themselves to an identity including something arbitrary such as diet, especially when the people who may be excluded from the movement because of their dietary habits are the very people anarchists are trying to attract. Other activists argue that shared identity is more important for a movement than individual choice:

I don't feel like it's realistic to build a community based on people who are all doing and believing different things. There has to be shared values at least so that people can hang out and co-exist. One of the shared values could be a belief that exploitation of animals is wrong. If you go strongly against that value, is there a place for you in that community? Go off and find somewhere that is more to your liking, don't hang around antagonising me. I don't have a problem with taking that stance on individualism to be honest.¹⁴⁹⁸

Vegan activist Robb Johnson believes that 'at one point it was seen as part and parcel of being a radical that you were a vegetarian or a vegan'.¹⁴⁹⁹ In Johnson's experience this sense of collective identity that included vegetarianism has declined since the 1980s alongside a wider decline in the left. This decline has included Labour politicians shifting further rightwards and countercultural vegetarians who

¹⁴⁹⁵ Interview with Isy Morgenmuffel, Cowley Club activist, via e-mail, 17/12/2013.

¹⁴⁹⁶ Brian Dominick agrees that veganism builds a collective identity, but he argues that anarchists should reject such subcultural identities because anarchism, to him, is 'not a clique or a community or even a movement'. Interview with Brian Dominick, conducted via e-mail, 08/01/16.

¹⁴⁹⁷ L. Portwood-Stacer, *Lifestyle Politics*, pp. 142-143.

¹⁴⁹⁸ Interview with Phil Chokeword, trade unionist, received via e-mail, 19/01/2014.

¹⁴⁹⁹ Interview with Robb Johnson, vegan, libertarian socialist, 1/10/2014.

'have become embourgeoisified' with the rise of 'extremely successful posh restaurants'.¹⁵⁰⁰ For Johnson, the retreat and marginalisation of veganism has mirrored a retreat of the left. If Johnson is correct, then strengthening veganism as part of the left's collective identity may help reinvigorate radical politics. Other activists point out that Johnson's logic 'would sort of assume that if there were less leftists there would also be less vegans, but I get the feeling there are more vegans'.¹⁵⁰¹ This Food Not Bombs activist believes that 'some sort of corruption of market values has meant that veganism has become a consumerist choice rather than just a consuming choice'.¹⁵⁰² Indeed the diffusion and mainstreaming of veganism, as with other 'anarchist subcultural practices', presents a problem in that such activities 'can no longer function in the same way if they no longer mark their practitioner as a member of a specific subculture or as holding a specific set of political beliefs'.¹⁵⁰³ There are further complications, including the fact that liberal vegan activists would rather be part of the mainstream than part of a counterculture. Paul Shapiro, vice president of the Humane Society of the United States, encourages activists to 'get a haircut for the animals' and 'put on a button-down shirt for the animals'.¹⁵⁰⁴ Nonetheless, some activists believe that veganism can clearly strengthen collective identity in some instances: 'that's certainly the case in a lot of punk; if you go to a punk festival then the catering is often de facto vegan'.¹⁵⁰⁵

Community Building

A final reason why vegan outreach may particularly appeal to anarchists is because it creates an opportunity to build communities and bring people together: 'veganism... can be a point of social gathering that exists a bit further outside of the capitalist dynamics of oppression and exploitation than a great many others'.¹⁵⁰⁶

¹⁵⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰¹ Interview with anonymous Food Not Bombs Activist, East Midlands, 03/04/2015.

¹⁵⁰² Ibid.

¹⁵⁰³ L. Portwood-Stacer, *Lifestyle Politics*, pp. 150.

¹⁵⁰⁴ P. Shapiro, 'Introduction', in M. Ball, *The Accidental Activist*, p. xv.

¹⁵⁰⁵ Interview with anonymous Food Not Bombs Activist, East Midlands, 03/04/2015.

¹⁵⁰⁶ G. Ambrosch, *Vindication of a Vegan Diet*, p. 24.

As Noam Chomsky explains, positive social change often seems impossible to envisage in capitalist societies because everyone is isolated: 'each person is sitting alone in front of the [television]. It's very hard to have ideas or thoughts under those circumstances; you can't fight the world alone'.¹⁵⁰⁷ For Chomsky, and many anarchists

it makes sense, I think, to look at what the institutions are trying to do and take that almost as a key. What they're trying to do is what we're trying to combat. So if they're trying to keep people isolated and separated and so on, well, we're trying to do the opposite – we're trying to bring them together. So in your local community you want to have sources of alternative action.¹⁵⁰⁸

These sources of alternative action would bring people with parallel concerns and similar values together to provide mutually beneficial sources of support against abuses of power. Vegan anarchists believe that vegan outreach can provide a forum for communities to come together. Moreover, vegan outreach challenges the isolation created by individuals cooking and eating alone by providing communities with spaces to eat together. Vegan activist Gerard Bane explains why vegan outreach is so significant to his activism:

Food is a very good way of reaching people. And the beauty of food is that food creates community. Sitting together and eating is a wonderful expression of community. Community has changed. The actual living together isn't necessarily the community we have today but the community of sharing together, sharing ideas, sharing time together, so vegan outreach is a way of using vegan food [to build community].¹⁵⁰⁹

Such vegan outreach can extend to communities growing and distributing their own food as well as cooking and eating together. For Gerard Bane there is something spiritual in the possibilities of communities eating together:

¹⁵⁰⁷ M. Achbar, P. Wintonick, (directors), *Manufacturing Consent: Noam Chomsky and the Media*, (Zeitgeist Films, 1992), 2:14:00 [viewed online, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RO51ahW9JIE>, last accessed 06/04/2015].

¹⁵⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰⁹ Interview with Gerard Bane, Tolstoyan anarchist, vegan outreach, campaign against live export, 18/08/14.

There is something hugely significant in our society that almost denigrates community. [So it is important] that we should be finding the time to eat together, there is a mystical and spiritual sense of having that community, the community of eating together, the community of discussion... those people coming together with that united purpose, there is something wonderful about that, something significant, something joyous.¹⁵¹⁰

Vegan outreach also provides a more mundane aspect of networking and community building, in that groups like Food Not Bombs can be a visible presence for radical communities in a particular town or city. Food Not Bombs groups might be the first point of contact linking together likeminded organisations including animal rights groups, wholefood shops, cooperatives and anarchist punks.¹⁵¹¹ Vegan outreach forces activists to engage with people who would not normally be attracted by anarchist politics. As one Food Not Bombs activist explained, engaging with the wider community in this way was an incredibly positive experience for activists because 'people... stop and have a chat... and a lot of times [it's clear from] what they say that they're really politically conscious... I've had so many conversations about UKIP and racism recently, which doesn't sound like something that Food Not Bombs is [about] but people see it as political and do chat to you about stuff, people do connect to you'.¹⁵¹² Through forging these connections vegan outreach allows activists to build the sources of alternative action that Chomsky describes.

Vegan outreach is a unique issue for anarchist animal advocates in Britain. Like campaigns against hunting and vivisection, vegan outreach provides opportunities to connect animal abuse to other leftist concerns, perhaps using the CAS concept of total liberation. However, it is unique because vegan outreach helps sustain a sense of collective identity and promotes community building and networking. Despite the distinctiveness of vegan outreach, anarchists who engaged in such campaigns still broadly fall into the model expected from a CAS framework. Vegan outreach aims to educate the public about the concept of speciesism, because it prohibits the consumption of animal products on moral grounds; vegan outreach fits into a rights or liberation approach, because no compromises with

¹⁵¹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹¹ Interview with anonymous Food Not Bombs Activist, East Midlands, 03/04/2015.

¹⁵¹² Ibid.

animal industries are reached. Finally, although the number of activists engaged in vegan outreach has increased following state repression, it still fits into a direct action, rather than legislation, mode of seeking political change.

Parliamentary Left and Vegan Outreach

In this section we consider why vegan outreach campaigns may be particularly intertwined with the Labour Party and the Green Party. Clearly, some vegan activists believe that dietary reform ‘must also be addressed on the level of government for more far-reaching changes to happen’.¹⁵¹³ When vegans make these calls for governmental changes it typically presumes an appeal to the left.

The first reason why leftists may be sympathetic to vegan outreach is that such campaigning can adopt the framework of existing drives to increase the nation’s health as seen in campaigns against other large corporate interests involving tobacco and alcohol. This is a typical approach from parliamentary animal activists, who often highlight human-centred justifications for animal advocacy. Certainly, some animal advocates believe that there should be laws to restrict animal products in a similar manner to the restrictions on tobacco and alcohol.¹⁵¹⁴ VegFest organiser Tim Barford explains his belief that regulation of the meat industry is needed:

I suppose what I’d like to see the government do is probably take an approach of what they’re doing to smoking, so meat eating would be discouraged, the health problems would be [made visible on packaging]... the likely increases in cancer and diabetes through eating meat and dairy would have to be published in the same way as smoking... the government already have put

¹⁵¹³ G. Ambrosch, *Vindication of a Vegan Diet*, p. 9.

¹⁵¹⁴ ‘Growling with Kim Stallwood’; J. Deckers, ‘Obesity, Public Health, and the Consumption of Animal Products: Ethical Concerns and Political Solutions’, *Bioethical Inquiry*, (2013), 10, pp. 29-38.

out warnings about eating processed meat, seventy grams or something is the maximum.¹⁵¹⁵

Barford believes that if advertising for the meat and dairy industry was prohibited, and it became mandatory for these products to have stark health warnings on packaging, then meat eating ‘stops being so cool, people don’t want to eat meat you know, because it’s just not a very nice thing to do any more than smoking fags is’.¹⁵¹⁶ Encouraging people to stop consuming animal products, in Barford’s plan, would also involve recognition that meat products are as potentially addictive as smoking and as such consumers would receive help becoming vegetarian in the same way that smokers currently receive support from the NHS.¹⁵¹⁷

The Labour Party does not accept the health claims of vegan activists; however, during the 2015 general election Labour pursued policies that aimed to ‘empower adults with information to make healthier choices and support to get active’.¹⁵¹⁸ Indeed, according to a document released by the then shadow health secretary Andy Burnham, Labour is prepared to take a proactive role in reforming the nation’s dietary habits. For instance,

[m]aximum limits will be set on levels of fat, salt and sugar in food marketed substantially to children. And to support the population as a whole, Labour will pursue improvements to food labelling to help people better understand what they are eating, including working at EU level to introduce traffic-light labelling of packaged food.¹⁵¹⁹

Labour is also prepared to restrict food advertising in some instances. For example, in 2015 the Party intended to ‘regulate to protect children, with options including a time watershed for advertising of products high in sugar, fat and/or

¹⁵¹⁵ The Department of Health ‘advises people who eat more than 90 grams (cooked weight) of red and processed meat a day to cut down to 70 grams... [because] there is probably a link between eating red and processed meat and the risk of bowel cancer’. NHS Choices, ‘Red meat and the risk of bowel cancer’ [viewed online, <http://www.nhs.uk/livewell/goodfood/pages/red-meat.aspx>, last accessed 16/04/15]. Interview with Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14.

¹⁵¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵¹⁸ Labour Press, ‘Labour’s new approach to public health - Andy Burnham’ [viewed online, <http://press.labour.org.uk/post/108114239664/labours-new-approach-to-public-health-andy>, last accessed 06/04/15].

¹⁵¹⁹ Ibid.

salt'.¹⁵²⁰ The New Labour government implemented a *Food 2030* programme with the aim of 'limiting the marketing of products with high fat, salt or sugar content reaching children' and ensuring the Food Standards Agency 'has the capacity to stop food fraud, improve safety and tackle unhealthy practices'.¹⁵²¹ Although these policies do not accept the arguments of vegan activists, there certainly seems more potential for animal advocates to work with a political party that is already attempting to shape dietary standards than to appeal to those on the political right who might see this as interference from a 'nanny state'.

Unlike Labour, the Green Party does accept the health and environmental arguments of vegan activists. Indeed, the Greens 'support a progressive change from diets dominated by meat, dairy and other animal products to healthier diets based mainly on plant foods'.¹⁵²² In order to bring about such a shift the Greens will use 'economic measures, research and education, coupled with support for more sustainable methods of production such as organic and stockfree farming'.¹⁵²³ One example of this is the Greens' promotion of Meat Free Mondays, a campaign which encourages 'local authorities, schools and other public and private bodies to allocate one day a week to providing a totally animal-free menu in order to help tackle the world's environmental and other problems'.¹⁵²⁴

Vegan Labour politicians are not necessarily eager for the Party to encourage people to reduce their consumption of meat and dairy products. Former Labour MP Cathy Jamieson argues that 'at this point in time... it would not necessarily be helpful for a "hard-sell" approach from Government'.¹⁵²⁵ However, Jamieson believes that there are immediate steps that could be taken by a future Labour government, including:

Ensuring that [a] vegan diet is available in schools, hospitals etc without it being portrayed as unusual or odd. Giving information and ensuring informed

¹⁵²⁰ *Protecting Children, Empowering All: Labour's New Approach to Public Health in the 21st Century* (Labour Party: 2015).

¹⁵²¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵²² Green Party, 'Food and Agriculture' [viewed online, <http://policy.greenparty.org.uk/fa.html>, last accessed 07/04/15].

¹⁵²³ *Ibid.*

¹⁵²⁴ Green Party, 'Green MP Prompts Parliament to Introduce Meat Free Monday', 11th August 2010 [viewed online, <https://www.greenparty.org.uk/News/11-08-2010-meat-free-monday-parliament.html>, last accessed 07/04/2015].

¹⁵²⁵ Interview with Cathy Jamieson, then Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, received on 23/04/2014.

choice is important, so clearer labelling of foods and products would be a start.¹⁵²⁶

Vegan activists who wish to see far-reaching changes at the level of government argue that ensuring 'clearer labelling' would be a realistic start. Certainly, vegan activists like Tim Barford wish to see higher standards of labelling on animal products:

I think meat producers should also be required by law to demonstrate visibly how they produce their meat, you know... You [should] have to show your clients [and] customers how your meat is produced and you [should] have to show on your website your source of techniques and how you store and kill your meat. The customers need to see how it's killed and stunned and how high your standards are, I think there should be a bigger expenditure in the way that's enforced.¹⁵²⁷

According to Compassion in World Farming, 83% of consumers believe that the method of labelling based on whether meat is 'free range' or 'factory farmed' should be included in all meat and dairy products.¹⁵²⁸ The Green Party's 2015 election manifesto included a commitment to ensuring that 'producers ... include on labelling the origin and production method for all meat, eggs and dairy products used, and the source of all seafood'.¹⁵²⁹ Although such reforms would clearly not satisfy many animal advocates, it would enable consumers to make more informed choices about the meat and dairy that they consume.

Meat subsidies

One reason why left-leaning parliamentarians may embrace the ideas of vegan outreach is because governments are already spending vast sums of money in subsidising the meat industry. Reducing national meat consumption would not

¹⁵²⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵²⁷ Interview with Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14.

¹⁵²⁸ D. Livingston, 'Food Labelling', *Impact: Journal of the Labour Animal Welfare Society*, September 2013, p. 14.

¹⁵²⁹ Green Party, 'Food and Agriculture'.

entail increases in expenditure, but a redistribution of spending to more sustainable, environmentally friendly and ethical companies and away from large agribusinesses. This shift may correlate to other leftist concerns about the environment and subsistence farmers.

The subsidies to the meat industry, which are distributed in accordance with the Common Agricultural Policy, amount to over three billion pounds annually in the UK and 55 billion Euros across the EU.¹⁵³⁰ George Monbiot describes this situation, in which 'the biggest landowners each receive millions of pounds a year in public money', as 'a vast and toxic scandal'.¹⁵³¹ Monbiot calculates that the biggest 174 landowners in England take '£120m between them', and as well as spending 3.6 billion pounds in farm subsidies, the British government spends a further 450 million pounds on 'research and development for the food and farming industries'.¹⁵³² The European Union legislation grants income support to farmers 'without any link to any specific production' and as such the data of such funds is not broken down per sector of production in relation to meat and dairy farming.¹⁵³³ Naturally, vegan activists believe that these subsidies should be transferred to support producers of vegan food:

My understanding is that government, certainly central government, UK government and also EU central government have a huge amount of subsidies that they pay to farmers to keep farming dairy products and animal products even if it's not required or if it's thrown away... massive [government] action is already going on... we could improve them I think if we adopted food subsidies, far bigger subsidies [for vegan food].¹⁵³⁴

¹⁵³⁰ Living Countryside, 'Diagram illustrating the hierarchy of farm support in the UK' [viewed online, http://www.ukagriculture.com/farming_today/bg_support_changes.cfm, last accessed 08/04/15].

¹⁵³¹ G. Monbiot, 'Just when hope and courage are called for, Labour promises bean-counting', *The Guardian*, 14th April 2015 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/14/labour-bean-counting-hope-courage-deficit-voters>, last accessed 16/04/2015].

¹⁵³² G. Monbiot, 'The welfare dependants the government loves? Rich landowners', *The Guardian*, 3rd March 2014 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/mar/03/rich-landowners-farmers-welfare-nfu-defra>, last accessed 16/04/2015].

¹⁵³³ Correspondence from Pierre Bascou, European Commission for Agriculture and Rural Development, 29/06/2015.

¹⁵³⁴ Interview with Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14.

Subsidies for the meat and dairy industry have been a longstanding concern for animal advocates in America.¹⁵³⁵ Carol Adams believes that

if we simply eliminated all the subsidies the United States [government] gives to dairy and meat industries, those products would be so expensive it would automatically change people's diets, the number of animals being killed and abused would be reduced simply because you'd almost have a de facto boycott.¹⁵³⁶

Opposition to these subsidies is often framed in terms of resistance to global corporate interests. Perhaps an opposition to multinational corporations, rather than a belief in animal advocacy alone, is likely to connect left-wing activists of all strands to vegan outreach.

Left-leaning parliamentarians have also encouraged vegan outreach at a municipal level. For instance, the Labour Animal Welfare Society explains that 'the public sector spends more than £2.2 billion on food each year, including meals in schools, hospitals, care homes and prisons'.¹⁵³⁷ Most of the chicken and pork brought by these institutions, according to the Labour Animal Welfare Society, is factory farmed. Their solution is to 'use public procurement policy to ensure that public bodies only use food ingredients that have been produced to high health, animal welfare and environmental standards... the range of meat-free and vegan options made available should increase wherever possible'.¹⁵³⁸

One complication is that since the 1947 Agricultural Act the Labour Party has felt proud of ensuring that citizens have access to 'a varied diet through the availability of cheap food'.¹⁵³⁹ When Bill Hanton, an activist from London, resigned from the Labour Party in 1952 because of his anarcho-syndicalist principles, he explained to his MP that: 'in this century, the Labour Party... stand for cheap food by bigger food subsidies. So that all the socialism of the Labour Party amounts to is

¹⁵³⁵ R. Kenner (director), *Food, Inc* (Participant Media, 2008).

¹⁵³⁶ Interview with Carol J. Adams, 24/04/2015; C. J. Adams, *Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals* (New York: Continuum, 1995), p. 17.

¹⁵³⁷ Labour Animal Welfare Society, *Animal Welfare Policy* (LAWS: 2014), p. 6.

¹⁵³⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵³⁹ Press Cutting, 'Labour Are Against Animal Cruelty', quote from Mr. Peter Scott, Labour candidate for Stretford and Urmston, (Hull History Centre, DBV/11/4).

bigger food subsidies and social insurance benefits'.¹⁵⁴⁰ Even in 2015 Labour still aimed to 'ensure that everybody has the chance to eat safe, nutritious and affordable food'.¹⁵⁴¹ Typically, the focus on 'affordable food' has implied reduced welfare for animals; although politicians such as Elliot Morley did aim to redress this balance whilst encouraging consumers to 'buy locally'.¹⁵⁴²

Connected to other causes

Another reason why the parliamentary left may connect with vegan outreach is because activists believe that the meat and dairy industry 'not only restricts our moral growth but also causes very real human hardship'.¹⁵⁴³ This connection overlaps with anarchist connections to veganism; but whereas anarchists may highlight the concept of total liberation, parliamentarians tend to justify animal advocacy by focusing on material benefits for humans. Animal advocates such as Kim Stallwood, a long-term Labour supporter, argue that opposition to the meat industry connects to other key leftist interests, particularly concerns with the environment and world hunger.¹⁵⁴⁴ Former Labour MP Chris Williamson believes that 'things are interconnected' and he promotes veganism in part because of 'the impact of consuming meat [and] the effect that has on... subsistence farmers, [and] on the environment'.¹⁵⁴⁵

The connection between veganism and the Green Party can partly be explained by the environmental impact of the meat and dairy industry. Animal advocates are liable to mention a catalogue of environmentally damaging aspects of livestock agriculture, including erosion, air and water pollution, deforestation and fresh water scarcity. The most notable connection is the contribution of the livestock

¹⁵⁴⁰ Bill Hanton to C. W. Gibson MP, 7th September 1952 (Sparrows' Nest, Nottingham, Ron02067).

¹⁵⁴¹ Labour Press, 'Labour announces new plan to cut food bank use' [viewed online, <http://press.labour.org.uk/post/114566811004/labour-announces-new-plan-to-cut-food-bank-use>, last accessed 08/04/2015].

¹⁵⁴² Interview with Elliot Morley, former Labour MP, Former Labour Animal Welfare Spokesperson, 11/08/14.

¹⁵⁴³ K. Stallwood, 'Abuse of Animals' (letter), *Labour Weekly*, July 22nd 1983.

¹⁵⁴⁴ Interview with Kim Stallwood, 25/10/2013.

¹⁵⁴⁵ Interview with Chris Williamson, then Labour MP, 04/04/2014.

sector to greenhouse gas emissions.¹⁵⁴⁶ The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that ‘agricultural emissions account for 10-12 per cent of the global total and that by 2030 agricultural emissions are projected to grow by 36-63 per cent’.¹⁵⁴⁷ The Green Party aims to combine environmentalism with animal advocacy by encouraging vegetarianism.¹⁵⁴⁸

Concern for world hunger and the impact on subsistence farmers are traditional concerns for the left which have led to some parliamentarians showing an interest in vegetarianism and veganism. Tony Benn adopted a vegetarian diet because he believed that ‘as [the] world population rises and food supplies fall short of human need’ a vegetarian system would be better placed to meet this growing demand.¹⁵⁴⁹ Of course, this is a concern for all leftists and not just parliamentarians. For instance, the anarchist authors of *Direct Action* magazine argued that ‘we could feed our world more sustainably with plants than with animals’.¹⁵⁵⁰ It is also claimed that ‘during the so-called Ethiopian “famine” food production actually went up locally – perfectly edible products were being exported for cash to feed Western animals’.¹⁵⁵¹ As VegFest organiser Tim Barford explains, it was the situation in Ethiopia that caused him to adopt a vegan diet:

We were also, as a nation, as the UK, we were paying Ethiopian farmers to use what little fertile ground and water they had to grow cattle fodder, so effectively in 1984 the UK dairy consumption was literally taking food out of the mouths of starving people in Ethiopia, I believe the figures... are that in 1984 British people gave approximately 80 million pounds to Live Aid, but in 1984 the UK spent over 100 million paying Ethiopian farmers for cattle fodder. So that was when I realised that there was an imbalance there, that, as happens today, much cattle fodder is grown in developing countries at a cost

¹⁵⁴⁶ Vegan advocates may be apprehensive about making these arguments because consumers may cut down on beef (which produces more greenhouse gasses) and eat more chicken or pork (which would require the deaths of more animals). S. Wirsenius, F. Hedenus, K. Mohlin, ‘Greenhouse gas taxes on animal food products: rationale, tax scheme and climate mitigation effects’, *Climate Change*, (2011), 108, pp. 159-184, p. 163.

¹⁵⁴⁷ T. Garnett, ‘Livestock and Climate Change’, in: J. D’Silva, J. Webster, (eds.) *The Meat Crisis: Developing More Sustainable Production and Consumption* (London: Earthscan, 2010), p. 36. This figure does not ‘take into account carbon dioxide emissions resulting from agriculturally induced changes in land (such as deforestation, land degradation and the conversion of pasture to arable)’.

¹⁵⁴⁸ Interview with Caroline Allen, Green Party Spokesperson for Animal Protection, 25/06/14.

¹⁵⁴⁹ T. Benn, *Letters to my Grandchildren: Thoughts on the Future* (London: Hutchinson, 2009), p. 126.

¹⁵⁵⁰ *Direct Action*, Winter 1998, No. 5, p. 22.

¹⁵⁵¹ *Ibid.*

to the indigenous people because land and resources could be used to be growing food for those people. So to grow cattle fodder so that we can have milk in our tea is nothing short of a disgrace and an insult to people who don't have enough food.¹⁵⁵²

Vegan advocates have consistently promoted these arguments.¹⁵⁵³ Writing in the animal rights magazine *Turning Point*, Vegan Society activist Juliet Breese argued that 'if the morals of not eating a piece of dead animal are hard to swallow for a lot of people in the D[eveloped] C[ountries]s surely the morals of contributing to a situation that literally starves other humans are reason enough to stop being a part of this sordid cycle of death'.¹⁵⁵⁴ Juliet Breese calculated that 'in recent years [the agricultural sector] has produced enough grain to feed the world's population, [but] 40% of this grain goes to feed animals so that a minority of people can eat meat'.¹⁵⁵⁵

Of course, different leftists will recognise that 'the crucial barrier to sustainability is capitalism, not carnivores' and although they believe that 'by cutting out animal products we can reduce some of the worst ravages of the capitalist food supply racket' these activists aim to simultaneously 'get on with the job of building a more sensible political and economic system'.¹⁵⁵⁶ David Nibert agrees that it is not enough to simply urge 'that if privileged humans would only eat "meat" less often, enough food would be available to feed all the hungry humans in the World' without confronting the 'structural forces underlying various forms of oppression and its effects'.¹⁵⁵⁷ Conversely, vegan Labour MP Kerry McCarthy is frustrated that some politicians seem to accept the structural problems without recognising the need to reduce their meat consumption:

You get invited to [breakfast meetings]... there was one that was all about sustainable food systems [for the UN]... and all around people are tucking into

¹⁵⁵² Interview with Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14.

¹⁵⁵³ Just two years after the Vegan Society was founded (in 1944) Britain was importing turkeys from Hungary at a time when a million Hungarians were liable to die of starvation. G. Orwell, S. Orwell, I. Angus (eds.) *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell. Vol. IV, In Front Of Your Nose* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968), p. 258.

¹⁵⁵⁴ J. Breese, 'The Perfect Crime – Starvation/ World Hunger', *Turning Point: The Animal Rights Magazine*, No. 5, Autumn 1986, pp. 12-14.

¹⁵⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵⁶ *Direct Action*, Winter 1998, No. 5, p. 22.

¹⁵⁵⁷ D. Nibert, *Animal Rights/Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), p. 116.

their bacon and black pudding and sausages whilst he's basically introducing a report which says that the way to feed the world is to eat a lot less meat.¹⁵⁵⁸

Whilst vegan leftists may recognise that some institutional change is needed, it is typical for Labour politicians to argue that 'animal exploitation isn't something that's the preserve of capitalism', whilst recognising, as Chris Williamson does, that 'certainly [capitalism] contributes to it'.¹⁵⁵⁹ As the left in parliament have retreated from opposition to capitalism, vegan outreach is seen as one way that capitalism could operate more ethically. Chris Williamson argues that 'getting rid of capitalism won't actually, on its own, improve the lot of animals'; instead, 'with proper regulation within a capitalist system, you can make sure that animals are protected and not exploited'.¹⁵⁶⁰

International Agreements

If vegan activists are concerned with the overall level of animal suffering in the world, with the emission of greenhouse gasses, and with the inequity of global food systems, then veganism in one country is not enough. These activists believe that a permanent vegan revolution is necessary to reduce the planet's overall level of meat and dairy consumption.¹⁵⁶¹ This is certainly a concern for some vegan outreach activists who recognise that 'the increase in meat eating is going on in big amounts in places like China and India'.¹⁵⁶² Tina Garnett agrees that 'the patterns of production and consumption that... the developing world is rapidly taking up, have potentially catastrophic consequences'.¹⁵⁶³ The desire for global change creates a

¹⁵⁵⁸ Interview with Kerry McCarthy, Labour MP, 02/05/14.

¹⁵⁵⁹ Interview with Chris Williamson, then Labour MP, 04/04/2014.

¹⁵⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶¹ Anders Nordgren explains that 'sector-specific caps... could be possible in well-integrated communities of states such as the EU'. A. Nordgren, 'Ethical Issues in Mitigation of Climate Change: The Option of Reduced Meat Production and Consumption', *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, (2012), 25, pp. 563-584, p. 573.

¹⁵⁶² Interview with Tim Barford. Although there has also been a rise in ethical veganism in China. T. Dean, 'China's vegan population is largest in the world', *VegNews Daily*, January 13th 2014 [viewed online, <http://vegnews.com/articles/page.do?pagelId=6392&catId=8>, last accessed 15/04/2015].

¹⁵⁶³ T. Garnett, 'Livestock and Climate Change', p. 34.

link between vegan activists and the parliamentary left as both groups recognise that international agreements are needed to improve the lives of animals.

Certainly, members of the New Labour government believed that international agreements were necessary to prevent imports undermining the welfare standards reached in the UK. For Elliot Morley, Labour's former Animal Welfare Spokesperson, unilateral improvements to welfare standards in Britain 'helps get legislation in Europe which can apply to all the European states'.¹⁵⁶⁴ Chris Mullin similarly praises Labour's 'part in the outlawing of battery cages, sow stalls and veal crates' but believes that the government 'were also hamstrung by the EU's free trade rules and the vested interests involved'.¹⁵⁶⁵ As Mullin recognises, these large agricultural interests, and the governments that support the farming industry, would have to be challenged in order to bring about the widespread changes that vegan activists desire.

The reaction of Green and Labour Party activists who are interested in vegan outreach falls broadly into the structure expected from the parliamentary left: firstly, extrinsic material improvements for humans, such as health and environmental benefits, are routinely highlighted; secondly, parliamentary animal activists maintain a welfare approach because they combine calls to increase the provision of vegan food with the argument that meat and dairy products should be produced with 'high welfare standards';¹⁵⁶⁶ thirdly, the Green Party and Labour activists who are interested in vegan outreach typically promote a legislative approach, which is understandable because existing national and international legislation is currently subsidising the meat and dairy industry. According to a CAS framework, this legislative change will allow for the continuation of statist hierarchy and therefore is not harmonious with the concept of total liberation.

Leftist Critiques of Vegan Outreach

¹⁵⁶⁴ Interview with Elliot Morley, former Labour MP, Former Labour Animal Welfare Spokesperson, 11/08/14.

¹⁵⁶⁵ Interview with Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, 22/07/14.

¹⁵⁶⁶ Labour Animal Welfare Society, *Animal Welfare Policy*, p. 6.

In this section we briefly consider leftist critiques of vegan outreach before moving on to the final element of the case study which looks at vegan outreach initiatives that do successfully combine veganism with other social justice issues. Vegan outreach is unlike anti-vivisection or anti-hunting activism because it has been heavily criticised, even by those within the animal rights movement. For instance, Steven Best argues that vegan activists live

in a deep state of denial and delusion about the urgency of ecological crisis and [are] dangerously naive in [their] faith in the singular efficacy of conjectural education and moral persuasion apart from direct action, mass confrontation, civil disobedience, alliance politics, and struggle for radical change.¹⁵⁶⁷

Josée Johnston links the critique of vegan outreach to a lack of class analysis within the vegan movement, which could explain why leftists are likely to challenge vegan outreach work. Johnston writes that

this particular framing of the citizen-consumer hybrid – as a chance to feel morally correct through shopping – creates a contradiction in terms of class politics. A close examination of the moral implications of the citizen-consumer hybrid reveals that it creates a hierarchy of moral stratification that maps onto class stratification, thereby lending more weight to consumerism versus citizenship.¹⁵⁶⁸

The leftist critiques broadly encompass three areas: firstly, that vegan outreach does not provide a challenge to capitalism; secondly, that vegan outreach stresses social change through activist's involuntary role as consumers; finally, that vegan activists are authoritarian or elitist in regarding veganism as a 'moral baseline' that everyone should adopt.

No challenge to capitalism

¹⁵⁶⁷ S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 45.

¹⁵⁶⁸ J. Johnston, 'The citizen-consumer hybrid: ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market', *Theory and Society*, No. 37, 2008, pp. 229-270, p. 256.

The term 'leftist critique' is not intended to imply that these assessments come from outside the animal rights movement. Although some criticisms come from anarchists and socialists who are unsupportive of animal advocacy, animal activists are also aware of the challenges they face. In particular, animal activists are aware that veganism does not automatically present a challenge to capitalism. As Lauren Ornelas, founder of the Food Empowerment Project, argues, there is nothing inherently ethical about non-animal products:

From vegan chocolate coming from West Africa that is laden with slavery and the worst forms of child labor to the plight of farm workers in the fields who pick our produce, we all need to recognise the impact that our food choices have on others.¹⁵⁶⁹

Vegan activists are aware of this dilemma; Carol Adams argues that products which contain no animal ingredients but that are produced in exploitative conditions for human workers would not meet her definition of veganism:

Veganism is about compassion, about caring. It's not just saying we're not going to eat x, y and z. It's much more inclusive of a caring ethic. I always think of it as 'do the least harm possible'. It's not about being a purist; it's about doing the least harm.¹⁵⁷⁰

Other activists try and balance the changes they ultimately wish to see with their everyday existence:

You can't necessarily live without cruelty, and being part of the western capitalist system which derives so much... because the system is cruel to the rest of the world. I hope to do my best to make it less cruel, I hope to do my best to eradicate capitalism once and for all but it is a slow process – you try and do the best you can, you try and live with minimal cruelty.¹⁵⁷¹

¹⁵⁶⁹ Quoted in. C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, 'Groundwork', in. C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, (eds.), *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals and the Earth* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), p. 33.

¹⁵⁷⁰ Interview with Carol J. Adams, 24/04/2015.

¹⁵⁷¹ Interview with Robb Johnson, vegan, libertarian socialist, 1/10/2014.

Many activists believe that there is also a danger that capitalism will create a niche market for vegan products which allows activists to 'play in the corner' without effecting any fundamental changes.¹⁵⁷² Many activists believe that capitalism has the ability to absorb and remarket oppositional ideas. This is the case with many elements of the environmental movement which use anarchist 'ideas as a critical touchstone and resource for inspiration' but have accepted a 'green market economy' which 'entails the rejection of ideas that are determined by the anarchist goal of complete abolition of the state'.¹⁵⁷³ Of course, there are many people who follow a vegan diet, including those who adopt veganism for health reasons, who have no desire to challenge capitalism or seek wider systemic changes.

Individual role as consumers

Some anarchists dismiss veganism as a mere consumer activity.¹⁵⁷⁴ David Nibert believes that promoting veganism as a solution to animal abuse undermines building a social movement for animal liberation because it focuses on the individual instead of the collective.¹⁵⁷⁵ Nibert believes that focusing on the structures of society, including an opposition to capitalism, should be at the centre of the vegan project. For Nibert, and other activists such as Roger Yates, vegan activists are wrong to focus exclusively on the notion of speciesism because it makes animal abuse appear to be an individual prejudice rather than a result of structural and economic forces.¹⁵⁷⁶ Animal activists have responded to the dismissal of veganism as an insignificant consumer choice by highlighting their opposition to capitalism, which many activists believe is 'the totalitarianism of economics over life. All life becomes a

¹⁵⁷² Ibid.

¹⁵⁷³ M. de Geus, 'The Ecological Restructuring of the State', in B. Doherty, M. de Geus, (eds.), *Democracy and Green Political Thought: Sustainability, Rights and Citizenship* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 205-206.

¹⁵⁷⁴ P. Gelderloos, *Veganism: Why Not: An Anarchist Perspective* (2011, The Anarchist Library, retrieved July 13, 2012).

¹⁵⁷⁵ 'David Nibert: Entangled Up in Blue'.

¹⁵⁷⁶ Ibid.

commodity in this society'.¹⁵⁷⁷ For these activists veganism has become 'an attempt to undermine or contest the commodification of animals'.¹⁵⁷⁸

As we have seen, activists who combine veganism with leftist politics recognise that 'changing your diet will never bring about an end to capitalism' because 'all food is produced within a rotten capitalist system. Even your vegan allotment is likely to involve capitalist products'.¹⁵⁷⁹ Of course, activists do not limit their analysis to a critique of capitalism alone; many also consider 'the ways in which, for example, the intersection of colonialist and patriarchal relations is particularly marked in the farming of animals for food'.¹⁵⁸⁰ Instead of dismissing all personal lifestyle changes as irrelevant, vegan activists seek to balance their own moral choices with efforts to bring about wider social change, for instance by participating in Food Not Bombs chapters. Dan Lyons, who founded the Centre for Animals and Social Justice, believes that vegan outreach must be 'part of a toolkit of approaches' which recognise that individualistic dietary change is not 'the be-all-and-end-all' but instead should operate alongside challenges to 'the broader social structures'.¹⁵⁸¹ For Lyons, challenges to political structures in which the industries that abuse animals wield great political influence can take place alongside a rise in veganism: 'the impact on the individuals can feed into the wider structure, and then that can feed back [to creating more vegans]'.¹⁵⁸²

Moral Baseline

The last criticism of veganism is that, in demanding that veganism act as a moral baseline, the use of the diet becomes elitist. Many animal rights activists, such as Roger Yates, argue that animal activists owe it to other animals to become vegan

¹⁵⁷⁷ *Arkangel*, No. 16. Undated. p. 33.

¹⁵⁷⁸ R. Twine, 'Embedding Animal Ethics in an Empirically Informed Theory of Social Change' presented at The Politics of Species Conference, University of Warwick, UK, 18th January 2014.

¹⁵⁷⁹ *Direct Action*, Winter 1998, No. 5, p. 22.

¹⁵⁸⁰ E. Cudworth, 'Beyond Speciesism: Intersectionality, critical sociology and the human domination of other animals', in: N. Taylor, R. Twine, (eds.), *The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: From the Margins to the Centre* (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 30.

¹⁵⁸¹ Interview with Dan Lyons, Centre for Animals and Social Justice, Uncaged, 28/07/14.

¹⁵⁸² *Ibid.*

and that anything less is going to be questioned. For Yates, veganism is a moral baseline and is no longer seen as the most one can do for animals, but the least one should do.¹⁵⁸³ This leads to a number of problems for animal advocates, including a potentially self-congratulatory attitude, a dismissal of vegetarianism and a belief that animal liberation is the 'final frontier' of discrimination.

As one of J. M. Coetzee's characters argues in his fictional exploration of our relationship with animals: 'vegetarianism is only an extreme form of dietary ban... and a dietary ban is a quick, simple way for an elite to define itself. Other people's habits are unclean, we can't eat or drink with them'.¹⁵⁸⁴ This criticism ties in with the unfairly perpetuated idea that vegans 'see themselves as better than non-vegans, morally superior, preachy, and even annoying'.¹⁵⁸⁵ It seems clear from discussions in animal rights magazines such as *Arkangel* that some vegan activists believe that they hold the 'moral high ground' and that veganism is a superior lifestyle to meat eating. Peter Gelderloos argues that such a self-congratulatory attitude in a social movement is potentially damaging not only because 'occupying the moral high ground necessarily entails the creation of an inferior "other" to oppose' but also because the success of protest groups requires constant assessment and self-criticism, and such evaluation will be blocked if a movement is always determined to appear morally wholesome.¹⁵⁸⁶ One correspondent to the *S.A.R.P Newsletter* believed that 'if we are morally superior through our beliefs then any action carried out in the furtherance of those beliefs cannot be morally wrong'.¹⁵⁸⁷

The belief that veganism should be a moral baseline is also liable to divide the animal rights movement and prevent alliances with other social justice issues. Firstly, vegan activists can be inexplicably hostile to vegetarians whom they perceive as hypocritical or ignorant. For instance Kevin Watkinson and Donald O'Driscoll argue that

[v]egetarianism doesn't challenge the paradigm of exploitation. Some people transition to veganism through vegetarianism, whilst others believe they are

¹⁵⁸³ 'Growling with Kim Stallwood'.

¹⁵⁸⁴ J. M. Coetzee, *The Lives of Animals* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), p. 42.

¹⁵⁸⁵ L. Gruen, 'Facing Death and Practicing Grief', in C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, (eds.), *Ecofeminism*, p. 133.

¹⁵⁸⁶ P. Gelderloos, *How Nonviolence Protects the State*, p. 49, p. 61.

¹⁵⁸⁷ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 5. November 1991, Anonymous, p. 3.

doing something useful to help animals, but instead merely enforce the property status of animals.¹⁵⁸⁸

Some vegan activists have claimed that ‘animal liberation must be seen as the moral imperative of our time’; and that because animal liberation ‘covers *all* abuse and exploitation. It is the *ultimate* freedom movement, the “final frontier”’.¹⁵⁸⁹ Such claims are clearly liable to alienate other social justice campaigners who would see no reason why other causes should be subsumed by animal liberation because it ‘covers *all* abuse’, and will be hostile to the suggestion that animal rights is the ‘final frontier’ when other frontiers of discrimination affect the daily lives of millions of humans.

There are three ways that vegan activists have addressed leftist critiques, and such solutions fit well with a CAS perspective: firstly, activists have highlighted that ‘it is not possible to be “pure” without collaborating with the current unjust system’ and so such a baseline cannot exist;¹⁵⁹⁰ secondly, vegan activists have focused on the oppression of human workers in food production, which means that ‘seen through an intersectional lens, vegan choices can certainly still be bound up in various forms of exploitation’;¹⁵⁹¹ finally, vegan activists have decided to ‘forgo top-down universalizing judgements’ and instead they promote an invitational approach of ‘contextual moral veganism’ that recognises ‘contextual exigencies’ that may affect one’s dietary choices.¹⁵⁹² Perhaps sections of the parliamentary left, which, as we have seen, have traditionally been concerned about conditions for agricultural workers, are well placed to adopt this ‘invitational approach’.

Vegan outreach as solidarity

¹⁵⁸⁸ K. Watkinson, D. O’Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism: Open Letter #3* (Leeds: Dysophia, 2014), p. 4.

¹⁵⁸⁹ M. Ball, ‘Activism and Veganism’; R. Webb, ‘Animal Liberation – By “Whatever Means Necessary”’, in S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?: Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (New York: Lantern Books, 2004), p. 76. Italics in original.

¹⁵⁹⁰ K. Watkinson, D. O’Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism*, p. 17.

¹⁵⁹¹ R. Twine, ‘Ecofeminism and Veganism: Revisiting the Question of Universalism’, in C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, (eds.), *Ecofeminism*, pp. 192-193.

¹⁵⁹² L. Gruen, ‘Facing Death and Practicing Grief’, p. 130.

Vegan outreach activism has been criticised by Steven Best as being ‘vague, elitist, [and] asocial’ and even ‘the new opiate of the people’.¹⁵⁹³ However, in this section it is suggested that in some instances vegan outreach has acted as a form of solidarity with other social justice movements. For instance, anarchistic animal rights activists have provided vegan meals at environmental camps or to ‘the hungry’, and in these instances vegan outreach provides more opportunities to put total liberation into practice than anti-hunting or anti-vivisection campaigns.

In previous decades the animal rights movement gained a reputation, not entirely undeserved, as an inward-looking crusade concerned with a single issue. In the 1990s the animal rights magazine *Arkangel* promoted a ‘common cause issue’, but rather than highlighting links with other social justice campaigns the magazine sought to emphasise the common causes between different animal rights groups.¹⁵⁹⁴ Vegan outreach provides activists with an opportunity to challenge the perception of animal rights as an insular movement by building alliances with other social justice issues. These solidarity alliances are particularly important for activists who combine animal activism with a wider socialist or anarchist philosophy. Groups like the Anarchist Teapot and Food Not Bombs provide this solidarity by distributing vegan food at protest sites, environmental or peace camps, on picket lines and at benefit gigs.¹⁵⁹⁵

Vegan outreach allows activists to create innovative ways of campaigning for animals. As Carol Adams explains:

I’d like to see... creative things, song, music, plays, drama, things where people suspend their anxieties, suspend their super-ego issues and experience something and then [for animal advocates to] provide the way for them to process that experience in a positive way.¹⁵⁹⁶

For instance, animal sanctuaries ‘recognise that creating opportunities for people to experience interactions with animals who usually were seen as “dinner” was an

¹⁵⁹³ S. Best, *Total Liberation*, p. 45, p. 47.

¹⁵⁹⁴ *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 7. Spring 1992.

¹⁵⁹⁵ Interview with Isy Morgenmuffel, Cowley Club activist, via e-mail, 17/12/2013; Interview with Anonymous Food Not Bombs Activist, East Midlands, 03/04/2015.

¹⁵⁹⁶ Interview with C. J. Adams, 24/04/2015.

important way of doing vegan outreach'.¹⁵⁹⁷ This outreach work has tied in with feminist initiatives that provide safe spaces for victims of domestic abuse and their companion animals. Animal activists have also combined their promotion of veganism with other initiatives focused around local communities growing their own food such as the Transition Network.¹⁵⁹⁸ From a socialist and anarchist perspective vegan outreach is at its most successful when it combines overlapping social justice issues; for instance the McLibel activists who highlighted the unethical targeting of children, exploitation of workers, animal cruelty, damage to the environment and the global domination of corporations.¹⁵⁹⁹ Such vegan outreach campaigns, particularly those that recognise the exploitation of both humans and animals within the meat and dairy industry, begin to fulfil Ted Benton's vision of building a broad strategy

aimed at a re-structuring of economic and technical relations in the food production, processing and distribution industries. A coalition of forces committed to diverse but complementary aims – animal rights and welfare organisations, agriculture trade unions, organic farming interests, health and diet campaigners.¹⁶⁰⁰

This is important from a CAS perspective because such solidarity work helps build progressive alliances and practically demonstrates total liberation politics. However, it is interesting that Benton's call for a movement that adopts 'diverse but complementary aims' could include parliamentarians and anarchist activists. As Benton suggests, both animal rights and animal welfare activists can play a significant role in such a movement, as well as those who highlight extrinsic human benefits of animal advocacy, and seek legislative change to improve the conditions for workers in agricultural industries.

Conclusion

¹⁵⁹⁷ C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, 'Groundwork', p. 18.

¹⁵⁹⁸ Transition Network [viewed online, <https://www.transitionnetwork.org/>, last accessed 27/08/2015].

¹⁵⁹⁹ *Freedom*, Vol. 60. No. 22. 13th November 1999.

¹⁶⁰⁰ T. Benton, *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights & Social Justice* (London: Verso, 1993), p. 161.

In this case study we have seen why the parliamentary left and self-identified anarchists may embrace vegan outreach. We have considered leftist critiques of vegan outreach and seen that vegan activists can promote solidarity with other social justice causes through outreach work.

Vegan outreach represents a shift to a genuinely 'invitational approach' and away from previous ALF pronouncements that some people could only be 'educated' by intimidation.¹⁶⁰¹ In the 1980s some animal activists viewed the prospect of forming connections with other oppressed groups as irrelevant. For instance, some ALF activists were even prepared to launch attacks against Halal butchers in 'area[s] of extreme racial tension. [Where] the N[atonal] F[ront] is very active' and local communities 'consider themselves, with some justification, to be in a state of siege'.¹⁶⁰² Current vegan activists, in groups like Food Not Bombs, help build alliances and create networks with other social justice movements by providing food at protest sites, on picket lines and in attempts to feed 'the hungry'.

Some activists argue that the shift to outreach work is due to a fear of repression, others argue that 'we're still in the vegan pioneer stage' and many more supporters will need to be recruited before meaningful activism can take place.¹⁶⁰³ Although these debates continue within the animal rights movement, it is clear that through vegan outreach activists are 'still left with a weighty task that could occupy advocates for generations to come – to educate the public on the need, as a matter of personal morality, to stop exploiting nonhumans through diet and consumer choices'.¹⁶⁰⁴

This is not to say that vegan outreach has replaced, or will replace, other forms of activism for animals entirely; instead it will remain 'part of a toolkit of approaches'.¹⁶⁰⁵ Moreover, leftist animal advocates will not be satisfied by the increase in vegan consumer choices alone. Leftist animal advocates will continue to

¹⁶⁰¹ Animal Liberation Front Supporters' Group, No. 2. December 1982, p. 2.

¹⁶⁰² *Freedom*, 11th February 1984, No. 3. Vol. 45. Letter from MU Diboll. Similar debates occurred within the North American ALF, *Underground: The Magazine of the North American Animal Liberation Front Supporters Group*, No. 1, August 1994, p. 22. In, *Underground: The A.L.F in the 1990s* (Warcry Communications, 2011).

¹⁶⁰³ Interview with Roger Yates, former ALF regional press officer, conducted via e-mail, 11/12/2013.

¹⁶⁰⁴ G. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder*, p. 183.

¹⁶⁰⁵ Interview with Dan Lyons, Centre for Animals and Social Justice, Uncaged, 28/07/14.

argue that fundamental social change is necessary to improve the status of other animals.

We have seen that both anarchists and the parliamentary left are willing to consider vegan outreach when it can relate to other progressive issues such as world hunger and the environment. Indeed, the growth of vegan outreach has coincided with animal rights activists attempting to 'get involved in alliance politics' and trying to 'forge links with our movements and other movements'.¹⁶⁰⁶ However, it remains the case that anarchists typically formulate such alliances by embracing the concept of total liberation, whereas British parliamentarians use extrinsic arguments about improving human society. This is not to say that one type of argument is more successful or morally superior. Indeed, it seems important for animal activists to highlight extrinsic arguments about the health and environmental benefits of a vegetarian or vegan diet as well as the potentially beneficial effect on world hunger.

Other key differences between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy persist, as they have remained – with some complexities - across all three case studies. Anarchists are likely to take a rights or liberation approach, to adopt some form of direct action and to educate the public about the concept of speciesism. Parliamentarians will typically form an animal welfare approach that favours legislative action and does not simultaneously challenge all forms of oppression. However, from a CAS approach one should be cautious of constructing such tidy dualisms; in reality parliamentarians, anarchists and others have all made important contributions to the growth of vegan outreach (and opposition to hunting and vivisection) and will continue to contribute to the animal advocacy movement in the future.

¹⁶⁰⁶ Interview with Roger Yates, former ALF regional press officer, conducted via e-mail, 11/12/2013.

9. Conclusion: ‘Social change is messy’

Since I began research on this thesis in 2012, the relationship between humans and other animals has continued to draw attention from the British media and general public. The ‘horse meat scandal’ of 2013 caused some people to think seriously for the first time about their routine consumption of animals. Evidently, many consumers decided that if it was morally wrong to eat horses, it was equally amiss to consume cows or pigs: sales of vegetarian products reportedly rose by 30% in light of the equine scandal and 7% of people who responded to one survey in *The Economist* stated that they had stopped eating meat entirely.¹⁶⁰⁷ Over the last three years, vegan dietary habits (if not the philosophical principles behind veganism) have achieved mainstream popularity.¹⁶⁰⁸ Media reports have focused on vegan celebrities, meat and dairy-free supermarkets and the ‘flexitarian’ approach which mean, according to one article in *The Guardian*, that ‘it’s no longer weird to be a vegan’.¹⁶⁰⁹

Nevertheless, as we saw in the previous chapter, many animal rights activists believe that this mainstreaming of veganism amounts to capitalist co-optation in which vegan products are available at the expense of a wider critique of capitalism. The rise in mainstream acceptance of vegan dietary practices has occurred

¹⁶⁰⁷ S. Butler, ‘Horsemeat scandal sparks rise in sales of vegetarian alternatives’, *The Guardian*, 05/03/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2013/mar/05/horsemeat-scandal-sales-vegetarian-alternatives>, last accessed 01/12/15]; ‘And the winner is’, *The Economist*, 23/02/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.economist.com/news/britain/21572230-what-horse-shy-consumers-are-eating-instead-and-winner>, last accessed 01/12/15].

¹⁶⁰⁸ Indeed the rise of vegetarianism and veganism, particularly amongst young people, suggests that the above quoted figures were more than a momentary change caused by the horsemeat scandal. Mintel, ‘Number of global vegetarian food and drink product launches doubles between 2009 and 2013’, October 2014 [viewed online, <http://www.mintel.com/press-centre/food-and-drink/number-of-global-vegetarian-food-and-drink-product-launches-doubles-between-2009-and-2013>, last accessed 21/01/2016].

¹⁶⁰⁹ H. Walker, ‘Relax, it’s no longer weird to be a vegan’, *The Guardian*, 04/01/2014 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/04/vegan-fad-meat-dairy-health-option>, last accessed 01/12/15]; A. Molloy, ‘No meat, no dairy, no problem: is 2014 the year vegans become mainstream?’ *The Independent*, 31/12/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/food-and-drink/features/no-meat-no-dairy-no-problem-is-2014-the-year-vegans-become-mainstream-9032064.html>, last accessed 01/12/2015].

alongside a trough in militant animal rights activism, as symbolised by the dissolution of SHAC in 2014.¹⁶¹⁰

If the animal rights protest cycle which began in the mid-1970s with the formation of the ALF is experiencing a trough in the mid-2010s, then the growth and mainstreaming of veganism may be regarded as one unexpected residue of animal rights activism. Alternatively, both consumer changes and the earlier activism could reflect a wider shift in public morality. Anthony Hoare believes that issues such as the environment and animal advocacy are post-materialist concerns which have increased in Britain because economic issues have become less pressing since the 1980s.¹⁶¹¹ Of course, one could dispute Hoare's claim that economic standards have improved for most people, and it also seems probable that these 'post-materialist' issues are becoming more prominent because climate change is becoming an increasingly important part of people's daily realities.

Whereas physical liberations and economic sabotage have declined in Britain, other forms of activism, such as online campaigns, remain consistent. In particular, the animal rights movement has mobilised against the Conservative government's recent efforts to reinstate foxhunting.¹⁶¹² These are also interesting and fast-developing times for the parliamentary left: time will tell if Labour are able to move in an animal rights direction under the leadership of Jeremy Corbyn, who is himself a vegetarian and opposed to vivisection; and the Scottish National Party, a growing force on the centre left, have also affirmed their animal welfare commitments.¹⁶¹³ These developments, which have helped increase the dialogue between radical and reformist leftists, make this thesis a particularly useful assessment of the changing moral, political and activist landscape as Britain enters a new 'age of dissent'.¹⁶¹⁴ The three case studies analyse ways in which direct action and legislative politics

¹⁶¹⁰ SHAC, 'SHAC Ends: We made history... The future is ours' [viewed online, <http://www.shac.net/>, last accessed 12/08/14].

¹⁶¹¹ A. G. Hoare, 'Hunting for Votes: the Geography of Free Votes and Electoral Advantage in the British House of Commons', *Geoforum*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (1995), pp. 459-478, p. 474.

¹⁶¹² J. N. Parkinson, 'Anti-foxhunting campaigners protest outside parliament', *The Guardian*, 14/07/2015 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/video/2015/jul/14/anti-foxhunting-campaigners-protest-parliament-video>, last accessed 02/12/15].

¹⁶¹³ SNP, 'Our Animal Welfare Priorities for Europe' [viewed online, http://www.animalaid.org.uk/images/pdf/SNP_Animal_Welfare.pdf, last accessed 21/01/2016].

¹⁶¹⁴ D. J. Bailey, 'Hard Evidence: this is the Age of Dissent – and there's much more to come' [viewed online, <https://theconversation.com/hard-evidence-this-is-the-age-of-dissent-and-theres-much-more-to-come-52871>, last accessed 25/01/2016].

interrelate on particular issues, and this is interesting because since the rise of Jeremy Corbyn there are growing calls on the British left for reformist and radical activists to support each other where possible.¹⁶¹⁵

The conclusion begins by examining the place of anarchistic and parliamentary left animal activists within a Critical Animal Studies (CAS) framework; the chapter then situates animal advocacy within key debates in leftist politics; this is followed by a brief discussion of the key contributions that this thesis will make, before looking at possible future research, and future activism, that might stem from the thesis. The aim of the conclusion is to revisit the major research questions of the thesis and make an effective case that CAS scholarship should take the relationship between direct action and legislative reform more seriously.

CAS Framework

The major purpose of this thesis has been to explore anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy in Britain since the 1970s; the principal way of scrutinising these relationships was through a CAS framework. The original premise set out in the introduction was that four key conceptual points would link anarchistic activists to a CAS framework, and that these points would help reveal the differences between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy: firstly, that anarchistic activists would use intrinsic arguments and seek to educate the public about the concept of speciesism; secondly, that parliamentary leftists would adopt a welfare rather than a rights/liberation approach; thirdly, that parliamentary left animal advocates would favour legislative reform over direct action; and finally, that anarchist animal advocates would link their activism to the concepts of total liberation, intersectionality and a rejection of all socially constructed hierarchy.

Speciesism

¹⁶¹⁵ For instance: H. Wainwright, 'My support for Jeremy Corbyn is about much more than "reclaiming Labour"' [viewed online, <http://www.redpepper.org.uk/my-support-for-jeremy-corbyn-is-about-much-more-than-reclaiming-labour/>, last accessed 21/01/2016].

The first key component of a CAS framework which it was expected would help explain the differences between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy is that whilst anarchists adopt intrinsic arguments about the moral worth of animals and are concerned with the concept of speciesism (either as a tool to educate the public or as a moral justification for their activism), parliamentarians in the Labour Party and the Green Party tend to adopt extrinsic arguments about the possible benefits to human society associated with animal advocacy. These approaches were anticipated given the practical and ideological nature of anarchists and the parliamentary left. It was believed that anarchists would use the concept of speciesism as a moral justification for their actions because a fundamental component of anarchist ideologies is deconstructing the formation of hierarchy and challenging existing hierarchies. Indeed, hierarchy (meaning the ‘cultural, traditional and psychological systems of obedience and command’) is often seen as more deep-rooted than the economic and political systems of class and the State.¹⁶¹⁶ Therefore, it is unsurprising that anarchists are interested in the concept of speciesism when it is regarded as another socially constructed form of hierarchy which contributes to, and is fostered by, hierarchical ways of viewing the world.¹⁶¹⁷ The parliamentary left have to appeal to the electorate, and therefore it was expected that they would use extrinsic arguments about improvements to human societies that might come through animal advocacy.

Chapter two focused on anarchism and animal advocacy. The expectation that anarchist animal advocates would use intrinsic arguments about the concept of speciesism was largely supported; however, some complications did emerge. For instance, anarchists have sometimes used extrinsic arguments that animal advocacy will lead to improvements for human society.¹⁶¹⁸ Moreover, some anarchists, notably Murray Bookchin, believe that humans are superior to any other animal species, and

¹⁶¹⁶ M. Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy* (New York: Black Rose Books, 1991), p. 4.

¹⁶¹⁷ Anarchist Survey [viewed online, <http://www.anarchismdocumentary.net/survey/>, last accessed 14/04/2014].

¹⁶¹⁸ É. Reclus, *On Vegetarianism, The Great Kinship of Humans and Fauna* (Jura Media, 1992), p. 5.

because of this superiority they are uniquely aware of the interests of other species and duty-bound to protect them.¹⁶¹⁹

Chapter three focused on the parliamentary left and animal advocacy. In this chapter it was argued that the parliamentary left, in particular the Labour Party, have relied on extrinsic arguments about possible improvements to human society, either by suggesting that alleviating the unnecessary suffering of animals will make Britain a more caring nation, or by highlighting the health and environmental benefits that might emerge from a reduction in meat consumption. However, both the Green Party and the Labour left in the 1980s used both intrinsic and extrinsic arguments and did seek to implement reforms based on the moral worth of animals.

Chapter four focused on animal advocacy in relation to class politics. This was valuable because CAS has downplayed the significance of class, and so by examining class we might expect the dichotomies between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy to be challenged. Indeed, approaches to the concept of speciesism are complicated by considering class. For instance, if activists believe that the exploitation of humans and animals are morally equivalent, then this implies that people working in animal-abusing industries are morally comparable to concentration camp guards. Such a belief, which is adopted by some anarchistic animal activists in the ALF and SHAC, has led to these workers being exposed to coercive forms of direct action. Such action ignores the class dimensions of the animal-industrial complex. From a CAS perspective, workers in these industries should be regarded as subjected to an interrelated form of oppression to the animals. This suggests that anarchistic activists have sometimes divorced their understanding of speciesism from total liberation and intersectional politics which it was also expected that anarchists would hold.

Chapter five considered the importance of gender, particularly an eco-feminist analysis. This chapter supported the hypothesis that anarchistic animal activists are more likely than parliamentary left activists to use the concept of speciesism as a moral justification for their actions and promote intrinsic arguments about the moral worth of animals. However, the use of the concept of speciesism was once again

¹⁶¹⁹ M. Bookchin, *Re-Enchanting Humanity: A Defence of the Human Spirit Against Anti-Humanism, Misanthropy, Mysticism and Primitivism* (London: Cassell, 1995).

complicated because of the aim of some non-leftist animal groups, notably PETA, to educate the public about the concept of speciesism whilst ignoring other interrelated forms of oppression. This ‘uncritical’ use of the concept of speciesism has alienated some feminists from the entire animal rights movement.

Chapters six, seven and eight provided three case studies of key animal advocacy issues in Britain. In relation to vivisection and hunting, Labour and Green Party activists sometimes use intrinsic arguments about the moral worth of animals, but this was usually limited to welfare demands and prohibitions on ‘unnecessary suffering’. Labour politicians might also use the extrinsic argument that animal advocacy would enhance the moral nature of humans: ‘for who could engage in slaughter or torture without being diminished themselves?’¹⁶²⁰ In relation to vegan outreach, Labour and Green animal activists were more likely to use extrinsic arguments about benefits to humans such as the health and environmental advantages of reducing meat consumption. All three case studies supported the claim that anarchist activists were likely to relate their opposition to animal abuse to intrinsic arguments and the concept of speciesism. However, it is clear that practical activism often differs from theoretical opposition to speciesism. For instance, some CAS theorists have placed great importance on the use of ‘speciesist language’ which they believe upholds socially constructed species hierarchies and systems of oppression.¹⁶²¹ Animal activists, who regularly risk violence or imprisonment to save animals, were less concerned with the theoretical construction of speciesism, indeed it was common to use conventional pronouns that label animals as ‘it’ and ‘something’.¹⁶²²

Rights and Liberation

The second key component of a CAS framework that it was initially suggested would help explain the difference between anarchistic and parliamentary left

¹⁶²⁰ T. Benn, *Letters to my Grandchildren: Thoughts on the Future* (London: Hutchinson, 2009), pp. 127-128.

¹⁶²¹ J. Dunayer, *Animal Equality: Language and Liberation* (Derwood: Ryce Publishing, 2001), p. 1.

¹⁶²² Interview with Luke, Southern Anti-Bloodsports, 07/08/14.

approaches to animal advocacy was that anarchists were likely to join CAS in adopting an animal rights or animal liberation approach whilst rejecting an animal welfare approach. Parliamentary left activists were regarded as more likely to adopt an animal welfare position, both because such an approach was considered to be electorally achievable and due to a genuine moral commitment to welfare principles.

Chapter two showed that anarchistic activists, particularly those associated with the ALF and SHAC, clearly fit into a rights/liberation framework because they seek to end all animal abuse rather than reforming the worst practices. However, it is worth remembering that some anarchists may reject the concept of rights, because they imply a higher political authority to grant the rights and are typically 'guaranteed through law' and state enforcement.¹⁶²³ This question also arose in chapter five, when we saw that some leftist feminists critique the concept of rights. The fact that such criticisms came from the group Feminists for Animal Rights (FAR) suggests that whilst the labels are theoretically imperfect, they are still convenient organisational banners for animal activists. In chapter two we also saw that Brian Dominick has rejected the term 'liberation' as a uniquely human concept that is beyond the capabilities of other animals.¹⁶²⁴

Chapter three confirmed that when in office the parliamentary left have adopted a welfare approach. It is clear from grassroots campaigns by trade unionists and Labour activists that there is a strongly held moral conviction that animals should not suffer 'unnecessarily', whilst their continued use for food and in experiments is seen as morally justified. Animal activists in the parliamentary left may also adopt what Gary Francione calls a 'new welfarist' approach, in which reformist means are adopted in the short term in the hope of achieving abolitionist ends.¹⁶²⁵ However, it is also possible for parliamentarians to adopt an animal rights position; indeed, the Bennite left, high profile activists such as Kim Stallwood, and current Green Party activists all combine an animal rights position with parliamentary politics.

¹⁶²³ K. Watkinson, D. O'Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism: Open Letter #3* (Leeds: Dysophia, 2014), p. 1.

¹⁶²⁴ B. A. Dominick, *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution: A Vegan Perspective on Anarchism or an Anarchist Perspective on Veganism* (Active Distribution, 2008/ First published 1995), p. 16. Dominick now uses the turn 'animal freedom'. Interview with Brian Dominick, conducted via e-mail, received 08/01/16.

¹⁶²⁵ G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), p. 41.

Chapter four highlighted a further complication with the rights/liberation versus welfare dichotomy, in that some interpretations of animal liberation focus on the domestication and incarceration of animals. These liberationists believe that hunting wild animals for food is less problematic than the ‘domeseccration’ of animals under capitalist farming practices. Only an animal rights approach fits a CAS framework which prohibits all ‘exploitation, domination, oppression, torture, [and] killing’ of animals.¹⁶²⁶

The case studies, particularly the chapters focusing on vivisection and vegan outreach, confirmed that the parliamentary left have adopted a welfare position. This may be because parliamentarians regarded legislative politics as ‘the art of the possible’, or because including animal welfare demands would attract progressive voters.¹⁶²⁷ In particular, Labour politicians campaigned against ‘unnecessary suffering’ and what were seen as extraordinary cases such as the testing of cosmetics on animals. Anarchistic activists adopted a rights/liberation approach in that they sought to end animal abuse entirely and rejected what they saw as reformist compromises. However, the split between rights/liberation and welfare approaches is not always visible, for instance opposition to hunting typically implied a total ban, rather than an attempt to improve the welfare of hunted animals. Moreover, when parliamentarians target particular aspects of animal abuse – for instance the LD50 test – it is often with the demand that such practices are prohibited entirely rather than reformed, even if wider systems of animal abuse continue.

Direct Action

One of the clearest contrasts between anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy is that anarchists would support the use of direct action whereas activists in Labour and the Green Party would favour legislative solutions.

¹⁶²⁶ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, ‘Introducing Critical Animal Studies’, *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5. No. 1. (2007), pp. 4-5.

¹⁶²⁷ Interview with Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, 22/07/14.

In chapter two we saw that the use of direct action was a key part of an anarchist tactical and philosophical repertoire, and that such strategies informed these activists' ways of understanding social change and helped build a collective identity and shared culture of resistance.¹⁶²⁸ Anarchists and contemporary animal activists also share a tactical connection because of the importance attached to the use of affinity groups, consensus decision making and a non-hierarchical structure.

Chapter three confirmed the expectation that the parliamentary left have favoured legislative reform over direct action; indeed, during the New Labour government strands of the direct action movement faced severe political repression. However, we also saw that it was possible for parliamentarians to support direct action. Past and present Labour MPs such as Tony Benn, Kerry McCarthy and Chris Williamson have praised the role of non-violent direct action.

Chapters four (class) and five (gender) confirmed the division between anarchists who use direct action and the parliamentary left who seek legislative reform. However, some complications emerge in the use of coercive or violent tactics that target individual workers or other groups subjected to interrelated forms of oppression: although activists who use such tactics may adopt an anarchistic action repertoire and they may be self-identified anarchists, some other anarchists – including those who stress prefigurative politics – have critiqued this use of violent or coercive tactics because it contravenes total liberation.

However, the case studies and interview material from animal activists challenged the rigid dichotomy between direct action and legislation. With regards to hunting, Labour activists such as Chris Williamson have been active as hunt saboteurs. Moreover, many anarchistic hunt saboteurs favour legislation as a stepping stone to more thoroughgoing change. With regards to vivisection there is also an overlap between legislation and direct action. For instance, left-leaning Labour MPs, including Jeremy Corbyn, used Barry Horne's hunger strike to raise the issue of vivisection in parliament. Activists within the ALF and SHAC called for political reforms, including an independent inquiry into vivisection. Vegan outreach is

¹⁶²⁸ D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), p. 127.

an interesting case study because anarchistic activists have shifted from militant forms of direct action to educational and outreach work following repression.

It is also clear from the case studies that many anarchist animal activists view legislative change as a significant development and sensible tactical goal; thus it is surprising that CAS scholars do not devote more attention to scrutinising the relationship between legislation and direct action. It may be that anarchist activists refuse to engage in traditional lobbying activities, yet instead engage in militant direct action in the hope that this will force governments to implement reforms whilst strengthening the animal liberation movement.

Total Liberation and Intersectionality

The final component of a CAS framework that it was anticipated would separate anarchist and parliamentary left approaches to animal advocacy was the anarchist use of concepts such as total liberation and intersectionality as linked to a rejection of all socially constructed hierarchy.

This dichotomy was largely confirmed in chapters two and three. In chapter two we saw that anarchist activists typically use the concept of total liberation and link animal abuse to other forms of hierarchy, particularly the state and capitalism. Parliamentary activists are less likely to link animal advocacy to concepts of total liberation and a rejection of all social hierarchies, however, we saw in chapter three that in Labour-controlled councils during the 1980s activists like Val Veness suggested that the status of animals was interconnected to the status of women and other oppressed groups.

Chapter four showed that Labour politicians typically support low paid workers in agricultural industries. It was suggested that a combination of support for agricultural workers and animals approached a total liberation framework, but the Labour Party did not meet such a framework because they prioritised human issues, focused on animal welfare rather than rights, and did not suggest that Earth, animal and human oppression were interconnected and must be simultaneously opposed.

Chapter five confirmed that opposition to hierarchy is a key component of anarchist thinking. The parliamentary left, particularly in the Labour Party, were seen to rely on 'single-axis thinking' and hence were less likely to discuss interrelated forms of oppression. Moreover, the parliamentary left could not reject all forms of hierarchy because they accept the state hierarchy which is needed to enact and enforce the legislative changes they desire.

The case studies provided further details of the different approaches of anarchist and parliamentary left animal advocates. In the hunting case study it was suggested that the anti-establishment attitude and solidarity with other campaign groups that is fostered by the experience of direct action might enhance anarchistic activists' acceptance of total liberation. Although the parliamentary left did not accept the concept of total liberation or campaign against all hierarchies, they did link their opposition to hunting with class issues. With regards to vegan outreach, activists in Labour and the Green Party regularly highlight related issues such as world hunger and the environment. This approaches a total liberation framework which links human, animal and Earth liberation; however, these parliamentary activists still prioritise human issues and use extrinsic arguments about improvements to human society that might come from vegetarian or vegan diets. The case studies provided examples of the negative 'use' of other animals by humans, whether these animals are hunted for pleasure or experimented upon in laboratories. However, it is also important that one remembers that different groups of animals can have countless different types of relationships with groups of humans, including mutually beneficial relationships. In the vegan outreach case study we saw that animals in sanctuaries may help provide a form of outreach when people meet animals who would typically be killed for food, in this instance animals might even be described as participating in animal rights campaigns. Moreover, the nature of 'animal liberation' should not be regarded as a static concept describing all human-animal relationships. The need for 'liberation' vastly differs between animals abused in vivisection industries, wild animals who may be hunted by humans and companion animals who may provide vegan outreach activists with emotional support. This thesis has focused on human animal rights activists, but it is important to remember that all the animals whose lives are recorded in this thesis have individual interests and desires and the potential to show agency, although their oppression is often so absolute (for instance

in slaughterhouses or vivisection laboratories) that it is impossible for these animals to act upon their agency.

It seems clear that the expectations formulated by a CAS framework are largely validated by this thesis; however, for every key point there are nuances and complications, and in some instances the assumptions accepted by CAS scholars, particularly involving the dichotomy between legislative reform and direct action, are challenged. Indeed, my initial hunch that a 'home' for radical animal activism could be located in the anarchistic left is proved incorrect because the reality is that animal activists operate in fluid networks which cross parliamentary and direct action boundaries.

Key Debates

This thesis contributes to current debates within animal rights scholarship as well as longstanding discussions within radical social movements about the nature of social change. In particular, the British animal advocacy movement can be situated within a wider debate about reformism or revolution, and it is also affected by debates surrounding the nature of the state.

Reform or revolution

The historical split between anarchistic and parliamentary left approaches to social change can be understood as a debate between the merits of reform against revolution. As a strategy, anarchists reject parliamentary reforms for a number of reasons. Guy Aldred argued that

reform activity means constant trotting round the fool's parade, continuous movement in a vicious circle. Something must be done for expectant mothers, for homeless couples... for rent-resisters, something to reform here or there, regardless of the fact that capitalism is a hydra-headed monster, that the reforms needed are as innumerable as the abuses begotten of the capitalist

system, and such abuses increase with every modification of capitalist administration, the better to perpetuate the system.¹⁶²⁹

Aldred's critique of parliamentary reform from an anarchist perspective helps to explain why the parliamentary left have only adopted an animal welfare position, and why anarchists favour direct action. Aldred highlights the core anarchist belief that parliamentarians who seek 'votes from an electorate anxious for some immediate reform' must

time the pulse of capitalist society, subject his [or her] first principles to the opinions arising out of capitalist conditions, to current local superstitions and respectabilities and immediate or fancied interests.¹⁶³⁰

If one applies Aldred's critique of 'parliamentarism' to animal advocates in the parliamentary left, then it could be argued that politicians seeking election must aim to situate their animal advocacy within existing beliefs about the legitimate use of animals, and thus will always adopt a welfare perspective. Aldred also explains the anarchist belief that 'Parliament is an institution existing for the defence of class society, the domination of man by man', and therefore parliamentary socialism will only achieve 'a Labour bureaucracy to administer Capitalism and preserve its authority'. It is for this reason that Aldred, and other anarchists, believe that social changes 'proceed from direct action' rather than parliament.¹⁶³¹ If Aldred represents the anarchist position, then a parliamentary position has been clearly set out by interviewees in this thesis including Chris Mullin, Chris Williamson and Kim Stallwood who believe that it is better to engage in 'the world of practical politics' and gain reforms which can be built on in time than to 'take the purist road and achieve nothing'.¹⁶³²

This thesis has verified the ideological dispute between revolutionary anarchists and reformist parliamentary leftists, yet we have also seen that there are overlaps, both theoretical and practical, between revolutionary and reformist politics.

¹⁶²⁹ G. Aldred, *Socialism and Parliament*, 1923 [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/guy-a-aldred-socialism-and-parliament>, last accessed 07/12/2015].

¹⁶³⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶³¹ Ibid.

¹⁶³² Interviews with Ronnie Lee, ALF founder, 25/04/2013; Kim Stallwood, animal advocate, 25/10/2013; Chris Williamson, then Labour MP, 04/04/2014; Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, 22/07/14.

As Murray Bookchin explained, revolutionary leftists have often engaged in the struggle for reforms 'as a means to *educate* the masses, not as a way to dole out charity or improve their material lot'.¹⁶³³ The radical wing of the animal advocacy movement fits well with Rosa Luxemburg's discussion about revolutionary or reformist politics. For Luxemburg, engaging in the 'practical daily struggle for reforms' could be a significant *means* towards reaching the long term *goal* of social revolution.¹⁶³⁴ Luxemburg argued that such reformist struggles were significant in that people become 'convinced of the impossibility of accomplishing fundamental social change as a result of... parliamentary struggles and arrives at the conviction that these struggles cannot basically change [the] situation'.¹⁶³⁵ It is clear from the case studies that such an approach has been adopted by radical animal activists. For instance, the anarchistic Vale and Valley sabs campaigned for legislative action against hunting, and when these reforms were not forthcoming the group argued that animal activists must 'look beyond the frustrating confines of the Parliamentary arena' and adopt a direct action approach.¹⁶³⁶ This thesis thus suggests that the binary distinction between reform and revolution, whilst helpful as a theoretical construct and held to some extent by some activists, is ultimately not that rigid in practice – certainly in the case of animal advocacy in Britain.

The State

Luxemburg also believed that the structures of the 'capitalist state develop in entirely opposed directions' to progressively socializing reforms.¹⁶³⁷ Clearly, the role of the state in social change separates anarchist and parliamentary left approaches, not just with regards to animal advocacy but to all areas of social justice. For instance, recent campaigns against police brutality have been troubled by tactics which demand reforms from the state:

¹⁶³³ M. Bookchin: *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1995), pp. 77-78. Emphasis in original.

¹⁶³⁴ P. Hudis, K. B. Anderson, (eds.), *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004), pp. 128-129.

¹⁶³⁵ *Ibid.* p. 140.

¹⁶³⁶ Vale & Valley Sabs, *Sabotage* (Cardiff: Vale & Vally Sabs, 1992), p. 3.

¹⁶³⁷ P. Hudis, K. B. Anderson, (eds.), *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader*, p. 141.

[W]hat are we doing when we demonstrate against police brutality, and find ourselves tacitly calling upon the government to help us do so? These notions of the state as the arbiter of justice and the police as the unaccountable arbiters of lethal violence are two sides of the same coin... What is needed is the development of a radical critique of the structure of the coin.¹⁶³⁸

Anarchists, in particular, will critique the 'politics of demand'; for instance, Bookchin argues that anarchists should not concede to the state the ability to deliver 'justice' or protect 'rights', as these concepts are used 'as a surrogate for the freedom that is lost with the decline of organic society'.¹⁶³⁹ However, anarchist animal activists often feel that they have a special and urgent duty to use a diversity of tactics to alleviate the suffering of animals. Animal activists feel this duty both because of the extreme level of suffering inflicted upon animals, and because the animals themselves are unable to formulate or prohibit any tactical suggestions, and so activists are wary of excluding any tactics on the animals' behalf. For instance, scholar-activist Lisa Kemmerer argues:

If I were a chicken sitting in a chicken shed I would be annoyed to hear that somebody thought that no one should be working with the legislators to try and bring change... We need to do everything we can do, and if you've got an activist out there that wants to do that type of activist manoeuvres [lobbying], I think go for it. How stupid is that to sit around and complain about other types of activists?¹⁶⁴⁰

Anarchist animal activists find themselves in the ironic position of recognising that state structures are an important tactical means to bring about improvements for animals, whilst also believing that 'the physical, political, economic, ideological, and diversionary power of the state support and build such entangled oppressions whilst giving such atrocities legal and social respectability'.¹⁶⁴¹ Anarchist activists may believe that only non-structural changes will be adopted by the capitalist state. David

¹⁶³⁸ CROATOAN, 'Who Is Oakland: Anti-Oppression Activism, the Politics of Safety, and State Co-optation', April 2012 [viewed online, <https://escalatingidentity.wordpress.com/2012/04/30/who-is-oakland-anti-oppression-politics-decolonization-and-the-state/>, last accessed 08/12/2015].

¹⁶³⁹ M. Bookchin, *Ecology of Freedom*, p. 141.

¹⁶⁴⁰ Interview with Lisa Kemmerer, CAS scholar, 25/08/2015.

¹⁶⁴¹ D. Nibert, *Animal Rights/ Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), pp. 184-185.

Nibert's assessment of animal rights activism is confirmed by evidence in this thesis; Nibert suggests that anarchistic activists:

Continue to pursue liberation through political measures, but they must also challenge the control of the capitalist elite over the various powers of the state while striving to change the structure of the state.¹⁶⁴²

In this thesis we have seen that one way animal activists can pursue such a strategy is through different wings of the animal advocacy movement – the legislative and direct action wings – working in tandem and using overlapping short-term tactics wherever possible. For instance, parliamentary left activists can raise an issue in parliament in response to the direct action campaigns of the more militant animal rights groups. Conversely, anarchist animal activists often welcome legislative reforms, even whilst campaigning for more radical change. It is clear from animal rights literature that many animal activists hope that different wings of the movement can work together and stop 'wasting our time criticising other areas of action'. An approach which recognises the parallels between parliamentary and direct action campaigns seems to fit with this demand because it respects ideological differences whilst recognising that activists are working towards the same ultimate goal.¹⁶⁴³

In light of the findings of this research, one might say that anarchist state theory has been as problematic as classical Marxism in reducing the state to the reproduction of capitalist relations. Anarchistic animal activists are left with the task of explaining how 'the state relates to other forms of domination and oppression not based on class, such as patriarchy and racism'.¹⁶⁴⁴ Interestingly, anarchists' 'solidarity with those who directly struggle against their own oppression leads them to privilege those agents' analysis', which puts anarchist animal rights activists in a unique position amongst anarchists because the oppressed group (whilst they have agency and in individual circumstances are able to liberate themselves) are unable to formulate any analysis of their oppression.¹⁶⁴⁵

¹⁶⁴² Ibid. p. 188.

¹⁶⁴³ *S.A.R.P Newsletter*, No. 5. November 1991, p. 2.

¹⁶⁴⁴ U. Gordon, 'Reinstating the State in Anarchist Critique', *Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed*, No. 77, pp. 26-37, p. 29.

¹⁶⁴⁵ Ibid.

Key Contributions

The aim of this thesis was to make a contribution to a number of different research areas, in particular CAS, but also wider animal rights theory, as well as anarchist studies, labour history and social movement studies. The thesis also aimed to be of use or interest to animal activists. The core originality of the thesis lies in the interview material conducted with 55 animal activists including politicians, scholar-activists, direct action campaigners, vegan outreach organisers and political lobbyists. Such a range of interviewees, selected by respondent driven and reputation sampling, offers a unique and valuable insight into the views of British animal activists. The method of triangulation, which included archival material alongside interviews and a range of primary and secondary material, was a significant way of analysing campaigners who engage in militant activism. Indeed, rather than adopting a method which relies on interview material alone, such triangulation presents a detailed picture of the developments in opinion amongst individuals and groups, for instance the shift of animal liberationists who now engage in outreach work. The case studies provide an original insight into the history of political activism in Britain at a time when the moral and political climate is rapidly changing. Finally, the vegan outreach case study is particularly significant because less research has been conducted on vegan outreach than on comparative animal advocacy issues.

CAS and animal rights

The major contribution of this thesis has been to CAS scholarship, not least by researching a topic which has not been previously scrutinised using a CAS framework. Previous CAS scholarship has focused on the role of direct action; indeed, pivotal collections such as *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?* focus on the history, motivation, perception and tactics of direct action activists.¹⁶⁴⁶ Jennifer

¹⁶⁴⁶ S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (New York: Latern Books, 2004).

Grubbs and Michael Loadenthal argue that CAS scholarship ‘must assert itself firmly as an advocate for social change’ and this includes writing in ‘support [of] the campaigns of economic sabotage carried out by the clandestine activists of the ALF and its allies’.¹⁶⁴⁷ In this thesis, particularly within the three case studies, we have seen that direct action activists constantly overlap with those seeking legislative solutions. Sometimes anarchistic activists directly engage with parliamentary politics and on other occasions the level, scope and threat of direct action is intended to force legislative reforms. This thesis suggests that CAS scholars should devote more attention to scrutinising the relationship between legislation and direct action, because such tactical diversity is significant to the activists themselves. The thesis has also scrutinised key CAS concepts such as total liberation and speciesism. It was suggested that animal rights activists do not fully accept these concepts when they are divorced from other areas of a CAS or anarchist framework. For instance, speciesism was often divorced from intersectional politics, and anarchistic animal rights activists often fell short of total liberation by failing to scrutinise the class dynamics of the animal-industrial complex. CAS remains in a strong position to scrutinise such claims because it rejects linear thinking and ‘dichotomous ways of looking at the world’.¹⁶⁴⁸ As Carol Gigliotti explains:

The sign of intelligence is to be able to hold two ideas, conflicting ideas or opposing ideas in your mind at the same time. And [to find a] creative solution... to only think either/or is not very helpful.¹⁶⁴⁹

CAS scholars can simultaneously recognise that workers in the animal-industrial complex are victims of an interrelated form of oppression, and that theoretically one could view them as ‘concentration camp guards’. CAS scholars must ask what this understanding says about society as a whole, in which it is impossible to opt-out of animal abuse entirely. CAS scholar-activists aim to find solutions that resist both the victimisation of workers in animal industries, and the victimisation of animals by those same workers, whilst also scrutinising the overarching systems of oppression.

¹⁶⁴⁷ J. Grubbs, M. Loadenthal, ‘From the Classroom to the Slaughterhouse’, in A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka, (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Social Justice Approach for Liberation*, p. 182.

¹⁶⁴⁸ Interview with Lisa Kemmerer, CAS scholar, 25/08/2015. This thesis helps to challenge a further dichotomy, sometimes held within CAS scholarship, between parliamentary and anarchistic activism.

¹⁶⁴⁹ Interview with Carol Gigliotti, CAS Scholar, 09/09/2015.

The thesis similarly aims to contribute to wider animal rights scholarship. Recent works by Robert Garner, Alasdair Cochrane and Dan Lyons focus exclusively on legislation without scrutinising the important role that direct action can play in forcing such reforms.¹⁶⁵⁰ Moreover, these works do not consider radical feminist and anarchist critiques of the state which are significant for many animal rights activists.

The thesis also challenges certain assumptions of 'mainstream' animal rights theorists. For instance, Tom Regan dismisses the role of violent or coercive action as being undertaken by a

small handful of people who say that they are [animal rights activists] ARAs [who] sometimes beat their breasts about their willingness to hurt animal exploiters, but these malcontents have no place in the animal rights movement and no standing in it.¹⁶⁵¹

We have briefly considered the role of violent and coercive tactics, including different definitions of such tactics and various condemnations or justifications for such tactics; if one includes groups such as the ALF, SHAC and more militant groups such as the Animal Rights Militia or Hunt Retribution Squad within a definition of animal rights activists, then Regan's statement is not representative of the diversity of tactics used by animal advocates.

In the introduction we saw David Pellow's argument that 'knowledge transmission' from 'one generation or movement to the next' is a vital task for social movements, and one that helps build a sense of collective identity.¹⁶⁵² It is hoped that this thesis will be valuable to animal rights activists by making a small contribution to this knowledge. It is also hoped that animal advocates, including interviewees engaged in anti-vivisection, anti-hunting and vegan outreach activism, will find this work interesting as they develop intersectional and total liberation politics.

¹⁶⁵⁰ R. Garner, *A Theory of Justice for Animals: Animal Rights in a Nonideal World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); A. Cochrane, *Animal Rights Without Liberation: Applied Ethics and Human Obligations* (Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2012); D. Lyons, *The Politics of Animal Experimentation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

¹⁶⁵¹ T. Regan, *Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), p. 203.

¹⁶⁵² D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 41.

Anarchist and social movement studies

As well as contributing to scholarship concerned with animal activism, the thesis also acts as an interesting case study when considering elements of wider anarchist studies and social movement studies.

The thesis contributes to anarchist studies by considering anarchistic direct action alongside reformist politics. For instance, Benjamin Franks discusses the direct action ethic and explains that direct action differs from constitutional action because the latter does not 'practically resolve the social problem, nor are the agents of change – parliamentarians – the ones directly affected'.¹⁶⁵³ Franks uses the example of homelessness or inadequate accommodation to show that the prefigurative practice of squatting is fundamentally different from lobbying parliament to raise the question of housing provisions.¹⁶⁵⁴ Of course, such direct action could lead to reforms from the parliamentary left, as was achieved by the Squatters Movement, and enacted by the Labour Government, in the 1940s.¹⁶⁵⁵ Franks argues that reformism 'is rejected as it looks to hierarchical authorities, such as Parliament, to act'; however, he uses the example of Class War celebrating the abolition of the Poll Tax to show that 'some reforms are welcomed which reduce oppressive practices'.¹⁶⁵⁶ This thesis helps show how reformist politics and direct action can overlap within the animal advocacy movement.

The thesis also contributes to research which considers the parliamentary left in relation to other progressive causes or social movements. For instance, in 2002 Paul Bagguley argued that British feminism had entered a period of abeyance or hibernation. Bagguley suggested that the move into abeyance had led to the co-option of some elements of the feminist movement into conventional political processes and the de-politicisation of other elements which focused on expressive activities as opposed to collective action.¹⁶⁵⁷ Interestingly, the process which led to the move into abeyance included the entrance of social movement participants into

¹⁶⁵³ B. Franks, 'Direct Action Ethic', *Anarchist Studies*, Vol. 11. No. 1. 2003. pp. 13-41, p. 20.

¹⁶⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵⁵ A. Carter, *Direct Action and Liberal Democracy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973), p. 17.

¹⁶⁵⁶ B. Franks, 'Direct Action Ethic', p. 32.

¹⁶⁵⁷ P. Bagguley, 'Contemporary British Feminism: A social movement in abeyance?', *Social Movement Studies*, Vol. 1. No. 2. 2002. pp. 169-185, p. 173.

the formal political sphere and the political incorporation of some feminist demands which was 'almost entirely due to feminist influence on the Labour Party'.¹⁶⁵⁸ It is not suggested that the development of the animal advocacy movement mirrors British feminism; however, through vegan outreach the animal advocacy movement has shifted into expressive activities, and this has occurred alongside the political incorporation of some welfare demands. Animal advocacy acts as one useful example of how the formal political sphere interacts with social movements.

The thesis also contributes to a number of debates within social movement studies. Works on social movements now habitually use examples from the animal advocacy movement and this thesis contributes to such knowledge. For instance, Wyn Grant argues that 'developing overly close links with one political party would be counterproductive [for pressure groups], as it would mean that the group would be influential only when that party was in power'.¹⁶⁵⁹ This thesis suggests that such links can produce beneficial results, especially when combined with a separate wing of the movement undertaking more militant direct action. In fact, attempts to convince 'opposition' parties to introduce progressive legislation, such as the 1986 Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, have not proved successful. Nick Crossley believes that the animal advocacy movement disproves Sidney Tarrow's claim that social movements confront 'elites, authorities and opponents'. For Crossley, the animal advocacy movement 'has identified the way in which changes in ordinary, everyday behaviour can make a strong contribution towards achieving change' and therefore the notion of opposing elites and authorities 'should be treated with caution'.¹⁶⁶⁰ This thesis supports Tarrow's original assertion and has shown that large sections of the animal advocacy movement oppose these elites and authorities and feel in solidarity with other oppositional social movements.¹⁶⁶¹

Crossley also challenges rational action theory by suggesting that the theory does not explain

¹⁶⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 178. S. Walby (ed). *New Agendas for Women* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

¹⁶⁵⁹ W. Grant, *Pressure Groups and British Politics* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), p. 162.

¹⁶⁶⁰ N. Crossley, *Making Sense of Social Movements* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2002), p. 5.

¹⁶⁶¹ Which is not to suggest Crossley is wrong; many animal advocates do focus on consumer changes.

how and why movements such as animal rights movements, which advocate entirely on the behalf of others (in this case other species) and seemingly do not stand to benefit at all from the goals they pursue, nevertheless manage to secure devoted recruits.¹⁶⁶²

This thesis has highlighted that many animal advocates argue that the oppression of animals is related to the oppression of humans, and consequently these animal advocates believe that they do stand to benefit from animal rights.

Finally, April Carter has considered the relationship between direct action and liberal democracy. Carter distinguishes direct action from guerrilla warfare; she argues that the latter includes forms of intimidation, coercion and property destruction.¹⁶⁶³ However, militant animal advocates do not seem to view such actions as a separate category from other forms of direct action; indeed, many animal activists use a diversity of tactics which include property damage and economic sabotage.¹⁶⁶⁴

Future Research

The thesis opens possible avenues of future research. Firstly, this work could be used as a case study as part of a comparison between different movements which combine legislative and direct action approaches, such as the environmental movement, peace and anti-war movements, feminist movements, human rights, trade unions and alter/anti-globalisation movements. A comparative approach would highlight 'the many linkages across social movements' and improve 'our understanding of the techniques and aims of other movements, thereby facilitating learning and coalition-building across progressive social movements'.¹⁶⁶⁵ In particular, the animal advocacy movement could be compared to the environmental movement, because both use direct action and legislative techniques; clearly the

¹⁶⁶² Ibid, p. 67.

¹⁶⁶³ A. Carter, *Direct Action and Democracy Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), p. 8.

¹⁶⁶⁴ Indeed, some activists do accept the label 'guerrilla warriors'. S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?*, p. 18, p. 27, p. 47, p. 70, p. 180, p. 182.

¹⁶⁶⁵ A. Krajnc, 'Popular Environmental Education: Lessons from the Labor and Civil Rights Movements', *New Political Science*, Vol. 22. No. 3. 2000. pp. 341-360, p. 345.

Green Party are concerned with environmental politics, and the Labour Party have adopted certain components of the green political agenda.¹⁶⁶⁶ Such research would add to work like Joel Handler's study of *Social Movements and the Legal System* by considering the overlap of direct action and legislative wings of progressive movements.¹⁶⁶⁷ Future research could also compare animal advocacy in Britain to the situation in other countries, for instance in France where animal activists 'have succeeded in at least putting [animal rights] on the agenda of the French radical left'.¹⁶⁶⁸

Finally, there have been attempts to present veganism as 'a basis for the struggle against all oppression' which can 'thus begin to unite the innumerable local and piecemeal struggles scattered across the face of the earth'.¹⁶⁶⁹ This presents numerous interesting questions for the study of animal activism, particularly because the rise in animal advocacy has occurred alongside a decline in the traditional 'radical left'.¹⁶⁷⁰ Future research would locate this new anti-oppression movement by studying the history and ideology of total liberation politics. Such politics tie in with the ecological left's approach that goes beyond 'the period of simple modernity, when politics was concerned with the distribution of "goods"', and rejects perpetual economic growth, and instead is concerned about 'the most basic conditions for survival itself'.¹⁶⁷¹

Future Activism

An increasing number of animal activists share the belief of the radical environmental movement that we live in a time of urgency in which, in terms of

¹⁶⁶⁶ M. Robinson, *The Greening of British Party Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992).

¹⁶⁶⁷ J. Handler, *Social Movements and the Legal System: A Theory of Law Reform and Social Change* (London: Academic Press, 1978).

¹⁶⁶⁸ *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 12. (n.d). p. 42.

¹⁶⁶⁹ K. Forkasiewicz, 'Fragments of an Animalist Politics: Veganism and Liberation', in J. Sorenson (ed.), *Critical Animal Studies: Thinking the Unthinkable* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2014), p. 56.

¹⁶⁷⁰ L. March, C. Mudde, 'What's Left of the Radical Left? The European Radical Left after 1989: Decline and Mutation', *Comparative European Politics*, No. 3. 2005. pp. 23-49.

¹⁶⁷¹ T. Benton, 'Beyond Left and Right? Ecological Politics, Capitalism, and Modernity', *The Political Quarterly*, 68.B (1997), pp. 34-46, p. 42.

planetary survival, 'Our future is problematic at best and doomed at worst'.¹⁶⁷² The project of total liberation aims to build emergency alliances across social justice movements at a time when the 'neoliberal economic system of infinite growth on the basis of finite resources threaten the earth with total destruction'.¹⁶⁷³ Animal advocates also believe that they must work with urgency to protect animals, not only because approximately 70 billion farm animals are now 'produced' for food worldwide every year, but because the planet is facing the worst extinction crisis in 65 million years, and at least 10,000 species become extinct annually.¹⁶⁷⁴ With this sense of urgency in mind, animal advocates feel they must do 'whatever it takes' to secure change 'by any means necessary', even if this means making tactical compromises by supporting legislation or engaging in more militant forms of direct action.

A growing number of animal activists, including those who support CAS and leftist politics, believe that it is vital to build alliances across social justice movements. To build these alliances activists must 'understand that one will get into conflicts and learn about others'.¹⁶⁷⁵ This may be particularly problematic for animal activists who use the concept of speciesism to stress the equivalence of human and animal oppression. These activists know that alliance politics come 'from a place of respect that carries out listening projects and healing and transformative activities'.¹⁶⁷⁶ It is important to recognise that conflicts will emerge, both between social movements and within the animal advocacy movement, but that 'everyone need not agree and should not agree, lest society become an ideological cemetery'.¹⁶⁷⁷ This thesis has explored one movement during a time of deepening crisis, and it has found that clear dichotomies between different tactical and ideological wings of the animal advocacy movement are not always possible to sustain; complications and tactical overlaps

¹⁶⁷² S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 164.

¹⁶⁷³ N. Phelps, 'Foreword', in. S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation*, p. ix.

¹⁶⁷⁴ Compassion in World Farming, 'Strategic Plan 2013-2017: For Kinder, Fairer Farming Worldwide' (Godalming: Compassion in World Farming); WWF, 'How many species are we losing?' [viewed online, http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/biodiversity/biodiversity/, last accessed 16/12/2015]; S. Best, 'Greening Philosophy', in. S. D. Fassbinder, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, (eds.), *Greening the Academy: Ecopedagogy Through the Liberal Arts* (Rotterdam: Sense, 2012).

¹⁶⁷⁵ A. J. Nocella II, 'Abolition a multi-tactical movement strategy', *Journal For Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1-2. 2010. pp. 176-183, p. 182.

¹⁶⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p. 183.

¹⁶⁷⁷ M. Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left: Interviews and Essays, 1993-1998* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1999), 149.

have emerged between the direct action and legislative wings of the movement. Animal activists who engage in leftist politics may remember David Pellow's assertion that

social change is messy, and that notion should be both humbling and emboldening: there is a great deal of work to be done, so there must be many forms of activism and types of activist.¹⁶⁷⁸

The use of Critical Animal Studies is particularly important because the future of the planet is in a critical condition.¹⁶⁷⁹ Just as these are critical times, they are also rapidly changing times: as can be seen with the growth of environmental activism, veganism and a renaissance of socialism within the British Labour Party. Amongst the despair caused by economic injustice, increasing extinction rates and ecological disaster, the animal advocacy movement will continue to provide a small beacon of hope.

¹⁶⁷⁸ D. Pellow, *Total Liberation*, p. 255.

¹⁶⁷⁹ D. McCance, *Critical Animal Studies: An Introduction* (Albany: New York Press, 2013), p. 4.

Bibliography

Books

- D. Abram, *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perceptions and Language in a More-Than-Human World* (New York: Vintage, 1996).
- C. J. Adams, *Neither Man Nor Beast: Feminism and the Defence of Animals* (New York: Continuum, 1995).
- C. J. Adams, J. Donovan, (eds.), *Animals & Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).
- C. J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (London: Continuum, 2011).
- C. J. Adams, L. Gruen, *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals & The Earth* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).
- S. Ali (ed.), *Why Vote Green* (London: Biteback, 2015).
- R. Amster, A. DeLeon, L. Fernandez , A. J. Nocella II, D. Shannon (eds.), *Contemporary anarchist studies: An introductory anthology of anarchy in the academy* (London: Routledge, 2009).
- R. Amster, *Anarchism Today* (California: Praeger, 2012).
- P. Avrich, *Anarchist Portraits* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988).
- M. Bakunin, G. P. Maximoff, (ed.), *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism* (London: The Free Press, 1953).
- M. Ball, *The Accidental Activist: Stories, Speeches, Articles, and Interviews by Vegan Outreach's Cofounder* (New York: Lantern Books, 2014).
- S. Ball (ed.), *Parliament and Politics in the Age of Churchill and Attlee: The Headlam Diaries: 1935-1951* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- J. Bari, *Timber Wars* (Monroe, Common Courage Press, 1994).
- R. Bartlett, *Tolstoy: A Russian Life* (London: Profile Books, 2011).
- J. Baughman, J. Danky, (eds.), *Protest on the Page: Essays on Print and the Culture of Dissent Since 1865* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2015).
- P. Beirne, *Confronting Animal Abuse: Law, Criminology, and Human-Animal Relationships* (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009).

T. Benn, *The End of an Era: Diaries: 1980-1990* (London: Arrow, 1994).

T. Benn, *Free at Last: Diaries 1991-2001* (London: Arrow Books, 2003).

T. Benn, *More Time For Politics: Diaries 2001-2007* (London: Hutchinson, 2007).

T. Benn, *Letters to my Grandchildren: Thoughts on the Future* (London: Hutchinson, 2009).

T. Benton, *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights & Social Justice* (London: Verso, 1993).

S. Berger Gluck, D. Patai (eds.), *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History* (London: Routledge, 1991).

G. Bernard Shaw, *The Doctor's Dilemma* (London: Penguin Books, 1911).

S. Best, A. J. Nocella II (eds.), *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (New York: Latern Books, 2004).

S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.) *Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defence of the Earth* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2011).

S. Best, *The Politics of Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

M. Bevir, *The Making of British Socialism* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011).

T. Blair, *A Journey* (London: Arrow Books, 2011).

R. Blatchford, *Merrie England* (London: The Journeyman Press, 1977, First Published 1893).

R. Blatchford, *God and My Neighbour* (London: Clarion Press, 1903).

R. Blatchford, *Not Guilty: A Defence of the Bottom Dog* (London: Clarion Press, 1906).

R. Blatchford, *The Sorcery Shop: An Impossible Romance*, (London: The Clarion Press, 1907).

M. Bloxsome, *The Green Casanova: An Affectionate Biography of Peter Freeman, Maverick MP* (Aberystwyth: Y Lolfa, 2004).

M. Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy* (New York: Black Rose Books, 1991).

M. Bookchin, *Re-Enchanting Humanity: A Defence of the Human Spirit Against Anti-Humanism, Misanthropy, Mysticism and Primitivism* (London: Cassell, 1995).

M. Bookchin, *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1995).

M. Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left: Interviews and Essays, 1993-1998* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1999).

J. Bourke, *What it means to be Human: Reflections from 1791 to the present* (London: Virago, 2011).

F. W. R. Brambell, *Report of the technical committee to enquire into the welfare of animals kept under intensive livestock husbandry systems* (London: HMSO, 1965).

A. Breeze Harper (ed.), *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, And Society* (New York: Lantern Books, 2010).

T. Brown, (ed.), *Edward Carpenter and Late Victorian Radicalism* (London: Frank Cass, 1990).

A. Bryman, *Social Research Methods 4th Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

D. Butler, D. Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1979* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1980).

D. Butler, D. Kavanagh, *The British General Election of 1983* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1984).

J. Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990).

P. Byrne, *Social Movements in Britain* (London: Routledge, 1997).

J. Callaghan, S. Fielding, S. Ludlam, (eds.), *Interpreting the Labour Party: Approaches to Labour Politics and History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

A. Campbell, B. Hagerty, (eds.), *The Alastair Campbell Diaries, Volume Two: Power & People, 1997-1999* (London: Arrow Books, 2011).

A. Campbell, B. Hagerty, (eds.), *The Alastair Campbell Diaries, Volume Three, Power & Responsibility, 1999-2001* (London: Arrow Books, 2012).

A. Campbell, B. Hagerty, (eds.), *The Alastair Campbell Diaries, Volume Four: The Burden of Power, Countdown to Iraq* (London: Hutchinson, 2012).

P. Caplan (ed.), *Food, Health and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1997).

E. Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams: Being Autobiographical Notes* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1921).

G. Carr, *The Angry Brigade: The Cause and the Case* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1975).

R. Carson, *Silent Spring* (London: Penguin Books, 2000).

- A. Carter, *Direct Action and Liberal Democracy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973).
- A. Carter, *Direct Action and Democracy Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005).
- A. Chappelow, *Shaw ~ "The Chucker-Out": A Biographical Exposition and Critique* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969).
- W. Churchill, M. Ryan, *Pacifism As Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America* (AK Press: Edinburgh, 2007).
- P. Clodd, *Shooting for Sport* (London: National Society for the Abolition of Cruel Sports, 1937).
- A. Cochrane, *An Introduction to Animals and Political Theory* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2010).
- A. Cochrane, *Animal Rights Without Liberation: Applied Ethics and Human Obligations* (Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2012).
- J. M. Coetzee, *The Lives of Animals* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).
- J. S. Cohn, *Anarchism and the Crisis of Representation: Hermeneutics, Aesthetics, Politics* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006).
- G. D. H. Cole, *A History of Socialist Thought: Vol. II: Marxism and Anarchism 1850-1890* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1954).
- R. Connell, *Gender: In World Perspectives* (Cambridge: Polity, 2009).
- R. Coronado, *Flaming Arrows: Collected Writings of Animal Liberation Front Warrior Rod Coronado* (IEF Press, 2007).
- CrimethInc, *Expect Resistance: A Field Manual* (Salem, Oregon: CrimethInc Workers' Collective, 2008).
- CrimethInc, *Work: Capitalism, Economics, Resistance* (Salem: CrimethInc Workers' Collective, 2011).
- N. Crossley, *Making Sense of Social Movements* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2002).
- E. Cudworth, *Developing Ecofeminist Theory: The Complexity of Difference* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
- E. Cudworth, T. Hall, J. McGovern (eds.), *The Modern State: Theories and Ideologies* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007).
- E. Cudworth, *Social Lives with Other Animals: Tales of Sex, Death and Love* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

- J. D'Silva, J. Webster, (eds.), *The Meat Crisis: Developing More Sustainable Production and Consumption* (London: Earthscan, 2010).
- Dark Star (ed.), *Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-Feminist Reader, 3rd Edition* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2012).
- T. C. Davis, *George Bernard Shaw and the Socialist Theatre* (London: Praeger, 1994).
- D. Della Porta, M. Diani, *Social Movements: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006).
- B. Doherty, M. de Geus, (eds.), *Democracy and Green Political Thought: Sustainability, Rights and Citizenship* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- S. Donaldson, W. Kymlicka, *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- J. Donovan, *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions* (New York: Continuum, 2012).
- J. Dunayer, *Animal Equality: Language and Liberation* (Derwood: Ryce, 2001).
- J. Earl, K. Kimport, *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Modern Age* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2011).
- P. Eltzbacher, *Anarchism: Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy* (London: Freedom Press, 1960).
- S. D. Fassbinder, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, (eds.), *Greening the Academy: Ecopedagogy Through the Liberal Arts* (Rotterdam: Sense, 2012).
- M. Fleming, *The Anarchist Way to Socialism: Élisée Reclus and Nineteenth-Century European Anarchism* (New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979).
- G. L. Francione, *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996).
- G. Francione, R. Garner, *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).
- B. Franks, *Rebel Alliances: The means and ends of contemporary British Anarchism* (Edinburgh: AK Press and Dark Star, 2006).
- B. Franks, M. Wilson, (eds.), *Anarchism and Moral Philosophy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- I. Fraser, L. Wilde, *Marx Dictionary* (London: Continuum, 2011).
- D. Ganguly, J. Docker, (eds.), *Rethinking Gandhi and Non-violent Rationality: Global Perspectives* (Oxon: Routledge, 2007).

- R. Garner, *Animals, Politics and Morality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, Second Edition, 2004).
- R. Garner, *Animal Ethics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005).
- R. Garner, *The Political Theory of Animal Rights* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).
- R. Garner, *A Theory of Justice for Animals: Animal Rights in a Nonideal World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- C. Geissler, D. J. Oddy, (eds.), *Food, Diet and Economic Change Past and Present* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993).
- K. P. George, *Animal, Vegetable, Or Woman?: A Feminist Critique of Ethical Vegetarianism* (Albany, New York: Suny Press, 2000).
- J. M. Gilheany, *Familiar Strangers: The Church and the Vegetarian Movement in Britain (1809-2009)* (Cardiff: Ascendant Press, 2010).
- R. Godlovitch, S. Godlovitch, J. Harris (eds.), *Animals, Men and Morals: An Inquiry into the Maltreatment of Non-humans* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1971).
- M. Gold, *Animal Century: A Celebration of Changing Attitudes to Animals* (Charlbury: Jon Carpenter, 1998).
- E. Goldman, *Living My Life: In Two Volumes, Volume One* (New York: Dover, 1970/ First Published 1931).
- E. Goldman, *Living My Life: In Two Volumes, Volume Two* (New York: Dover, 1970/ First Published 1931).
- E. Goldman, *Red Emma Speaks: An Emma Goldman Reader* (OpenMedia, 2012).
- U. Gordon, *Anarchy Alive!: Anti-authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory* (London: Pluto Press, 2008).
- C. Grant, *The No-Nonsense Guide To Animal Rights* (Oxford: New Internationalist, 2006).
- W. Grant, *Pressure Groups and British Politics* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).
- L. Green, P. Singer, D. Hine, *Animal Liberation: A Graphic Guide* (London: Camden Press, 1987).
- J. Gregory, *Of Victorians and Vegetarians: The Vegetarian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2007).
- C. V. J Griffiths, *Labour and the Countryside: The politics of rural Britain 1918-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

- L. Hall, *Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights advocacy in the age of terror* (Connecticut: Nectar Bat Press, 2006).
- J. Handler, *Social Movements and the Legal System: A Theory of Law Reform and Social Change* (London: Academic Press, 1978).
- D. J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (London: Free Association Books, 1991).
- R. Harrison, *Animal Machines: The New Factory Farming Industry* (London: Vincent Stuart, 1964).
- D. Henshaw, *Animal Warfare: The Story of the Animal Liberation Front* (London: Fontana, 1989).
- M. Horkheimer, M. Shaw, *Dawn & decline: notes 1926-1931 and 1950-1969* (New York: Seabury Press, 1978).
- B. A. Holderness, *British Agriculture Since 1945* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985).
- C. Hollands, *Compassion is the Bugler: The Struggle for Animal Rights* (Edinburgh: Macdonald Publishers, 1980).
- E. Hopley, *Campaigning Against Cruelty: The Hundred Year History of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection* (London: British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 1998).
- J. Hribal, *Fear of the Animal Planet: The Hidden History of Animal Resistance* (California: CounterPunch and AK Press, 2010).
- P. Hudis, K. B. Anderson, (eds.), *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004).
- S. Humphries, *The Handbook of Oral History: Recording Life Stories* (London: Inter-Action Imprint, 1984).
- M. Huskisson, *Outfoxed* (London: Mike Huskisson Associates, 1983).
- J. M. Jasper, D. Nelkin, *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest* (New York: The Free Press, 1992).
- L. Kalof, (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Forthcoming).
- H. Kean, *Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain Since 1800* (London: Reaktion Books, 1998).
- M. E. Keck, K. Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).

L. Keith, *The Vegetarian Myth: Food, Justice and Sustainability* (Crescent City, Flashpoint Press, 2009).

L. Kemmerer, A. J. Nocella II, (eds.), *Call to Compassion: Religious Perspectives on Animal Advocacy* (New York: Lantern Books, 2011).

L. Kemmerer, (ed.), *Sister Species: Women, Animals and Social Justice* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2011).

L. Kemmerer, *Animals and World Religions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

S. Kemp, J. Squires, (eds.), *Feminisms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

R. Kinna, *Anarchism: A Beginners' Guide* (Oxford: One World, 2005).

R. Kinna (ed.), *The Continuum Companion to Anarchism* (London: Continuum, 2012).

P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (New York, Black Rose Books, 1989).

P. Kropotkin, *The Conquest of Bread* (London: Elephant Editions, 1990).

P. Kropotkin, *Fields, Factories and Workshops* (London: Transaction, 1993).

D. Kuipers, *Operation Bite Back: Rod Coronado's War to Save American Wilderness* (London: Bloomsbury, 2010).

K. Laybourn, *A Century of Labour: A History of the Labour Party, 1900-2000* (Gloucester: Sutton, 2001).

S. Lukes, *Marxism and Morality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

D. Lyons, *The Politics of Animal Experimentation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

C. A. MacKinnon, *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1989).

E. Malatesta, *At The Café: Conversations on Anarchism* (London: Freedom Press, 2005).

A. Malle (ed.), *A Cat in Hell's chance: The story of the campaign against Hill Grove cat farm* (London: Slingshot, 2002).

A. Mandelker, *Framing Anna Karenina: Tolstoy, the Woman Question, and the Victorian Novel* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993).

K. Mann, *From Dusk 'til Dawn: An Insider's View of the growth of the Animal Liberation Movement* (London: Puppy Pincher Press, 2007).

M. Mansfield, Y. Vanson, *Memoirs of a Radical Lawyer* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009).

G. Marcus, *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (London: Faber and Faber, 2001).

- P. Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (Oakland: PM Press, 2008).
- K. Marx, 'Production and Intercourse. Division of Labour and Forms of Property – Tribal, Ancient, Feudal' in *The German Ideology* (1845) (<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm#a4>).
- J. Masson, S. McCarthy, *When Elephants Weep: The Emotional Lives of Animals* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2004).
- J. Masson, *The Pig Who Sang to the Moon: The Emotional World of Farm Animals* (London: Vintage, 2005).
- D. McCance, *Critical Animal Studies: An Introduction* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013).
- K. McHenry, *Hungry for Peace: How you can help end poverty and war with Food Not Bombs* (Tucson: See Sharp Press, 2012).
- G. McKay (ed.), *DiY Culture: Party & Protest in Nineties Britain* (London: Verso, 1998).
- P. McLaughlin, *Anarchism and Authority: A Philosophical Introduction to Classical Anarchism* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 1988).
- A. Meltzer, *I Couldn't Paint Golden Angels: Sixty Years of Commonplace life and Anarchist Agitation* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1996).
- G. Michael (ed.), *Extremism in America* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2014).
- L. Michel, B. Lowry, E. E. Gunter, (eds.), *The Red Virgin: Memoirs of Louise Michel* (Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1981).
- C. Mullin, *A View From The Foothills* (London: Profile Books, 2010).
- C. Mullin, *A Walk-On Part: Diaries, 1994-1999* (London: Profile Books, 2011).
- I. Newkirk, *Free The Animals: The amazing true story of the animal liberation front in North America* (New York: Lantern Books, 2012).
- D. A. Nibert, *Animal Rights/Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002).
- D. A. Nibert, *Animal Oppression & Human Violence: Domesecration, Capitalism, and Global Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013).
- A. J. Nocella II, J. Sorenson, K. Socha, A. Matsuoka (eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Approach for Liberation* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014).

A. J. Nocella II, R. J. White, E. Cudworth (eds.), *Anarchism and Animal Liberation: Essays on Complementary Elements of Total Liberation* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2015).

North American ALF, *Underground: The A.L.F in the 1990s* (Warcry Communications, 2011).

C. O'Hara, *The Philosophy of Punk: More Than Noise!* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 1999).

G. Orwell, S. Orwell, I. Angus, (eds.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, Vol. 1: An Age Like This, 1920-1940* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968).

G. Orwell, S. Orwell, I. Angus (eds.) *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell. Vol. IV, In Front Of Your Nose* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968).

D. Y. Orwin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

L. Panitch, C. Leys, *The End of Parliamentary Socialism: From New Left to New Labour* (London: Verso, 1997).

C. Patterson, *Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust* (New York: Lantern Books, 2012).

H. Pelling, A. J. Ried, *A Short History of the Labour Party* (Hampshire: Macmillan, 1996).

D. N. Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

R. Perks, A. Thomas, *The Oral History Reader* (London: Routledge, 1998).

S. Peters, *Bernard Shaw: The Ascent of the Superman* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

V. Plumwood, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (London: Routledge, 1993).

L. Portwood-Stacer, *Lifestyle Politics and Radical Activism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

W. Potter, *Green Is The New Red: An Insider's Account of a Social Movement Under Siege* (San Francisco: City Lights, 2011).

R. Preece, *Sins of the Flesh: A History of Ethical Vegetarian Thought* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008).

R. Preece, *Animal Sensibility and Inclusive Justice in the Age of Bernard Shaw* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011).

A. Prichard, R. Kinna, S. Pinta, D. Berry, *Libertarian Socialism: Politics in Black and Red* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

P.-J. Proudhon, D. R. Kelly, B. G. Smith (eds.), *What is Property?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

É. Reclus, *On Vegetarianism, The Great Kinship of Humans and Fauna* (Jura Media, 1992).

T. Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

T. Regan, *Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004).

V. Richards, *Violence and anarchism: A polemic* (London: Freedom Press, 1993).

J. J. Roberts, *Up Against The Law: Animal Rights and the 1986 Public Order Act* (London: ARC Print, 1986).

M. Robinson, *The Greening of British Party Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992).

S. Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter: A Life Of Liberty and Love* (London: Verso, 2008).

M. Rowlands, *Animals Like Us* (London: Verso, 2002).

R. D. Ryder, *Victims of Science: The Use of Animals in Research* (London: Davis-Poynter, 1975).

R. D. Ryder, *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Towards Speciesism* (Oxford: Berg, 2000).

R. D. Ryder, *Speciesism, Painism and Happiness: A Morality for the Twenty-First Century* (Exeter: Societas, 2011).

H. Salt, *Seventy Years Among Savages* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1921).

J. Sanbonmatsu (ed.), *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011).

M. Savage, *Social Class in the 21st Century* (London: Pelican Books, 2015).

R. Scarce, *Contempt of Court: A Scholar's Battle for Free Speech from Behind Bars* (Maryland: AltaMira Press, 2005).

S. J. Scholz, *Feminism: A Beginner's Guide* (Oxford: One World, 2010).

R. Scruton, *Animal Rights and Wrongs* (London: Demos, 1996).

S. Sheehan, *Anarchism* (London: Reaktion, 2003).

V. Sheppard, *My Head Against the Wall: A Decade in the Fight Against Blood Sports* (London: Moonraker, 1979).

- P. Singer, (ed.), *In Defence of Animals* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985).
- P. Singer, *Animal Liberation* (London: Pimlico, second edition 2005).
- P. Singer, *Practical Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- D. Skinner, *Sailing close to the wind: Reminiscences* (London: Quercus, 2014).
- A. Skirda, *Facing The Enemy: A History of Anarchist Organisation From Proudhon to May 1968* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2001).
- K. Socha, S. Blum, *Confronting Animal Exploitation: Grassroots Essays on Liberation and Veganism* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2013).
- J. Sorenson, (ed.), *Critical Animal Studies: Thinking the Unthinkable* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars', 2014).
- C. Spencer, *Vegetarianism: A History* (London: Grub Street, 2001).
- A. Strauss, J. Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for developing grounded theory* (London: Sage, 1998).
- C. R. Sunstein, M. C. Nussbaum, (eds.), *Animal Rights: Current Debates and New Directions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- D. Tanner, P. Thane, N. Tiratsoo, (eds.), *Labour's First Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- N. Taylor, R. Twine (eds.), *The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: From the Margins to the Centre* (London: Routledge, 2014).
- K. Tester, *Animals and Society: The Humanity of Animal Rights* (London: Routledge, 1991).
- M. Thomas, *As Used on the famous Nelson Mandela: Underground Adventures in the Arms Trade* (London: Ebury Press, 2006).
- L. Thompson, *Robert Blatchford: Portrait of an Englishman* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1951).
- A. Thorpe, *A History of the British Labour Party* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2008).
- B. Torres, *Making A Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2007).
- P. Toynbee, D. Walker, *Better or Worse?: Has Labour Delivered?* (London: Bloomsbury, 2005).
- P. Toynbee, D. Walker, *The Verdict: Did Labour Change Britain?* (London: Granta, 2011).
- C. Tsuzuki, *Edward Carpenter 1844-1929: Prophet of Human Fellowship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

- C. Ward, D. Goodway, *Talking Anarchy* (Nottingham: Five Leaves, 2003).
- H. Wilson, *The Labour Government 1964-1970: A Personal Record* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971).
- M. Wilson, *Rules Without Rulers: The Possibilities and Limits of Anarchism* (Winchester: Zero Books, 2014).
- S. Winsten, *Salt and His Circle* (London: Hutchinson & Co, 1951).
- C. Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism?* (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis, 2010).
- G. Woodcock, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004).
- M. Woods, *New Labour's Countryside: Rural Policy in Britain Since 1997* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2008).
- L. Wright, *The Vegan Studies Project: Food, Animals, and Gender in the age of Terror* (Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 2015).
- I. M. Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).
- V. R. Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists* (London: Sage, 1994).

Articles

- A. Anderson, 'Spinning the Rural Agenda: The Countryside Alliance, Fox Hunting and Social Policy', *Social Policy & Administration*, Vol. 4. No. 6, December 2006, pp. 722-738.
- P. Bagguley, 'Contemporary British Feminism: A social movement in abeyance?', *Social Movement Studies*, Vol. 1. No. 2. 2002. pp. 169-185.
- T. Benton, S. Redfearn, 'The Politics of Animal Rights – Where is the Left?', *New Left Review*, 215, (1996). pp. 43-58.
- T. Benton, 'Beyond Left and Right? Ecological Politics, Capitalism, and Modernity', *The Political Quarterly*, 68.B (1997), pp. 34-46.
- T. Benton, 'Marxism and the Moral Status of Animals', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 1, No.1 (2003), pp. 73-79.

- S. Best, R. Kahn, 'Trial By Fire: The SHAC7, Globalization, and the Future of Democracy', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 2. No. 2, 2004, pp. 1-36.
- S. Best, A. J. Nocella II, R. Kahn, C. Gigliotti, L. Kemmerer, 'Introducing Critical Animal Studies', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5. No. 1. (2007), pp. 4-5.
- S. Best, 'The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: Putting Theory into Action and Animal Liberation into Higher Education' July 22, 2009. *State of Nature: An Online Journal of Radical Ideas* (<http://www.stateofnature.org/?p=5903>).
- L. Birke, 'Unnamed Others: How Can Thinking about "Animals" Matter to Feminist Theorizing?' *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 2012, pp. 148-157.
- F. Bongiorno, 'Love and Friendship: Ethical Socialism in Britain and Australia', *Australian Historical Studies*, 32: 116, pp. 1-19.
- D. Clark, 'The Raw and the Rotten: Punk Cuisine', *Ethnology*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (Winter, 2004), pp. 19-31.
- M. Correggia, 'Where Reds Meet Greens – Comrade Animals', *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 2001, pp. 137-140.
- P. Cowley, M. Stuart, 'Parliament: Hunting for Votes', *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 58. No. 2, (2005), pp. 258-271.
- J. Deckers, 'Obesity, Public Health, and the Consumption of Animal Products: Ethical Concerns and Political Solutions', *Bioethical Inquiry*, (2013), 10, pp. 29-38.
- M. Deckha, 'Disturbing Images: Peta and the Feminist Ethics of Animal Advocacy', *Ethics and the Environment*, Vol. 13, No. 2, (Autumn 2008), pp. 35-76.
- J. Donovan, 'Animal Rights and Feminist Theory', *Signs*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Winter, 1990), pp. 350-375.
- Editorial Board, 'The History and Philosophy of the Centre on Animal Liberation Affairs', *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, Vol. 1. No. 1. 2003. pp. 3-6.
- R. L. Einwohner, 'Motivational Framing and Efficacy Maintenance: Animal Rights Activists' Use Of Four Fortifying Stategies', *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 4. pp. 509-526.
- B. Eynon, 'Cast Upon The Shore: Oral History and New Scholarship on the Movements of the 1960s', *The Journal Of American History*, September 1996. pp. 560-570.

- G. Francione, 'Animal rights and animal welfare', *Rutgers Law Review*, No. 48, 1995.
- L. P. Francis, R. Norman, 'Some Animals are More Equal Than Others', *Philosophy*, Vol. 53, No. 206, October 1978, pp. 507-527.
- B. Franks, 'Direct Action Ethic', *Anarchist Studies*, Vol. 11. No. 1. 2003. pp. 13-41.
- R. Garner, 'Defending Animal Rights', *Parliamentary Affairs: A Journal of Comparative Politics*, Vol. 51. No. 3, July 1998. pp. 458-469.
- S. Gemie, 'Anarchism and Feminism: A Historical Survey', *Women's History Review*, Vol. 5. No. 3. 1996. pp. 417-444.
- J. Greenebaum, "'I'm Not an Activist!": Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare in the Purebred Dog Rescue Movement', *Society & Animals*, 2009, Vol.17. No. 4. pp. 289-304.
- U. Gordon, 'Reinstating the State in Anarchist Critique', *Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed*, No. 77, pp. 26-37.
- R. Gunderson, 'Marx's Comments on Animal Welfare', *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture and Society*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 2011, pp. 543-548.
- R. Gunderson, 'From Cattle to Capital: Exchange Value, Animal Commodification, and Barbarism', *Critical Sociology*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 2011, pp. 259-275.
- M. Hall, 'Beyond the human: Extending ecological anarchism', *Environmental Politics*, Vol. 20, No. 3, (2011), pp. 374-390.
- A. G. Hoare, 'Hunting for Votes: the Geography of Free Votes and Electoral Advantage in the British House of Commons', *Geoforum*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (1995), pp. 459-478.
- R. Jaffe, 'Ital chic: rastafari, resistance, and the politics of consumption in Jamaica', *Small Axe* 14. No. 1. Vol. 31. 2010, pp. 30-45.
- J. Johnston, 'The citizen-consumer hybrid: ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market', *Theory and Society*, No. 37, 2008, pp. 229-270.
- P. Joosee, 'Leaderless Resistance and Ideological Inclusion: The Case of the Earth Liberation Front', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 2007, pp. 351-368.
- R. Kinna, S. Evren, 'Unscientific Survey: 7 Sages of Anarchism', *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies*, Issue I: 'Blasting the Canon'. 2013, pp. 211-241.
- J. A. Klein, 'Afterword: Comparing Vegetarianisms', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 199-212.
- A. Krajnc, 'Popular Environmental Education: Lessons from the Labor and Civil Rights Movements', *New Political Science*, Vol. 22. No. 3. 2000. pp. 341-360.

- R. Lee. "How long... ?" Revisited', *Critical Society*, No. 5, Winter 2010/11, pp. 1-5.
- T. Liddle, 'Extending the Circle of Compassion: Socialism and Animal Rights', *What's Next*, No. 29, 2004 [viewed online, <http://www.revolutionaryhistory.co.uk/terry-liddle/marxist-writers/liddle/extending-the-circle-of-compassion-socialism-and-animal-rights.htm>, accessed 6/3/2014].
- L. March, C. Mudde, 'What's Left of the Radical Left? The European Radical Left after 1989: Decline and Mutation', *Comparative European Politics*, No. 3. 2005. pp. 23-49.
- M. Maurizi, 'The Dialectical Animal: Nature and Philosophy of History in Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1, (2012), pp. 67-103.
- A. R. McDowell, 'Lev Tolstoy and the Freedom to Choose One's Own Path', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 5. No. 2. (2007), pp. 2-28.
- R. Monaghan, "'Not Quite Terrorism": Animal Rights Extremism in the United Kingdom', *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 36, No. 11, 2013.
- D. Morris, H. Steel, 'McWorld on Trial', *The Raven: Anarchist Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 193-216.
- L. Munro, 'Strategies, Action Repertoires and DIY Activism in the Animal Rights Movement', *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, Vol. 4. No. 1, pp. 75-94.
- J. C. Nash, 'Re-thinking Intersectionality', *Feminist Review*, 89, (2008), pp. 1-15.
- P. Neville, 'Anarchism and the Sociology of Food: a figurational approach', *The Raven*, Vo. 11, No. 3, 43, pp. 278-283.
- A. J. Nocella II, 'Animal Advocates for Prison and Slave Abolition: A Transformative Justice Approach to Movement Politics to End Racism', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2001, pp. 119-126.
- A. J. Nocella II, 'Abolition a multi-tactical movement strategy', *Journal For Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1-2, 2010, pp. 176-183.
- A. Nordgren, 'Ethical Issues in Mitigation of Climate Change: The Option of Reduced Meat Production and Consumption', *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, (2012), 25, pp. 563-584.
- D. N. Pellow, H. N. Brehm, 'From the New Ecological Paradigm to Total Liberation: The Emergence of a Social Movement Frame', *The Sociological Quarterly*, No. 56. (2015), pp. 185-212.

- K. Perlo, 'Extrinsic and Intrinsic Arguments: Strategies for Promoting Animal Rights', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 5. Issue. 1, 2007, pp. 1-14.
- A. Plumb, D. Marsh, 'Beyond party discipline: UK Parliamentary voting on fox hunting', *British Politics*, Vol. 8. No. 3, (2013), pp. 313-332.
- R. Povey, B. Wellens, M. Conner, 'Attitudes towards following meat, vegetarian and vegan diets: An examination of the role of ambivalence', *Appetite*, No. 37. 2001. pp. 15-26.
- A. Prichard, O. Worth, 'Left-wing convergence: An introduction', *Capital & Class*, Vol. 40. No. 1. February 2016, pp. 3-17.
- H. Proctor. 'Animal Sentience: Where Are We and Where Are We Heading?', *Animals*, Vol. 2. 2012, pp. 628-639.
- A. Robinson, S. Tormey, 'Beyond the state: Anthropology and "actually-existing anarchism"', *Critique of Anthropology*, 2012, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 143-157.
- R. D. Ryder, 'Harrison, Ruth, (1920-2000)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; Online edn, May 2005 (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/74285>).
- J. Seager, 'Peperoni or Broccoli?: On the Cutting Wedge of Feminist Environmentalism', *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 167-174.
- S. Smith 'Black feminism and intersectionality', *International Socialist Review*, #91, [viewed online, <http://isreview.org/issue/91/black-feminism-and-intersectionality>, last accessed 29/06/2016].
- J. Specht, 'Animal History after its Triumph: Unexpected Animals, Evolutionary Approaches and the Animal Lens', *History Compass*, Vol. 14. No. 7. pp. 326-336.
- A. Starr, L. A. Fernandez, R. Amster, L. Wood, M. J. Caro, 'The impacts of state surveillance on political assembly and association: A socio-legal analysis', *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 31. No. 3. (2008), pp. 251-270.
- D. E. Taylor, 'The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm: Injustice Framing and the Social Construction of Environmental Discourses', *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol. 43, No. 4, 2000, pp. 508-580.
- N. Taylor, 'In It for the Nonhuman Animals: Animal Welfare, Moral Certainty, and Disagreements', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 12. No. 4, 2004, pp. 317-339.
- M. Tichelar, 'Putting Animals into Politics: The Labour Party and Hunting in the first half of the Twentieth Century', *Rural History*, 2006, Vol. 17. No. 2. pp. 213-234.

- D. Toke, 'Foxhunting and the Conservatives', *The Political Quarterly*, Vol. 81, No. 2. (April-June 2010), pp. 205-212.
- R. Twine, 'Intersectonal Disgust? Animals and (eco)feminism', *Feminism & Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 3, 2010, pp. 397-406.
- R. Twine, 'Revealing the "Animal-Industrial Complex" – A Concept and Method for Critical Animal Studies?', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 10. No. 1, 2012, pp. 12-39.
- A. Upton, "'Go on, Get Out There, and Make It Happen": Reflections on the First Ten Years of Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC)', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 2011, Vol. 65, No. 1, pp. 238-254.
- A. Upton, 'Contingent communication in a hybrid multi-media world: Analyzing the campaigning strategies of SHAC', *New Media & Society*, Vol. 13, No.1, 2011, pp. 96-113.
- A. Upton, 'In Testing Times: Conducting an Ethnographic Study of UK Animal Rights Protesters', *Sociological Research Online*, 16 (4) 1, (<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/4/1.html>).
- J. Wallwork, J. A. Dixon, 'Foxes, green fields and Britishness: On the rhetorical construction of place and national identity', *British Journal of Social Psychology*, (2004), No. 43, pp. 21-39.
- D. Weinbren, 'Against all cruelty: The Humanitarian League, 1891-1919', *History Workshop Journal*, 1994, No. 38, pp.86-105.
- L. Wilde, "'The Creatures, too, must become free": Marx and the Animal/Human Distinction', *Capital & Class*, 2000, No. 72, pp. 37-53.
- S. Wirsenius, F. Hedenus, K. Mohlin, 'Greenhouse gas taxes on animal food products: rationale, tax scheme and climate mitigation effects', *Climate Change*, (2011), 108, pp. 159-184.
- C. L. Wrenn, 'Resisting the Globalization of Speciesism: Vegan Abolitionism as a Site for Consumer-Based Social Change', *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 2011, pp. 9- 27.

Pamphlets

G. Aldred, *Socialism and Parliament*, 1923 [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/guy-a-aldred-socialism-and-parliament>, last accessed 07/12/2015].

ALF, *Animal Liberation Through Direct Action* (Undated, ALF).

G. Ambrosch, *Vindication of a Vegan Diet* (London: Active Distribution, 2013).

Anon. *Animal Liberation: Devastate to Liberate or Devastatingly Liberal* [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/anonymous-animal-liberation-devastate-to-liberate-or-devastatingly-liberal>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

B. Black, *Apes of Wrath* [viewed online, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/bob-black-apes-of-wrath>, last accessed 17/02/2016].

BUAV, *BUAV in Crisis* (Campaign for a Progressive BUAV, May 1985).

Compassion in World Farming, 'Strategic Plan 2013-2017: For Kinder, Fairer Farming Worldwide' (Godalming: Compassion in World Farming)

Corporate Watch, *State Crackdown on Anti Corporate Dissent: The Animal Rights Movement* (Corporate Watch, 2009).

Crimethinc, *To Change Everything: An Anarchist Appeal* (Crimethinc, 2015).

B. A. Dominick, *Animal Liberation and Social Revolution: A Vegan Perspective on Anarchism and an Anarchist Perspective on Veganism* (London: Critical Mess Media, 1995).

C. Ehrlich, 'Socialism, Anarchism and Feminism' [viewed online, <https://libcom.org/library/socialism-anarchism-feminism-carol-ehlich>, last accessed 20/06/2016].

L. Farrow, *Feminism As Anarchism* [viewed online, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/lynne-farrow-feminism-as-anarchism.pdf>, last accessed 20/06/2016].

P. Freeman, *Great Britain and the World's Food Supply* (London: London Vegetarian Society).

GGCCAP, *Animals And Politics* (London: GECCAP, 1982).

P. Gelderloos, *Veganism: Why Not: An Anarchist Perspective* [viewed online, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/peter-gelderloos-veganism-why-not>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

P. Gelderloos, *How Nonviolence Protects the State* [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/peter-gelderloos-how-nonviolence-protects-the-state#fn127>, last accessed 30/03/15].

P. Gelderloos, *Veganism Is A Consumer Activity* [viewed online, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/peter-gelderloos-veganism-is-a-consumer-activity>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

Hunt Saboteurs Association, *New Members Pack* (Exeter: Hunt Saboteurs Association, 1987).

Labour Animal Welfare Society, *Animal Welfare Policy* (Labour Party, 2015).

Labour Party, *Now Britain's Strong – Let's Make it Great to Live In* (Labour Party, 1970).

Labour Party, *Britain Will Win With Labour* (Labour Party, 1974).

Labour Party, *The Labour Way is the Better Way* (Labour Party, 1979).

Labour Party, *Living Without Cruelty: Labour's Charter for Animal Protection* (The Labour Party: Policy Background Paper, 1979).

Labour Party, *The New Hope For Britain: Labour's Manifesto 1983* (Labour Party, 1983).

Labour Party, *Britain Will Win With Labour* (Labour Party, 1987).

Labour Party, *Who Cares About Animals?* (Labour Party, 1992).

Labour Party, *Protecting Children, Empowering All: Labour's New Approach to Public Health in the 21st Century* (Labour Party, 2015).

Labour Party, *Labour: Protecting Animals* (London: The Labour Party, 2015).

League Against Cruel Sports, *90 years of protecting wildlife* (Godalming: League Against Cruel Sports, 2014).

League Against Cruel Sports, *The Hunting Act: the most successful wild animal welfare legislation* (Godalming: League Against Cruel Sports, 2015).

Men Against Sexist Shit, *It's A Man's Game: Hunt Sabotage and Men* (Leeds, no date).

J. Moore, *A Primitivist Primer* (viewed online, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/john-moore-a-primitivist-primer>, last accessed 14/06/2016).

L. Pogson, *Inside The Cages: Animal Liberation & Imprisonment* (London: South London Press, 2013).

W. Price, 'Do Anarchists Believe in Freedom?' [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/wayne-price-do-anarchists-believe-in-freedom>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

Vale & Valley Sabs, *Sabotage* (Cardiff: Vale & Vally Sabs, 1992).

Vegan Society, *Ripened by Human Determination: 70 Years of The Vegan Society* (Birmingham: The Vegan Society, 2014).

K. Watkinson, D. O'Driscoll, *From Animals to Anarchism: Open Letter #3* (Leeds: Dysophia, 2014).

Western Wildlife Unit, *Memories of Freedom* [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/western-wildlife-unit-of-the-animal-liberation-front-memories-of-freedom>, last accessed 24/09/2015].

M. Wilson, *Biting the Hand that Feeds Us: In Defence of Lifestyle Politics* (Leeds: Dysopia Open Letter # 2, 2014).

Newspaper, magazine and blog articles

38 Degrees, 'Stop the repeal of Animal Welfare Codes', [viewed online, <https://you.38degrees.org.uk/petitions/stop-the-repeal-of-animal-welfare-codes>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

M. Albert, 'N. Chomsky in conversation', October 26, 2011 [viewed online, <http://www.zcommunications.org/chomsky-sessions-4-the-political-system-part-2-by-noam-chomsky>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

M. Arthurs, 'All liberation struggles are important – why the Green Party must embrace intersectionality', 20/11/2015 [viewed online, <http://bright-green.org/2015/11/20/all-liberation-struggles-are-important-why-the-green-party-must-embrace-intersectionality/>, last accessed 23/11/2015].

ARZone, 'Ronnie Lee interview', March 27th 2010 [viewed online, <https://arzonetranscripts.wordpress.com/2010/03/27/ronnie-lee-interview/>, last accessed 23/09/2015].

D. J. Bailey, 'Hard Evidence: this is the Age of Dissent – and there's much more to come' [viewed online, <https://theconversation.com/hard-evidence-this-is-the-age-of-dissent-and-theres-much-more-to-come-52871>, last accessed 25/01/2016].

M. Ball, 'Activism and Veganism Reconsidered' [viewed online, <http://www.veganoutreach.org/advocacy/path.html>, last accessed 30/03/15].

A. Barnard, 'The Hunting Act in 2010' [viewed online, <http://www.countryside-alliance.org/ca/campaigns-hunting/the-hunting-act-in-2010>, last accessed 23/02/2015].

S. Best, 'Manifesto for Radical Abolitionism: Total Liberation By Any Means Necessary' [viewed online, <http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Manifesto-TotalLib.htm>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

J. Breese, 'The Perfect Crime – Starvation/ World Hunger', *Turning Point: The Animal Rights Magazine*, No. 5, Autumn 1986, pp. 12-14.

S. Butler, 'Horsemeat scandal sparks rise in sales of vegetarian alternatives', *The Guardian*, 05/03/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2013/mar/05/horsemeat-scandal-sales-vegetarian-alternatives>, last accessed 01/12/15].

The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness [viewed online, <http://fcmconference.org/img/CambridgeDeclarationOnConsciousness.pdf>, last accessed 11/06/2015].

Countryside Alliance Campaign for Hunting, 'Hunting with dogs: Read what the defectors say' [viewed online, <http://www.supportfoxhunting.co.uk/docs/whatthedefectorssay.pdf>, last accessed 04/02/2015].

CrimethInc, 'The SHAC Model: A Critical Assessment' [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/crimethinc-anonymous-the-shac-model>, last accessed 12/11/2015].

Croatoan, 'Who Is Oakland: Anti-Oppression Activism, the Politics of Safety, and State Co-optation', April 2012 [viewed online, <https://escalatingidentity.wordpress.com/2012/04/30/who-is-oakland-anti-oppression-politics-decolonization-and-the-state/>, last accessed 27/10/2015].

N. Darom, 'Is vegan superstar Gary Yourofsky an animal savior or a mad militant?', *Haaretz*, 6/11/2012 [viewed online, <http://www.haaretz.com/weekend/magazine/is-vegan-superstar-gary-yourofsky-an-animal-savior-or-a-mad-militant-1.463267>, accessed 6/3/2014].

T. Dean, 'China's vegan population is largest in the world', *VegNews Daily*, January 13th 2014 [viewed online, <http://vegnews.com/articles/page.do?pageld=6392&catId=8>, last accessed 15/04/2015].

P. Dominiczak, J. Kirkup, 'Hunting Act "unenforceable" and encouraging anti-social behaviour says senior MP', *Daily Telegraph*, 25th December 2013 [viewed online, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/10537821/Hunting-Act-unenforceable-and-encouraging-anti-social-behaviour-says-senior-MP.html>, last accessed 26/02/15].

Early Day Motion 92, 'Animal Testing of Drugs', [viewed online, www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/92, last accessed 15/02/2016].

Early Day Motion 426, [viewed online, <http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2015-16/by-topic/59153/animal-experiments>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

The Economist, 'And the winner is', *The Economist*, 23/02/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.economist.com/news/britain/21572230-what-horse-shy-consumers-are-eating-instead-and-winner>, last accessed 01/12/15].

Editorial Collective, Anarchist FAQ [viewed online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/the-anarchist-faq-editorial-collective-an-anarchist-faq-06-17>, last accessed 30/04/15].

R. Evans, P. Lewis, 'Call for police links to animal rights firebombing to be investigated', *Guardian*, 13 June 2012, [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2012/jun/13/police>, last accessed 28/10/14].

Farm Animal Welfare Council, 'Five Freedoms', [viewed online, <http://www.fawc.org.uk/freedoms.htm>, accessed 18/04/2013].

V. Graham, 'Beyond The Pale', *Arkangel*, No. 3. Summer 1990, p. 37.

Green Party, 'Animal rights report', June 2004 [viewed online, <http://www.greenparty.org.uk/files/reports/2004/1ANIMAL%20RIGHTS%20REPORT%20fn.htm>, last accessed 09/02/2015].

Green Party, 'What we stand for' [viewed online, <https://www.greenparty.org.uk/we-stand-for/>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

Green Party, 'Food and Agriculture' [viewed online, <http://policy.greenparty.org.uk/fa.html>, last accessed 07/04/15].

Green Party, 'Green MP Prompts Parliament to Introduce Meat Free Monday', 11th August 2010 [viewed online, <https://www.greenparty.org.uk/News/11-08-2010-meat-free-monday-parliament.html>, last accessed 07/04/2015].

Green Party, 'Policy Statements: Animal Rights', [viewed online, <http://policy.greenparty.org.uk/ar.html>, last accessed 06/02/2015].

Green Party, 'Green Party calls on government to maintain and strengthen anti-hunting legislation', 13/07/2015 [viewed online,

<https://www.greenparty.org.uk/news/2015/07/13/green-party-calls-on-government-to-maintain-and-strengthen-anti-hunting-legislation/>, last accessed 26/11/2015].

P. Harris, 'Hunters 'breeding foxes' to provide for the kill', *The Observer*, 17/02/2002 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2002/feb/17/hunting.ruralaffairs>, last accessed 25/11/15].

M. Hawkins, 'London Green Party' [viewed online, <http://london.greenparty.org.uk/elected-greens/london-officers/matt-hawkins.html>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

J. Hochschartner, 'Laurie Penny's species politics are disappointing', 02/11/2012 [viewed online, <http://speciesandclass.com/2014/11/02/laurie-pennys-species-politics-are-disappointing/>, last accessed 18/11/2015].

Hunt Saboteurs Association, 'Blatant illegal hunting ignored by Suffolk Police', 16th September 2006 [viewed online, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/index.php/news/press-archive/158-news-release-16-sept-2006>, last accessed 20/02/2015].

Hunt Saboteurs Association, 'Press Release' [viewed online, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/index.php/news/press-releases/526-anti-fascist-network-hsa-announce-affiliation>, last accessed 06/02/2015].

Hunt Saboteurs Association, 'Hunt Saboteurs Retrieve Body of Illegally Hunted Fox' [viewed online, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/index.php/news/press-releases/550-hunt-saboteurs-retrieve-body-of-illegally-hunted-fox>, last accessed 23/04/2015].

The Hunting Act: A website for enforcement professionals, 'Prosecutions' [viewed online, <http://huntingact.org/?q=node/18>, last accessed 23/02/2015].

ICAS, 'Definition of Critical Animal Studies' [viewed online, <http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/about/>, last accessed 02/09/2015].

M. Kite, 'Hunt ban is revenge for Thatchers' defeat of the miners, says Labour MP', *Daily Telegraph*, 19th September 2004 [viewed online, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1472099/Hunt-ban-is-revenge-for-Thatchers-defeat-of-the-miners-says-Labour-MP.html>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

Labour Press, 'Labour's new approach to public health - Andy Burnham' [viewed online, <http://press.labour.org.uk/post/108114239664/labours-new-approach-to-public-health-andy>, last accessed 06/04/15].

Labour Press, 'Labour announces new plan to cut food bank use' [viewed online, <http://press.labour.org.uk/post/114566811004/labour-announces-new-plan-to-cut-food-bank-use>, last accessed 08/04/2015].

D. Lane, 'Who Cares if Vivisection Works', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 9, Spring 1993, p. 31.

R. Lee, 'Unjustifiable Explosions', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 3, Summer 1990.

'Les animaux, ils sont gentils', *Le Monde Libertaire*, 18th October 2012, p. 18.

H. Lewis, 'Why PETA makes me want to eat a barn owl', 16th February 2012, *New Statesman* [viewed online, <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/helen-lewis-hasteley/2012/02/violence-imagery-domestic-peta>, last accessed 6/3/2014].

Living Countryside, 'Diagram illustrating the hierarchy of farm support in the UK' [viewed online, http://www.ukagriculture.com/farming_today/bg_support_changes.cfm, last accessed 08/04/15].

D. Livingston, 'Food Labelling', *Impact: Journal of the Labour Animal Welfare Society*, September 2013, p. 14.

C. Lucas, 'Standing Firm Against Fox Hunting', 25/03/2014 [viewed online, <http://www.carolinelucas.com/latest/standing-firm-against-fox-hunting>, last accessed 26/11/2015].

K. Mann, 'Psycho Analysis', *Arkangel*, No. 13. Undated, p. 58-59.

R. Mason, 'Ministers abandon plan to scrap farm animal welfare codes', *The Guardian*, 07/04/2016 [viewed online, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/apr/07/ministers-abandon-plan-to-scrap-farm-animal-welfare-codes-chicken-farming>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

M. Meacher, 'Animal Rights We Need A Debate' [viewed online, <http://www.michaelmeacher.info/weblog/2008/12/animal-rights-we-need-a-debate/>, last accessed 6/2/2014].

S. Mills, P. Williams, 'Political Animals', *Marxism Today*, April 1986.

Mintel, 'Number of global vegetarian food and drink product launches doubles between 2009 and 2013', October 2014 [viewed online, <http://www.mintel.com/press-centre/food-and-drink/number-of-global-vegetarian-food-and-drink-product-launches-doubles-between-2009-and-2013>, last accessed 21/01/2016].

N. Molland, 'The Gandalf Trial', *Arkangel*, No. 19, p. 39.

A. Molloy, 'No meat, no dairy, no problem: is 2014 the year vegans become mainstream?' *The Independent*, 31/12/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/food-and-drink/features/no-meat-no-dairy-no->

problem-is-2014-the-year-vegans-become-mainstream-9032064.html, last accessed 01/12/2015].

G. Monbiot, 'The welfare dependants the government loves? Rich landowners', *The Guardian*, 3rd March 2014 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/mar/03/rich-landowners-farmers-welfare-nfu-defra>, last accessed 16/04/2015].

G. Monbiot, 'Just when hope and courage are called for, Labour promises bean-counting', *The Guardian*, 14th April 2015 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/14/labour-bean-counting-hope-courage-deficit-voters>, last accessed 16/04/2015].

S. Moss, 'The banned rode on', *The Guardian*, 7th November 2006 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/nov/07/hunting.ethicalliving>, last accessed 20/02/2015].

A. Mullan, 'Forget Unity!', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 9, Spring 1993, p. 39.

I. Newkirk, 'Why this feminist would "Rather Go Naked"', 21st March 2016 [viewed online, <http://prime.peta.org/2016/03/feminist-rather-go-naked>, last accessed 21/06/2016].

NHS Choices, 'Red meat and the risk of bowel cancer' [viewed online, <http://www.nhs.uk/livewell/goodfood/pages/red-meat.aspx>, last accessed 16/04/15].

J. N. Parkinson, 'Anti-foxhunting campaigners protest outside parliament', *The Guardian*, 14/07/2015 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/video/2015/jul/14/anti-foxhunting-campaigners-protest-parliament-video>, last accessed 02/12/15].

L. Penny, 'Humourless feminazi *1: fuck the animals', Tuesday, 12 May 2009 [viewed online, <http://pennyred.blogspot.co.uk/2009/05/humourless-feminazi-1-fuck-animals.html>, accessed 15/11/2013].

PETA, '2012 financial report' [viewed online, <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/learn-about-peta/financial-report/>, accessed 6/3/2014].

PETA, 'PETA Sues SeaWorld for Violating Orcas' Constitutional Rights' [viewed online, <http://www.peta.org/blog/peta-sues-seaworld-violating-orcas-constitutional-rights/>, last accessed 31/03/15].

T. Pye, 'Putting Animals into Politics', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 2, p. 44.

Red Black Green, 'The End of SHAC and what we can learn from it', August 29, 2014 [viewed online, <https://network23.org/redblackgreen/>, last accessed 03/09/14].

Red Black Green, 'Where has the Hunting Act gone?', April 23rd 2015
[<https://network23.org/redblackgreen/2015/04/23/where-has-the-hunting-act-gone/>].

RSPCA, 'Our History', [viewed online,
<http://www.rspca.org.uk/utilities/aboutus/history>, last accessed 16/10/2015].

S. Russell, 'Importance of Sabbing', *Arkangel: For Animal Liberation*, No. 2, p. 45.

H. S. Salt, 'Is Socialism Slavery?', *Pioneer*, Date unknown. Henry Salt Archive
[viewed online, <http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/is-socialism-slavery>,
last accessed 15/02/2016].

H. S. Salt, 'Vegetarianism "As She is Spoke"', *The Vegetarian*, Vol. 11, No. 27, July
6, 1889. [viewed online,
<http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/vegetarianism-as-she-is-spoke>, last
accessed 23/06/15, last accessed 15/02/2016].

H. S. Salt, 'Socialists and Vegetarians', *To-Day*, November 1896, [viewed online,
<http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/socialists-and-vegetarians>, last
accessed 15/02/2016].

H. S. Salt, 'Have Animals Rights?', *Human Review*, January 1908, Vol. 8 [viewed
online <http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/bibliography/essays/have-animals-rights>, last
accessed 15/02/2016].

H. S. Salt, 'The Socialist not a Vegetarian', *The Vegetarian Messenger and Health
Review*, Vol. 25 No. 2, February 1928. Henry Salt Archive.

R. Sanghani, 'Catcalling happens to most women between the ages of 11 and 17',
Daily Telegraph, 29th May 2015, [viewed online,
[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/womens-life/11637697/Catcalling-Women-
sexually-harassed-on-the-street-from-puberty.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/womens-life/11637697/Catcalling-Women-sexually-harassed-on-the-street-from-puberty.html), last accessed 17/06/2016].

SHAC, 'SHAC ENDS: We made history... The future is ours' [viewed online,
<http://www.shac.net/>, last accessed 12/08/14].

SNP, 'Our Animal Welfare Priorities for Europe' [viewed online,
http://www.animalaid.org.uk/images/pdf/SNP_Animal_Welfare.pdf, last accessed
21/01/2016].

K. Stallwood, 'Party Political Conference at Vegfest UK Brighton' [viewed online,
[http://www.kimstallwood.com/2015/03/30/party-political-conference-at-vegfest-uk-
brighton/](http://www.kimstallwood.com/2015/03/30/party-political-conference-at-vegfest-uk-brighton/), last accessed 24/08/15].

P. Tatchell, 'Why I Joined the Greens' [viewed online,
<https://www.greenparty.org.uk/archive/183.html>, last accessed 19/06/15].

They Work For You, 'Hunting Act 2004: Prosecutions, Justice written question – answered on 4th February 2010' [viewed online, <http://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2010-02-04a.315013.h&s=speaker%3A10444#g315013.q0>, last accessed 23/02/2015].

P. Tsolkas, 'No System but the Ecosystem: Earth First! and Anarchism', 03/31/2015. [viewed online, <http://anarchiststudies.org/2015/03/31/no-system-but-the-ecosystem-earth-first-and-anarchism-by-panagioti-tsolkas-1/>, last accessed 04/06/2015].

Vegan Feminist Network, 'Understanding Sexism' [viewed online, <http://veganfeministnetwork.com/resources/what-vegans-should-know-about-patriarchy/>, last accessed 20/11/2015].

Vegan Society, 'Definition of Veganism' [viewed online, <https://www.vegansociety.com/try-vegan/definition-veganism>, last accessed 13/10/2015].

J. Vidal, 'Out for blood', *The Guardian*, December 1st 2001 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2001/dec/01/weekend.johnvidal>, last accessed 18/02/2015].

Viva, 'The Farrowing Crate: Factsheet' [viewed online, <http://www.viva.org.uk/resources/campaign-materials/fact-sheets/farrowing-crate>, accessed 13/05/14].

Viva, 'Veal: Babies on the menu' [viewed online, <http://www.viva.org.uk/what-we-do/condemned-to-a-crate>, accessed 29/04/14].

H. Wainwright, 'My support for Jeremy Corbyn is about much more than “reclaiming Labour”' [viewed online, <http://www.redpepper.org.uk/my-support-for-jeremy-corbyn-is-about-much-more-than-reclaiming-labour/>, last accessed 21/01/2016].

H. Walker, 'Relax, it's no longer weird to be a vegan', *The Guardian*, 04/01/2014 [viewed online, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jan/04/vegan-fad-meat-dairy-health-option>, last accessed 01/12/15].

War on Want, 'Time for Food Sovereignty in the UK!' [viewed online, <http://www.waronwant.org/news/latest-news/17602-time-for-food-sovereignty-in-the-uk-join-the-movement>, last accessed 31/03/15].

R. Webb, 'ALF Press Office News', *Arkangel*, No. 21, c. 1999.

T. Wise, 'Animal Whites', August 13th 2005 [viewed online, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2005/08/13/animal-whites/> last accessed 23/09/2015].

C. Wrenn, 'Sexism as a tactic in animal rights advocacy', 18/01/2013 [viewed online, <http://www.onegreenplanet.org/animalsandnature/sexism-as-a-tactic-in-animal-rights-advocacy/>, last accessed, 20/11/2015].

WWF, 'How many species are we losing?' [viewed online, http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/biodiversity/biodiversity/, last accessed 16/12/2015].

R. Yates, 'Growling with Kim Stallwood', [viewed online, <http://human-nonhuman.blogspot.ie/2013/07/growling-with-kim-stallwood.html>, last accessed 24/09/2015].

R. Yates, 'David Nibert: Entangled Up in Blue', podcast interview with Roger Yates [viewed online, <http://human-nonhuman.blogspot.com/2013/05/david-nibert-entangled-up-in-blue.html>, last accessed 26/03/15].

Websites

38 Degrees, <https://you.38degrees.org.uk/>

Anarchist Survey, <http://www.anarchismdocumentary.net/survey/>

Animal Aid, <http://www.animalaid.org.uk/>

Animal Rights Zone, <https://arzonetranscripts.wordpress.com/>

Association of Chief Police Officers, <http://www.acpo.police.uk/>

Blue Fox, <http://www.conservativesagainstfoxhunting.com/>

Campaign to Strengthen the Hunting Act,
<http://campaigntostrengthenethehuntingact.com/>

C. Adams, <http://caroljadams.com/>

Centre for Animals and Social Justice, <http://www.casj.org.uk/about>

Class Action, <http://www.classism.org/>

Countryside Alliance, <http://www.countryside-alliance.org/>

Early Day Motions, www.parliament.uk/edm/

Eat Jamaican, <http://eatjamaican.com>

European Association for Critical Animal Studies, <http://www.eacas.eu/>

Food Not Bombs, www.foodnotbombs.net/

Green Party, <https://www.greenparty.org.uk/>

The Great Ape Project, <http://www.projetogap.org.br/en/>
The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/>
Hansard, <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/>
Henry Salt Archive, <http://www.henrysalt.co.uk/>
Human-Nonhuman Relations, <http://human-nonhuman.blogspot.ie/>
The Hunting Act: A website for enforcement professionals, <http://huntingact.org/>
Hunt Saboteurs Association, <http://www.huntsabs.org.uk/>
ICAS, <http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/>
The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/>
Kim Stallwood, <http://www.kimstallwood.com/>
One Green Planet, <http://www.onegreenplanet.org/>
Rape Crisis, <http://rapecrisis.org.uk/>
Red Black Green, <https://network23.org/redblackgreen/>
Red Pepper, <http://www.redpepper.org.uk/>
Road Peace, <http://www.roadpeace.org/>
RSPCA, <http://www.rspca.org.uk/>
SHAC, <http://www.shac.net/>
PETA, <http://www.peta.org/>
They Work For You, <http://www.theyworkforyou.com/>
Transition Network, <https://www.transitionnetwork.org/>
Unlocking the Cage, <http://www.unlockingthecagethefilm.com/>
Veg News, <http://vegnews.com/>
Vegan Feminist Network, <http://veganfeministnetwork.com/>
Vegan Outreach, <http://veganoutreach.org/>
Vegan Society, <https://www.vegansociety.com/>
Vegan Views, <http://www.veganviews.org.uk>
Viva, 'White Lies', <http://www.whitelies.org.uk/>
Viva, <http://www.viva.org.uk/>
War on Want, <http://www.waronwant.org/>
Website of the Coalition for Safer Spaces, <https://saferspacesnyc.wordpress.com/>

Publications

A Murder of Crows
A Pinch of Salt
Alive!: Journal of the Vegetarian Society
Anarchy
Animal Liberation Front Supporters Group Newsletter
Arkangel: For Animal Liberation
Bald Cactus
Cargo Cult: DIY Punk Fanzine
Class War
Direct Action
Feminists For Animal Rights Newsletter
Freedom: Anarchist Fortnightly
GECCAP Newsletter
Green Anarchy
Head Wound
Howl: The Magazine of the Hunt Saboteurs Association
Labour Weekly
Last Hours
The Humanitarian
Impact: Journal of the Labour Animal Welfare Society
New Vegetarian
Newsletter of the Nottingham ALF
Outrage
Rancid News
Rolling Thunder: An Anarchist Journal of Dangerous Living
S.A.R.P Newsletter
SHAC Newsletter
Spectacular Times
Turning Point: The Animal Rights Magazine
Undercurrent
*Underground: The Magazine of the North American Animal Liberation Front
Supporters' Group*
The Vegetarian

Other printed sources

Labour Party Annual Conference Reports

PhD thesis

R. Carmichel, 'Becoming vegetarian and vegan: rhetoric, ambivalence and repression in self-narrative' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University, 2002).

J. Donaghey, 'Punk and Anarchism: UK, Poland and Indonesia' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Loughborough University, 2016).

A. R. Gordon, 'The Authentic Punk: An Ethnography of DiY Music Ethics' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, *Loughborough University*, 2005).

U. Gordon, 'Anarchism and Political Theory: Contemporary Problems' (PhD Thesis, Mansfield College, University of Oxford, 2007) [available online, <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/uri-gordon-anarchism-and-political-theory-contemporary-problems>].

J. Nightingale, 'The Concept of Solidarity in Anarchist Thought', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Loughborough University, 2015).

A. J. Nocella II, 'A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent: Critical pedagogy, critical criminology, and critical animal studies'. *Social Science – Dissertations*. 2011. Paper 178.

M. Wilson, 'Rules without rulers: the possibilities and limits of anarchism' (PhD thesis, Loughborough University, 2011).

Conference papers

E. Cudworth, 'Intersectionality, Species and Social Domination', paper presented to the Anarchism and Other Animals panel at the Anarchist Studies Network 2.0 Conference, University of Loughborough, 3rd-5th September 2012.

M. L. Krook, M. K. Nugent, 'Intersectional Institutions: Representing Women and Ethnic Minorities in the British Labour Party', European Consortium for Political Research [viewed online, <http://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/efa38872-8271-4dd6-9e15-bb24267dd7d4.pdf>, last accessed 23/11/2015].

R. Twine, 'Embedding Animal Ethics in an Empirically Informed Theory of Social Change' presented at The Politics of Species Conference, University of Warwick, UK, 18th January 2014.

Film

The Animals Film, directed by V. Schonfeld, M. Alaux (Beyond The Frame, 1981).

Animal Liberation: History in the Making (Compassion Media, 2005).

BBC Hardtalk, 14th June 2007 [viewed online, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nrNd_OSiDuQ, last accessed 15/02/2016].

Brassed Off, directed by M. Herman (Film 4, 1996).

N. Chomsky, delivering the 2013 Edward W Said Lecture: Violence and Dignity - Reflections on the Middle East at Friends House in London on 18th March 2013 [viewed online, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=26WRw7jRbnU>, last accessed 15/02/2016].

Food, Inc, directed by R. Kenner (Participant Media, 2008).

Forks Over Knives, directed by L. Fulkerson (Virgil, 2011).

Hamlet: Out of the Ashes, directed by R. Cotter (North Carolina Occupational Safety and Health Project, 1994).

Manufacturing Consent: Noam Chomsky and the Media, directed by M. Achbar, P. Wintonick (Zeitgeist Films, 1992) [viewed online, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RO51ahW9JIE>, last accessed 06/04/2015].

Project Nim, directed by J. Marsh (BBC Films, Passion Pictures, Redbox Films, 2012).

Unlocking the Cage, directed by D. A. Pennebaker, C. Hedgedus, (Pennebaker Hedgedus films, 2016).

Correspondence

Correspondence from Pierre Bascou, European Commission for Agriculture and Rural Development, 29/06/2015.

Interviews

Jon Active, Vegan, ex-hunt sab, punk, active distribution, 05/11/2014.

Carol J. Adams, animal rights scholar, 24/04/2015.

Caroline Allen, Green Party Spokesperson for Animal Protection, 25/06/14.

Anonymous, vegan and anarchist, conducted via e-mail, 25/09/14.

Anonymous Northumberland, Hunt Saboteur, 29/05/14.

Anonymous South Wales, Hunt Saboteur, 17/06/14.

Gerard Bane, Tolstoyan anarchist, vegan outreach, campaign against live export, 18/08/14.

Tim Barford, VegFest UK, 07/07/14.

Hilary Benn, Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, received on 15/04/14.

Wally Burley, Chair, Labour Animal Welfare Society, 29/07/14.

Phil Chokeword, Trade Unionist, conducted via e-mail, received on 19/01/2014.

John Denham, Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, received on 03/02/2014.

Brian Dominick, Author and activist, 08/01/16.

David Drew, Labour MP 1997-2010, 25/09/14.

Jim Fitzpatrick, Labour MP, 01/05/2014.

Kevin Flack, International Fund For Animal Welfare, Parliamentary Officer, conducted via e-mail, 31/07/14.

Robert Garner, animal rights theorist, 17/07/14.

Max Gastone, SHAC legal adviser, conducted via e-mail, received on 15/11/2013.

Carol Gigliotti, CAS Scholar, 09/09/2015.

Paul Gravett, London Animal Action, conducted via e-mail, received on 07/12/2013.

Tansy Hoskins, author, vegan, peace activist, 18/08/14.

Vanessa Hudson, Leader, Animal Welfare Party, 3/10/2014.

Cathy Jamieson, Labour MP, conducted via e-mail received on 23/04/2014.

Jane, London Animal Action, 18/06/15.

Janice, SPEAK campaign, 02/04/2015.

JJ, former SHAC activist, 19/06/14.

Robb Johnson, vegan/libertarian socialist singer songwriter, 1/10/2014.

Lisa Kemmerer, CAS scholar, 25/08/2015.

Robin Lane, ALF Press Officer, 9/03/2014.

Ronnie Lee, ALF founder, 25/04/2013.

Len, Food Not Bombs Activist, East Midlands, 03/04/2015.

Steve Llewellyn, hunt saboteur, conducted via e-mail, received on 31/01/2014.

Luke, Southern Anti-Blood sports, 07/08/14.

Dan Lyons, Centre for Animals and Social Justice, Uncaged, 28/07/14.

Kerry McCarthy, Labour MP, 02/05/14.

Michael Miller, Veggies Catering Company, 02/10/2014.

Alf Moon, HSA Information Officer, conducted via e-mail, 05/06/14.

Isy Morgenmuffel, Cowley Club activist, conducted via e-mail, received on 17/12/2013.

Elliot Morley, Former Labour MP, Former Labour Animal Welfare Spokesperson, 11/08/14.

Chris Mullin, former Labour MP, conducted via e-mail, received on 22/07/14.

Anthony J. Nocella II, CAS scholar, 15/09/2015.

Nick Palmer, Director of Policy European Coalition to End Animal Experiments, Head of Policy and Government, BUAV, conducted via e-mail, received on 11/04/2014.

Phoebe, London Animal Action, 18/06/15.

Veronika Powell, VIVA Health Officer, 09/04/2014.

Roddy, Northern Vegan Festival, 08/07/14.

Simon, HSA Chair person, 25/04/14.

Kim Stallwood, animal advocate, 25/10/2013.

David Thomas, Legal Consultant, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 16/04/14.

Andrew Tyler, Animal Aid director, 26/02/2014.

Liz Tyson, PALS, 23/06/15.

Dawn Varley, Director of Fundraising and Campaigns League Against Cruel Sports, 20/05/14.

Nicole Vosper, SHAC, 17/01/2014.

Chris Williamson, then Labour MP, 4/04/2014.

Roger Yates, ALF regional press officer, conducted via e-mail, received on 11/12/2013.

Gary Yourofsky, animal advocate, ex-PETA, conducted via e-mail, received on 7/03/2014.

Archives

Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick:

Collection: Trades Union Congress

Title: Cruelty to Animals, MSS.292/800.5/6

Title: Humane Killing, MSS.292/800.5/5

Collection: Trades Union Congress

Sub series: Cruelty to animals, MSS.292D/802.5/1-5

Collection: Papers of Sir Victor Gollancz

Title: Animal Welfare, MSS.157/3/ANI/1/1-43

TUC Library, London Metropolitan University,

Collection: TUC Library

Title: Animal Protection, HV 4701-4725

Title: Animal Protection, HV 4728-4959

League for the Prohibition of Cruel Sports, 'Messages of Sympathy and Goodwill: Received on Inaugural Public Meeting, November 25th 1925' (TUC Library, HV47/25).

Labour History Archive and Study Centre:

Collection: Papers of Judith Hart

Title: Non-constituency correspondence from organisations and individuals interested in human and animal rights, LP/HART/13/146 1984-1985

Title: Correspondence and publications on animal experimentation from groups opposed to it and general animal welfare groups such as the PDSA, LP/HART/13/150 1986-1987

Collection: General Secretary's Papers

Title: Blood Sports and Animal Welfare LP/GS/BLO [n.d.]

Collection: The William Gillies Papers

Title: Protection of animals LP/WG/POA [n.d.]

Sparrows' Nest, Nottingham

Collection: Public Archive

Collection: Solidarity Federation Archive

Collection: Syndicalist Materials 1940s-1960

Hull History Centre

Collection: British Union For the Abolition of Vivisection

Title: Mobilisation for Laboratory Animals Campaign, 1983-86, DBV/14/1

Title: Discussion paper prior to the introduction of the Bill on animal experiments
DBV/14/3

Title: Mobilisation's analysis of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Bill DBV/14/4

Title: General Election Coordinating Committee for Animal Protection (GECCAP),
DBV/11/1

Title: Putting Animals Into Politics DBV/11/12

Title: GECCAP Newsletter DBV/11/3

Title: BUAV Information Bulletin DBV/11/4

Title: GECCAP campaign – general correspondence DBV/12/1

Title: GECCAP campaign Meetings – 1983 DBV/12/2

Title: GECCAP Steering Committee, meetings and related correspondence
DBV/12/3

Title: GECCAP – mail outs to all supporters DBV/12/5

Title: GECCAP – Animals and Politics DBV/12/9

Title: GECCAP – General information on campaigns and aims DBV/12/6

Title: GECCAP – media coverage DBV/12/7

Title: Campaign for a progressive BUAV DBV/21/37

