

## Introduction

Welcome to the sixth issue of our journal. You'll first notice that our journal and site has undergone a name change. The Center on Animal Liberation Affairs is now the Institute for Critical Animal Studies, and the *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal* is now the *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*. The name changes, decided through discussion among our board members, were prompted by both philosophical and pragmatic motivations. Philosophically, we recognized that the phrase "animal liberation" is too narrow to describe our broad range of interests and the type of essays we have published. Pragmatically, in the bleak era of George Bush, the USA PATRIOT ACT, the Green Scare, and a renewed wave of academic repression, the phrase "animal liberation," unfortunately linked to "eco-terrorism" in the minds of many, was an obstacle to our organization's growth among academics.

Despite the name changes, nothing has changed in our mission, policies, activities, and goal, and we continue to be the only academic journal that welcomes scholarly analysis and radical perspectives on all facets and tactics of the animal rights/liberation movement. We continue to feature a wide range of perspectives, and impose no party line or doctrinal ideology.

By refocusing our work within the broader framework of "animal studies," we situate ourselves more generally within the growing movement in academia for scholarly historical, sociological, and philosophical studies of animals and human-animal relationships. This is reflected in the growth of the body of literature on animal issues, the number of academic conferences, and the organizations forming to study and promote animal studies. We think it is likely these trends will continue, that animal studies will gain ever-broader acceptance within academia, and that "animal studies" programs will take their place alongside Women's Studies, African-American Studies, and Chicano/a Studies.

As a *critical* animal studies, however, we seek to avoid the scholasticism, jargon-laden language, apolitical pretense, and theory-for-theory's sake style and mentality that infects so much academic writing, including the field of animal studies. A concept we have coined for an approach we hope to spread, "critical animal studies" takes shape in awareness of historically-constructed ideologies and systems of power and domination in which humans have oppressed and exploited animals. Rejecting the masks of objectivity and neutrality that in fact hide covert commitments and by default support systems of oppression, critical animal studies is informed by a normative commitment -- such as grounded in ethology, ecology, and the moral philosophy of animal rights -- to animal liberation. Critical animal studies has a broad and holistic understand of hierarchical power systems (e.g., racism, sexism, classism, and speciesism) and their intricate interrelationships, explores the systemic destructive effects of capitalism on all life and the earth, and views animal liberation and human liberation as inseparably interrelated projects. Most generally, critical animal studies uses theory as a means to the end of illuminating and eliminating domination.

This issue features two articles that deal with the ongoing debate over welfare vs. rights, reforms vs. abolitionism, and two regarding the government repression of the animal protectionist movement by demonizing it as a form of "domestic terrorism" or "eco-terrorism" and attacking it as part of the overall "war on terror" which has served as Bush's proxy-war against dissent and threats to the hegemony of neoliberalism and corporate hegemony throughout the world.

Katherine Perlo's essay, "Extrinsic and Intrinsic Arguments: Strategies for Promoting Animal Rights," is a provocative dissection of the contradictions and speciesist

biases inherent in efforts to promote animal liberation through appeal to “extrinsic” appeals (such as human health or ecology) rather than “intrinsic” appeals to what is good, just, and right for animals apart from any other consideration. Whatever the immediate benefit of persuading people to support animal rights because of the benefits it has for humans and the environment, Perlo shows how this leads to inconsistencies, ethical ambiguity, and speciesism. Instead, she argues, “We need to *tackle speciesism head-on*, instead of relying on less challenging extrinsic arguments – “widely-accepted and existing frames” ...which tacitly consign “animal rights” and its policy demands to a marginal, indeed “extreme,” position.”

From an important and original perspective, Perlo’s essay is clearly related to the larger debate within the animal advocacy movement about whether it is best to focus on the immediate reduction in the suffering of animals in a reform-oriented and compromised-based way, or to reject collaboration with corporations and watered-down moral ideals to pursue the long-term goal of the abolition of animal exploitation. In a lengthy and rigorously argued essay, “Animal Rights Law: Fundamentalism versus Pragmatism,” David Sztybel tries to undo any strict opposition between welfare and rights and argues that the “fundamentalist” rights approach urged by Gary Francione needs to yield to a more flexible “pragmatism.” Sztybel tries to map out a position that promotes welfare policies, without endorsing speciesist belief that humans are superior to animals; he thereby provides an interesting contrast to the arguments of Perlo and mounts a significant critique of Francione.

In “Unmasking the Animal Liberation Front Using Critical Pedagogy: Seeing the ALF for Who They Really Are,” Anthony J. Nocella, II provides a broad overview of the current “Green Scare” and the corporate-state demonization of the militant animal groups as forms of “domestic terrorism.” He critically analyses terms such as “terrorism” and “violence” and defends tactics such as taken by the Animal Liberation Front. This defense, however, will seem unfounded if one does not have a way to understand the ALF on its own terms. Thus, using a “critical pedagogy” method that tries to overcome the alienating distancing devices of “objective” methodologies, Nocella seeks to provide the context of understanding that could help bolster support for the ALF and other radical groups.

My own contribution, “The Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act: New, Improved, and ACLU-Approved,” discusses in more concrete terms how the corporate-state complex has attacked groups like Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) through the recent updating of the 1992 Animal Enterprise Protection Act. Within the broad context of post-9/11 USA and Bush attack on civil liberties and privacy rights, I discuss the motivations for the changes in this law, how it is used as a tool of repression, and how civil liberties defense groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) failed to mount an adequate challenge to the AETA and to understand its broader implications.

Finally, we feature reviews of *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave* (edited by Peter Singer) by Matthew Calarco; Matthew Scully’s *Dominion: The Power of Man, the Suffering of Animals, and the Call to Mercy*, by Lisa Kemmerer; and *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?: Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (edited by Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II) by Lauren E. Eastwood.

Dr. Steven Best  
Chief Editor