

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to Volume V, Issue 2 of the *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, which features another stimulating round of scholarly studies published for the first time in these pages. The *Journal for Critical Animal Studies* is now in its fourth year of publication; the Institute for Critical Animal Studies continues to grow; and in February 2008 we host our sixth annual conference at the Montana State University, Billings. I invite our readers to meet the new members of the Institute's advisory and editorial boards, whom I warmly welcome to our organization. I must give a special welcome and thanks to our new Associate Editor for the *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, Dr. Carol Gigliotti, a writer, artist, and teacher of Interactive Media and Critical and Cultural Studies at Emily Carr Institute in Vancouver BC, Canada.

The *Journal for Critical Animal Studies* is the first and only peer-reviewed academic journal devoted to interdisciplinary and international writing on topics related to animal rights, animal liberation, animal advocacy, and animal studies. We are happy to see the worldwide growth of animal studies, such as evident in the increase of books, articles, conferences, departments, courses, and centers related to this topic. As these developments point to a change toward more progressive ethics and laws, they nonetheless stem from the sociopolitical *mainstream*, the strengths of which are more than matched by its weakness and limitations, and underscore the uniqueness of our own institution.

The Institute for Critical Animal Studies emerged and matured in the post-9/11 era and the frightening turns toward conservatism, conformity, and persecution of dissent, rampant throughout academia and society as a whole. Unlike other animal studies approaches, the Institute for Critical Animal Studies engages controversial issues relating to radical theory, tactics, and politics. In mainstream human rights, animal advocacy, and environmental movements, discussion of issues such as sabotage, violence, armed struggle, global capitalism, and revolutionary struggle against corporate domination is *verboten*. Anyone with political experience knows that activists across the spectrum of causes are captive to the dogma of pacifism that see nonviolence as the sole correct philosophy and tactic, rather than one approach among many, each pertinent to different contexts and situations. As a system of dogma, fundamentalist pacifism is inherently problematic in its refusal to countenance other perspectives in a rational and open discussion. But pacifists have also revised and whitewashed history such that the diversity leaders, groups, and tactics fusing together to ignite change (e. g., to force the British out of India or to win passage of the US Civil Rights Act of 1964) are reduced to one Prime Mover (e.g., Gandhi, King), thereby reducing the complexity of history and politics to a cartoon or Hollywood narrative.¹

Once this complexity is restored, contemporary groups like the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) no longer seem like aberrations or threats to our movement and can be viewed for what they really are: *heirs to the militant tactics and approaches indispensable for progressive change throughout the modern era*. Awareness of the complexity of historical struggle, of how both "violent" and nonviolent tactics together spawned social change, of how few people know these histories, of how dogmatic pacifism straitjackets thought and hinders effective resistance, the Institute for Critical Animal Studies emerged. We recognized the

need for a less dogmatic and more radical and pluralist approach to animal liberation and animal studies, one that allows engagement of the entire spectrum of theories, politics, and tactics used by past and present liberation movements.

Another unique aspect of our Institute, journal, and conferences is the emphasis on situating animal exploitation within the larger socioeconomic context of global capitalism. While problematic or wrong in many of its theoretical and political positions, Marxism is hardly a “dead” theory, and the key categories of Marxist political economy – such as labor, capital, competition, profit, commodification, exploitation, growth imperatives, and structural contradictions – remain vitally important for analyzing speciesist systems of oppression, as well as other forms of domination such as patriarchy, racism, classism, and statism. The Institute for Critical Animal Studies recognizes that multinational corporations and capitalist markets are the most powerful influences shaping the contemporary world, commodifying nature, animals, and humans alike to stoke the insatiable machines of growth and profit.² Because the exploitation of animal labor power and profit is a global operation driven by the pharmaceutical and livestock industries, to name just two, and capitalist economies merge with industrial technologies (e.g., factories), a global *animal industrial complex* has emerged. While much of Marx’s analysis still remains useful to analyze contemporary global capitalism, in searching for a more pluralistic, democratic, and decentralized politics many radicals nonetheless find better alternatives in the anarchist traditions that developed from the nineteenth century to the present.

While animal studies generally is multidisciplinary, theorists in this field typically ignore one key perspective -- political economy -- and fail to mediate culture with the larger structures of capitalism. While some forms of animal studies are apolitical, and others are political in their call for welfare or rights, very few theorists – including the “radical” abolitionists -- recognize the need for the *ultimate abolition*, that of capitalist domination itself. Animal liberation will never be remotely possible without human liberation from capitalist oppression and until social movements can end corporate control of the state and state hegemony itself. Thus, as many correctly emphasize that human liberation is impossible without animal liberation, it is equally true that animal liberation is impossible without human liberation. The only adequate political position for radical politics today is through building a broad alliance politics, one that connects animal liberation, human liberation, and earth liberation in a global struggle for *total liberation*.

Thus, in contrast to mainstream animal studies, the Institute for Critical Animal Studies promotes a *critical* animal studies which is characterized, among other things, by (1) a transdisciplinary perspective that incorporates not only history, sociology, philosophy, anthropology, literature, art, and so on, but also political economy; (2) a normative and engaged position that links theory to practice and critique to politics; (3) a radical political orientation that views capitalism as inherently unsustainable and exploitation; (4) a holistic understanding of the commonality of oppressions, such that speciesism, sexism, racism, ableism, statism, classism, militarism and other oppressive ideologies and institutions are viewed as parts of a larger, interlocking system of domination; (5) a radical alliance politics perspective that attacks all forms of hierarchical domination.

We are only beginning to clarify and develop what a critical animal studies is, in contrast to more academic, apolitical, and conservative forms of animal studies. The inchoate nature of this notion and project can be seen with a Google search of “critical animal studies” which, on our recent effort, turned up only a mention to a small program at the University of Washington and to our own Institute for Critical Animal Studies.

We must emphasize, finally, that the broad characterization of “critical animal studies” in this Introduction is not a party line or the exact characterization that all our members would provide. Nor is it a touchstone or checklist of theoretically and politically correct criteria that every writer must meet in every detail before publishing in our journal. One will find, indeed, a variety of philosophical and political perspectives in the papers published in this issue and in the past archived issues. Without seeking an impossible (and repressive) consensus on theoretical and political particulars, the goal of the Institute for Critical Animal Studies, broadly put, is to situate animal studies and animal liberation within a larger socioeconomic context; to theorize the linkages of human, animal, and earth liberation movements; and to study a broad range of politics, tactics, and means of struggle.

Issue Overview

We begin this issue with Andrea Rossing McDowell’s probing study, “Lev Tolstoy and the Freedom to Choose One’s Own Path.” Tolstoy -- renowned vegetarian, anti-vivisectionist, and animal rights advocate living in nineteenth century Russia -- was ahead of his place and time, as indeed were animal rights and vegetarian advocates since the days of Pythagoras. While it has not gone unnoticed that Tolstoy incorporated his views on animals and vegetarianism into the narratives, characters, and themes of his books, few theorists have grasped the moral depth and meaning of Tolstoy’s passion and compassion for animals. McDowell, in contrast, sets Tolstoy’s philosophy within a far broader context that points the way for more fruitful work in this direction. From this perspective, McDowell emphasizes that Tolstoy’s vegetarianism was motivated not only by the ascetic strain of Russian Christianity, but also by genuine compassion for animal suffering.

McDowell argues that Tolstoy’s “liberation philosophy” viewed animal and human issues as inseparably linked, such that the moral evolution of humanity was impossible so long as society was based on violence and the destruction of animal life. Writing about the victimization of humans and animal, Tolstoy’s novels condemn hierarchy, exploitation, patriarchy, and injustice per se. McDowell shows, moreover, how Tolstoy’s concern with animal abuse “resonate[s] with his larger social concerns, such as his opposition to serfdom, the role of women in society, the devolution of sexual mores, and the destruction of rural life through modernization.” McDowell links these social issues to Tolstoy’s preoccupation with personal authenticity and the individual’s obligation to break with the entire system of social oppression and forge a new ethic and mode of existence. “At the core of *all* of these issues,” she writes, “lies his intrinsic concern: the impact of socio-historical factors on the morality, autonomy, and valuation of the individual being.” While noting some limitations in his liberation ethics, such as his Christian-influenced patriarchal beliefs, McDowell argues that Tolstoy’s work not only represented a major innovation within Russian literature, but his all-inclusive ethics

that knitted animals and humans into the same community of life was a key step toward changing modern views toward animals.

From Tolstoy's most unorthodox Christianity we move to a study on "Jewish Ethics and Nonhuman Animals." In this thought-provoking essay, Lisa Kemmerer highlights the much-ignored moral resources in ancient Judaism, such as expressed in the Old Testament (*Tanakh*). By way of her overview of recent critical literature on Judaic ethics, Kemmerer uncovers a startlingly progressive view of animals and human obligations to other living beings, as she highlights passages that "reveal the world as God *preferred* and *intended* it to be." Her interpretation stands in bold contrast to those who identify Judeo-Christianity as the root cause of the human war against animals and nature, as it also contradicts standard speciesist views of the faithful Christian flocks. Whereas "Westerners have long admired the nature-friendly qualities of Eastern spiritual traditions, such as *ahimsa* and *reincarnation*, which tie human beings to the circle of life that reaches across species and which requires a compassionate approach to all living beings," Kemmerer notes that "we have often failed to acknowledge this same beauty—teachings of compassion toward all living beings—in Western traditions." New critical interpretations of the Judaic roots of Western society are crucial, for they provide "ethical standards to which others might hold both Jews and Christians accountable in their relations to animals and the world as a whole."

Kemmerer's reading of Genesis reveals a positive, peaceful, loving egalitarian world in which humans are animals, all animals have intrinsic value, and veganism is the ideal, divinely-intended diet. Speciesist interpretations of the Bible, Kemmerer argues, stem principally from decontextualized readings of Genesis 1 apart from Genesis 2 and other key passages. Genesis 1 states that (1) God creates humans in his "own image," and (2) grants them "dominion" over the world. Noting that unwarranted readings of these passages "have justified much human arrogance, exploitation, and general indifference toward the rest of creation," Kemmerer exposes two major errors in order to clear the ground for a new ethic. First, reliance on the human creation "in the image of God" model ignores God's covenant (Genesis 9) which created all beings as interdependent members of one community. Second, mainstream Christianity confuses "dominion" with domination and confounds a normative concept of "rule" with the naked exercise of power. The speciesist interpretation of the Bible correctly emphasizes that God gives humans a special mission in the world, but fails to grasp God's true intent -- to respect, love, and care for animals, and to help them realize their own unique purposes. If we shift focus from Genesis 1 to Genesis 2, she claims, one can discern that humans are meant to be the servants of God's creation, not self-appointed masters, tyrants, and world-destroyers.

Turning from religious to secular debates, we present Stephen D'Arcy's bold and original essay on "Deliberative Democracy, Direct Action, and Animal Advocacy." D'Arcy shows how animal rights issues are largely ignored in debates over democratic theory and politics, yet are nonetheless directly relevant to their core concerns. Specifically, D'Arcy engages a sorely neglected topic – militant direct action for animal liberation – suppressed from nearly all journal, online, and conference forums on animal issues, but is more than welcome in the *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*. D'Arcy describes a shift in recent democratic theory from a passive model of citizenship reliant upon behavior such as voting and its outcome in aggregate public preferences to an active

model of citizenship that emphasizes rational deliberation and public debate. The concept of deliberative democracy upholds the process of rational and critical discussion of political issues in a “free and unmanipulated way” as a precondition for the legitimacy of policy, government, and the voting acts fetishized by the first model as authentically democratic without specifying their relevant background conditions.

The strengths and flaws of the deliberative model of democracy are immediately apparent: it grasps how voting is subject to manipulation and encourages a richer concept of citizenship and democracy, yet it does not address the fundamental flaws of liberal democracies and capitalist state systems in their hierarchical and corporate-dominated forms. Moreover, this ethereal outlook assumes reason by itself can guarantee democracy and justice, that truth can always speak to and be heard by power, that democracy can be realized within the constraints of a corporate-dominated state and legal system, and that persuasive talk can achieve results independent of forceful actions. The deliberative approach, therefore, cannot address a key aspect of contemporary animal liberation struggles – namely, direct action and tactics such as threats and sabotage – such as undertaken by groups such as the ALF and SHAC. Acutely aware of the limitations of rational dialogue and moral persuasion, direct activists choose the path of confrontation. Rather than aiming to influence the general public, direct activists apply pressure tactics to their specific targets: the individuals and/or corporations profiting from the exploitation of animals. Instead of following the niceties of open communication, radicals go underground to form affinity groups and cells that act clandestinely. D’Arcy argues that direct action tactics are necessary and justifiable and exist as supplementary not antithetical to deliberation, debate, education, and persuasion in public contexts. Thus, D’Arcy seeks to initiate a “potentially fruitful dialogue” in which theorists think about direct action animal advocacy in light of the deliberative turn, and analyzing the deliberative turn from the perspective of direct action animal advocacy.

Continuing with the critical discussion of tactical issues, Katherine Perlo’s essay, “Should Anti-Vivisectionists Boycott Animal-Tested Medicines?” In this illuminating essay, Perlo examines arguments for and against boycotting animal-tested drugs. She raises a host of moral dilemmas that animal liberationists and vegans confront everyday in a society organized around animal exploitation. Confronting the possibility of taking a drug tested on animals, anti-vivisectionists face the dilemma (or, “near-dilemma”) of using a medicine possibly helpful for their condition, and thereby opening themselves to the charge of hypocrisy, or staying true to their moral commitments at potential harm to their health and their dependents (including animals). Although some individuals may refuse to take animal-tested medicines, the animal liberation movement has rejected an organized boycott of these drugs for fear of not gaining wide support and alienating the public from the anti-vivisection cause.

Perlo notes the difference between boycotting animal-tested cosmetics and animal-tested drugs, such that the cost of avoiding the latter is much higher, and the choice is far more strenuous, given the wide availability of cruelty-free cosmetics compared to vegan medicines. Thus, should a vegan choose to take animal-tested medicines, the issue is less a statement of personal hypocrisy than it is an indictment of a society and science institution reliant on outmoded and fallacious biomedical paradigms and that severely restricts individuals’ choice in pharmaceutical drugs. It must be emphasized, of course, that the availability of a drug is no guarantee it is safe or will

work, as the harmful and deadly unintended consequences of drugs that test “safe” on animals is well documented. If the issue of hypocrisy is on the table, Perlo turns the table to reveal the hypocrisy of the British government and scientific establishment which promised to reduce animal experiments but in fact increased them while providing less enforcement of “animal welfare” regulations. Perlo notes it is a powerful statement that those who could benefit from such drugs refuse to take them at their own risks, and thereby demonstrate their passion and sincerity for a cause in a potentially influential way. Avoiding a simplistic either/or alternative, Perlo concludes that anti-vivisectionists ought to promote a number of strategies, including rejecting such medicines in favor of alternative treatments and making their voice heard in favor of non-animal research.

Finally, in “Critical Pedagogy and Humane Education: Making a Difference in the Classroom,” Piers Beirne and Meena Alagappan explore whether a rights-based course on the sociology of animal abuse can significantly change university student attitudes and behaviors toward animals. In their compelling narrative, Beirne and Alagappan discuss the experience of teaching a sociological course on “Animal Abuse” at the University of Southern Maine. Foregoing a disingenuous “neutral” or “objective” approach, the course was taught from a “pro-animal” perspective that “seeks to develop empathy and compassion in relation to other living beings and which, through the development of critical thinking, seeks to affect students at the cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels.” As they describe, the goals of the course are two-fold. First, it aims to provide a sociological introduction to the enormity of animal abuse, engaging not only historical, cultural, and institutional questions but also the discursive issues of how concepts such as “animals” and “humans” have been socially (and quite fallaciously) constructed in Western societies. Second, moving from theoretical to personal issues, they draw on the methods and goals of humane education. Here, Beirne and Alagappan seek to promote critical thinking, to cultivate empathy and compassion, and to draw the practical conclusions of animal rights for everyday life.

The objectives of the course are pursued through film as well as articles and books, and through a number of theoretical and political perspectives including feminism, utilitarianism, and liberal-rights models. As their approach is sound to the extent it *works*, Beirne and Alagappan describe the methodology they adopt to assess the degree to which the course changes thinking and behavior, by inspiring students to shift from uncritical speciesism to a reflexive animal rights standpoint. Analyzing the contrasting responses of control and sample groups, the authors describe their substantive success and conclude that a critical pedagogy of animal studies has great potential for promoting social change, and they affirm the importance of humane education approaches for *all* levels of education, from grade schools to universities.

We conclude, as always, with critical reviews of recent and/or classic literature in the animal studies field. Lisa Kemmerer examines Eric Schlosser’s influential book, *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All-American Meal*. While noting the value of the book’s account of the rise the fast-food industry, the poisons this empire peddles, and its catastrophic impact on public health, Kemmerer emphasizes Schlosser’s startling moral schizophrenia, such that despite vivid descriptions of animal torture and killing inside the ghoulish hell of slaughterhouses, he limits his moral concern to exploited workers and poisoned consumers. (For those seeking a deeper holistic analysis that addresses the connections between human and animal exploitation, Kemmerer rightly directs us to Gail

Eiznitz's powerful book, *Slaughterhouse*.) Kemmerer notes that the movie adaptation of Schlosser's book replicates the same error of moral myopia and speciesist exclusion, by focusing on human travails and by treating animals as if they were no more than inanimate parts of the machines that destroy them as fast as humanly and technologically possible. The film does the book one turn better, though, in its negative portrayal of animal activists as misguided and incompetent.

In the first of two contributions, Steven Best reviews Charles Patterson's classic, *Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust*. Best emphasizes the acute importance of what he calls the "animal standpoint" -- a much-ignored but crucial perspective for understanding history, culture, human identity, and ecological crises -- and he views Patterson's book as a masterful application of this perspective. Typical of animal studies, however, Patterson abstracts his analysis from the political economy of global capitalism and has no plausible suggestions for changing the acute crises he diagnoses. Best next appraises Norm Phelps's new historical study, *The Longest Struggle: Animal Advocacy from Pythagoras to PETA*. Best notes the numerous contributions of Phelps's history of animal advocacy, but underscores the inconsistencies of Phelps's praise for the liberation actions of Jesus and others, while nonetheless denouncing the ALF and SHAC. Best reads Phelps symptomatic of the animal advocacy movement's failure to grasp the legitimacy and importance of militant direct action and of radical alliance politics, and the unsettling ways much of the mainstream movement (e.g., the Humane Society of the United States) directly or indirectly supports the chilling neo-McCarthyesque attack on contemporary radicalism or dissent of any kind.

A Distinction with a Difference

Many of this issue's articles and reviews develop key themes of critical animal studies. As one of two broad strands of animal studies, *critical* animal studies differentiates itself from an apolitical, abstract academic approach that studies human relations to and representations of animals for its own sake, without openly endorsing animal liberation or engaging its immense political significance. As Best wrote in the last issue of this journal, *critical* animal studies seeks "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 ... [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."

It is crucial to emphasize here that different theorists will have varying interpretations of the meaning of critical animal studies, and the attempt of Best and Gigliotti in this Introduction to clarify the concept should not be confused with an effort to impose or essentialize a particular viewpoint as *the* meaning, definition, and approach. We, the co-authors of this Introduction, do not mean to speak for other members of the Institute for Critical Animal Studies nor anyone else theorizing this inchoate, emerging

field, but rather seek to begin a dialogue on different tendencies within animal studies and to initiate a radical intervention within this field.

Nonetheless, if our distinct orientation and project is to have any meaning, the word “critical” cannot be empty or infinitely plastic. Among other things, “critical” suggests open normative commitments to animal liberation, opposition to hierarchical domination of any kind (e.g., speciesism, racism, patriarchy, classism, statism, militarism, and homophobia), and a theoretical and political engagement of human and animal domination as one integrated and inseparable system of oppression. While critical animal studies ideally mobilizes a number of theoretical perspectives (e.g., Marxism, anarchism, feminism, anti-racism, and postmodernism) in order to analyze a number of forms of domination, it simply cannot comprehend animal exploitation without engaging the crucial role of capitalism, which requires – not in any crude “vulgar” or reductionist way – use of Marxist categories such as class, profit, exploitation, capital, labor, and commodities. However anarchist one chooses to be in the critique of Marxist authoritarianism, statism, or centralism, Marxist categories remain inescapably relevant and important to understanding capitalist social dynamics.

Two fall 2007 conferences -- “Nature Matters: Materiality and the More-than-Human in Cultural Studies of the Environment” (Toronto, Ontario), and the “Twenty-First Annual Conference of the Society for Literature, Science and the Arts” (Portland, Maine) -- highlighted major contrasting versions of animal studies. Enriching this emerging field with unique interdisciplinary perspectives, members from the growing number of animal studies organizations, institutes, and networks were represented, including the Institute for Critical Animals Studies, the New Zealand Centre for Human-Animal Studies at the University of Canterbury, the Center for Animals and Public Policy at Tufts University, the Society and Animals Forum, the H-Animal Network, and the British Animal Studies Network, as well as many unaffiliated presenters.

While a majority of the presentations at both conferences were involved with articulating what Erica Fudge calls “the meaningful role of animals in making cultural meaning,”³ a sizeable number of the presenters were *also* building on these issues to mount critiques of underlying issues of political economy as well as prioritizing the negative impact of these issues on animals themselves. At the “Nature Matters” conference, audience questions and discussion also encouraged the shift to a more critical discussion about the connections among the capitalist exploitation of humans, animals, and the environment. The multiple streams of presentations at the Society for Literature, Science and the Arts conference, in contrast, limited somewhat the interdisciplinary possibilities of similar discussions involving the impact of capitalism and technologies on the nonhuman world. Presentations specifically concerned with animal studies were separated from those involving forms of power and domination in contemporary society and unfortunately missed opportunities for dialogue.

To be sure, there are other tendencies this broad distinction between “critical animal studies” and “animal studies” does not cover, such as, for instance, involve welfarist and liberal-rights orientations. There are also various orientations of method, such as feminist, posthumanist (e.g., the ever-elliptical Donna Haraway), and postmodernist (e.g., Steve Baker), and a combination of these and/or other methods. There is also a more sociological and empiricist approach to animal studies, such as associated with the *Animals and Society* journal, contrasted to more philosophical,

cultural, interpretive, and normative-critical approaches. There are many complex differences, divergences, overlapping, yet to be mapped and to surface.

The theorization and development of critical animal studies – as we hope to do in this journal and elsewhere – seems to us highly significant and important. We hope not only to clarify the general terrain of animal studies, but also to interject a radical perspective and to help ensure the political relevance and potential of animal studies before it freezes into a dominant method and meaning that is coopted by academia. What Karl Marx said about theory in the nineteenth century has never been more relevant than today: “Hitherto philosophers have only interpreted the world; the point, however, is to *change* it.”

Of course, theory must inform practice, but practice must also inform theory. The point of critical animals studies is not to be clever in the deconstruction of “texts,” not to spin esoteric word webs around the minutia of a Renaissance painting or an eighteenth century novel, not to engage in theory for theory’s sake, nor even to question cultural representations of animals or society in a limited (moralistic and psychologistic) way. Rather, critical animal studies seeks to illuminate core structures of power, to analyze overlapping systems of domination, to see salient connections theoretical and politically, and to help bring about a new enlightenment that transcends the limitations of humanism and speciesism in all forms. Critical animal studies, certainly, champions the goal of abolitionism, but recognizes that animal liberation, as opposed to kinder killing and larger cages, is possible only through a global struggle dedicated to the ultimate abolition – that of capitalism and all forms of hierarchy.

We hope you will join us in the development of critical animal studies. This important task has just begun, but it has an exciting future in store for those of us who understand the importance of animal liberation to other liberation movements and who seek a vital alternative to the academic and social mainstream.

Steven Best, Chief Editor

Carol Gigliotti, Associate Editor

¹ For an excellent discussion of this point, see Peter Gelderloos, *How Nonviolence Protects the State* (Boston: South End Press, 2007).

² An important contribution to this broad theorization is David Nibert’s book, *Human Liberation, Animal Liberation*. More recently, we find another significant systemic analysis in Bob Torres’s book, *Making a Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights* (Berkeley: AK Press, 2007). Torres is a rare example of a Leftist radical who was able to break through the conceptual prisons of speciesism and grasp the larger field of domination involving the human war of extermination against animals. Unfortunately, Torres’s book is marred by fundamentalist pacifism and failed attempt to defend the outrageously implausible and historically falsified argument that animal liberation can be brought about by legal and peaceful means, and these means only. This is a particular bizarre argument for someone like Torres, who clearly understands that the mechanism and range of capitalist domination extend to an implacable control of a militarized and violent state pacifists think they can dismantle with arguments and petitions. To recall the words nineteenth century anarchist, Emma Goldman, “If voting changed anything, they would have made it illegal long ago.”

³ Erica Fudge, “The History of Animals,” H-Net-H-Animal Discussion Network (http://www.h-net.org/~animal/ruminations_fudge.html).