13

Vegan Feminism Then and Now: Women's Resistance to Legalised Speciesism across Three Waves of Activism

Corey Lee Wrenn and Lynda M. Korimboccus

Introduction

There is an implicit deviance in women's activism, exemplified in the popular adage: 'Well-behaved women seldom make history' (Ulrich, 2007). This is certainly the case in anti-speciesism work beginning in late-18th and early 19th-century Britain and Europe. Advocacy on behalf of other animals was stealthily adopted by women who played on gender stereotypes such as 'angels of the home' and 'nature's caretakers' in order to enter the patriarchal public sphere and resist anthroparchal oppression (Unger, 2012). Originally, these campaigns focused on especially male pursuits, such as 'hunting' (a euphemism for male violence against other animals) and vivisection. Women's contributions to campaigns, funding and public support were invaluable to early efforts. Yet, as was typical of the time, women were also frequently prevented from leadership positions due to Victorian mores and concerns that the cause might face delegitimisation via feminisation (a fear that persists today) (Groves, 2001).

A small but significant body of research has documented the efforts of women in the nonhuman animal rights movement as founders of leading charities, authors of seminal texts, and community organising and education (Ferguson, 1998; Kean, 1998; Gaarder, 2011; Donald, 2020), but this chapter is interested in the extra-institutional ingenuity of women who eschewed prevailing laws, tactfully adopted the deviant mantle, and

advanced anti-speciesist practice and theory through their actions. To achieve this, we highlight the efforts of one notable woman in each of the three waves of Western anti-speciesist activism. Charlotte Despard is offered as a representative of the first wave. This initial wave transpired over the Victorian and early Edwardian eras, emphasising humane education and challenging vivisection head on. Next, Patty Mark is chosen as a representative of the second wave which rose in the mid-20th century, inspired by goals and strategies of the civil rights movement and characterised by increased attention to 'farmed' animal welfare. Lastly, we examine Sarah Kistle as a representative of the current wave of nonhuman animal rights activism. This third wave is distinguished by a commitment to veganism, conscious attention to intersectionality, and access to new social media technologies. These three women are not only interesting in their explicit challenge to the legal system to advance nonhuman animal interests; they also demonstrate the deeply entangled nature of oppression in their resistance to speciesist subjugation through explicitly gendered (and sometimes racialised) lenses. The intersectional lens that has become popularised in current green criminology and eco-feminist discourses is an extension of foundational connections made by Victorian-era activists more than a century ago (Lahar, 1991). This survey of three women defying speciesism across the centuries interweaves generations of activism and demonstrates the centrality of intersectional, feminist thought to critical vegan, anti-speciesist and environmental work.

As this chapter furthers, the *activist* element of eco-feminist theory is also particularly relevant (see Chapter 2 on eco-feminism for further exploration). That is, collective consciousness and theoretical awareness of social injustices and their intersectional nature are important, but practitioners are expected to participate, disrupt and bring theory into action (Sturgeon, 1997). Said theory combines various approaches to support the victims of injustice. Feminist criminology, for instance, highlights a wider system of domination that is maintained, at least in part, by the stigmatisation or criminalisation of various aspects related to identities of 'otherness' (Crenshaw, 1991). Feminist criminology has been unforthcoming with regard to the otherness of nonhuman animals, however. Green criminologists have been better representatives in this regard, although they are primarily interested in the injustices faced by 'wild' nonhuman animals. More recently, some of these scholars have started to address this gap in turning their attention to the millions of other nonhuman animals imprisoned in agribusiness (Taylor and Fitzgerald, 2018; Sollund, 2021). This 'critical animal turn' in green criminology has roots in the more established environmental ethic of eco-feminism. Eco-feminism understands environmental and nonhuman oppression as a consequence of complex power relations manufactured by capitalist, patriarchal and white supremacist systems. By the 1980s, a

vegan eco-feminist (or, more broadly, vegan feminist) branch had emerged, explicitly acknowledging the plight of other animals, both domesticated and free-living (Adams, 1991; Gaard, 2002; Foster, 2021).

As the overlapping emphases of these theoretical traditions suggest, an intersectionality in injustices faced by various marginalised groups is worth examining, and the result of these examinations must be acted upon. This chapter argues that many anti-speciesist activists, particularly *feminist* anti-speciesists, have acknowledged that intervention will be necessary to disrupt unjust power structures, and that this disruption will need to consider the entanglements of species, gender, 'race' and other identities. The ways in which this gendered green philosophy has transpired in real-world efforts are diverse and, of course, shaped by their historical contexts. The following examination of three waves of nonhuman animal rights activism as exemplified by three extraordinary women, however, identifies one predominant commonality: some element of extra-institutional participation will be vital to achieving both short- and long-term social change for the benefit of nonhuman animals and other marginalised groups.

Charlotte Despard and Edwardian anti-speciesist activism

The history of nonhuman animal rights activism, we would argue, is relatively unknown to the average activist in the West. The dominant narrative usually begins with the modern incarnation of the movement in the 1970s, ushered in with the hugely popular work of Peter Singer (1975). Some might be familiar with the work of British activist and author Henry Salt (1851–1939) or founder of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Henry Bergh (1813–88). However, few may be familiar with the extraordinary efforts of so many powerful women of the era. Charlotte Despard is one such titan who deserves to be a household name in the vegan home.

Despard's obscurity in nonhuman animal rights history may be due to the fact that she is more popularly historicised as a leading suffragette. Like many feminists of the time, the various strains of her activism often merged (Leneman, 1997). She served as president to the Women's Freedom League in Britain, which regularly served vegetarian food at events, offered demonstrations in vegetarian cookery, and even opened up wartime vegetarian restaurants. She was also on the Council of the London Vegetarian Society and a plethora of other social justice organisations. Although born in Edinburgh and living for most of her life in the south of England, Despard (whose father was Irish) was a key supporter of Irish nationalism and co-founded the Irish Women's Franchise League in 1908. At one point, Despard operated a jam-making enterprise on her property as a means of

providing employment independent of Britain, food independent of colonial control, and vegetarian produce free of nonhuman animal suffering (Farr, 2019) (she would likely be horrified that a modern London pub in her name and neighbourhood sells all manner of nonhuman animal bodies on its snacking menu).

Although her tactical and organisational accomplishments in the field of social justice are many, for the purposes of this chapter, we focus on her contributions to nonhuman animal liberation. In this area, she dedicated particular attention to anti-vivisection work in London. Despard took the lead on the 1906 erection of a statuesque fountain in Battersea to commemorate some of the victims of the exploding and controversial vivisection industry. The statue depicted a small, stray dog who had been publicly vivisected upon in 1903 at University College London. The subsequent campaign and its associated legal case are probably best remembered in the nonhuman animal rights annals as the 'Brown Dog Affair' (less graciously known as the 'Brown Dog Riots') (Lansbury, 1985). Battersea was strategically chosen as the statue's location as it was home to England's largest dog shelter. Though the borough was a poor one, it also enjoyed a rather democratic (and anti-vivisectionist) council and offered housing estates that were a point of pride. The small brown dog, just one of the hundreds vivisected at University College London that year, stood atop the statue in one of these estates. More than a symbolic protest against vivisection, the little dog came to represent the injustices experienced by the residents of humble Battersea and beyond, all those who had been languishing under a rigid class system. Despard was far from working class herself, but she was nonetheless accepted as a local resident in the industrial Nine Elms area of London (Farr, 2019).

The statue quickly became a lightning rod in the clash between University College London, its students, and middle- and upper-class medical practitioners, and the disenfranchised women, Irish immigrants, working-class labourers and slum-dwellers. As one historian observes: 'the brown dog stared across to the neat ranks of council houses, and if ever a riot had been deliberately instigated, this was it' (Lansbury, 1985: 15). University students, boisterous, male, and intent on preserving their threatened power and entitlement, descended on the borough with sledgehammers and crowbars to (unsuccessfully) dismantle the statue, and were met with retaliatory bonfires on campus. Participants on both sides of the row were arrested, including Despard. In a later attempt, pro-vivisection medical students created trouble in Trafalgar Square, engaging in fights with the working-class men there and necessitating police intervention. They then attempted an attack on the flagship National Anti-Vivisection Hospital in Battersea (later Battersea General Hospital), an institution designed to defy prevailing medical authority by providing treatment without the need for vivisection

or state support (Bates, 2017). Anti-vivisection meetings were also targeted by pro-vivisection students, leading to considerable violent disruption.

In this remarkable campaign, activists not only recognised the terrible injustices enacted on nonhuman animals, but also the deeply entangled nature of human and nonhuman oppression. The blatant torture of nonhuman animals in scientific and medical establishments for the privilege of the elite, and rationalised by the elite as being in the so-called 'greater good', represented similar sufferings enacted on vulnerable human groups. In some cases, the sufferings were identical – humans were frequently forced or coerced into vivisection, especially women, children, poor persons and enslaved persons (Beecher, 1959; Savitt, 1982; Kenny, 2015). With many suffragettes on the forefront of anti-vivisection campaigning, the women's movement soon became conflated with the nonhuman animal rights movement (Donald, 2019). Yet, as the working classes continued to step up to protect the statue (and what it represented), this conflation shifted. When council leadership in Battersea moved away from the political left in 1908, for instance, the brown dog came to symbolise the threat of socialism (Lansbury, 1985). The working-class character of the borough became a point of vulnerability when the citizens were ordered to pay for the heavy policing required to deal with constant rioting the statue provoked. Although anti-vivisectionist leaders moved quickly for an injunction, the council moved quicker, and in 1910, under cover of darkness, the brown dog was removed with the protective assistance of 120 policemen. Just over a week later, a crowd of 3,000 assembled in Trafalgar Square to hear stirring anti-vivisection orations and calls for the dog to be reinstalled, but the original statue was never seen again.

Almost simultaneously, women in Scotland were battling similar heavy-handedness and what they experienced as oppressive London-centric sentiment. In 1908, the Research Defence Society in Britain was formed in an attempt to counter the increase in anti-vivisection narratives and activities. In 1911, a dispute between the Scottish Branch of the National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS) and its national representatives from England saw its female activists at the helm of the breakaway Scottish Co-operative Anti-Vivisection Society, looking to achieve 'financial independence' but 'friendly cooperation' with the UK-wide organisation. Like Despard, these (mostly middle-class) women were supporters of the women's suffrage and other social movements of the time, often outspoken and frequently adorned with sandwich board campaign slogans. Included in an address to their 1911 meeting by activist Louise Lumsden, was an important sentiment: 'to bring before them ... the danger to human beings involved in this practise of vivisection' (Kean and Pakeman, 2013: 1).

More than a century on, vivisection continues practically unabated. The medical institution, now greatly industrialised, has monetised the practice.

Millions continue to suffer and die in the name of research, usually for unnecessary studies and product development (Hermann and Jayne, 2019). Vivisection is now protected by secrecy and a veil of welfare laws that make civil the very barbaric reality of nonhuman animals' experiences. However, the public's attitude towards vivisection is considerably more sceptical today, at least with regard to familiar species such as dogs, cats, monkeys and apes. More welfare laws exist to at least alleviate some of the pain, stress and poor living conditions endured by individuals in some experiments (Hall and Favre, 2004). In 1985, the National Anti-Vivisection Society (originally formed as the 'Victoria Street Society' by Despard's contemporary Frances Power Cobbe a century before) reinstated a new statue in Battersea Park, and more recently, author of the fictionalised *Little Brown Dog* (2021), Paula Owen, has created a replica based on original photographs, which she is campaigning to install in the original Latchmere location (Thorpe, 2021).

Despard's campaign ultimately failed when the justice system sided with the powerful medical establishment, but her effort was nonetheless groundbreaking as the largest protest against speciesism of the time. Her efforts to mobilise change simultaneously across a number of causes in a concerted effort to resist oppression also illustrates her awareness of the intersectional nature of multispecies advocacy. Even the single-issue brown dog campaign was not isolated in its reach. Despard intentionally chose the location and framing of the protest to draw on parallel campaigns and the momentum of communities who recognised a shared enemy. It is exactly this intersectional awareness that green criminologists such as Beirne and South (2007: xx) believe to be key to overthrowing multigenerational harms that have manifested in 'gender inequalities, racism, dominionism and speciesism, classism, the north/south divide, the [lack of] accountability of science, and the [lacking] ethics of global capitalist expansion'. The success of social justice and ecological movements, in other words, will depend on solidarity across campaigns as Despard's efforts helped to initiate.

Patty Mark and modern anti-speciesist activism

As the nonhuman animal rights movement entered its second wave in the 1970s, activists were heavily influenced by the grassroots, direct action of the American civil rights movement and tended to operate outside of the large non-profit institutions that had grown increasingly conservative since their establishment in the Victorian era (Ryder, 1989; Wrenn, 2019). The Animal Liberation Front (ALF), frustrated with peaceful protest and slow-moving non-profits, began to physically disrupt laboratories, 'fur' farms and other speciesist industries. In doing so, they filmed and photographed spaces that were largely unknown to the public. This material was vital for

galvanising the movement, with many images gathered by ALF activists featuring in the campaigning materials for grassroot groups and charities. However, the ALF also pursued property damage as a strategy of economic disruption, a tactic that backfired by decreasing public support for the cause and heightening legal restrictions on anti-speciesist activism. The United States' Animal Enterprise Protection Act of 1992, for instance, was designed in response to ALF interferences (in 2006 it was strengthened and renamed the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act) (Fiber-Ostrow and Lovell, 2016). Similar legislative (and many argue, disproportionate) restrictions were placed upon activism in the UK in response to the increase in nonhuman animal rights activism throughout the late 1990s and at the turn of the 21st century, for example, Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty and other anti-vivisection campaigns (see Ellefsen and Busher, 2020) prompted similar amendments to several UK Bills, though open rescue was not a much-utilised British tactic.

Also in the 1990s, the Western nonhuman animal rights movement entered another phase of transition (Wrenn, 2019). The grassroots, direct action approach that had characterised mobilisation in the 1970s and 1980s was giving way to the professional non-profit pathway. The ALF lost crucial movement support and became a far more marginal player. Yet, the materials the ALF were able to source through illegal entries were essential for campaigning, and the direct interference with speciesism was still seen as admirable and motivating.

In 1978, Australian Patty Mark was organising what would become one of her country's leading anti-speciesist charities, Animal Liberation Victoria. At the time, no other organisation in that country with its vast expanse of agricultural land was campaigning for farmed nonhuman animals (ALV, nd). By the 1990s, Mark, vegetarian since 1974 and vegan since 1991, had developed open rescue as a middle-ground tactic that was *not* intentionally clandestine as was typical of the ALF but *was* intentionally and directly disruptive – atypical among competing charities. Starting in 1993, Mark would regularly enter facilities such as chicken barns or piggeries, alert the media to her plans, and remove injured nonhuman animals in broad daylight. Following her first open rescue, Mark mused of its utility in demonstrating the reality of speciesism to the world: 'How could we expect the general public to comprehend the situation without visual proof?' (OpenRescue.org, 2003). In some cases, Mark and fellow activists would liberate nonhuman animals, then chain themselves to the farms (what they termed as a 'lock-on'), again, without secrecy or property damage. The impact was effective, not only in documenting the horrors within, but also in gaining media coverage to heighten public awareness of the brutal reality of nonhuman animal 'farming', despite the risk to their own liberty. Open rescue as a tactic has since become a valuable staple in the repertoire of many within the nonhuman animal rights movement.

Open rescue, as Mark developed it, is an intentional and strategic challenge to the law. First, open rescue rejects the validity of laws that commodify sentient beings as owned property. The act of rescue is a protest against the legalised, widespread killing of other animals. Open rescue is distinct from 'intervention purchases' in which activists buy nonhuman animals (usually 'livestock') to spare them from slaughter or other nefarious ends. Other activists often frown on this approach as it does little to disrupt the commodity status of nonhuman animals, maintains the profitability of the system, and does not prevent the replacement of those rescued nonhuman animals by the sellers. By way of an example, the Friends of Philip Fish Sanctuary[1] monitor 'pet' shops and Craigslist (a classified advertisement website) for vulnerable nonhuman animals, offering them a safe home, but not compensating the 'owners'. In the case of 'pet' shops, it is usually the fishes who are near death and unlikely to sell that are released to the sanctuary by management. The sanctuary then documents the fishes' recovery and improved quality of life on Facebook and Instagram, where the experiences of Philip and his comrades become educational resources.

In most cases, however, activists enter industrial farming facilities which house hundreds if not thousands of inmates. Unlike 'pet' shops, security measures are far more foreboding in nonhuman animal agriculture. It is not possible to rescue all nonhuman animals, nor is it even possible to rescue those who appear to be experiencing greater than normal levels of pain and stress. This tactic comes at considerable psychological cost to activists (Gorski et al, 2019) as they come face to face with speciesism at its worst. It is fair to say that most activists rarely witness extreme speciesist violence against living nonhumans, such as 'slaughter', given that most speciesist industries are located in rural, isolated and protected areas. Worse still, liberators must make the wrenching decision of who to rescue from a sea of suffering, crying and desperate prisoners. Activists will often negotiate adoptive homes and sanctuaries for survivors before and after rescues, but it is generally the case that a small number of activists (between one and five) will enter a facility and abscond with as many nonhuman animals as possible, though this may not be many. Although limited in their capacity, liberation for even a tiny percentage is a monumental achievement, and an unquantifiable delight for the birds, pigs, rabbits, rats and others removed from farms and laboratories, able thereafter to live their lives naturally with dignity, care, medical attention and rehabilitative therapy. Shelters, sanctuaries and activist collectives frequently document these journeys. For example, vegan-run Tribe Animal Sanctuary Scotland is home to dozens of nonhuman animals, including turkeys, pigs, cows, donkeys and goats. Narratives of their lives and liberation are publicly detailed for educational purposes (TASS, 2017).

The second premise of open rescue is to gather information. Activists enter speciesist facilities not only to directly rescue victims, but also to

document the reality of living and dying conditions. Advertisements for some restaurants, for instance, regularly depict nonhumans as happy captives who look forward to their death for human consumption (for example, cartoons of smiling pigs relaxing atop barbeques, or dressed as chefs). Nonhuman animal agriculture operates in relative secrecy compared with the rest of the food system. By way of example, exceedingly few farmers open the doors to their layer hen housing systems for public tours, not least because the noxious levels of ammonia and chicken litter would make doing so unsafe (farmers themselves typically must suit up in protective gear to enter) (HSE, 2017). More importantly, though, the conditions required to mass produce affordable nonhuman animal products will never match the advertised (more palatable) ideal that is presented to consumers. The nonhuman animal agriculture industry is rightfully concerned with the negative potential of exposure, leading to a series of 'ag gag' laws across the United States and Canada (Sorenson, 2016). These legislative manoeuvres criminalise whistle-blowing from within the industry's ranks, rendering possible allies silent.

Third, open rescue is designed to invite media coverage and sometimes even police involvement. Direct Action Everywhere, for instance, regularly enters farming establishments to remove suffering nonhuman animals and welcomes arrest, hoping to utilise the opportunity within the legal system to challenge speciesist laws. Direct Action Everywhere operates an Open Rescue Network, formed in 2015 by activist Wayne Hsiung, who was convicted of felony larceny in late 2021 for liberating a sick six-week-old baby goat from a North Carolina farm. Hsiung (2021) cites Ganz's sociological concept of 'strategic capacity' in defence of what he believes to be morally obligatory in such circumstances, and states: 'by going in with our faces proudly uncovered, we dare the industry to try our actions in the court of public opinion' (2021: np), a rationale that reflects that which Mark initiated almost 30 years prior. Also aligned with Mark's open rescue strategy is the direct activism of various environmental campaigners. This might include interference with any proposed ecologically damaging development projects, by way of camps and vigils or lock-ons to bulldozers, trees or corporate offices. So-called 'ecoterrorists' join so-called 'animal rights terrorists' on government watch lists, despite their goals of preserving life and liberty by disrupting the 'corporate colonisation of nature' (South, 2007: 230). The comparison with the well-documented political activism of women's liberation and civil rights across time is also clearly evident (Sturgeon, 1997). Consider, for instance, suffragette Emily Davidson's fatal trespass onto Epsom racecourse in 1913, the Miss America beauty pageant demonstrations of 1968, or more recently, 21st-century Russian feminist performance protestors, Pussy Riot, objecting to state oppression.

Sarah Kistle and intersectional anti-speciesism

Like activists of the second wave, third wave anti-speciesists continue to be influenced by civil rights efforts. The language of anti-slavery abolition, for instance, persists among radicals who hope to liberate other animals entirely from speciesism, while campaigns draw on modern civil rights themes including intersectionality, food justice and challenges to carceral logics (Sturgeon, 1997). This contemporary style of activism resists the criminal justice system and its oppression of vulnerable humans and other animals, but does so in developing alternatives to speciesism and by building alliances across social justice movements (Phillips and Rumens, 2016). The efforts of Sarah Kistle[2] exemplify this approach. Kistle is an adopted Korean-American activist who pioneered intersectional social justice work in the Western nonhuman animal rights movement in the early 2010s. A long-time vegan, she began her activist career volunteering in the abolitionist faction of the movement through extensive social media campaigning and the founding of the short-lived Abolitionist Vegan Society. Abolitionism pushes for the total liberation of other animals and is explicitly critical of the dominant welfarist paradigm in the movement, a paradigm which primarily seeks to improve living and working conditions of commodified nonhuman animals through legal initiatives (Wrenn, 2016). Abolitionist theory, by contrast, is deeply critical of the legal system, positing that the property status of nonhuman animals renders impotent any liberatory ambitions, offering instead merely ameliorative results, successful only where they prove profitable to speciesist industries. Abolitionists are divided on whether the legal system is at all useful for achieving liberation. 'Animal rights' itself is a contested term, believed by some to be a project intent on realising actual legal rights for other animals, while for others it is shorthand for a more general approach to opposing speciesism.

Abolitionism in nonhuman animal rights was developed by philosopher and environmental ethicist Tom Regan (1984). Regan often spoke of nonhuman animals in terms of their 'inherent value'. This concept aligns with that of individual rights: 'the formal principle of justice stipulates that each individual is to be given his or her due' (Regan, 1984: 263). He furthered that 'the rights view will not be satisfied with anything less than the total dissolution of the animal industry as we know it' (1984: 395), but just how to achieve such abolition using the legal system is questionable. The ending of many practices falls within welfarism rather than abolitionism (for example, killing without stunning first: stunning was eventually supported by the industry as it made the process more efficient) (Welty, 2007), or simply pushes the practise elsewhere (which has been the case with outlawing horse slaughter in the United States) (*Meat Trades Journal*, 2012).

A century prior, however, recall that abolitionists became disillusioned with the capabilities of the law following failed efforts to curb vivisection. Frances Power Cobbe, instrumental in bringing to fruition Britain's Cruelty to Animals Act in 1876, hoped to make vivisection legally difficult to engage in, and to restrict the use of nonhuman animals in science. Instead, the Act had the opposite effect, creating a veneer of legitimacy to, and state approval of, the blossoming industry. Cobbe was incensed, thereafter committing herself and her organisation to an abolitionist approach, hoping to end rather than regulate the practise (Bates, 2017). Since then, the legal and criminal justice systems have merely strengthened support for animal-based industries. Rather than reduce society's reliance on speciesism, industrialisation has rationalised and expanded it. Today, the number of nonhuman animals who are harmed and killed for food, clothing, entertainment, product development, medicine, companionship, labour and land acquisition is so vast it is not possible to estimate with any accuracy. Subsequently, abolitionists today remain deeply critical of the legal system's ability to acknowledge fairness for all of earth's sentient inhabitants, but increasingly they draw on the language of social justice to increase recognition of nonhuman animals as stakeholders and individuals, worthy of rights and recognition.

Furthermore, vegan abolitionism of the nonhuman animal rights movement's third wave insists that resistance to the oppression of nonhuman animals is inherently linked to that of marginalised human groups. Kistle (2015) suggests that any notion that people of colour, or women, are less worthy of anti-speciesists' attention is a reflection of the white-supremacy and androcentrism that continues to plague movement structures (Kistle, 2015). The growing cultural presence of Black Lives Matter proved to be a turning point in the vegan abolitionist faction, with some activists embracing intersectional values and others rejecting the relevance of other movements. By the mid-2010s, Kistle was disinvested in social media activism and brought her charity, the Abolitionist Vegan Society, to a close. To some extent, this was a response to the intense racism she experienced in the nonhuman animal rights movement (Wrenn, 2019), but Kistle was also drawn to the possibilities of collaborating more directly with Black Lives Matter, particularly given its heightened activity where she lived, in Minneapolis.

Among others, Kistle assisted activist and father-of-four Louis Hunter during and after criminal trial where he had been wrongfully arrested and falsely accused of throwing missiles at police while protesting the fatal police shooting of his cousin. Following extensive and relentless campaigning by numerous activists (organised in part by Kistle), the case was dismissed. Following the ordeal, Hunter went on to collaborate in community food justice with Kistle and her partner, launching a food truck to serve, heal and connect the surrounding communities with healthy vegan comfort food. Successful vegan pop-up restaurants followed until finally, funded

by the community, the three opened a permanent vegan restaurant, Trio Plant-Based (2020). Understanding the importance of community activism against injustice and oppression, Kistle's approach was unique at a time when the emerging third wave of nonhuman animal activism was just coming to remember and reimagine the importance of intersectional activism. It is an approach that, at the time of writing, is widely acknowledged as important in anti-speciesism campaigning. But this taken-for-grantedness was hard won by the likes of determined women of colour such as Kistle.

Conclusion

There is something to be said about the goals and motivations of these women, and the millions of other women like them, who risk personal safety and liberty to advocate for other animals in a society that has legalised speciesism and criminalised anti-speciesism. Although environmental wellbeing is of concern to anti-speciesist activists, it can in some cases be secondary in importance. The effort to gender green criminology is commendable in drawing attention to the explicitly patriarchal motivation behind men's war on nature, but anti-speciesism can sometimes make for an awkward disciplinary inclusion. These women are not just eco-feminists, they are social justice activists. The growing attention to nonhuman animals in green criminology is an important development in the recognition of nonhuman personhood, but to truly recognise their personhood, scholars will need to retrieve nonhuman animals from the wilderness of 'other'. Most nonhuman animals that humans interact with exist *within* human society, languishing in aquariums, zoos, pet shops, laboratories, feedlots, dairies, battery cages, live export cargo ships, transport trucks and slaughterhouses. Many others interact with us in more categorically ambiguous spaces such as parks, cities and homes. Indeed, millions of species inhabit areas we would typically categorise as 'green', but just as we would not subsume feminist criminology to green criminology because of the stereotypical association between women and nature, we should be likewise hesitant to do the same with other animals. Anti-speciesism is not just a matter of environmental justice, it is a matter of *social* justice.

Given the speciesist, sexist, racist and classist nature of many social institutions, some activists have opted to circumvent institutional means for social change, opting instead for a variety of physically and ideologically disruptive tactics. While various waves have been characterised by different tactical styles, many strategies have persisted across time (Sturgeon, 1997). Open rescue today remains a staple of anti-speciesist resistance, for instance, while intersectional campaigning is perhaps even stronger in 21st-century campaigning than it was in the 19th century. Modern vegan feminists, for instance, regularly employ food justice as a means to liberate human and

nonhuman animals alike. Across all activist generations, the recognition that the criminal justice system must be interrogated if not outright provoked is evident. The criminalisation of certain ecological and environmental harms, but not others, reflects the anthropocentric nature of the system (White, 2007) as well as its tendency to protect the interests of upper-middle-class white men. Achieving social justice for so many nonhuman animals, women, people of colour, working-class individuals, and other marginalised groups, can and will happen with intersectional discourse and an interdisciplinary approach (Cudworth, 2005; South, 2014). Social equity and environmental justice *is* possible (Lynch and Stretsky, 2003) if scholars and activists are willing to engage the moral logic of anti-speciesism within the wider eco-feminist movement and green criminological perspectives.

Notes

1 This rescue group is named in honour of Philip, the organisation's first rescue beta.

2 For many years Sarah went by the name of Sarah K. Woodcock, particularly during the years when the Abolitionist Vegan Society was active.

References

Adams, C.J. (1991) Ecofeminism and the eating of animals. *Hypatia*, 6(1), 125–45.

ALV (Animal Liberation Victoria) (nd) About ALV. Available at: https://www.alv.org.au/the-facts/about-alv/ (accessed 20 May 2022).

Bates, A. (2017) *Anti-Vivisection and the Profession of Medicine in Britain: A Social History*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beecher, H.K. (1959) Experimentation in man. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 169(1), 461–78.

Beirne, P. and South, N. (eds) (2007) *Issues in Green Criminology: Confronting Harms against Environments, Humanity and Other Animals*. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Crenshaw, K. (1991) Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–99.

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

Donald, D. (2020) *Women against Cruelty: Protection of Animals in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ellefsen, R. and Busher, J. (2020) The dynamics of restraint in the Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty campaign. *Perspectives on Terrorism Special Issue: Restraint in Terrorist Groups and Radical Milieus*, 14(6), 165–79.

Farr, M. (2019) Charlotte Despard: Suffragist, vegetarian, radical. Available at: www.exploringsurreyspast.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Charlotte-Despard-full-text-for-PDF2.pdf (accessed 28 January 2022).

Ferguson, M. (1998) *Animal Advocacy and Englishwomen, 1780–1900*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fiber-Ostrow, P. and Lovell, J.S. (2016) Behind a veil of secrecy: Animal abuse, factory farms, and Ag-Gag legislation. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19(2), 230–49.

Foster, E. (2021) Ecofeminism revisited: Critical insights on contemporary environmental governance. *Feminist Theory*, 22(2), 190–205.

Gaard, G. (2002) Vegetarian ecofeminism. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 23(3), 117–46.

Gaarder, E. (2011) *Women and the Animal Rights Movement*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Gorski, P., Lopresti-Goodman, S. and Rising, D. (2019) 'Nobody's paying me to cry': The causes of activist burnout in United States animal rights activists. *Social Movement Studies*, 18(3), 364–80.

Groves, J. (2001) Animal rights and the politics of emotion. In J. Goodwin, J. Jasper, and F. Polletta (eds) *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp 212–32.

Hall, C.F. and Favre, D.S. (2004) Comparative animal welfare laws. Available at: www.animallaw.info/article/comparative-national-animal-welfare-laws-0 (accessed 30 April 2022).

Hermann, K. and Jayne, K. (eds) (2019) Animal experimentation: Working towards a paradigm change.

HSE (Health & Safety Executive) (2017) *Farmwise: Your Essential Guide to Health and Safety in Agriculture*, 3rd edn. London: The Stationery Office.

Hsiung, W. (2021) The trial of Open Rescue. Available at: https://simplehe art.substack.com/p/the-trial-of-open-rescue (accessed 27 January 2022).

Kean, H. (1998) *Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain Since 1800*. London: Reaktion Books.

Kean, H. and Pakeman, D. (2013) Report on origins of SSPV. Available at: www.onekind.scot/wp-content/uploads/Origins-of-SSPV-by-Hilda-Kean.pdf (accessed 28 January 2022).

Kenny, S.C. (2015) Power, opportunism, racism: Human experiments under American racism. *Endeavour*, 39(1), 10–20.

Kistle, S. (2015) 'It is anything but': Sarah K. Woodcock comments on equality in abolitionist spaces. [Blog]. Available at: http://academicactivistvegan.blogspot.com/ (accessed 14 February 2022).

Lahar, S. (1991) Ecofeminist theory and grassroots politics. *Hypatia*, 6(1), 28–45.

Lansbury, C. (1985) *The Old Brown Dog: Women, Workers, and Vivisection Edwardian England*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Leneman, L. (1997) The awakened instinct: Vegetarianism and the women's suffrage movement in Britain. *Women's History Review*, 6(2), 271–87.

Lynch, M.J. and Stretsky, P.B. (2003) The meaning of green: Contrasting criminological perspectives. *Theoretical Criminology*, 7(2), 217–38.

Meat Trades Journal (2012) Horse slaughter ban has lessons, says US speaker. *Meat Trades Journal*, 22 June, p 13.

OpenRescue.org (2003) Latest news: Interview with Open Rescue pioneer Patty Mark. Available at: www.openrescue.org/news/20030327.html (accessed 14 February 2022).

Owen, P. (2021) *Little Brown Dog*. Aberystwyth: Honno Welsh Women's Press.

Phillips, M. and Rumens, N. (2016) *Contemporary Perspectives on Ecofeminism*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Regan, T. (1984) *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ryder, R. (1989) *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Toward Speciesism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Savitt, T.L. (1982) The use of blacks for medical experimentation and demonstration in the old south. *The Journal of Southern History*, 48(3), 331–48.

Singer, P. (1975) *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*. New York: New York Review.

Sollund, R. (2021) Green criminology: Its foundation in critical criminology and the way forward. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 60(3), 304–22.

Sorenson, J. (2016) *Constructing Ecoterrorism: Capitalism, Speciesism and Animal Rights*. Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

South, N. (2007) The 'corporate colonization of nature': Bio-prospecting, bio-piracy and the development of green criminology. In P. Beirne and N. South (eds) *Issues in Green Criminology: Confronting Harms against Environments, Humanity and Other Animals*. Devon: Willan Publishing, pp 230–47.

South, N. (2014) Green criminology: Reflections, corrections, horizons. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 3(2), 6–21.

Sturgeon, N. (1997) *Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, Feminist Theory and Political Action*. Abingdon: Routledge.

TASS (Tribe Animal Sanctuary Scotland) (2017) Our animals. *TASS*. Available at: https://tribesanctuary.co.uk/our-animals/ (accessed 12 February 2022).

Taylor, N. and Fitzgerald, A. (2018) Understanding animal ab(use): Green criminological contributions, missed opportunities and a way forward. *Theoretical Criminology*, 22(3), 402–25.

Thorpe, V. (2021) How the cruel death of a little stray dog led to riots in 1900s Britain. *The Guardian*, 12 September. Available at: www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2021/sep/12/how-the-cruel-death-of-a-little-stray-dog-led-to-riots-in-1900s-britain (accessed 6 January 2022).

Trio Plant-Based (2020) Our story. *Trio Plant-Based*. Available at: www.triopl ant-based.com/our-story (accessed 20 May 2022).

Ulrich, L.T. (2007) *Why Well-Behaved Women Seldom Make History*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Unger, N. (2012) *Beyond Nature's Housekeepers: American Women in Environmental History*. London: Oxford University Press.

Welty, J. (2007) Humane slaughter laws. *Law & Contemporary Problems*, 70(1), 175–206.

White, R. (2007) Green criminology and the pursuit of social and ecological justice. In P. Beirne and N. South (eds) *Issues in Green Criminology: Confronting Harms against Environments, Humanity and Other Animals*. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Wrenn, C. (2016) *A Rational Approach to Animal Rights: Extensions in Abolitionist Theory*. London: Palgrave.

Wrenn, C. (2019) *Piecemeal Protest: Animal Rights in the Age of Nonprofits*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.