

Abolitionist vegans reject violence, including (a) direct violence, (b) racism, sexism, heterosexism, ageism, speciesism, and other forms of indirect violence and prejudice, as well as (c) the promotion of violence toward nonhuman animals through campaigns that promote regulating rather than abolishing animal use (e.g., campaigns that encourage ‘cutting back’ on animal use, vegetarianism, ‘reforming’ animal use to make it more ‘humane’, domestication, single-issue uses of nonhuman animals, and so on).



In 1979, veganism was formally defined by the Vegan Society as “a philosophy and way of living which seeks to exclude — as far as is possible and practicable — all forms of exploitation of, and cruelty to, animals for food, clothing or any other purpose; and by extension, promotes the development and use of animal-free alternatives for the benefit of humans, animals and the environment.”

Recommended Reading by Gary L. Francione and Anna Charlton

- *Eat Like You Care*
- *Animal Rights: The Abolitionist Approach*
- *Advocate for Animals: An Abolitionist Vegan Handbook*

Why Abolitionist Veganism?

HowDoIgoVegan.com

AbolitionistApproach.com



HowDoIGoVegan.com

AbolitionistApproach.com

©2018 Gary L. Francione and Anna E. Charlton. Distribution by other individuals or organisations does not necessarily indicate approval by the authors of any views other than those contained herein.

What is Abolitionist Veganism?

Abolitionist veganism is a position developed by Gary L. Francione that fills in some of veganism's moral and practical gaps.

What veganism requires in terms of nonhuman animals is clear: we shouldn't use them. The definition focuses almost entirely on veganism as a way of acting, not a way of thinking. This focus on practice has resulted in a number of problems, questions, and debates as to

- * what is and is not vegan
- * what are the morally appropriate and practically effective ways to advocate veganism
- * whether veganism addresses human exploitation
- * what obligation, if any, do we have to adopt or care for domesticated animals
- * whether domestication and veganism are compatible
- * whether people who reject nonviolence are vegan, and so on.

Abolitionist veganism answers a number of these questions.

For those hoping for a broad view of justice, there is a lot missing from the original definition of veganism.

Abolitionist vegans adopt and promote the standard definition of veganism as a moral baseline, reject violence toward both human and nonhumans clearly, broadly, and by definition, and promote a position in which animals are understood as moral persons and members of the moral community.

The abolitionist position, developed by Gary L. Francione, stands out from other positions with its insistence on veganism as a baseline, its focus on sentience, its inclusion of human and nonhuman beings, its rejection of campaigns that will result in changes in how animals are used rather than the abolition of that use, as well as its focus on an evidence-based approach to change.

Abolitionist veganism: an evidence-based approach.

Abolitionists reject welfare reform on moral principle, but also on practical grounds based on the available evidence. Over the last 30 years or so, welfare campaigns have encouraged people to eat 'humane' animal products. That encouragement has correlated with a per capita increase in the quantity of animal products consumed.

As such, animal advocacy that has focused on reform measures has failed, obviously and consistently, to help animals in the short-term as well as to build long-term change; instead, it has increased the public's comfort with eating 'the right' animal products, as evidenced by the growth of the 'humane' animal products market. This failure has encouraged some welfare proponents to promote the use of violence in place of education and dialogue.

In contrast, abolitionists promote creative, nonviolent vegan outreach, education and community organizing as the groundwork to abolish animal use.