

I have personally crawled through many fur farms, cattle rearing farms, poultry houses and pig barns and I am still surprised that all of this is real.

I have seen minks, ferrets and arctic foxes being killed so that an image obsessed slut could feel luxurious and sexy; lonely calves confined to small boxes, torn away from their mothers and their milk, because milk belongs to the business and calves to the slaughter houses; pigs sitting and gagging in shit, their own as well as others; purposely distorted chicks that are then called broiler chickens, who are advertised as healthy and tasty meat; and I have seen hens - madly cackling and half-lunatic egg machines - covered on feathers; and I saw that all is so damn hard. I have witnessed many other terrible abuses that the judiciary system as well as the mainstream society either endorse outright or are complicit with through their silence.

I could hope that one day a change will come and I can strive towards that future. It's just that... what about the animals whose lives, at this very moment, are maimed?

**I don't harm
if I don't have to**

Michal Kolesár

Michal Kolesár 2009

michalkolesar.net
directaction.info
realita.tv





It is important to do these actions and it is also important to talk about why we do them. To talk about why it is not normal to keep animals in such conditions and for the purpose of slaughter. But liberate them from such a life is normal.



To those who say that saving eleven or three hundred or one hen is only symbolical, I answer: If there was three hundred people drowning in water and you saved only one, would that be symbolical?

into my foot, which will remain there forever, they took a bit of my pelvis with which they filled a hole in my heel and because it was not enough they filled the rest with ceramics. I had another operation the next day because one of the wires got badly between the bones. The doctors told me that I'll have problems with that foot from now on.

Now I am back from hospital, but I spend most of the time lying down with my foot up, because in any other position it gets swollen quite quickly and it gets a kind of happy and healthy looking violet colour. Unfortunately, after the operations there were further problems: part of the foot (the instep and three fingers) are affected by osteoporosis.

I think that considering the height, the type of fall and the surface on which I fell, I was incredibly lucky. The years of training martial arts were certainly very useful, because I learned quick reactions and techniques of falling. Now I'll be going through physiotherapy and later I'll return to the investigations and rescues. I am not worried about the injury, but rather about it distracting me from work.

My colleague and friend took in her arms one chicken from the first building we entered that night, and couple of days after the accident my friends from SaboTiere went to the poultry farm where the accident had happened and rescued two hens and in another farm they took 13 of them. I therefore have a lot of reasons to smile.



Because the animals do not care if you wear or not a mask

Speech at Tierrechtskongress Wien 2008 (Austria), Nebudme zvery 2008 (Bratislava, Slovakia), Animal Liberation Fest 2009 (Brno, Czech Republic)

I have personally crawled through many fur farms, cattle rearing farms, poultry houses and pig barns and I am still surprised that all of this is real.

I have seen minks, ferrets and arctic foxes being killed so that an image-obsessed slut could feel luxurious and sexy; lonely calves confined to small boxes, torn away from their mothers and their milk, because milk belongs to the business and calves to the slaughter houses; pigs sitting and gagging in shit, their own as well as others; purposely distorted chicks that are then called broiler chickens, who are advertised as healthy and tasty meat; and I have seen hens - madly cackling and half-lunatic egg machines - covered on feathers; and I saw that all is so damn hard. I have witnessed many other terrible abuses that the judiciary system as well as the mainstream society either endorse outright or are complicit with through their silence.

I could hope that one day a change will come and I can strive towards that future. It's just that... what about the animals whose lives, at this very moment, are maimed?

I can feel empathy and I can pity them when someone has taken them as mere properties - as if they didn't have own interests that makes it something unthinkable - but I have to leave them in that condition. That is what the law states.

The question is simple as is the answer. If the law goes against life what is more important, life or law? Life.

Chapter one: They call me a Terrorist

It is convenient as well as dangerous for a society full of lies and half-truths, following a policy of domestication, to criminalise and demonise and therefore disqualify any inconvenient action and apply to those acts the attributes of extremists or terrorists. Such manipulation of words leads to their meaning being lost.

Is there really no difference, or is it imperceptible, between me; who has never hurt or killed while reaching my targets and between those who maim people with their bomb attacks? Words are very flexible and easily misused and propaganda (as well as dull people) loves stigmas as it makes it possible to distinguish not according to acts but according to those stigmas.

If they call me a terrorist because I have cut a few fences, sometimes broken a door or a window so I could get into places where the sun does not shine, to expose and record that which cannot be seen in adverts; the immense misery and anguish normally hidden from view. And if I am called a terrorist because I take away animals from these places of anguish to where they are loved and safe, what should we call those who put the animals in there, spoil their lives, make business from their spoiled lives, kill them, eat them or defend all of it?

Not to break a law, if by breaking it one helps someone in need, in anguish or when their life is in jeopardy then I can see no virtue in that.

People took away from the (so called) livestock their personal and evolutionary freedom, reduced them to a production unit, shut them in the dark and concrete of the breeding farms and after a short life where their everyday reality is fear, boredom, pain and loneliness, they sent them to an execution line in a slaughterhouse. This is terror. It's real and protected; by the culture, the economy and also by politics. It's sacred by the superiority of the humans over any other kind of life and because of this superiority it's also non-punishable.

To hell with this protection and sacredness.

Chapter two: What are laws good for where money rules? Gaius Titus Petronius

There is a lot we can do for the animal's benefit without breaking valid laws but I am convinced that it is not enough and also that the belief in the change through a law - if the law is supposed to be the basic instrument and the goal - is counterproductive.

I cannot see what the future holds. It is only through my own thoughts and experience that I have reached the conclusion that the world as it is, while constructing and upholding the mentality of the labour camp, market-hall

activities. Be it from the state, the industry, the non-profit sector, the majority or minority public opinion. We are an anti-terrorist, not a terrorist movement.

You made the first open rescue in a fox farm, can you talk about that action?

I don't think it is important whether it was the first or not. I am not in a race. We just took six foxes from a small farm where they had been kept probably for training burrow hunting dogs and we drove them to various places where we let them free. I hope they are OK. I only regret that there appeared complications during the action itself, so we had to disappear quickly and we could not take more animals.

You usually do open rescues in egg farms? Why do you choose this type of farms?

The choice of animals and at the same time their numbers are determined by the capacity to provide a new home for them and what possibilities of transport we have.

How do you avoid getting arrested?

I am not trying to avoid it. I am not looking forward to it. I am not afraid. I won't chicken out.

You had an accident in a chicken rescue, can you tell us what happened?

It was in Austria during an investigation in a two storey hall, from where I hoped that we would also take some hens. I had a difficult week, several hours of driving, the previous day we were in approximately five buildings and this was the second building that night. What happened was a consequence of my carelessness and perhaps also due to my overall tiredness. I just couldn't stop, I slept little and worked a lot.

I was securing the ladder to the two people who went before me and then I went up an unsecured ladder. When I was on the last step and was about to get into the building, the ladder slipped down, collapsed to the ground and I went with it. I fell with my back against the ground and my feet got between the steps. From a height of about 4 metres and landing on a concrete surface.

The result is a triple comminuted fracture of the heel and the collapse of the foot arch. In the hospital they put my foot on ice for five days and after this I went for an operation. They wired bits of bones together, put nine screws

public workshops where I teach terrain reconnaissance, how to move, communicate, how to enter buildings, how to place sentries, what equipment to use, what to pay attention to, what are the police techniques for crime scene inspection and interrogation. I try to inspire and motivate other people in the Czech Republic and Slovakia to conduct investigations and rescues. There have been some results already.

What advantages do you find in open rescue compared to ALF raids?

The animals one takes somewhere from a farm don't care if you have a mask or not. But an open rescue means a greater chance of social change. Of course only when it is not perceived just as direct action, but also as part of an awareness campaign. It is important to do direct actions, but it is equally important to talk about why we do them. To talk about the fact that the enormous misery and suffering in which millions of animals are forced to live are not normal, but that it is normal not to leave them in such a misery and suffering.

Open rescue involves more confrontation with society which protects and supports the abuse of animals. One can see a person who doesn't hide or run away. It is, in my opinion, a stronger act of defiance. And it is harder to demonise us.

But my open rescues are not against or outside the Animal Liberation Front.

Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that the ALF is not only about rescuing animals.

Do you support the ALF?

Not only I support the ALF. I consider myself part of the Animal Liberation Front. Last year I was prosecuted with the possibility of a prison sentence of up to one year for promoting the ALF in a TV documentary about experiments on animals. The prosecution was later dropped by the state prosecutor.

Realita.tv informs about our fallen ones as well as about those in prisons. We translate news from Bite Back and other sources into Czech and Slovak. We also translate texts from the history and theory of the ALF. I am currently thinking about translating some chapters from the book *From Dusk 'til Dawn* by Keith Mann, to whom I send my greetings and whose book I promote.

I think that it is important to confront openly the demonisation of these

and slaughterhouse, cannot be distorted by agreement and cooperating. We must live against and away of such a mentality. In words and in acts we must sabotage and boycott the culture, economy and policy that abuses animals, including those that masquerades as their welfare. We must realise that an animal's life is not measured as „goods”, nor as „commodities” and that life belongs to those who live it no matter who attempts to manipulate it or makes claims of mastery over it.

I do not believe that law and its repressive animal protection can offer any real solution because it is solution reached by force and fear. (The law is based on force and fear. Without these twin instruments it cannot function.) I do not believe in wooing the so called powerful (I call it the asslick strategy) because it leads to the selection of reasons (both emotional and rational) according to how pleasant they seem to be, with no or little consideration, to the level of verity and honesty and it will sooner or later corrupt every single thought and render every human being toothless, unless this wooing of the powerful is abandoned.

I am convinced, that animal liberation (if that is possible) as a real and long-lasting change is not possible to reach only by fighting for animal liberation because what is happening to animals is not separated or independent from the rest of the world, its problems and solutions.

Here is an example. What do you want from a woman who gets up at six in the morning, prepares a snack for her children, goes to work for eight or ten tedious soul crushing hours in a job that never challenges her own wit and intelligence but is afraid of the consequences of losing it anyway? After the savage fantasy of wage slavery she goes home to the economic reality of domestic struggle and counts money for food and for the kids school; she cooks, does the washing, switches off by watching a soap opera and then she watches the news where she can see pictures from a slaughterhouse where animals are beaten or are cut up alive and in the following coverage she finds out about the rising prices of energy and consequently all prices will go up. Food, rent, transport... Which news will be worse for her? How much space and power is left for compassion? How much space and power is left for making the connection?

Chapter three: Grab a hen and run!

Animal liberation is not a matter of opinion. It is a fight for life. If we lose this awareness, it will be only a discussion about wasted lives and dead bodies. And from time to time a petition.

It is important to do these actions and it is also important to talk about why we do them. To talk about why it is not normal to keep animals in such conditions and for the purpose of slaughter. But liberate them from such a life is normal.

To those who say that saving eleven or three hundred or one hen is only symbolical, I answer: If there was three hundred people drowning in water and you saved only one, would that be symbolical?

The direct rescue of animals changes the present instead of dreaming of a better future. This is not about abstract lives but about concrete lives. It holds to the real priorities and destroys the pretended ones. The immediacy of saving a life is more important than possession, law, the will of the majority or a democratic choice.

You can do direct action hidden behind a mask. I used to wear one and I still sometimes do. Thanks to a hidden identity you can work longer and do a better job because without your identity nobody can fine you, bully you or put you in prison. Why open rescues then?

Because it is a stronger form of resistance. It means more confrontation with society, its values and the rules that determine those values. I am (according to the law) on private land, I take private property so I am a robber; but I say that I am not a robber because the animals that I take are not property and cannot be claimed as property. I do not respect the status quo that protects, supports and legitimizes animal abuse. I do not run away, I do not hide my identity, I say my name to a camera, I say my ID number, I publish the recordings from the actions.

It is easier to identify with the horror of the slaughterhouse (which makes my fists clenched so much I could die) when what can be seen is a real human face that shares the sheer dread with the animals. With an open rescue it is also much more difficult to demonise the person or to idolise them.

Interview for the magazine Accion Vegana (11/2008)

How is the animal liberation movement in the Czech Republic?

It mostly made concessions and collaborates with those who defend the abuse of animals and it justifies this as a strategy. It is tame and concerned with welfare. Full of empty words. More focused on popularity and less on content.

As far as direct actions are concerned, most is happening in the area of wearing ALF t-shirts and drivelling at concerts and in internet discussions.

In my opinion, what is missing, above all, is the awareness of the fact that in a society which has ethical norms set according to the rules of the market and perceives animals as its property, the protection of animals has to be both practical resistance as well as political struggle.

I am not talking about petitions, lobbying the powerful etc. This leads to the dilution of forces and sooner or later it becomes corrupt and makes any idea powerless. Animal protection is not a game of chess and animals are not chess pieces. It is a struggle for life. If we lose this understanding, it will become just one opinion against another. The same can be said about people we are addressing: they are not chess pieces.

I think that what can lead to an improvement is political work in the sense of creating strong social or political movements that will not play according to the rules by which life is a labour camp, a market and a slaughterhouse.

How did you form the open rescue team?

There is no open rescue team. Open rescues are done by me with the help of some groups of friends of mine who wish to remain anonymous. At one time it seemed that there will be more people doing open rescues, but then I was prosecuted for defending and promoting the ALF and they changed their minds. There is currently only one girl willing to do open rescues.

I say this with regret, but at the same time with respect to those remaining anonymous. I appreciate their work and also their support of my work. After all I myself had worked for a long time behind a mask. However, I reached the conclusion that if I step out of the shadow it will be more beneficial for the animals.

I don't hide my face or my name, I speak and write about what I see, I take photos and make films at the farms, why I carry the animals away, I do

Not only human at the Wailing Wall

Isaac Bashevis Singer wrote in his Letter Writer, „In our behaviour to animals, all men are Nazis.“ Jana modernised this saying. She used to say that for so called farm animals, most humans are terrorists and every country, every state a terrorist organisation. The situation is much worse for very few of those people realise their terror towards other animals. So called farm animals are beings most frequently and most heartlessly abused, tormented and slaughtered. And all this done to them is accepted, endorsed without concern, even mocked. Those around have forgotten that it is not a piece of meat, smartly packed and with a happy label, it is not an egg or a low-fat yoghurt, it is a life.

They picked some of their fellows, deprived them of freedom, both personal and evolutionary, of their families, homes, reduced them to production units, shut them into darkness and concrete and set their clear destination, the execution lines at slaughterhouses. In some moments she could hardly breathe thinking of the horror.

One early morning, when she could no longer sleep and went for a walk, a slaughter transport passed her by. In the first moment she did not realise what the car was. She stopped at the side of the road and gave way to it. Only when the car turned round and the pigs started to squeal in anxiety, running across the sides and trying to keep balance, she got stuck. She followed the transport with her eyes until it disappeared, and long after it. This situation was one of her turning points. It stayed deep. It became part of her experiencing. It was that more alert given that she knew about the routine lives of pigs, starting with birth and ending with their throat cut. She saw them squealing on a cold daybreak, beaten with rubber hoses, forced by kicking and screaming into a two-storied transport, she saw them, desperate with fear, climbing one over each other. Then the loaded transport went past her, and her eyes stayed in it. What if she wanted more than just sympathy? But what would she achieve if she started to yell and run after the transport, so that they stop, so that it's murder?

However, she's never stopped feeling she should have done so.

(From my unfinished novel "Not only human at the wailing wall")

Open rescues (as I understand and do them) are not a contradiction to the anonymous rescues. They support each other. Because the animals do not care if you wear or not a mask.



Abolitionism, Veganism and Anarchy in the Protection of Animals

I remember how a friend and I once caught a mouse. We climbed with it onto the roof of the local bowling alley (as children we spent a lot of time on that roof), tied a string to its tail, and played with it. When it tried to run, we let it get a little way, then we slowly pulled it back, or yanked on the string, and had fun watching it fight for its life.

We walked around on the roof, pulling it behind us, then we ran, dropped it over the edge, pulled it back up, swung it from side to side, spun it over our heads, and finally struck it against the wall.

At first the mouse tried to run away. Then it just stood there shaking. We saw that it was afraid, that it was trying to escape those huge children's hands, get to safety. So why didn't we leave it alone? Because it was fun and interesting? Because its fear, pain and life were just the fear, pain and life of our toy? Why didn't it hurt me at all at the time? Until today.

Slavery

If I wanted to name the relationship of the majority of people towards animals on farms, in laboratories, etc., outright, which I do, then the way I see it, I am talking about slavery.

Being enslaved means having your personal freedom taken away from you and being a tradable property. It means being owned by someone else.

Only an individual with her or his own interests in life can be enslaved, because only such an individual can have their personal freedom taken away from them.

Because other animals, not only humans, have their own interests in life, are capable of making decisions for themselves, where and which way to go, who to have contact with, what and who to avoid, or who to love, because they are capable of a free life and because life belongs only to the individual who lives it, regardless of the type of animal. I am talking about their enslavement where humans requisition them as property. Because we are able to live without destroying everything for them or taking it, their enslavement is unnecessary violence.

Birth



The sun's gone down, the sky is starlit, the air stinks of manure, a calf has been born in a stall. Her eyes are black, so deeply black that there's no end. She breathes heavily. Huskily. It was not an easy birth.

Cows can live up to 20 or 21 years. This mother is four years old, second baby, but she's near her end. Aching joints and back, inflamed lacteal glands. The baby has stopped breathing. A man in overalls, a woman with scarf on her head, both in gum boots, hoist the calf by hind legs, hold her head down and sway with her motionless body to relieve airways. It helped. The woman reaches for a bucket with cold water and pours it on the calf.

The mother is lying on concrete with little of straw, tired, she doesn't attend to the baby. She should stand up, start licking her, gently shove her with her head, challenge her to stand up and offer her udder for the first suck, but she doesn't want to. The woman gets a shovel and hits her with force on the prolapsed uterus. The cow cries out and tries to get up, but no pain can make her stand on her feet. They wind a chain around her leg and drag her out with a tractor next to a pile of waste. They leave her there. She will be dying and watching stars. The only way how to escape the butcher's knife is to die before it cuts.

They hang a metal stamp into the calf's right ear and a yellow, plastic one, into the left ear. A code of the country, an identification number and a ĚMSCH a.s. logo (Ěskomoravský svaz chovatelů – Czechomorian Breeder's Association). She is no longer a calf, they made a milk machine from her. CZ 953189134.

that the life of the animal did not suffer the death? Is it certain subconscious awareness of the needlessness and unjustifiableness of this act? Is it a distance from murder? Conscious and unconscious marketing strategy at the same time? I think it's a bit of everything.

We shouldn't forget that even in this form of holding, animals are products, commodities, accounting entries and that they will be killed.

The fundamental question all of us should ask, is, what do we need for life. Do we need meat, milk, eggs, honey? No. Bears on bikes and sea lions in shorts? No. Fur? No. Animal experiments? No. We do not need any of this. And where there is no need, there is no reason, and where there is no reason, there is no justification. Why should I decide between an egg and a better egg if I can live without both? Why should I choose between a nasty and a less nasty exploitation when I do not need to exploit at all?

Without commentary:

The animals were given to the hands of yours, is said in Bible. It means that the hands should care for them and nurse them, not treat them as machines. Only he should farm animals who in them, as much as in the plants, sees a Godly creature destined to fulfil its tasks in ecosystems and biotypes and to serve man and his needs, without humiliation and enslavement. Only that will have permanent high performance from his cattle.

Gerhardt Preuschen: An alternative for foreseeing farmers: Transition to ecological farming, MZ ČR, 1990

„Here we have an organic meat growing.“ (A commentary on a photo in which the farmer (M. Knápek) watches cattle grazing.)

Miloslav Vohralík: Succulent veal from organic farms, Czech organic products, FOA + MZ ČR, 1995

1) Cynism = ancient Greek philosophical movement defined by straightness, explicitness, simplicity, even harshness.

2) Coccidiosis = parasitic disease of poultry and other animals. Anticoccidials have demonstrable negative effects on the animals' immune system.

3) www.pro-bio.cz

4) Dipl. Ing. Reinhard Geßl, chairman of the Austrian association of the natural animal farming: Farmers' ethical responsibility – animal welfare in terms of natural farming, Bulletin for organic farming, issue 25, PRO-BIO Association of ecological farmers, Šumperk, November 2003

At the same time, legislation valid in the Czech Republic mentions slavery in the same way as I do, although in different dimensions and euphemistically. It defines animals as “*living beings, able to feel pain and suffering*” (1), where for the purpose of this law the human is not considered an animal, as if it were possible to consider the human as something else.

Thus the law, by its own definition, acknowledges animals' life and the specific special ability to live life yet also considers them to be property. It does not say that a pig, dog or rat is something like a chair, tractor, scalpel or money. It regards them as living things. If you hurt an animal which is owned by someone else, you can be prosecuted for damaging another's property. That is legal and factual slavery and a schizophrenic admission of this.

Being enslaved does not necessarily mean to live in cruelty, but it is always a loss of the possibility to have the power to make your own decisions.

Animals on farms, in laboratories and other places are not only deprived of personal freedom, but also evolutionary freedom. The characteristics of animals and their life cycles change as if they were just money-making toys. In the 1980s, the average chicken's breast muscle was 10% of its weight, now it is 21%, and it is expected to reach 30% (2).

A sow has (stupidly put) 10 to 16 piglets in one litter; that means more than she has functioning nipples, and in a year the sow (if she is a good quality reproduction unit) has 2 to 2.5 litters. Her life rotates around violent artificial insemination and birthing, in one big circle, until she is completely exhausted. Then she is thrown on the back of a lorry and taken to be slaughtered.

The FAO estimates that in 2003 over 50 billion different animals were killed worldwide for human consumption. The estimate is based on reports from over 210 countries and state territories and it is important to realise that this is a significantly reduced number since some countries or territories have given no information about hundreds of thousands, since some types and animals are not included (for example aquatic animals are not counted), and neither are animals which do not survive the livestock production process (3).

The largest slaughterhouses in the world have been opened close to Mecca, with a daily capacity of up to 200,000 animals and it is estimated that they will employ up to 100,000 people (4).

Danish Crown was the first company in the world to operate a fully automatic pig slaughter line with a maximum work capacity of 360 to 400 pigs per hour (5).

Animals are reduced to production units, enclosed in the dark and concrete, and after a short life, when their everyday reality is fear, pain, boredom and solitude, their end station is the execution line of the abattoirs.

1) Act No. 246/1992 Coll., on the Prevention of Animal Cruelty.

2) Joel Achenbach: *Meaty Chickens*, National Geographic, April 2005 (In the 1980s meat from the breast made up 10% of the weight of an average chicken, today it is 21%, says John Hardiman, a geneticist from the firm Cobb-Vantress in Arkansas' Siloam Springs. "I believe it is clear we will reach 30%, which is noticeably closer to the status of today's turkeys," adds Hardiman.)

3) Statistics database of FAO – Agriculture – <http://faostat.fao.org/faostat/collections?subset=agriculture>

4) *Fleischwirtschaft*, 80, 7/2000

5) *Schlachtlinie für Schweine komplett*, *Fleischwirtschaft*, 2001, No. 5, pp. 111-115

Human and Animal

It is a mistake to ask whether I put human life on the level of an animal's life. Do you prefer apples or fruit? What kind of question is that? An apple is a fruit. Just as a human is an animal. One of many different kinds of animals. I don't find anything offensive in this, but I know a lot of people, in fact the majority, who disavow themselves and are then reminded of this, are offended and offend. Human is after all totally different from animal, they say. I cannot compare a human with a rat or cow. I can. The term – animal – is extensive enough to include a bug, human, dolphin or elephant. And a rat and cow too. This term includes us based on mutual characteristics that do not deny the differences. A dolphin is not a bug, a rat not a cow, a human not an elephant. But they are all and we are all animals. No offence.

Of course, we have different scopes of consciousness and consciousness of self, differing abilities and varied possibilities in development. Different shapes, consistencies of hair. But we are not different.

enabled to live and behave by their innateness and for this opportunity they repay us with vitality and good health, whereby we obtain tasty products that we can use with clear conscience (3) and that the right to make use of animals and to kill them can only be assumed, is it combined with the obligation to care for the animals. (4) Surely this form of animal seizure is closer to their natural needs, but it is still an invasion to and disturbance of their natural course of life, and its destruction; the animals surely are healthier than in the less considerate forms of keeping, but to say that they repay us with their health, so they can be tastier, is, to me, a very perverse logic. The fact that I treat someone better than somebody else doesn't give me any right to kill him or her with a clear conscience and relish his or her corpse.

Let's illustrate it with this simple scheme: Someone kidnaps and murders your loved one and tries to assert that he or she didn't do anything wrong, because he treated the person nicely before he or she killed them. What a perversity to interconnect the obligation to care with the right to kill the cared?

Once I was, along with a more organic farmer, invited to a discussion where this person chatted about how much he likes the beef cattle, the animals of his, that the cattle is always primary for him, that even to the slaughterhouse he drives them himself. I told him that if he actually liked the animals, he wouldn't take them for the slaughter in the first place. He explained to me how willingly and peacefully the animals go towards their death. Why wouldn't they when they trust him?

Another argument used to create positive outlook on the seizure and killing of animals, and not only in its more ecological forms, is that *without humans, there would be no farm animals whatsoever. One thing is to be realized: farm animals are obliged to us for their lives, and to our human wants to use their meat, milk and eggs as food. Without human interests, there would be no cows, no pigs, no chickens at all in the barns and pastures.* (4) This is simply a lie. Not cows, nor pigs, nor chickens do owe us a thing for their lives, in that humans want their meat, milk and eggs.

Czech organic product for 2004 is a sausage. It is spoken of as a bio sausage, but that is a deceptive promotion. Bio sausage is a lie. **Bio is from Greek bios and it means life, I doubt there is any in the processed dead pig.** Why do they talk about bio meat, bio lamb, bio sausage then? Why the assertion

Organic sausage is a lie!

A young woman once explained me that, she only eats organic meat because factory farms are sick and she doesn't want to take part in such things. I answered that, if I were in the condemned cell, I would be pleased if it was padded, with a cable TV and mating every evening. It would be better than to sleep in dirt, hungry, with rats biting into me and a warden smacking my face. It would be thousand times better, but the purpose is absolutely the same.

Would you like to be a Jew, Jehovah's Witness, German anti-fascist or Roma girl in Auschwitz if it was tidy? I guess you wouldn't. Would gas chambers be alright if the death was quick and painless? They wouldn't. Of course it is better than Auschwitz full of lice and the gas suffocating so slowly that you hit your head against the wall in order to finish yourself, but better doesn't imply good.

There is a tale about Alexander of Macedon and Diogenes of Sinope. While riding a horse, Alexander noticed Diogenes raking a pile of bones with his leg. When questioned, Diogenes explained: I'm thinking about the difference between the bones of your father and those of his slaves. Although Diogenes is my favourite Cynic (1), here he was wrong. The difference is not in the bones, i.e. death; it is in the lives.

Organic farming, or, better, more organic farming, is more considerate to the animals' needs than are the factory farms. More immune breeds are used, sucklings have to be breastfed by their mothers (cattle for 3 months, pigs for 40 day, sheep and goats for 45 days), less stress is developed on the animals' efficiency, less severe technologies are used, some of the factory-like practices, e.g. battery cages for hens, tail docking for piglets and other mutilations, are absent, and some of the pharmaceuticals and dietary supplements, such as growth stimulators or anticoccidics (2) are restricted, the use of hormones is allowed only for isolated cases, cloning and embryo transfer is prohibited, etc. All of this is very important and significant step outwards the disregard for billions of animals living in humans' bondage.

But, although the propagators of this form of animal exploitation would like to have us believe, it is not true that the animals they *keep in capture are*

Perhaps we are less able to sympathise with other types of animals, just as we cry more for the pain of our mother or for the pain of the mother of the flat opposite, but it is not a reason to inflict more distant pain or overlook it or give it your own value in place of the value of the one experiencing it.

When you poke out a cow's eye, it will hurt in the way it can only hurt a cow. If you poke out a human eye, it will hurt in the way it can only hurt a human. What more do we need to know so we do not cause pain when it is not necessary?

I must add, to explain, that the majority of people, when they hear the word "animal", they hear something below human, and when they hear the word "human" they heard something above an animal.

Abolitionism

The route from slavery is the abolition of slavery. It is necessary here to start differentiating between human slavery, playing at animal liberation and actual animal liberation.

Welfare recognises the dominance of humans over other animals, does not doubt slavery, leaves it legal and legitimate, keeps them alive, and only tries to make the slavery humane, whatever that means.

The extent to which such logic can lead is evident for example when it is considered better to remove a calf from its mother immediately after its birth instead of two weeks later, because their instinctive common bond is stronger after two weeks than immediately after birth, so it is less traumatic – and they are right. Fault-free logic, when you think only of the possibilities of enslavement.

Some time ago, I was asked what I recommend to those who want to eat meat, eggs and milk but do not like the way animals are usually treated today. If I recommend for example food from ecologically farmed animals. I said in no event would I recommend this. I recommend them one, two or as many days of the week that they want and are able to be vegan. It is not so demanding after all. Furthermore, it teaches them and allows them to think about refusing or accepting slavery. It does not just remain in the logic of its acceptance and respective regulation.

Veganism is not Vegetarianism

You can go on about the legislative amendments again and again, about improving conditions for those who should be free, but you become a vegan and promote and live the vegan culture. Why shout for better slavery and murder when you can stop it simply?

The best protection of animals is not the law but veganism, and the realisation that with all the non-human misery and suffering, veganism is not everything, but part of the whole.

Many people consider veganism to be part of vegetarianism. I do not agree. Veganism exceeds vegetarianism not only with the measure of perspective over needless suffering and killing of animals, but also with its potential. Vegetarianism is positive because it rejects the consumption of meat, and the connected killing, and is, negative because it does not reject and actually facilitates the consumption of milk and eggs, and the connected suffering and killing. For this reason it is important to popularise and spread veganism not as a part of vegetarianism, but as an independent cultural movement.

The production of milk is inseparably linked to the spilling of blood. Worn out cows, surplus bullocks and calves all end up at the abattoir. Milk is murder. If you drink milk, and eat yoghurt and cheese, you are among those who keep a cruel roundabout in motion. Cows' milk is food for calves, and this is its only value. It is not an agricultural commodity. The meaning of a cow's life is not the production of milk. When a lorry transporting animals to slaughter passes you vegetarians, your animals will be there too, only someone else will cut and eat them.

Vegetarians are also fully responsible for hens dying of exhaustion with the egg yield and cockerels gassed on the day they are born in the hatches themselves, or minced alive by fast rotating blades, because the cockerels do not make eggs, and are therefore superfluous.

Violence

You go for a walk round town, for example. It is sunny, a nice day. You see someone beating up someone else. What do you do? Do you walk on? Do you stop? Do you help? And if you decide to help, how do you do it? The



Not to break a law, if by breaking it one helps someone in need, in anguish or when their life is in jeopardy then I can see no virtue in that.

They degenerate in mere advertising for compassion without confrontation with the economic political reasons for their abuse. They regard and declare themselves apolitical, but simultaneously try to have a legislative impact, they lobby parliament, the senate, government, they start petitions and lose their voices in elections.

They believe that one day they will reach the horizon, because they believe the world is flat.

I am convinced that even that which can be positively enforced within the system is thanks to the work of those who defy it, and not those who let themselves be chewed.

My observations led me to realise that I would basically feel it would be inconsistent and illogical if I were a vegan but not an anarchist.

For those of you who are now startled, because their idea of an anarchist is the same as one essay written in a primary school at the White House in 1904, where it is written, I quote: *"The anarchist is a very wild creature. It is the closest relative of the gorilla. It kills presidents, princes, ministers, by way of sabotaging their meetings and summer vacations. It wears long, unkempt hair, which covers the whole face. In place of nails it has long, sharp claws. The clothing of the anarchist conceals a multitude of pockets, in which it rocks, knives, pistols and fuses. It is a creature of the night. After dusk they meet in packs, large and small, and plot assaults, murders, and epidemics."*

For those of you who believe that this is anarchy, all I have to say is: never fear, it is not. Anarchy is the belief that we do not have to be owned, that we do not have to rule ourselves to live well and better and in the effort for such a life.

We need more anarchy in the protection of animals.

Still, we live together with differing power, values and priorities, wisdom and debility, internal and external empathy, faith in hierarchy and denial of it. We coexist.

What about it?

(Omnia vincit amor?)

victim in front of you has no more strength, is just stiff and huddled on the ground, lying there beneath the blows.

You can try to discuss it with the person doing the beating. They should stop, because it hurts and is harmful. Perhaps it will work and the person will stop, but if they do not? Do you just carry on discussing it?

A couple of years ago the group *Only One Solution (OOS)* arose from the conviction that the world is not just about humans and if one animal type causes such a large amount of suffering around it, believing it is to the general advantage to destroy this animal type. In their manifesto they state that they are not led by hate, just that there is no other way.

They say that history and daily reality has shown that you cannot rely upon human sympathy, that people will never give up their dominance over non-humans, that power is too addictive and dominance too comfortable, that protection of some animals, including the changes in some people, is not enough. And how do those animals which are now suffering feel about our waiting?

If you accept the fact that the world is not the property of humans and if you look at the world in this way and the way humans behave, free of all of human moral and amoral rules, this solution stops seeming mad or at least madder than what humans have done to the world.

So that you realise the measure of the misery, try and imagine what it would be like if everything humans inflicted on animals happened to them.

I am convinced that the background research and protection of animals, masked or not, have more power and potential than assassinations, not just because of the mistakenly created value of human life by the majority, which puts it as the centre of everything, and the connected strategic reasons. Nor because I would believe that humans are basically good and for this we should choose a peaceful path, because I am not sure of that. Nor because I would wait until the hundredth monkey understood. But I do not know about anything that would fail to reverse the misery and horrors more than murder, even regulated. Also my sentiment is elsewhere and I am with it, even when it sways.

Violence when preventing violence to animals has its momentary and possibly positive value, but minimum potential for greater and more permanent positive changes, as with every war, even a just one.

It is also important to realise what war does with those who fight and how easy self defence may slide down to retaliation.

Unfortunately I am afraid, even regarding what has just been said, that if we do not also recognise the authority of armed battle for the defence of animals other than humans, they will talk about how we recognise the value of their life just like human life, only with lies and hypocrisy.

I can imagine that in the defence of animals I will be aided with violence and I do not regard this as an inadequate response. I am too conscious of violence, maiming and killing and the fact that it is not necessary for that. I am too much on the victim's side for that. I know it is not the overall or the conclusive solution, but the world is not just about this.

I know that in modern society such a battle would not be understood and categorised with general fanaticism, but how many of us would hesitate for those really close to us?

A.L.F.

An example of non-violent direct action is the *Animal Liberation Front*. Thanks to this work this animal protection movement has materials documenting bad behaviour towards animals in laboratories and on farms, evidence for the public, devotees of the parasiting of animals for financial losses, halted projects, closed laboratories and breeding stations, thousands of animals have been liberated from cruelty and pointless death, thousands have changed their direction to the benefit of animals.

Of course it is limited success but not even the legal protection of animals is able to have more than limited successes. Furthermore it retains the reverse priorities. Saving lives for them is not more important than property, the law, majority opinion. Or they behave as if it was not really like this.

The truth is that these people often harm the work of ALF and similar groups and do this consciously, for various reasons. Mostly they do not think it through, because they do not even break legal boundaries in their thoughts.

I think it is necessary to openly confront the demonisation of these activities, either on the part of the state, industry, the non-profit sector, or majority opinion. We are anti-terrorist, we are not a terrorist movement.

Anarchy

Someone recently asked me whether I could summarise what I am talking about in a couple of sentences. I said that one was enough – I don't harm if I don't have to. This philosophy leaves me choice and responsibility and also teaches me to think in confidence and doubts. The same goes for anyone else. It is not authoritative. It does not intrude its will timocratically, oligarchically, democratically or tyrannically.

I believe less and less in the categorical imperative and desire it less and less. More and more I ask why animal rights and more and more I retreat from them. When I first entered a hall full of broiler chickens and saw just week-old birds dragging their industrially mutilated limbs behind or next to their bodies, sometimes moving with the help of their wings in an attempt to balance their walk, probably as if they were rowing, I did not ask in equity and did not look for obligations. Why would I force this on others?

Mostly in the animal protection movement they do not appeal to humans as able free beings, but to show business. To the government, laws, media, celebrities. In misplaced faith in a perestroika, and in their selves as some kind of positive faith, they regard it as success when they can become part of the system against which they declaim. When more people tune into their program, because bags full of hope is more important than the bare truth. Because they want those who have tuned in to stay watching. And the real face and reasons for abuse of non-humans remain more and more hidden like a nun's pierced clitoris.

They become part of a game, the folklore of a system, which gives them a specific weight in society in exchange for helping them maintain faith in its principles, order and the path offered for this change.

They rely more or totally on the law and on charity instead of their own power and direct action. They suspend the creation of ideas about a possible better future instead of changing the present.