



Supplementary Material for Submission to

**Inquiry into  
the impact of animal rights activism  
on Victorian agriculture**

***Challenging tyranny against animals***

Paul Mahony

## Supplementary material

This document is a supplement to the author's submission dated 30<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

Noting that the committee requires submissions to address one or more of the issues identified in the terms of reference, the supplement is intended to demonstrate the submission's compliance.

### TERM OF REFERENCE a.

#### Description:

*"the type and prevalence of unauthorised activity on Victorian farms and related industries, and the application of existing legislation"*

#### Comment:

The submission was prepared in the context of activists entering premises to gain evidence of cruel conditions and treatment. It is noted here that trespass laws already exist to deal with such actions.

Sections 1 and 2, dealing with honesty, justice and legal cruelty, were relevant.

### TERM OF REFERENCE d.

#### Description:

*"the civil or criminal liability of individuals and organisations who promote or organise participation in unauthorised animal activism activities"*

#### Comment:

Section 5 referred to Emmeline Pankhurst of the suffragette movement and Dr. Martin Luther King. Both organised participation in unauthorised activism activities and suffered through resultant intimidation, arrest and incarceration. They were eventually lauded as heroes when society awoke to the validity of their positions.

With the lessons from history of Pankhurst and King, along with those of Mohandas Gandhi and Nelson Mandela who were also mentioned, law makers have the opportunity to consider the community's growing awareness of the gross injustice involved in our treatment of animals. It seems almost inevitable that history will look favourably upon the efforts of today's animal activists.

The material was supported by Sections 1 and 2 (referred to above) and Section 4, dealing with the concept of carnism. All illustrated the double standards that apply to our treatment of animals.

## **TERM OF REFERENCE e.**

### **Description:**

*“analyse the incidences and responses of other jurisdictions in Australia and internationally”*

### **Comment:**

This matter was addressed in Section 3 through the example of Oliver’s Piggery in Tasmania. It involved activists being supported by and assisting police after the activists had uncovered extreme cruelty. The individual and company involved in running the piggery were eventually fined. The individual had been appearing in brochures as one of Woolworth’s “fresh food people”.

## **TERM OF REFERENCE f.**

### **Description:**

*“provide recommendations on how the Victorian Government and industry could improve protections for farmers’ privacy, businesses, and the integrity of our biosecurity system and animal welfare outcomes, whether through law reform or other measures”*

### **Comment:**

The submission argued in Section 1 that Agriculture Victoria should conspicuously inform the community that cruelty is permitted when it involves animals bred for food and other purposes. The increased transparency may reduce the perceived need of activists to obtain evidence for informing the community themselves.

Closed-circuit television in livestock establishments may also assist, provided the scope and integrity of the coverage were at a satisfactory level.

END

### **Cover image:**

© Bear Witness Australia, *“A beautiful face, with someone inside - sold to the highest bidder”*, Witness #5