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ABSTRACT

In recent years political parties advocating animal rights and animal interests have sprang up in several countries and seem to constitute a new party family. At first sight, they appear to be single-issue parties, but a closer look at their party programmes suggests that they are developing a new ideology based on the core concept of compassion and adjacent concepts of equality, intrinsic value and interdependence.

Introduction

‘All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others’ (George Orwell, Animal Farm)

At the European elections of 2014, two animal advocacy parties made their debut in the European Parliament: the German Party Man, Environment and Animals (Partei Mensch Umwelt Tierschutz (PMUT), also called the Tierschutzpartei) and the Dutch Party for Animals (Partij voor de Dieren, PvdD). The latter has been represented in the Dutch lower house of parliament since 2006 and increased its number of seats from two to five in 2017. Five other animal advocacy parties had participated also in the European elections but failed to win seats. One of them, the Portuguese Party Persons, Animals and Nature (Pessoas Animais Natureza, PAN) gained a seat in the Portuguese Assembly of the Republic in 2015 and went to four seats in 2019. In the same year, the Australian Animal Justice Party (AJP) entered the New South Wales Legislative Council. In 2016 an Animalist Party (Parti animaliste, PA) was founded in France which obtained 1.1% of the votes in 50 districts at the parliamentary elections a year later. Though still quite small, a new party family seems to have emerged. All these animal advocacy parties were founded after 2000, except for the German party which was established already in 1993.

A party family usually shares a common origin as well as a common ideology. However, the animal advocacy parties appear to share only a common goal, animal welfare and the protection of animal rights, and rarely refer to an ideology. True, the Spanish party calls itself since 2011 ‘Animalist Party Against the Maltreatment of Animals’ (Partido Animalista Contra el Maltrato Animal, PACMA) and the French party also calls itself ‘animalist’, but neither spell out animalism in ideological terms. Perhaps the parties should be regarded as single-issue ‘advocacy parties’ or ‘prolocutors’ which articulate particular interests without challenging dominant ideas and values,
rather than as prophets of a new ideology? Prolocutor parties are usually short-lived, if they do not develop some kind of ideology, as the history of the farmers’ parties and pensioners’ parties in several European countries shows. Perhaps the animal advocacy parties are also in the process of developing a new ideology? At least some of their leaders seem to think so. An answer to this question might add to our understanding of (new) ideologies, but also help to explain and predict the potential of these parties.

Therefore, it might be useful to analyse the declarations of principles, election programmes and manifestos of animal advocacy parties. Seven have been selected here: the Australian AJP, the British Animal Welfare Party (AWP), the Dutch PvdD, the French PA, the German PMUT, the Portuguese PAN and the Spanish PACMA. There are similar parties in at least seven other countries but so far they seem less important in terms of votes and members and/or they have not yet produced substantial programmes.

The analysis will be guided by two main questions:

1. do the programmes deal with other issues than animal rights and animal welfare?
2. if so, are the programmes (at least to some extent) coherent and based on explicit or implicit principles or core values, which might distinguish them from other parties, e.g. the Greens?

If both questions can be given an affirmative answer, the conclusion would seem justified that animal advocacy parties are developing a more or less coherent system of ideas that guide their actions, in other words: an ideology. At least it would fit the rather broad definition of ideology proposed by writers like Andrew Heywood: ‘a more or less coherent set of ideas that provides the basis for organized political action’; but perhaps also the more demanding definition of Michael Freeden: ‘a wide-ranging structural arrangement that attributes decontested meanings to a range of mutually defining political concepts’.

The party programmes: a quantitative analysis

To answer the first question, seven recent programmes or manifestos of the parties under study have been analysed quantitatively, by classifying paragraphs according to three categories:

1. Animal welfare and related issues;
2. Environmental policies, including energy, transportation, agriculture and environmental protection;
3. ‘Human issues’: social and economic policies, justice, migration, constitutional issues, foreign policy, defence, culture and education, health care.

As Table 1 shows, four out of seven animal advocacy parties (PACMA, PAN, PMUT and PvdD) devoted more words to human issues than to animal welfare. The AWP spent half of its 2017 manifesto on animal issues and one-third on human issues. Only the AJP and the PA dealt exclusively with animal issues. Admittedly, the classification is very rough, done by one person without a reliability test. Categories might overlap. Yet with some caution, one may conclude that our first question can be answered in the affirmative: five out of seven animal advocacy parties under investigation have presented broad programmes dealing
with human and environmental questions as well as animal rights and animal welfare. Only the AJP and PA could still be considered prolocutor parties focusing merely on animal-related issues, though they might also broaden their programmes as they expand their electorate and membership.¹⁰

### The programmes: a qualitative analysis

In this section we try to find out if the three parts of the party programmes show some coherence; if the positions on animals, environment and human issues are based on common principles or core concepts.

Theorists like Gary Francione distinguish sharply between on the one hand animal advocates who claim animal rights and want to abolish all exploitation of animals in the long run (abolitionists), and on the other hand those who merely want to improve animal welfare (welfarists).¹¹ The parties studied here seem to belong to the former category, even if they are sometimes a little vague – possibly for tactical reasons, e.g. for fear of alienating moderate voters.¹² All parties demand a ban on hunting, bull-fighting and other blood sports.¹³ All parties strive for the abolition of husbandry as we know it, as an explicit or implicit long-term goal, to be achieved step by step by reforms, like a gradual improvement of conditions in livestock farming and increasing taxes on meat to discourage its consumption.¹⁴ Another long-term goal is the abolition of scientific experiments with animals, not only because they may result in the death of the animals but also because they infringe on their freedom.¹⁵ For a similar reason, the parties oppose the use of animals in a circus and in a zoo – the latter should be converted into sanctuaries where the animals can roam freely without being disturbed by human spectators.¹⁶ More complicated are the rights of companion animals, which enjoy a limited freedom in most cases. The animal advocacy parties do not propose to free them to live in the wild – understandably, as many would probably die a cruel death without human care – but to improve their well-being through a system of registration and licencing and other measures.¹⁷

In the long run, these quite radical demands are justified in three ways: first, by a theory of animal rights, intrinsic worth or value and progressive egalitarianism; second, by a call for compassion or empathy and third, by emphasizing the interdependence of animals, human beings and environment.

Practically all parties claim basic rights for animals, primarily the right to life and liberty, or the right to live in accordance with their nature; the Spanish and Portuguese parties refer also

---

**Table 1. The focus of animal right parties in party programmes.**

| Parties | On animals | On environment* | On people** | Total (number of words) |
|---------|------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|
| AJP     | 100%       | 0%              | 0%          | 100% = 29 589          |
| AWP     | 49%        | 22%             | 28%         | 100% = 16 383***       |
| PMUT    | 29%        | 22%             | 49%         | 100% = 13 034          |
| PA      | 100%       | 0%              | 0%          | 100% = 3 289           |
| PACMA   | 27%        | 17%             | 56%         | 100% = 17 189          |
| PAN     | 18%        | 32%             | 50%         | 100% = 40 402          |
| PvdD    | 20%        | 24%             | 56%         | 100% = 21 980          |

* Including energy, transportation, agriculture and environmental policies.
** Social and economic policies, justice, migration, constitutional issues, foreign policy, defence, culture and education, health care.
*** Rounding error.
to a right to psychological integrity or well-being. All parties state that an animal should not be regarded as an object that can be owned, sold, used and abused by human beings. It (or rather: he or she) has intrinsic value and should have legal standing, possibly a status between ‘property’ and ‘persons’, as the AJP suggested in one of its policy papers. The PAN regards mammalians, birds and octopi as persons (in the moral and legal sense), comparable to children or disabled people. The argument for animal rights is usually supported by a discourse on the intrinsic value of animals (and possibly other forms of life as well) and the rejection of ‘speciesism’, i.e. the discrimination of other species by the dominant human species. Human beings are animals, too (animal advocacy parties often refer to them as ‘human animals’) and share essential capabilities with non-human animals. The AJP quotes the Australian philosopher Tom Regan who argued that an animal (whether human or non-human) is ‘subject-of-a-life’: it has desires, memories, emotions and a psychophysical identity over time. Hence, it has an intrinsic value or worth that should be respected. Intrinsic value cannot be measured or compared, so we have to assume it is equal for all animals.

The PACMA, PAN and PvdD compare the struggle for animal rights or animal liberation to the emancipation of slaves in the nineteenth century and the emancipation of women in the twentieth century. Animal liberation is perceived as an extension of the same progressive emancipation process, based on the enlightenment principles of justice, freedom and equality of rights. This ‘progressive egalitarianism’ (as one could call it) justifies or supports the demands for equal basic rights to life, liberty, integrity or well-being for an ever widening circle, now including ‘non-human animals’. Progressive egalitarianism may denote progress in two directions: inequalities should become smaller within a particular group, but also between groups. Male property-owners may first acquire civil rights, then political rights and finally social rights; at the same time, some or all of the same rights should be granted to all men and women, and hopefully in the near future to (at least some) animals.

Compassion is mentioned explicitly in the programmes of the AJP, AWP, PA and PvdD. The PACMA defined respect and consideration (consideración) for animals as its first priority (in its declaration of principles) and regarded empathy and respect as important values to be promoted in education in its electoral manifesto of 2015 (and 2016). The PAN is more implicit in its plea for ‘cosmic ethics’ (etica cosmica). PMUT coined the term ‘Mitgeschöpflichkeit’ (co-creatureship) for its first priority: animals should be recognized as fellow-creatures that share with human beings the capacity for joy and grief, love, pain and fear.

Most parties refer directly or indirectly to the interdependence or interconnectedness of all living beings. The AJP, PAN and PvdD do so explicitly. The AWP asserted that ‘(T)he important links between animals, people and the environment are central to our political ideology’. More specifically it pointed out that ‘evidence suggests a link between abuse of non-human animals and human violence’; and that our dependence on animals and animal products has ‘devastating effects (...) upon the environment, human health and animal welfare’. Similar holistic arguments have been made by PMUT in its plea for a vegan diet. The German party also feels that ‘man, animal and nature form a unity’ (‘Nach unserer Überzeugung bilden Mensch, Tier und Natur eine Einheit’). Interdependence figures prominently also in the sections of the programmes dealing with environmental problems. Both in the interest of animals and of human beings the parties want to prevent climate change, make the economy sustainable and maintain biodiversity. The measures proposed are usually ‘green taxes’ on carbon dioxide emissions
and on fossil energy, on the use of cars and airplanes, sometimes also on the consumption of meat and other animal products. All parties want to close nuclear power plants and ban genetic manipulation; both might have unintended consequences for the environment but the latter also shows disrespect for the intrinsic value of nature, both animals and plants.

When animal advocacy parties deal with human issues, they rarely present a comprehensive and elaborate set of policies but select the issues they consider most important. When discussing foreign policy and defence, they tend to argue for the non-violent resolution of conflicts. The PvdD asserts that ‘compassion and sustainability should direct foreign policy’. Compassion and non-violence are closely related: the more compassion one feels for other creatures, the less likely one may be to commit violence against them, other things being equal. When discussing socio-economic policies, health care and immigration, animal advocacy parties also refer often to compassion. Compassion implies a moral obligation to protect or care for the weakest creatures and give ‘a voice to the voiceless ones’ – not only animals but also human beings with severe restrictions, children, and possibly poor people and oppressed or discriminated minorities. Of course, one can also feel compassion with the strongest creatures, but they rarely need our protection. The AJP ‘will give a voice to those who cannot speak for themselves’. In its policy paper on kangaroos, it compared the cruelty shown towards the animal to the ‘disregard shown towards the disabled, the homeless, the aged, the mentally ill and other vulnerable members of our society’. The AWP wants to represent ‘a shift in political thinking and action, away from the short-term interests of the few, to one in which the interests of the weakest are protected, along with what is truly for the long-term good of people and our planet’. In its first election manifesto, the PvdD claimed to stand up for ‘the weakest, the voiceless in our society: people, animals and environment’. PMUT regards itself as ‘the advocate of those who cannot constitute a lobby themselves, in particular, ill people who need care, the handicapped, the victims of physical and psychological violence, children living in poverty and homeless people’. It also wanted to promote solidarity with the elderly and ‘socially weak’ (sozial Schwache) groups.

In a broader perspective, animal advocacy parties seem to embrace and defend the welfare state and the mixed economy against neo-liberal attempts to reduce state intervention and privatize social services. Capitalism should not be abolished, but it should be regulated. The present economic system is too much ‘money-oriented’ and dominated by banks and multinational corporations. The government should stimulate small enterprises and local co-operatives, non-profit ‘solidarity banks’ and more humane and democratic labour relations. The two parties on the Iberian peninsula go a little further in this direction than their sister parties in the North. Yet the latter also favour a strong public sector and object to privatization of health care, public transport or housing. Implicit may be the fear that privatization would enhance inequality and restrict access to these services for low-income groups.

The pursuit of equality characterizes most, if not all animal advocacy parties. Conditions need not be equal, but individuals should have equal rights and equal chances in life. Discrimination based on gender or sexual preference, race or species is rejected in principle. Animal advocacy parties adhere to progressive egalitarianism, one could argue, so they might be expected to defend rights not only for non-human animals but also for human animals. And indeed they do. They claim equal rights for gays, lesbians, transgenders and bisexuals to get married and to adopt children. Men and women should receive equal wages for equal
work. All citizens should have equal access to education and health care. The Spanish party goes even further and argues for basic rights to water, light and gas. Its Portuguese sister-party wants to grant all citizens a basic income without any strings attached. The AWP claims a 'basic right to union membership and participation in all workplaces'. Most parties also propose to expand political rights and influence of citizens, through electoral reform and the introduction or facilitation of popular initiatives, citizen initiatives and referendums at the national and possibly also at the European level. The PAN developed a system of corporatist participatory democracy at different levels, where assemblies representing civil servants, trade unions, employers, NGO's, political parties and religious denominations would advise the local or national government and deliberate about budgets and planning.

Equal rights do not necessarily produce equal conditions. If the right-based egalitarianism of the animal advocacy parties has a liberal flavour, it is a progressive or social liberalism, to be distinguished from classical or conservative economic liberalism, but also from socialism. Right-based, liberal egalitarians tend to accept an unequal distribution of income, wealth and other values resulting from different talents, efforts or even plain chance, as long as there is a 'level playing field', equal opportunities and open access to the game. Animal advocates are rarely radical, socialist egalitarians who call for an equal distribution regardless of individual merit or achievement, or a distribution based on different needs. Yet the distinction is not watertight, especially when egalitarians claim social rights. Both the PACMA and the PAN come close to radical egalitarianism when they demand rights to water, light and gas and to a basic income. Besides, they argue for higher minimum wages and more progressive taxes, which should lead to a more egalitarian income distribution. Other animal advocacy parties do not go quite as far but may favour a (modest) redistribution of income, by introducing a minimum wage as the German party proposed, or raising the minimum wage and increasing the top tax rates, as the AWP demanded.

Thus, more or less the same principles seem to guide the parties in their programmes, with respect to animals but also to environmental and human issues: compassion, equality of rights (in the context of progressive egalitarianism), intrinsic worth or value (of all animals) and interdependence. The next question to be answered is whether we can see here a 'a wide-ranging structural arrangement that attributes decontested meanings to a range of mutually defining political concepts' (Freeden). Therefore, we need a closer look at the concepts and their mutual relations.

The structure of the ideology

Arguably, compassion is the core concept of the animalist ideology, while intrinsic worth, (progressive) equal rights and interdependence can be seen as adjacent concepts that help to define and decontest the core concept (and vice versa).

Compassion is usually perceived as a private emotion, rather than as a political principle. The American philosopher Steve Bein, however, shows it could serve as foundation for ethical judgement. He distinguishes compassion from empathy, commiseration, pity and sympathy. Compassion 'entails a kind of awareness and a kind of wish or desire', or 'attentiveness and a will to act', e.g. to alleviate suffering of another living being, or share in its rejoicing. In his view it is broader than commiseration, which focuses only on suffering, and is not condescending like pity. It may be linked to the idea
that all beings are interdependent, as emphasized by Buddhists and Daoists.\textsuperscript{59} Though compassionate ethics cannot be impartial and does not imply a formal procedure, like Kantian ethics, Bein argues it can provide moral guidance if combined with practical wisdom, or Aristotelian \textit{phronēsis}.\textsuperscript{60} Other theorists like Cary Wolfe and Florence Chiew do not distinguish between compassion and commiseration, emphasizing the ‘shared fact of suffering’ rather than shared joy, but seem to reach similar conclusions.\textsuperscript{61} Human beings are finite and mortal just like non-human animals. However, the former can feel and express compassion with the latter, but not the other way around.

Another American philosopher, Nancy Snow, takes a further step, arguing that compassion could provide the basis for a theory of civil and political society.\textsuperscript{62} The theory – which is hinted at but not elaborated by Snow – would include a ‘realistic perspective on the social interdependence of individuals’ and take a more restricted view of personal autonomy than Hobbes and his followers.\textsuperscript{63} The compassion-based theory would be compatible with belief in moral equality, but does not imply it logically. It need not be communitarian, but might be liberal and even moderately individualistic, albeit not in the Hobbesian sense.\textsuperscript{64}

The animal advocacy parties also refer to a compassionate society, but they talk ideology rather than philosophy: they have to specify and decontest the meaning of the concept. In their view, compassion should be organized by the state, rather than by individual citizens or intermediate organizations like churches or charity funds – even if citizens bear responsibilities, too. Moreover, compassion is linked to the extension of rights and the intrinsic worth of individuals, both human and non-human animals. The state should protect the intrinsic worth of animals, by banning hunting and angling, by regulating and monitoring the conditions of animals in private homes and in farms – as long as husbandry has not been abolished.\textsuperscript{65} It should also guarantee equal rights to ethnic, sexual and other human minorities, and eliminate discrimination.\textsuperscript{66} It would help the poor, through some kind of welfare, a (higher) minimum income or a basic income without obligations.\textsuperscript{67} It would provide public services, in particular education, health care and social housing, rather than leave this to private companies.\textsuperscript{68} It would focus on crime prevention and support for victims, rather than apply more repression and tougher penalties.\textsuperscript{69} It would treat refugees and other immigrants in a humane way and increase foreign aid, especially to the poorest and most vulnerable groups.\textsuperscript{70}

The central position and specific meaning of compassion in the ideology of the animal advocacy parties distinguishes it from other ideologies. Like animal advocacy parties, Christian Democrats ‘tend to intervene in favour of various deprived groups’, as the Belgian social scientist Guido Dierickx points out.\textsuperscript{71} According to the Dutch political scientist, Kees van Kersbergen ‘Christian Democrats claim that the maturation of compassion in society is the actualization of the spirit of Christianity’; therefore, those people who defend values like compassion, human rights, morality and public justice ‘are, in fact, Christian Democrats, even if they do not believe in God’.\textsuperscript{72} Compassion is usually implied rather than explicitly mentioned in Christian Democratic programmes, the (tiny) British Christian People’s Alliance being an exception – in its election manifesto of 2005 it advocated a ‘compassionate society’.\textsuperscript{73} However, when calling for compassion, Christian Democrats also emphasize the role of intermediate organizations and private charity organizations and regard the state as ‘last resort’.

Compassion obviously must play a pivotal role in an ideology called ‘compassionate conservatism’. The term might have been invented in 1981 by Vernon Jordan, then president of the National Urban League in the US, but the idea was developed by Marvin Olasky, an evangelical Christian, in the 1990s. In 1999 George W. Bush began using the term in his campaign for the presidency. After his election, he and his advisors, Olasky among them, continued to use it to defend social policies, such as the devolution of the responsibility for welfare from government to faith-based and community organizations, educational reforms and (modest) medicare for disabled and senior citizens. Mathew Scully, a speechwriter for Bush, sought to extend the domain of conservatives’ compassion to the animal kingdom – without much success, however. Critics usually considered compassionate conservatism empty rhetoric or an insincere oxymoron. After 2004 the idea lost popularity, as did the Bush presidency. Nonetheless, Bruce Pilbeam, a specialist in American studies, shows that compassionate conservatism should be regarded as a relatively coherent and ‘authentic form of moral conservatism’, somewhat similar to traditionalist and religious conservatism. It implies a moral hierarchy in society: a compassionate elite delivering services and giving directions to the poor and benighted. The elite also discriminates between ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving poor’, separating the ‘truly hungry from those who are looking for a free lunch’. In Pilbeam’s words, compassionate conservatism is ‘a paternalistic and inegalitarian doctrine, which justifies the authority of the “compassionate” regulating the lives of those who are the subjects of their compassion’. Clearly, compassionate conservatism and Christian Democracy do not link compassion to the intrinsic worth of animals (pace Scully) nor to a progressive extension of equal rights organized by the state, as do animal advocacy parties. The latter favour equality and vehemently reject paternalism and discrimination of any group, including non-working poor, migrant workers or sexually different minorities. So, they decontest the concept compassion differently.

Compassion also distinguishes the ideology of the animal advocacy parties from ecologism, the ideology of the green parties. Animal advocacy parties share many ideas with green parties, in particular about the intrinsic value of nature and the interdependence of human and non-human animals, plants, and ecosystems. The latter two ideas could be considered the core concepts of ecologism. However, whereas the ecologists see animals as part of the ecosystem or the biosphere, animal advocacy parties regard them as individuals with more or less equal rights, or as moral patients. Thus, animal advocacy parties link interdependence to compassion – as do philosophers like Snow, Chiew and Bein – whilst the green parties rarely refer to the latter. Green parties also claim equal rights for women and men, sexual and ethnic minorities, but not for animals. They combat sexism and racism, but not speciesism.

Though authors like Robin Eckersley and Mark Smith seem to regard the animal advocacy movement as part of a wider environmental or ecological movement, they also point out the relative independence of the former and its ‘atomistic’ concern for individual animals, which seems incompatible with the more holistic or collectivist ideas of (other) ecologists.

A comparison of the programmes of animal advocacy parties and green parties throws more light on the differences and similarities. It seems most appropriate to look at green parties competing in the same systems as the animal advocacy parties studied here, like the Australian Greens, the German Die Grünen, the Dutch GroenLinks (Green Left) and...
the Green Party of England and Wales. All are minor parties, but giants compared to their animalist competitors, with the exception of the Dutch Green Left that is ‘only’ three times as big as the PvdD in terms of voters and has almost twice as many members.  

The green parties share core values: first of all (of course) ecology and sustainability, ‘the value of all life’ or ‘the mutual interdependence between humanity and the rest of nature’, but also social justice and equality, solidarity, emancipation or self-determination and democracy. Compassion does not seem a core concept, at best an adjacent one. The Australian Greens mention it when discussing social policies: ‘As a prosperous nation, Australia can ensure that all people are treated fairly, are treated with compassion and can access world-class public health care, education and services. (.) An equal and compassionate Australia will also include all its citizens in one of its major institutions, marriage, finally realizing the dream of marriage equality for LGBT Australians’. The British Green Party refers to ‘care’ in its manifesto, which seems a broader and more diffuse concept than ‘compassion’.  

All four green parties attribute intrinsic value and rights to animals, and all intend to improve the welfare of animals. Their proposals for improvement are less radical and less elaborate and detailed than those of the animal advocacy parties. However, like those parties, the Greens want to abolish intensive livestock farming and recreational hunting, as well as the use of animals for sports or circuses. They also aim to phase out animal experimentation – at least in the long run. Yet none of them argues for a plant-based agriculture without any husbandry at all, not even as a long-term ideal, even if they want to discourage the consumption of meat (through taxation). Obviously, the abolition of all livestock farming would change most people’s daily lives more drastically than a ban on hunting or closing zoos for the public. Most of us do not go to a zoo or circus every day and would not join a hunting party very often but consume meat or at least eggs and dairy products on a daily basis. Green parties tell us to reduce our consumption of animal products but not to abstain altogether. From an ecologist perspective that makes sense. Yet from an animalist point of view, liberating possibly a few hundred animals from circuses and zoos while slaughtering millions for meat seems inconsistent with compassion as a core concept. Therefore, it seems clear that the focus on compassion as a decontested core concept distinguishes animal advocacy parties from green parties.  

After a more extensive analysis of the programmes of the Spanish PACMA and the Dutch Green Left and PvdD, the Belgian political scientist Constanza Adonis Villalon reaches a similar conclusion: animalist parties constitute a new political family, overlapping yet different from the Greens.

Conclusions

This is the age of thin ideologies, apparently: feminism, green ideology (or ecologism), nationalism and populism have been described as thin (or thin-centred) ideologies. Arguably, animalism can be included here. In philosophy, the term denotes the view that human beings should be regarded as animals. This view seems to be shared generally by animal advocacy parties, so why not refer to their ideology as ‘animalism’? As it deals mainly with the relationship between human and other animals, it is a thin ideology, even if its core concept and adjacent concepts have implications for other political issues, as the analysis of party programmes has shown.
Five out of seven parties investigated here have presented broad programmes dealing not only with animal rights and with environmental questions but also with human problems such as health care, migration, foreign policy, education and constitutional reforms. Only the relatively new parties in Australia and France focus purely on animal-related issues. Compassion seems to be the core concept, while the intrinsic worth of all living beings, equal rights (progressively extended) and interdependence can be considered adjacent concepts. Compassion is decontexted as a political principle rather than a private virtue: it should be organized by the state, rather than by corporations, churches or charity institutions. The state should organize compassion for non-human as well as human animals, such as discriminated minorities, migrant workers and refugees, unemployed and handicapped people. The central position and specific meaning of compassion seems to distinguish animalism from ecologism, but also from ‘compassionate conservatism’ and Christian Democracy; the latter do not aim for a progressive extension of equal rights (by the state) to non-human animals.

The animalist ideology seems coherent up to a point, even if some questions have not been dealt with yet – hence it might be considered an ideology in statu nascendi. How far should equal rights be extended from human to non-human animals? Should domesticated animals acquire full citizenship rights, while animals living freely in a human (urban) environment should be tolerated as ‘animal denizens’ with limited rights, and animals in the wild should be left alone as much as possible, like a sovereign foreign nation, as Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka have suggested? Will the animal-citizens need some kind of guardian to protect them, like children and mentally disabled human beings? Is a subtle or ‘stratified’ hierarchy inevitable? At some point in time, animalist parties may have to find answers to these questions, in particular when they continue to grow and acquire political responsibility. Their relatively coherent ideology might help the animalist parties to grow further and prove to be more durable than prolocutor parties advocating particular interests.
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