ARTICLES

Veganism as Anti-anthropocentrism: The Potential of Vegan Advocacy Discourse

Louis Arthur Gough
University of the West of England

louis.gough@uwe.ac.uk

Copyright © 2024 (Louis Arthur Gough).
Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License. Check.

How to cite this article: Gough, Louis Arthur. 2024. "Veganism as Anti-Anthropocentrism: The Potential of Vegan Advocacy Discourse". *Animal Ethics Review* Vol. 4: e2024401. https://doi.org/10.31009/aer.2024.v4.01.

PHOTO: Photo by Simon Berger on Unsplash.

Abstract

Proceeding from an identification of anthropocentrism as the ideological bedrock of interconnected human to nonhuman animal and intra-human oppressions, and the central role played by discourse in transmitting and normalising anthropocentrism and its consequences, this article provides a critical exploration of four ways in which vegan advocacy discourse can undermine anthropocentrism in its various manifestations. These include: the centring of the beyond-human interests of nonhuman animals through ethical vegan argumentation and the simultaneous decentring and invalidating of the human interests in exploiting them; the exposing of the oppressive reality of animal products for the affected nonhuman animals, in opposition to the connected industries' efforts to manufacture the public's understanding of animal product production; the eroding of the discriminatory, otherising human/animal dichotomy through the championing of shared animality between humans and other animals and the decentring of human-supremacist judgements to the contrary; and an intersectional analysis of nonhuman and human oppressions which recognises their common ideological source under the inherently oppressive system of capitalism. Several potential anthropocentric or otherwise counterproductive pitfalls of each recommended discourse strategy are also considered. In providing said critical exploration, the author hopes to have supported the case for veganism's indispensable contribution to opposing the interconnected nonhuman and human oppressions of Western societies, and elucidated some key ways in which vegan advocates can enact this potential.

Keywords

Advocacy, anthropocentrism, capitalism, discourse, intersectionality, language, nonhuman animals, oppression, vegan, veganism.

1. Introduction

In Western societies, anthropocentrism "determines what it is to be a being who matters" (Adams 2015, 204). For most beings across the globe — nonhuman and human — this spells deeply deleterious consequences (Calarco 2014), with anthropocentrism being identified as the bedrock of nonhuman animal, environmental and intra-human oppressions (Crist and Kopnina 2014). As with all ideology, anthropocentrism is upheld by a discourse that "naturalizes" its perspectives and outcomes (Fairclough 2001). Thus, central to undermining the ideology of anthropocentrism is the "denaturalization" of its supporting discourse (*ibid*.). Elsewhere (Gough 2023) I have empirically analysed the capacity of mainstream vegan advocacy discourse to do just that. The current article — premised on the belief that anti-anthropocentric veganism is *indispensable* to efficacious anti-oppression efforts, and that "consistency in anti-oppression for all" is *indispensable* to efficacious anti-anthropocentric veganism (Brueck 2017, 19) — constitutes a critical discussion of some key ways in which vegan advocacy discourse can achieve its anti-anthropocentric potential.

The remainder of this section defines and outlines the foundational role of anthropocentrism in interconnected nonhuman and human oppressions, before introducing the role of discourse in perpetuating and normalising — or "naturalizing" (Fairclough 2001) — the ideology of anthropocentrism and its harmful consequences. From here, the main section of the article begins by introducing veganism as a movement capable of making fundamental contributions to anti-oppression efforts — for nonhuman animals primarily, but also for human groups exploited and otherised in and by Western societies — and the importance of language in this connection. An exploration of ways in which vegan advocacy discourse can be employed to subvert anthropocentrism in its various manifestations (see below) is then provided, with critical consideration of potential pitfalls throughout. Said exploration is not intended to be exhaustive and regards only four possible areas of anti-anthropocentrism in vegan discourse — others could be discussed. Moreover, the current article is limited by its focus on vegan *discourse* — and that of the contemporary English language in Western contexts — and the ideology of anthropocentrism; the contributions of the physical *practice* of veganism to the material conditions of anthropocentric societies is beyond its scope. So too is any empirical contribution to the debate (for an empirical contribution, see Gough 2023) — the current article is a theoretical contribution and should be read as limited accordingly.

1.1. The Importance of Anti-anthropocentrism

Anthropocentrism is an ideology through which the human animal is perceived, presented and treated as distinct from, and worthier than, all that is considered *other-than*-human. Said ideology arises from, and manifests as, both an inescapable "perceptual anthropocentrism" — that is, the impossibility of the human animal perceiving reality from outside the limits of human perception — and as avertible "descriptive" and "normative" anthropocentrisms — which separate out then centre, universalise and exalt the human animal, its perspectives and interests (Mylius 2018). Calarco (2014) identifies the "conceptual

characteristics" of anthropocentrism as follows: a "narcissism and exceptionalism" which ceaselessly foreground the supposedly "special" human animal; a "binary human-animal ontology" through which humanity is wholly distinct from other animals, who are assumed "deficient… in comparison"; and a "strong moral hierarchy" whereby the human animal is granted "value over [emphasis added]" the rest of existence (416-417). Importantly, anthropocentrism's aggrandisement of "the human" embraces only those considered "quintessentially human", animalising and thus subordinating the "vast majority of human beings" (417-418).

Whilst anthropocentric "orientations" are apparent in many past and present cultures across the globe, the West has been "staunchly" so for millennia (Weitzenfeld and Joy 2014, 4). Western societies are "profoundly anthropocentric", with nonhuman animal oppression being "built into" their "very fabric" — from their exploitation for consumption, labour, science, entertainment and companionship, to our violent appropriation of their habitats (Calarco 2014, 418-419). Said oppression has ruinous environmental and human health consequences (Nibert 2012; Winters 2022) which disproportionately impact marginalised communities (Harper 2010). Further, the mass exclusions of anthropocentric thinking (see above) render nonhuman animal oppression, colonialism, racism, sexism, classism, ableism and the like inextricably linked, with derogatory "animalisation" arguably constituting their *shared foundation* (e.g., Adams 2015; Colling et al. 2014; Ko and Ko 2020; Plumwood 1993; Trigg 2021). Resultantly, subverting anthropocentrism amounts to a tackling of a "root cause" of the "problem symptoms of our time" (Crist and Kopnina 2014, 387-388).

1.2. The Importance of Discourse

Discourse refers to the "process of social interaction" (Fairclough 2001, 20) through which "structures of shared meaning" are communicated (Aydın-Düzgit and Rumelili, 2019, p. 286). These structures of meaning dictate the "boundaries of rational/irrational" thought and behaviour (*ibid.*), and in this sense discourses are "different representations/visions of the world" (Fairclough 2000, 21). For dominant discourses this ideological function goes mostly unnoticed, as the visions they convey come to be perceived as neutral "common sense" rather than as particular perspectives — unavoidably partial, and laden with values (2001). As a discourse becomes dominant, the beliefs and practices it represents "cease to be seen as… one among several possible ways of 'seeing' things", and instead become "simply the way", through a process Fairclough (ibid.) calls "naturalization" (76).

For the majority in anthropocentric societies, the exploitation of nonhuman animals is "a taken-for-granted truth" (Freeman 2014, 57); farmed and otherwise (ab)used nonhuman animals are "objects" to be utilised for human benefit, as opposed to sentient, "living, breathing, being[s]" with their own interests and needs (Adams 2015, 33). Labelled "carnism" by Joy (2011), this anthropocentric perspective is supported by terminology that obfuscates the "reality" of so-called "animal products" (47-48). In contemporary English, slaughtered and dismembered animals are made "absent" — everywhere but in reality — by the euphemisms that signify their flesh: "meat", "beef", "pork" and even "chicken wings", which in actuality are a *chicken's wings* (Adams 2015, 28).

This "discursive violence" *undergirds* the "material violence" of flesh consumption (207), with the mere act of classifying a nonhuman species "food" diminishing their perceived sentience and in turn their perceived moral significance (Bratanova et al. 2011). For many children, "hamburgers", "hot dogs" and "chicken nuggets" are made from plants (Hahn et al. 2021), whilst non-vegan adults maintain a "knowing without knowing" in this relation (Joy 2011, 71). Either way, the institutionalised instrumentalisation of our fellow animals continues and grows largely unquestioned, naturalised by a dominant, anthropocentric discourse that reduces other animals to exploitable objects.

2. Vegan Advocacy Discourse as Anti-anthropocentrism

As stated (see 1.1.), anthropocentrism lies at the heart of nonhuman animal, environmental and intra-human oppressions. Veganism — a movement founded on the elevation of nonhuman interests which, due to their "intimately linked" nature, has the "power to dissolve [both] the speciesist" and "racist, sexist, disablist, classist, ageist… and heterosexist foundations" of Western societies (Wrenn 2016, 180, 186) — operates at the "intersections" of these oppressions (Brueck and McNeill 2020). Nonetheless, the anti-anthropocentric potency of veganism is not a given (Giraud 2021; Gough 2023), and in Western societies the practice faces extensive backlash from "respected professionals in medicine, religion, education, industry, politics, law, and the media" (Freeman 2014, 57) who remain committed to presenting the consumption of animal products as "normal, natural, and necessary" (Joy 2011, 96). We have seen that much of this work is done through discourse (see 1.2.).

The gravity of discourse to "power relations, oppression, and exploitation" has long been recognised (Nguyen 2019, xi), with Fairclough (2000) going so far as to state: "Changing culture is centrally a matter of changing language" (122). Accordingly, what follows is a critical discussion of four areas in which vegan advocacy can contribute to the replacement — or "denaturalization" (Fairclough 2001) — of the "common sense" anthropocentric discourse that underpins non-vegan culture. Section 2.1. makes a case for the centring of the interests of nonhuman animals through ethical vegan argumentation, and warns of various ways health, environmental and *ethical vegan* advocacy can depart from the latter's radical potential. The next section concerns the exposing — through exposés and non-euphemistic language — of the otherwise obscured reality of animal products for the beings from which they are made/stolen, with caution of a potential human saviour narrative and similar displays of human egotism. Section 2.3. endorses the erosion of the otherising human/animal dichotomy through terminology that reflects an unconditional recognition of *nonhuman personhood* and underscores *human animality*, as opposed to arrogantly assessing the "humanness" of other animals. And finally, section 2.4. asserts the importance of an intersectional understanding of nonhuman animal oppression and a concomitant need for consistency in anti-oppression efforts.

2.1. Centring the Interests of Nonhuman Animals

Firstly, vegan advocacy discourse can undermine anthropocentrism by centring the interests of nonhuman animals. Presenting veganism, not as an individualistic dietary trend with self/human-centric benefits, but as a practice and philosophy oriented around *moral consideration toward nonhuman animals* — commonly referred to as "ethical veganism" (Vidakovic 2023) — is the basis from which said discourse can achieve this. At its best, ethical veganism is wholly "other-directed" (Freeman 2014, 165), spotlighting and condemning the plights of nonhuman animals at the hands of humans in all areas of human-nonhuman interaction and simultaneously contributing toward a radical alternative to the speciesism of anthropocentric, capitalist societies (Vidakovic 2023).

Explicitly foregrounding the interests of nonhuman animals — including the mere existence of said interests — is a vital component of ethical vegan advocacy. Such efforts disrupt the anthropocentric "instrumentalist model" that perceives nonhuman animals as objects — "resources" to be converted into "food" and other "products" of human benefit — by relating to them as "distinct centre[s] of agency" with needs and preferences and thus intrinsic value to be "considered and respected" (Plumwood 1993, 145). Morally, "what happens to sentient beings matters because it matters to them", Donaldson and Kymlicka point out (2011, 33). By stating, detailing, showcasing and otherwise affirming the interests of other animals — their desires to live, roam, interact, play, love, build families and engage in innumerable other behaviours outside of potential human gain, and the evident suffering that results from the subduing of said desires — vegan advocates can present them as such: *sentient individuals* with *beyond-human* moral significance.

This presentation of nonhuman animals weakens the validity of the human interests in exploiting them. Vegan advocates can support this move by communicating the needlessness of animal products to those with choice. Said products not only cause untold suffering for nonhuman animals, they also engender manifold health and environmental issues for humans (Nibert 2012; Winters 2022). However, health-based arguments for veganism detached from ethical considerations are plain "self-absorption" (Adams 2015, 140) — reinforcing the anthropocentric status quo (Vidakovic 2023) — whilst espousing veganism *solely* as a means to mitigate the impacts of environmental degradation and the like on *humans* constitutes a kind of "anthropocentric altruism" (Freeman 2014). A predominant focus on "protecting" megafauna and other "charismatic" species through environmentally motivated veganism also falls short of anti-anthropocentrism, exhibiting instead the "anthropocentric logic" of considering other animals due to their "aesthetic value" to the human (Giraud 2019, 133; Nguyen 2019, 28). And lastly, ethical veganism as a path to wellbeing, the assuaging of guilt or "self-improvement" too centres the human and its interest and thus provides "no challenge" to the anthropocentric "hierarchy that supports and nurtures oppression" (Wrenn 2016, 152, 178); whilst the common advocacy strategy of revealing "irrationality" in our treatment of other animals implies logical "inconsistency" — an ordinary feature of human behaviour — is the *primary offence* of non-veganism, distracting us from the anthropocentric "*moral*

failings [emphasis added]" at the core of nonhuman animal (ab)use (Cooper 2018, 126-127).

Only when avoiding these pitfalls (and no doubt others, including some discussed below) — with their explicit and implicit anthropocentrism — can vegan discourse be said to meaningfully centre the *beyond-human* concerns of other animals. When successful, the foregrounding and championing of nonhuman interests by careful ethical vegan argumentation contributes to the erosion of "descriptive" anthropocentrism's incessant orientation around "the human" (Mylius 2018). This deviation from the human narcissism of Western societies (Calarco 2014) additionally undermines the moral hierarchy (*ibid*.) and human chauvinism of "normative anthropocentrism" (Mylius 2018), and therefore makes a crucial contribution to the addressing of nonhuman animal oppression at its ideological *root*.

2.2. Exposing the Reality of Animal Products

The aforesaid vindication of animal products through the "three Ns of justification" — the ubiquitous insistence that their consumption is normal, natural and necessary (Joy 2011; 2023) — rests in large part on *manufactured* understandings of the nonhuman animal abuse that their production demands. As discussed by Monbiot (2023), unabating media portrayals of a "humane" and environmentally-sound "bucolic fantasy" condition us — from infancy onwards — into a "benign perception of animal farming" with a "remarkable ignorance of what it involves" (216-217). Hence, audiovisual exposés of the unmistakable physical and emotional pain of confinement, mutilation, forceful impregnation and other forms of sexual violation, mother and young separation, slaughter and the like, alongside an honest account of animal agriculture's *leading* contribution to environmental degradation (Winters 2022), allow for the public's informed and unbridled ethical evaluation of animal product production — a vantage point the industry endeavours desperately to obscure due to its potential to disturb consumptive desires (*ibid*.; Adams 2015; Joy 2011).

In addition to above, we have seen that the violent reality of animal products is mystified through terminology that renders their victims "absent" in the minds of consumers (see 1.2.). During consumption, "gastronomic language" replaces "butchered animals" with "cuisine" (Adams 2015, 21); beforehand, the plural-only term "livestock" objectifies, commodifies and denies nonhuman individuality (Winters 2022, 199-200), whilst "farm animals" erases all identity outside of human interest (Nguyen 2019, 30-31). In response, vegan advocacy discourse should "make the absent referent present" through a rejection of "euphemisms, distortions [and] mis-naming" (Adams 2015, 32, 167) — calling "meat", "dairy" and "eggs", for example, what they are: the commodified flesh and secretions of dead or soon to be slaughtered, non-consenting, sentient animals subjected to short lives of "unnecessary and intentional physical and mental harm", otherwise known as "animal abuse" (Winters 2022, 14) — and reverse the animal-exploiting industry's objectifying "massification" of nonhuman beings by foregrounding their suffering as heterogeneous individuals (Cole and Stewart 2021, 325) with beyond-human moral significance and corresponding interests (see 2.1.).

From such efforts a non-anthropocentric ethical rationale for abstaining from the products of nonhuman animal (ab)use can patently be made, yet dangers remain. To avoid endorsing "hierarchies of concern", advocates should maintain a "holistic" vegan message if/when spotlighting specific cases of exploitation in single-issue campaigns (Wrenn and Johnson 2013); to avoid perpetuating a "toxic human savior" narrative of "infantilized" nonhuman animals and their lionized human "protectors", veganism must not be framed as the "defence" of the "voiceless", "helpless" or "innocent" (Quinn 2021, 266; Trenkova 2020) — rather than "speaking for" them, vegans should elevate the otherwise quelled "political voice(s)" of exploited animals and encourage society to *listen* (Colling et al. 2014, 65-68); and to provide a robust challenge to human narcissism, the moral significance of other animals should not be measured in their seeming likeness to humans. Ethical consideration motivated by similarity not only excludes those perceived as radically other-than (Quinn 2021, 268), it exhibits a colonial mindset: for the "coloniser can recognise the other *only as a form of self* [emphasis added]" (Plumwood 1993, 161).

When these framings are evaded, exposing the oppressive reality of animal products via exposés and non-euphemistic language sabotages the industries' efforts to the contrary, refusing the metaphorical "absence" of nonhuman animals and their resultant "transmutation" into mere objects of human desire within anthropocentric discourse (Adams 2015, 21-22). By centring the affected beings of animal products, the human interests in instrumentalising their bodies are decentred and subordinated in favour of the oppressed individual's *right to themselves*, leaving the narcissistic, hierarchical and deeply oppressive premise of anthropocentric human-nonhuman interaction (Calarco 2014) unobscured, vulnerable to scrutiny and therefore ideologically weakened (Fairclough 2001).

2.3. Eroding the Human/Animal Dichotomy

To elude the inadequacies of a similarity-based ethics (see 2.2.), vegan advocates should honour the "singular otherness of the nonhuman" (Quinn 2021, 266). And yet, "othering" is the "foundation of prejudice" (Joy 2023, 37); it is from a dichotomous "human-animal ontology" — whereby the latter is perceived as entirely "other" in its supposed "deficiencies" — that anthropocentric moral hierarchy proceeds (Calarco 2014). For this reason, vegan advocacy discourse that erodes the "human/animal dichotomy" not by anthropomorphising "animals", but by "deconstructing" the human sense of separation from "animality", is most fruitful (Freeman 2010). When referring to nonhumans and humans respectively, terms such as "fellow animals" and "human animals" are productive in this connection (13-14).

Wynter (1976; 1992) has elucidated how systemic oppression is legitimated and sustained by othering discourse through which the oppressor is defined *in contrast* to the oppressed. In the current case, "language-use" is commonly advanced as the trait that distinguishes humanity from "the animal" (Freeman 2010, 15). However, such a belief constitutes "descriptive anthropocentrism by extrapolation" (Mylius, 2018): our inability to comprehend nonhuman language does not mean that other animals "use no language", or "some proto-version… that reaches its zenith in humans" (177). Rather, operating from an

anthropocentric conception of "language" (Nguyen 2019, 103) leaves us unperceptive to the acoustic, "kinesthetic semiotics… chemosensory, visual, and tactile language[s]" of the other-than-human (Haraway 2016, 122). In addition to language-use, "it is not just human people who mourn the loss of loved ones" (38) or otherwise suffer when being exploited for another's ends. And yet, language norms deny nonhuman animals the "personhood" that these experiences suggest, blinding us to what "connect[s] us as animal kin" (Nguyen 2019, 34-35). Accordingly, productive too is the species-inclusive use of relational nouns such as "mother" (*ibid.*), and the common noun "person" (Freeman 2010, 13-14), in vegan advocacy.

Lest we remain embedded in human narcissism, though, the personhood of nonhuman animals upheld by vegan advocates must rest on an unconditional embracing of their *intrinsic value*, and not on their capacity to "prove" their moral "worth" — through language and the like — to the human gaze (MacCormack 2020). Reinforcing the very "benchmarks" to moral consideration that underpin nonhuman and human oppressions in the first place, ability-based ethics engender a discriminatory and anthropocentric "meritocracy" and should thus be rejected (Plumwood 1993; Trigg 2021). Moreover, the "trans-species solidarity" championed within vegan discourse must be rooted in our "shared animality" (Husain 2023, 67) rather than — as stated above — a colonial "imposition of self" (Plumwood 1993), for our denial of our own animality is not only deeply misled, it "serves as a primary boundary" to "consideration of animal rights as a valid ethical position" (Freeman 2010, 11).

When abandoning these blunders, the subverting of the human/animal dichotomy via vegan advocacy discourse undermines human supremacy assumptions, "problematize[s] the fragile borders" of oppressor and oppressed, and in turn delegitimises speciesist moral hierarchy (Freeman 2010, 29). Put differently, mitigating the limitations of "perceptual anthropocentrism" by decentring human judgement, such efforts discard the separating, centring and exalting of the human by descriptive anthropocentrism and its narcissistic human-animal ontology and associated human exceptionalism, and consequently call into question the moral hierarchy of anthropocentric ideology (Calarco 2014; Mylius 2018).

2.4. Intersectionality

The final way in which vegan advocacy discourse can undermine anthropocentrism to be discussed here is by promoting an intersectional analysis of nonhuman animal oppression. "Intersectionality" is a theory through which "overlaps" and "connections" between "different axes of subordination" can be understood (Trigg 2021, 89). We have seen that, far from lauding all of humanity, anthropocentrism provides the rationale for the oppressions of nonhuman animals and various human groups (see 1.1.). *All beings* — nonhuman and human — deemed to be outside of a contrived template of the white, cis-male, heterosexual, able-bodied, property-owning, etcetera "archetypal human" are "animalized" through anthropocentric thinking and thus rendered inferior, contemptable, exploitable and expendable (Trigg 2021, 78-79). Ergo, anthropocentric "animalization" can be understood as the "common source" of

"racism, sexism, speciesism, ableism, and so on — or coloniality in general" (Ko and Ko 2020, 82-87). The theory of intersectionality can be utilised by vegan advocates to reveal this interrelatedness between, and common source of, said oppressions (Trigg 2021).

Central to these efforts is recognising that such an approach is not a "distraction" from "the animals" — as is sometimes claimed — but an attempt to address the injustice highlighted by the ethical vegan movement at its *root* (Ko and Ko 2020, 82-87). Failure to grasp the mutual foundations of nonhuman animal and human oppressions leaves any critique of the former partial, and liable to reproduce the very discriminatory frameworks it hopes to oppose (*ibid*.; Trigg 2021). Importantly however, in articulating these interconnections, vegan advocates must not merely make *comparisons* between oppressions. Although potentially powerful, comparing nonhuman animal exploitation with, say, human slavery, limits veganism's appeal to "privileged white" communities by *exploiting* human suffering, in turn dismissing its *ongoing* reality and restating one of the central mechanisms of intra-human oppression — namely, derogatory animalisation via comparison with nonhumans (Brueck 2017, 20-21). Rather than exposing their root cause, such comparisons leave the anthropocentric "moral hierarchy" that inferiorises "both Blackness and animality" intact (Constantine 2020, 66-67).

Brueck and McNeill (2020) write that "most movements miss the opportunity to address systems of oppression by failing to embrace consistent anti-oppression" (25). In addition to above, the mainstream vegan movement perpetuates the animalisation at the heart of nonhuman and human oppressions in a variety of ways: from the sexual objectification of women in advocacy campaigns which, counterintuitively, uses the patriarchal frame of "consumable" *human* bodies in an attempt to convince audiences "to *not* consume and overpower" nonhuman bodies (Wrenn 2016, 101-102); to the demonisation of highly exploited, often vulnerable and "disproportionately people of color" slaughterhouse workers which is both "racist and classist" *and* overlooks the inextricableness of *systemic* nonhuman and human exploitation under capitalism (121-123). Moreover, as an "*inherently* exploitative" system, capitalism precludes the possibility of a "cruelty-free" lifestyle and thus veganism under capitalism should not be framed as such, but rather as an *aspirational* stand against oppression that necessarily transcends "consumer identities" (182-186).

Far from exhaustive, this discussion begins to illustrate how a lack of intersectional awareness leaves veganism incompatible with other social justice efforts, frustrating its otherwise *indispensable* contribution to the dismantling of the systemic oppressions of our time (Colling et al. 2014; Dickstein et al. 2022). When intersectional in its approach, vegan advocacy discourse can "de-center the archetypal human in the status quo" to benefit nonhuman animals and otherised human groups (Trigg 2021, 93), spotlighting the foundational role of anthropocentrism in the subordination of all excluded from the "master category" of speciesist, racist, "cisheteropatriarchal" colonial capitalism (Brueck and McNeill 2020; Plumwood 1993).

3. Conclusion

Proceeding from a recognition of anthropocentrism as the ideological substructure of the entangled oppressions of nonhuman animals and marginalised humans in and by Western societies, and the central role discourse plays in communicating and normalising said ideology and its destructive consequences, the current article has critically explored ways in which vegan advocacy discourse can undermine anthropocentrism and its legitimating discourse. As contended, when carefully done, the centring of other-than-human interests can disrupt the narcissism and moral hierarchy of descriptive and normative anthropocentrisms respectively; exposés and non-euphemistic language can incapacitate the animal-exploiting industries' efforts to obscure the truth of animal product production, thus rendering its violent and environmentally unsustainable reality visible and therefore ideologically vulnerable; the eroding of the otherising human/animal dichotomy can challenge the self-aggrandising conclusions of perceptual anthropocentrism whilst destabilising a hierarchical and deluded human-animal ontology; and the championing of an intersectional understanding of oppression can elucidate the interconnectedness of human to nonhuman and intra-human injustices under capitalism and decentre the exclusionary, anthropocentric conception of the quintessentially human. It is the author's hope that, by providing this critical discussion, the current article has underscored the essential role veganism can play in subverting the deeply noxious ideology of anthropocentrism.

References

Adams, Carol J. 2015. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Aydın-Düzgit, Senem and Rumelili, Bahar. 2019. "Discourse Analysis: Strengths and Shortcomings". *All Azimuth* 8 (2): 285–392.

Bratanova, Boyka; Loughnan, Steve and Bastain, Brock. 2011. "The effect of categorization as food on the perceived moral standing of animals". *Appetite* 57 (1): 193–196.

Brueck, Julia Feliz. 2017. *Veganism in an Oppressive World: A Vegans of Color Community Project*. Wroclaw: Sanctuary Publishers.

Brueck, Julia Feliz and McNeill, Zane. 2020. *Queer and Trans Voices: Achieving Liberation Through Consistent Anti-Oppression*. [s.l.]: Sanctuary Publishers.

Calarco, Matthew. 2014. "Being toward Meat: Anthropocentrism, Indistinction, and Veganism". *Dialectical Anthropology* 38 (4): 415–429.

Cole, Matthew and Stewart, Kate. 2021. "(Mis)representing Veganism in Film and Television". In *The Routledge Handbook of Vegan Studies*, edited by Laura Wright, 319-332. London: Routledge.

Colling, Sarat; Parson, Sean and Arrigoni, Alessandro. 2014. "Until All Are Free: Total Liberation through Revolutionary Decolonization, Groundless Solidarity, and a Relationship Framework". *Counterpoints* 448: 51–73.

Constantine, Moe. 2020. "Oppressive Dichotomies: Fighting for Animals with Queer Liberation". In *Queer and Trans Voices: Achieving Liberation Through Consistent Anti-Oppression*, edited by Julia Feliz Brueck and Zane McNeill, 63–70. [s.l.]: Sanctuary Publishers.

Cooper, David E. 2018. *Animals and Misanthropy*. London: Routledge.

Crist, Eileen and Kopnina, Helen. 2014. "Unsettling Anthropocentrism". *Dialectical Anthropology* 38 (4): 387–396.

Dickstein, Jonathan; Dutkiewicz, Jan; Guha-Majumdar, Jishnu and Winter, Drew Robert. 2022. "Veganism as Left Praxis". *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 33 (3): 56–75.

Donaldson, Sue and Kymlicka, Will. 2011. *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 2000. *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman. 2001. *Language and Power*, 2nd edn. Harlow — Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Freeman, Carrie P. 2010. "Embracing Humanimality: Deconstructing the Human/Animal Dichotomy". In *Arguments about Animal Ethics*, edited by Greg Goodale and Jason E. Black, 11–30. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Freeman, Carrie P. 2014. *Framing Farming: Communication Strategies for Animal Rights*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Giraud, Eva Haifa. 2019. *What Comes After Entanglement?: Activism, Anthropocentrism, and an Ethics of Exclusion*. London: Duke University Press.

Giraud, Eva Haifa. 2021. "The 'Posthumanists': Cary Wolfe and Donna Haraway". In *The Routledge Handbook of Vegan Studies*, edited by Laura Wright, 50–61. London: Routledge.

Gough, Louis Arthur. 2023. "Veganism's Anti-Anthropocentric Capacity: A Critical Analysis of the Advocacy Discourse of Three Prominent Vegan Organisations". Relations. *Beyond Anthropocentrism* 11 (1): 9–28.

Hahn, Erin R.; Gillogly, Meghan and Bradford, Bailey E. 2021. "Children are Unsuspecting Meat Eaters: An Opportunity to Address Climate Change". *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 78.

Haraway, Donna J. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Croydon: Duke University Press.

Harper, A. Breeze. 2010. Sistah *Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Books.

Husain, Amber. 2023. *Meat Love: An Ideology of the Flesh*. [s.l.]: MACK.

Joy, Melanie. 2011. Why *We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs and Wear Cows: An Introduction to Carnism*. San Francisco: Conari Press.

Joy, Melanie. 2023. *How to End Injustice Everywhere: Understanding the Common Denominator Driving all Injustices, to Create a Better World for Humans, Animals, and the Planet*. Woodstock, NY: Lantern Publishing & Media.

Ko, Aph and Ko, Syl. 2020. *Aphro-ism: Essays on Pop Culture, Feminism, and Black Veganism from Two Sisters*. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Publishing & Media.

MacCormack, Patricia. 2020. *The Ahuman Manifesto*. London: Bloomsbury.

Monbiot, George. 2023. *Regenesis: Feeding the World Without Devouring the Planet*. London: Penguin Books.

Mylius, Ben. 2018. "Three Types of Anthropocentrism". *Environmental Philosophy* 15 (2): 159–194.

Nguyen, Hanh. 2019. *Tongue Tied: Breaking the Language Barrier to Animal Liberation*. New York: Lantern Books.

Nibert, David. 2012. "The Fire Next Time: The Coming Cost of Capitalism, Animal Oppression and Environmental Ruin". *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment* 3 (1): 141–158.

Plumwood, Val. 1993. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. London: Routledge.

Quinn, Emelia. 2021. "Vegan Studies and Queer Theory". In *The Routledge Handbook of Vegan Studies*, edited by Laura Wright, 261–271. London: Routledge.

Trenkova, Lilia. 2020. "Conversations with Activists: Why Should LGBTQIA+ and Vegan Communities Work Together to Fight Intersectional Oppressions?". In *Queer and Trans Voices: Achieving Liberation Through Consistent Anti-Oppression*, edited by Julia Feliz Brueck and Zane McNeill, 313–317. [s.l.]: Sanctuary Publishers.

Trigg, Robyn. 2021. "Intersectionality: An Alternative to Redrawing the Line in the Pursuit of Animal Rights". *Ethics & the Environment* 26 (2): 73–121.

Vidakovic, Anja. 2023. "Mainstream Veganism. An Obstacle to Animal and Social Rights Movements". *Animal Ethics Review* 3 (1): 60–67.

Weitzenfeld, Adam and Joy, Melanie. 2014. "An Overview of Anthropocentrism, Humanism, and Speciesism in Critical Animal Theory". *Counterpoints* 448: 3–27.

Winters, Ed. 2022. *This is Vegan Propaganda (and Other Lies the Meat Industry Tells You)*. London: Penguin Random House.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2016. *A Rational Approach to Animal Rights: Extensions in Abolitionist Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wrenn, Corey Lee and Johnson, Rob. 2013. "A Critique of Single-Issue Campaigning and the Importance of Comprehensive Abolitionist Vegan Advocacy". *Food, Culture & Society* 16 (4): 651–668.

Wynter, Sylvia. 1976. "Ethno or Socio Poetics". *Alcheringa* 2 (2): 78–94.

Wynter, Sylvia. 1992. "Beyond the Categories of the Master Conception: The Counterdoctrine of the Jamesian Poiesis". In *C.L.R. James's Caribbean*, edited by Paget Henry and Paul Buhle, 63–91. Durham: Duke University Press.