ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

‘Anyone who Abuses Animals is no Italian’: Animal Protection in Fascist Italy

This is the final peer-reviewed author’s accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:
Giulia Guazzaloca (2020). ‘Anyone who Abuses Animals is no Italian’: Animal Protection in Fascist Italy. EUROPEAN HISTORY QUARTERLY, 50(4), 669-688 [10.1177/0265691420960672].

Availability:
This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/774709 since: 2020-10-16

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1177/0265691420960672

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

15 September 2026

‘ANYONE WHO ABUSES ANIMALS IS NO ITALIAN’ ANIMAL PROTECTION IN FASCIST ITALY

Giulia Guazzaloca

Abstract: This article examines the animal protection policies in Fascist Italy, placing them in the more general framework of Mussolini’s political and economic strategies and the history of Italian animal advocacy, which began in the second half of the nineteenth century. Focusing on fascist propaganda campaigns on animal welfare, legislation on animal experimentation and slaughter, state reorganization of animal protection societies, which were incorporated in 1938 into the Ente nazionale fascista per la protezione animale, the article aims to show the conceptual and political basis of fascist activism in the prevention of cruelty to animals. Far from being based on the recognition of animals as sentient individuals, it was determined by specifically human interests: autarky and economic efficiency, public morality, the primacy of ‘fascist civilization’, the regime’s totalitarian design.

Keywords: Animal Advocacy, Animal Welfare, Antivivisectionism, Fascism, Mussolini

1. Foreword

Benito Mussolini wanted to make respect for animals an ornament of fascist ‘modernism’. He raised it to a patriotic duty and hymned it along with pride and courage as a major virtue of the Italian people. The regime’s grounding in animal rights, and the schemes and laws introduced by fascism on animal protection are the subject of this essay – still underexplored by Italian and international historians. Mussolini’s decision to bolster defence of animals formed part of a movement that, in Italy and elsewhere, stemmed from the second half of the nineteenth century. As early as the 1870s–1880s animal protection societies had arisen in all the main Italian cities, set up by members of the upper and middle classes, who combined philanthropic ideals and commitment with sensitivity to the plight of animals; an 1890 article of the criminal code covered maltreatment of animals, while a 1913 law governed application of this, as well as regulating the practice of vivisection.[1] Considered by the nineteenth-century liberal elite a sign of civilization and human progress, the kind treatment of animals was likewise seen by fascism as part of its modernization project for the Italian people. Moreover, the animal cause fell within Mussolini’s grandiose scheme for centralising the State; he argued that ‘there are no big or little things: everything must advance together in the life of a people’.[2] This issue was thus connected and subordinated to the regime’s most ambitious aims: achieving economic autarky and creating a ‘sovereign totalitarian State that interprets and regulates the life of the Nation’.[3]

Focusing on fascism’s anti-cruelty policies, namely the measures brought in by Mussolini in propaganda, organization and legislation, the article would like to show that, as with other sectors, animal protection served the regime to create the myth of a clean break with the past, the image of ‘palingenesis’ and that of a nation at the top of ‘civilization’. Yet it actually sprang from traditions and experience dating from previous epochs and in this sphere, as in many others such as colonial rule in Libya, legislation or State administration, there were continuities between liberal and fascist Italy.[4] More restrictive laws were promulgated, especially on experiments with animals: the *Ente nazionale fascista per la protezione animale* (Fascist National Agency for Animal Protection, ENFPA), founded in 1938, enjoyed resources that furthered its cause; there were major propaganda campaigns to promote a culture of animal welfare, specifically styled ‘a duty upheld by law’.[5]

However, the Duce never spoke of 'animal rights' in any modern sense, and it was not only Italy, in the years between the wars, that saw the growth of animal welfare schemes: in that respect Mussolini's regime was no exception. In Great Britain, for example, the societies gradually abandoned the 'all embracing' approach, which was replaced by a greater fragmentation of issues and vocations; they intensified their anti-vivisectionist campaigns, the pressure to regulate the hunting and their lobbying activities even during election campaigns.[6] What the Duce did try and alter from previous liberal tradition was the basic assumptions and the public face of animal advocacy: he invested heavily in the task of sensitising the people to treat animals well and could obviously do so with means and resources that the old anti-cruelty societies lacked.

This essay draws on sources from the Central State Archives and the historical archive of ENPA (*Ente nazionale per la protezione animale*), as well as pamphlets, popularising matter and newspaper articles since these are a useful way to capture the image that fascism wanted to give to its 'new' policies for animal welfare. It divides into three parts. The first outlines the theoretical and operative bases of fascist pro-active protectionism, highlighting points of continuity with, and change from, the previous stage of Italian history. The tenets of animal protection, with their roots in the nineteenth-century British world, had long been viewed in Italy as a foreign import backed by the bourgeois liberal elite;[7] they hence seemed to have little to do with the ideological and political pillars of fascism. It will be seen how Mussolini and regime propaganda took them over and recast them in the light of fascism and its cultural needs and heritage. The second section focuses on the main legislative steps that got under way towards the late Twenties and culminated in 1938 with the disbanding of all animal associations and establishment of ENFPA. In its last part the essay traces the fortunes of this last, down to the Second World War and the fall of the regime when many branches were bombed and forced to close through lack of funding. Eventually, however, amid the devastation, want and poverty of war, the *Ente* managed not to be closed down. Mussolini's animal scheme – though far from based on recognition of the status of non-humans – survived him and came down to our own day.

2. Nationalism, virility and animal welfare

Stemming from unification itself, often thanks to upper-class foreign and especially British enthusiasts, Italy's anti-cruelty societies slowly began to revive in the early Twenties despite difficulties of funding. The strays problem had become a priority with all animal refuge concerns, and veterinary clinics sprang up in Bologna, Rome, Florence, Turin, Naples and Milan.[8] The associations (among whose members were many women, mostly from the middle and upper classes) monitored the treatment of draught animals and beasts of burden; they investigated cases of illegal trafficking in game, the blinding of decoy birds, transportation of animals to abattoirs and 'humane' slaughtering of them, the hygiene of stables and cowhouses, protection of doves and swallow nests, and the creating of veterinary facilities.[9] After at least three decades of discussion, 1929 saw the birth of the *Federazione nazionale italiana fra le Società zoofile*, tasked with coordinating society action 'in the field of education and repression', and introducing the 'legislative improvements' needed 'for more effective defence of the animal world'. The Federation had its own journal, *L'idea zoofila e zootecnica*, but failed to function properly or liaise effectively among the various local groups.[10]

Another 1929 foundation was the *Unione antivivisezionista italiana* (UAI) by which physician and biologist Gennaro Ciaburri sought to 'apprise the public of the methods and conclusions of vivisection and combat them by every means'.[11] One year after establishment, the UAI already numbered 400 members and two affiliations, Palermo and Genoa, to be followed by Milan, Florence and Naples. The topic of animal experimentation, which Italian animal defenders had been discussing since the 1860s, was thus back in the thick of the debate. Ciaburri was against it not only on moral grounds, but primarily as a method of scientific research. 'By the hecatomb of so many animals has the physiologist achieved his ends?', he wondered in his 1930 volume *La vivisezione*.

'For that to be so, each experience would have to tie up with an important discovery'.[12] In over 300 pages packed with data, experiments and techniques he showed its uselessness to science or teaching; picking up Jeremy Bentham's remarks on animal 'sensitivity', he claimed there was 'a pronounced sensibility and emotional depth in animals belonging to bird and mammal groups'. Victor Hugo's cry was right: 'la vivisection est un crime'.[13] Ciaburri's was the first rigorously argued objection in Italy to the use of animals for research purposes. He pointed out the limitations and contradictions of an anthropocentric approach to the relations between human and other species.

In this late-Twenties context of awakening interest by animal defenders and anti-vivisectionists, the Mussolini regime set to work. Once the dictatorship's building was completed, plans for 'a unified totalitarian State' – wrote the MP Innocenzo Cappa, in 1928 – also called for standardisation of the norms and deeds of animal protectionism. 'In any fascist atmosphere' it was hardly 'serious' to allow the various provinces' animal protection groups to persist in disparities of treatment and 'wayward interpretations of the law'.[14] Beginning with stepping up the rules on vivisection and maltreatment, fascist activism in animal protection kept pace with Mussolini's design to implement a corporative centralising State. Although burgeoning public security set limits to basic freedoms, for a while the animal protection societies preserved a degree of independence under the guarantee of close supervision by the prefect's office. It was the job of police and prefects to report on the 'moral and political conduct' of any 'undesirable elements', and in 1938 the Police Chief applied specifically to monitor associations run by foreigners.[15] Sometimes, too, it was the society that initiated the fascist line-toeing, as in 1934 when the Emilia-Romagna Society altered its statute to make its council into a directorate and render it obligatory for the president to be a party member.[16]

In the historical and cultural roots of animal advocacy there was little apparent compatibility with fascism, a system anchored to ultra-nationalism and anti-liberalism, revelling in physical strength and prowess to the point of constantly supporting the hunting lobby. To think that animal protectionism sprang from the 'social and moral ferment' of nineteenth-century liberalism; it had had 'Victorian England's humanitarianism for its horizon';[17] it was supported by a noble and upper-middleclass elite of liberal progressive thinkers; it worked in synergy with the cultural milieu of social reformers, radical intellectuals and politicians, theosophists and anticlericals, methodists and feminists. One and all believed that a merciful attitude to 'lower beings' would make people more charitable, serve to combat social squalor and refine manners, especially among the working class.[18] In espousing the cause of animal welfare, Mussolini's first task was to rid it of all English and American overtones, give it a nationalist native hue, and link it to authentic civil virtues of the Italians. 'Anyone who abuses animals is no Italian',[19] he was wont to say, compelling the fascist cult of the Patria to include benevolence towards animals.

Regime propaganda strove to brand the 'sentimental' and 'extravagant' protectionism of the British people as an 'exaggeration', and 'exaggeration is a fault': to erect funeral monuments to pets or leave them one's inheritance were forms of eccentricity verging on 'animal idolatry'. Cats and dogs had become 'the "dumb masters" of the haughty British'.[20] In 1941 the hope was that the 'triumph of the Axis powers' would sweep away all that was 'excessive and unreasonable about the English love of animals'.[21] The lack of an authentic feeling for animals in Sicily, Palermo's ENFPA commissar implied, was due to the 'deplorable, humiliating munificence of British and American old maids'.[22] Support and funding by foreigners living in Italy, which had been of vital importance for the first Italian animal advocates, were now totally rejected, and fascism intended to make this an exclusively and specifically national issue.

Thus, while squaring animal protection values with fascist doctrine entailed rejecting the 'sometimes morbid passions' of sentimentality and all the 'Americanisms unworthy of a civilised people',[23] the regime also sought to bring them into line with the key tenets of its political religion: energy, drive, courage, cult of the fatherland. Education Minister Giuseppe Bottai insisted that 'proud virility of character need not rule out gentle ways and pity for lower beings'.[24] Indeed, the whole fascist approach to animals was based on 'combining the material with the sentimental, the

law of profitability with humanitarianism'.[25] Since 'pity is a quality of giants',[26] Mussolini himself, with his lifelong 'deep love of animals', was the living proof that respect for animals did not rule out 'heroic and virile deeds'.[27] Rapprochement with Nazi Germany reinforced the Duce's claim that militarism and honing will power could twin with love of animals: 'look at the German people', he would say: 'beyond all doubt they are a military nation, yet respect for animals runs naturally deep and even at times seems like a cult'.[28] Hitler passed an anti-cruelty law that, for 1933, was ahead of its time, and animal welfare was supported by the main leaders of the government such as Göring and Himmler. Partially different from the fascist one, the Nazi view linked animal welfare to the traditions of nature preservation and romantic protest, with a non-anthropocentric approach.[29] Obviously, the mythical new 'fascist civilization' also entailed reviving homespun traditions and *pietas* towards animals had deep roots in Italian Catholicism. The feast of St Francis, the 'holiest and keenest' apostle of tenderness towards animals,[30] was instantly included in Mussolini's 'zoophilous' liturgy; on October 4th events paying tribute to Francis and his beloved animals were put on in all the main Italian cities to show how the great Franciscan lesson – 'love of all creatures, respect for everything' – was daily renewed in the 'new Italian, Mussolini's Italian'.[31]

For fascism forging the 'new Italian' began in infancy; instilling respect for animals found room in the complex mobilisation of children by the regime. From 1936 to 1938 Minister Giuseppe Bottai sent circulars to teachers and education officers urging them to step up 'feelings of respect for and protection of animals' in schools. Respect for the 'lower beings', he insisted, was to 'depend on a sense of duty rather than on fear of punishment'.[32] Although it was practised by animal advocacy associations back in the liberal age, propaganda for children became part of fascism's all-inclusive education programme designed to teach young people the health-giving traditions of the soil, contact with nature and zeal for agricultural labour. It was coordinated among the anti-cruelty societies and divisions of the youth movement, *Gioventù italiana del littorio.* Certificates of merit, prize competitions, compositions on subjects of animal wellbeing, distribution and projection of informative matter and lessons on animal psychology were some of the 'fecund schemes' implemented in schools. In rural areas the government made sure children understood the importance to agriculture of birds keeping down insects; sections of the national Balilla movement were enlisted in the project. Such schemes were reported in the press as 'truly worthy of the homeland of Francis of Assisi'.[33]

Friends and helpers of humans in any representation destined for youngsters, animals were first and foremost 'resources' of the nation. In fostering the cult of agricultural life and rural tradition, the regime was presenting a nature tamed and controlled by man, made fecund by his labour, where animals were a source of wealth and a means of lightening human toil. 'Rational exploitation' of them would further the national economy and the attainment of autarky. The argument was not a new one. Not just in Italy, but throughout the liberal tradition and nineteenth-century laws on protection, the cause of animal welfare twinned with the economic potential of exploitation. At times, too, the ban fell on killing an animal 'belonging to another person' but not one's own or one without an owner, anti-cruelty legislation being overtly geared to private property.[34] The late eighteenth-century welfare societies themselves made frequent reference to the individual and collective 'utility' of keeping animals in good trim. The Florentine Society proclaimed the principles of 'Humanity, Justice, Utility' since 'a well-fed and better tended animal gives a bigger and better economic return'.[35] The utilitarian slant was thus no novelty, but fascism went a step further in tying it to the 'harmonious collective' of its project for a totalitarian State.[36] As part of Mussolini's plan for productive self-sufficiency (this economic policy started in the early Thirties and was strengthened after the sanctions imposed on Italy by the League of Nations following the invasion of Ethiopia), the proper tending of animals combined 'right with duty', the 'material' with the 'sentimental', the 'law of return' with 'that of humanity'.[37]

The short work by Michele De Matteis *Proteggere gli animali* provides a summary of fascist thinking on the subject: it showed how proper treatment was, in the first place, a patriotic cause, serving both the struggle for autarky, and conservation of the fauna heritage: 'sparing animals cruelty, maltreatment, hunger and undue toil, defending them from the snares of disease, will

improve the breed and further the nation's economy'. The book was intended primarily for farmers, vets and stock-breeders. It cast over animal protection that image of organic unity and cohesion among parts which underlay the regime's totalitarian design. 'Zoophilia is the purest flame of humanity', claimed the author: 'it has its roots in the mystique of autarky'.[38] In essence, sparing animals undue suffering would both morally regenerate the fascist population, and help attain the nation's economic self-sufficiency.

Fascism's zealous promotion of animal welfare fell foul of two quite separate problems. The first was that Mussolini had to reconcile animal protection with unflagging support for hunting which was hailed as 'an economic, sporting and military activity for the nation'. In 1931 the Duce himself figures on the cover of *Diana* with the headline 'I too am a hunter'.[39] He saw field sports as healthy physical exercise and a useful introduction to soldiering. Seen in terms of economics, militarism and physical prowess – and considering that the societies for animal protection had hitherto not included wildlife –, hunting posed no real obstacle to the 'harmonious collective' when it came to the treatment of animals. The members of zoophilous societies were only too concerned not to be 'taken for a bunch of hysterical puritans', and confined their protest to the killing of small birds: that was not 'economic either for the hunter or for the cause of autarky', let alone sporting. 'We animal lovers', stated the president of the Florentine Society, 'support hunting on economic, sporting and military training' grounds, in line with the Duce's dictates.[40] To combat poaching, protect nests, respect species that were 'inviolable' for their rarity or usefulness in agriculture, to eradicate the malpractice of turning dogs loose once the hunting season was closed: these were targets on which all basically agreed – the regime, hunters and animal defenders.[41] Although the earliest anti-cruelty societies did not actually oppose the hunting or slaughtering of animals for food or horse racing, in fascism it was the Duce himself, and thus the State, who tried to combine and integrate different and apparently irreconcilable activities, which the all-embracing functions of State rendered legitimate. To Mussolini both hunting and animal protection were 'just' pursuits, both of them redounding to the grandeur of the nation[42]. The regime culture showed a rather similar contradictory approach to nature. Autarchic ideology and support for the industrialization process caused very harmful consequences for the country's natural and artistic heritage; at the same time, the ruralist component of the fascist movement tried to instil the concept of conserving natural beauty, achieving positive results in legislation to protect the artistic and natural heritage.[43]

The second problem was the inveterate image of Italy as a country that paid scant attention to animals. As Giuseppe Gregoraci president of Roman Society admitted, it was 'one of the most deplorable shortcomings of popular education'.[44] To be sure, even the founders of the British Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (1824) had been prompted by fear of distressing 'foreigners coming amongst us for the first time';[45] likewise in Italy, this side to the issue had always been acutely felt. In 1899 it formed the subject of a lecture by Fr. Ignazio Lazzari entitled (in Italian in the original) *On the protection of animals, showing why foreigners do not come to Naples*, while the 1913 law partly stemmed from the realization that maltreatment of animals was jeopardising 'national character and decorum'.[46] Although progress had been made in terms of prevention and penalties, Mussolini found that foreigners' complaints about the condition of animals in Italy were an insult to fascist grandeur and a goad to the tightening of anti-cruelty laws. Thus in 1925 it was a letter to the Duce from an English lady that led to Public Security deciding to tighten up existing legislation and enlisting the voluntary Militia in the prevention of maltreatment, seeing that 'it is imbued with a precious moral force'.[47] In urging prefects and police to enforce the law more strictly, government officials always appealed to 'national prestige' and the 'good name of our Country'.[48] A circular from police chief Arturo Bocchini described abuses of animals as 'prejudicial to our country, especially for the painful and repugnant impression foreigners may receive in visiting Italy'.[49] The Duce took part personally in the propaganda drive to redeem Italy's image as a country insensitive to animal welfare: 'protection of animals', he reiterated, 'is a people's highest form of civilization' and 'respect for animal lives is one of the noblest traits of a country's life'. The press fêted the founding fathers of the Italian animal welfare movement, like Giuseppe Garibaldi and Timoteo Riboli,[50] and gave prominent coverage to any steps by the regime

concerning animals and the environment. It was said that the ban on wildfowling on the island of Capri 'filled the hearts of the most civilised peoples with admiration for Italy'.[51] In 1938 ENFPA brought out a pamphlet by Feliciano Philipp, *Protection of Animals in Italy*, whose aim was to inform people of 'the Italian people's true sentiments towards animals and perfect animal welfare organization as desired by the Duce'.[52]

3. A patriotic duty

The rise of a centralising State sought to create a closed monopoly of central regulations. It was bound to include animal protection, where the uncoordinated associations and differing interpretations of the law on, and role of, protection agencies undermined the efficiency of regulatory measures. Coordination by the National Federation of Animal Protection Societies had achieved but little. Tightening up anti-cruelty regulations, reorganizing and rationalising the whole subject served the purpose of manifesting the primacy of the party-State and, in Mussolini's eyes, making a clean break with previous decades. As of the late Twenties, the general reform of law and organization started to be added to animal protection propaganda.

Ever since the animal protection movement began, scientists and intellectuals had argued and disagreed about animal experimentation. This came under attack once more as the Twenties came to a close, spurred by Ciaburri and the UAI. Between 1927 and 1941 fascism passed three laws on the subject, and the most important of them – law 924/1931 – would remain in force for the next sixty years. The title itself, for the first time, introduced the term 'vivisection'. The ban extended to all 'experiments on warm-blooded vertebrates (mammals and birds)' except when they had 'the aim of furthering progress in biology and experimental medicine'. Vivisection on dogs and cats, 'normally forbidden', was only permitted if it was 'indispensable for experiments in scientific research', and provided it was 'absolutely impossible to use animals of other species'. The 1927 law had already ruled that experiments might only be carried out in authorized institutes and laboratories and that, barring indispensable requirements, the animal might only undergo one experiment.[53] These restrictions were confirmed in 1931, but pressure from the academic world reintroduced the clause enabling vivisection to be performed by persons without the necessary qualifications, upon ministerial authorization and only 'in cases of acknowledged exceptional importance'. A control system, as per art. 4, obliged directors of institutes and laboratories to keep a register of experiments so as to enable the provincial doctor to monitor events for authorization, where required, and any administrative or criminal infringements. For all the restrictions – such as the obligation to anaesthetize the animals except in highly unusual circumstances, and keep them in good housing conditions[54] –, law 924/1931 still granted considerable leeway to vivisectionists. In foreseeing a series of waivers which in actual fact curtailed the restrictions, it met neither the expectations of those who wanted science free from regulation, nor the claims of the anti-vivisectionists.[55]

Even monitoring the experiment institutes proved quite hard to carry out, especially at the beginning, so the animal protection societies largely confined themselves to reporting the stealing of dogs for sale to laboratories.[56] Not until ENFPA was created in 1938 did its officials begin making regular checks on laboratories and institutes, often finding – in the words of president Maria Vezzani Bottai – 'fierce opposition in the field of so-called high science'.[57] Without taking the hardest of lines, ENFPA worked 'towards rigorous and strictly controlled limitation' of vivisection and claimed the right to make periodic spot-checks on how laboratory animals were being treated.[58] With support from the Home Minister, Vezzani Bottai managed to get law 615/1941 passed: this acknowledged and formalised inspections by ENFPA officials, provided they were graduates in medicine or veterinary science and backed by directives from the provincial health authority.[59]

While the new regulations on experimentation and the inspections instituted by ENFPA were a small step forward from the 1913 Luzzatti law, when it came to setting penalties fascism hardly differed from the old Zanardelli code of 1890. In the 1930 criminal code promulgated by the Justice Secretary Alfredo Rocco there were four articles on animal protection. Though not particularly

innovative or binding, they might have ensured 'due defence of the animal world' if applied 'with intelligent firmness', along with 'that broad work of education instilling a climate of respect for animals'.[60] The most important article, 727 on the crime of maltreatment, by and large repeated the Zanardelli code in ranking it as an offence against public morality and proper behaviour. What interested the legislator was not so much legal protection of animals, as the prevention of displays of cruelty, for these – wrote Rocco – 'conflict with feelings of pity and humanity and denote the lack of all gentility of manner'.[61] Basically, art. 727 aimed to protect people from distress caused by ruthlessness towards animals; it preserved a sense of humane pity towards them, the same approach as had dictated Italian and European anti-cruelty laws in the second half of the nineteenth century. Likewise art. 638 on killing or maiming other people's animals sought to protect them not as sentient beings but as economic chattels that the State saw fit to safeguard in the interest of owners. The implication was that one might lawfully kill one's own animal or one that belonged to nobody. The only significant departure from the past was the new crime of 'failure to protect animals or mismanagement of them', including leaving them in the charge of 'inexpert persons' (art. 672).

Hence, for all the rodomontade about animal protection, the clauses of the Rocco code were no real improvement on the past. Not only was the focus of protection still largely on human feeling and the inviolability of property as a public interest, but fascism inherited past problems connected with application of the law and a concept of 'maltreatment' that left much to discretion. In other words, state centralisation did not really simplify regulations, or eliminate waivers on vivisection, and failed to provide a clear definition of maltreatment. In all public and semi-public areas there were many stumbling-blocks curbing Mussolini's design for a 'totalitarian-style authoritarian regime';[62] in animal protection the main problem was still that of getting local authorities to monitor compliance and enforce the law.

In the book that contains his 'Proposed law on animal protection' Giuseppe Gregoraci collected the various ministerial circulars (Home Office, Justice, Education, Agriculture): nearly all were in response to complaints by protection societies and the National Federation, and urged prefects and *podestà* to ensure 'strict enforcement' of the law. The main focus was on transportation of animals by rail and sea, management of municipal kennels, entertainment and sports involving animals, improper use of dogs as draught animals, and the condition of livestock in markets. In 1927, drawing on a similar circular from 1914, the Office of Public Security banned the issuing of licences for all entertainment that entailed 'tormenting animals' (fights, races employing sharpened goads, bullfighting, goose hurling, greasy poles involving live animals). In the same year Minister Rocco asked the legal authorities for 'their intelligent cooperation' in enforcing the law and thus contributing 'to the task of refining behaviour which the National Government has embarked on'.[63]

Fines and prosecution did not increase until the late Thirties after prompting by ENFPA,[64] though often convictions came to naught owing to the vagueness of art. 727 and – so said Vezzani Bottai – the magistrates' lack of concern about maltreatment offences.[65] In 1938 the press made much of an acquittal by the Court of Cassation concerning a farmer from Tortona who had transported six turkeys trussed head downwards. Since, to the judges, an animal was 'a thing that is a self-propelling piece of property', the only maltreatment lay in causing it 'suffering that might have been spared, and hence is subject to public censure'.[66] Similarly, the Court of Cassation found that plucking geese live was not an instance of an article 727 offence.[67] Convictions were passed for the blinding of quails, beating dogs and cats to death, skinning rabbits alive, illicit vivisection, beating of oxen heading for slaughter 'out of pure maliciousness', and – in one Turin magistrate's ruling that caused some sensation – application of improper harness on carthorses.[68]

The issue of butchery for food purposes came under the sights of the protection societies during the Twenties; here the regime stepped in to regulate controls on meat in 1928. It ruled that in butchering one must take 'steps to ensure as quick a death as possible', using a captive bolt pistol or severing the medulla oblongata. The captive bolt pistol came in, largely thanks to the Lucca animal protection Society. According to the president of ENFPA, it provided a 'system of humanitarian slaughtering, quite acceptable from all standpoints', whether animal protection or the food industry. By 1940 public slaughterhouses in seven provinces were already committed to that kind of pistol.[69]

Giuseppe Gasco was one who warmly advocated it in his 1939 booklet: 'euthanasic butchery' was seen as 'a moral necessity' and the new pistol as eliminating 'cruelty and brutality – the two main obstacles to civil progress'.[70] With the advent of racial laws, the government banned Jewish ritual butchery as of October 1938. Amid the broad anti-Semitic campaign stirred up by the Italian press from early on that year, the proposed ban was given great prominence. Fascism was said to have put paid to a 'barbarous practice', a rite 'unworthy of any civilised race', which has always caused animal lovers 'profound disgust'.[71] Possibly forgetting its links to racial law, the 1950 International Conference for the Animal Protection held in Geneva expressed 'reiterated tokens of satisfaction and approval' at the legislation in force in Italy.[72]

For all the handful of restrictions on vivisection, butchery and transportation, the regime's policy on animals lacked any broad, consistent, organic systematization. In 1936 Gregoraci, Commissar of the National Federation, made an abortive proposal to group the whole body of rules and decrees pertaining to animals into a single text. To have done so would probably have given greater thrust to animal welfare schemes and improved coordination of monitoring. Of course, there was also a need for radical reform of the Federation of affiliated societies. Gregoraci's proposal included a major change to article 638 governing the killing or maiming of animals, even by the owner, since 'such regulations cannot be construed as protecting property alone'. It meant an important concession to 'the animal's personal rights', which is to say 'the right to be respected in its personality as a living being'.[73] Had it been accepted, it would have played a decisive role in the recognition of animals as sentient beings. Such a viewpoint had hitherto lain outside the bounds of animal protection, though as the Thirties drew to an end it began to make a shy appearance in the press: articles devoted to animal intelligence ('thinking is not just man's privilege'), to the fact that 'they feel and understand', to humans' duty by them, to the animal's right 'to live and not be abused':[74] these marked a slight change in the view of relations between humans and non-humans. But that was not the gist of Mussolini-style zoophilia: the Duce chose the road of centralising the protectionist movement altogether, interested not so much in acknowledging animal dignity, as in clamping down on all free enterprise by civil society.

4. The *Ente nazionale fascista per la protezione degli animali*

1938 saw the creation of the *Ente nazionale fascista per la protezione degli animali*, which marked the high point of Mussolini's policy of growing State control in this field. 'Ideological purity, corporate theory and totalitarian aspirations' were pushing fascism towards a new phase of the dictatorship[75]; at the same time the alignment with Nazi Germany, participation in the Spanish civil and the racial laws slowly and surreptitiously began to erode the solid consensus behind the Duce. Perhaps it was partly to distract public opinion from the major issues of international politics that the press gave such publicity to the birth of ENFPA. That 1938 law was presented as a 'radical reform' of the old animal welfare movement, 'a new peal of bells by fascist society' which would lift animal protection 'from the plane of mere sentimentality (as it was generally rated) onto the plane of an activity recognised by the State'.[76] The government charged the new agency with 'imparting a lively thrust to the work so far done by the societies', penalised as they had often been by 'precariousness' and 'deficiency of means'.[77] These were limitations indeed, but disbanding the previous associations and setting up ENFPA came about chiefly in the conviction that only the State could turn defence of the flora and fauna heritage into a norm 'for the masses who nearly always live by imitation'.[78] Institutionalised by the new agency, animal protection would thus take its stand 'in the grand corporative picture of the Fascist Nation'[79] – one more tool by which the State was to re-educate and integrate the masses.

Raised to the status of a moral body and 'authorized to sport the Lictor's fasces', the new institute was to help 'defend the zootechnical heritage', produce 'effective propaganda on animal welfare and animal-raising practice', and make sure all the relevant legal requirements were complied with; it could absorb the previous legally recognised protection societies as provincial or

municipal entities. The law awarded it a share of the proceeds from various activities involving exploitation of animals: shows, exhibitions and fairs, horse and greyhound races, fishing and fowling licenses, hunters' gun licenses.[80] In that way it was the animals and the revenue they brought in that assisted 'in this task of dignifying, protecting and defending them'.[81] Its working mechanisms were laid down on 2 May 1939 by royal decree: all the central council members would be appointed by decree upon proposal by the Home Office, the fascist party and other ministerial offices, while the ranks of members were debarred from taking any direct part in management.[82] The following September brought the official appointment of Maria Vezzani Bottai, elder sister of the high-ranking party official Giuseppe Bottai, in the role of president, and the lawyer Corrado Trelanzi as vice president.[83]

Although initially a token continuity with the previous societies was preserved (for example by confirming the inspectors already serving), ENFPA was organized along rigidly vertical and centralised lines under the iron control of the central managing council over the outlying sections, and Home Office ratification of any financial or capital decision, the budget and nomination of inspectors.[84] As official public security agents, these last were authorized to carry revolvers, pistols or rifles,[85] though with the outbreak of war weapons would become expensive and hard to procure. Later on under the German occupation the agency would have to hand them over as part of the disarming of the civil population.[86] ENFPA was totally embedded in the tissue of the fascist State, and as such formally complied with the anti-Jewish laws. To begin with, Vezzani Bottai merely asked the local sections to report on the number of members 'of Jewish race' and give a profile (including race, religion and fascist membership) of the inspectors.[87] But as of 1941, after a tip-off from the prefect of Catania, the police chief sent out a circular forbidding Jews to take part in 'groups having animal protection as their purpose'.[88]

By little over a year after foundation, there were already 79 provincial sections, 31 municipal, and 367 inspectors on the strength. The president voiced her satisfaction in her report on the year 1940: the agency had government support on the issue of inspecting vivisection laboratories, getting slaughterhouses to use captive bolt pistols, the ban on slaughtering pregnant animals and on 'gypsies crossing the territory of the Kingdom with animals for public display', liaison with the Carabinieri command and the Ministry of Communications to find ways of improving animal conditions during transport, including the presence of an accompanying person, 'since deaths […] while travelling largely occur through lack of food and water'. In the course of the year inspectors had inflicted nearly 8,000 fines, made over 8,800 inspections and served more than 3,400 injunctions, as well as confiscating 9,400 objects. Local sections were in charge of surgeries, cowhouses, abattoirs, monitoring hunting and fishing, and teaching schoolchildren, though Vezzani judged this last activity to have been 'very half-hearted' because of 'the teaching staff's poor grasp of agency policy'.[89] The local and national press were covering all these operations regularly, while for the future plans were equally ambitious: to increase the number of inspectors, veterinary surgeries and equipment, start up municipal kennels, standardize the butchery system, abolish certain unfriendly practices such as fox-hunting on horseback. On closer inspection, however, the main concern was not that of furthering animal welfare. Vezzani herself regarded maltreatment chiefly as damaging to the nation's livestock reserve, while her application to have animal sports and spectacles banned was on economic grounds (they were fruitless in terms of autarky); there was also an element of persecution aimed at the Balkans-style nomad population of buskers and jugglers with animals in tow, who provided 'an indecorous spectacle of filth and poverty' and were an 'anachronistic category of down-and-outs' who preferred 'that idle existence to the discipline of a regular job'.[90]

When Italy joined the war, ENFPA was forced to scale down its operations, mainly because its income dwindled and there was a dearth of vets, who had been called up. Despite military setbacks and mounting loss of confidence in the regime, the Duce tried stubbornly to keep up an appearance of normality and continuity; he hence arranged an extraordinary subsidy of one and a half million lire for 1943 to enable the agency to go ahead with ordinary business, which brought 'satisfactory results'. Despite the precarious circumstances, in the course of 1942 the inspectors managed over

8,900 inspections and more than 7,600 fines; from 1941 to 1942 membership actually went up (from almost 17,500 to 20,718) and a few new sections were opened, for example at Messina.[91] The press kept up its coverage in the thick of the war, reporting cases of maltreatment, animal rescue operations, legacies in favour of ENFPA, and a range of animal welfare schemes.[92] By contrast, a dramatic shortage of foodstuffs (which the agency tried unsuccessfully to offset by devolving a quota of rationed foods to feeding dogs) brought up a new emergency: clandestine trafficking in cat meat and skins. In 1942 vice president Trelanzi described this as 'fullscale extermination […] in town and countryside'. For health reasons, among other things, ENFPA urged the government to authorize prefects to ban the killing of cats 'for consumption as well as use of skins and fats'.[93] Mussolini looked into the matter personally and allowed the agency to go in for cat breeding. In February 1943 the Home Office made it illegal to kill felines.[94]

The situation collapsed in most sections after the armistice and the German occupation. Where sections escaped bombing, they ran out of money to pay rent and salaries, while premises and equipment were frequently commandeered by the Nazi army. In 1945 the Commissar extraordinary directing the agency in areas under the *Repubblica Sociale* confessed he was unable to draw up a report for 1944 for lack of any news from the sections.[95] Devastated by civil war and the Nazi occupation, torn by institutional, ideological and territorial rifts, prostrated by poverty and famine, Italy in early 1945 was in no condition to look after animals. The State General Accounts department did in fact toy with suppressing the agency altogether in view of the 'extraordinary current state of finances'. A long and impassioned defence was put up by Commissar Ezio Padovani who pointed to the capillary labours of the 88 sections, at least down to the end of 1942, and to the reasons underpinning its constitution: 'to discipline the animal welfare work performed by private Societies differing in criteria and with the most limited and uncertain means'. In the end, the Home Office decided there was no case for suppressing the agency: first because doing so 'would hardly bring any financial advantage to the treasury, in practice' and also because 'in any self-respecting country a humane attitude to animals is part of civil education'.[96] Italy was brought low by twenty years of dictatorship, military defeat and civil war, the country was destroyed, the economy collapsing and the institutional future still to be decided, yet animal protection would form part of it.

With the return to liberal democracy in postwar Europe, animal protection movements gathered momentum everywhere. Side by side with ENPA, Italy saw new groups spring into life, animal welfare operations became more extensive and the work of educating and sensitising the public was stepped up. Animal protection, in short, entered upon a phase of transition and part renewal which would last down to the Seventies and Eighties. At that point anti-speciesist thinking and new demands and forms of activist mobilization ushered in a radical turning point, both in theory and in practice, in the defence of animals. In Anglo-American climes a distinction began to be made between animal *welfare* and animal *rights*; in 1982 Italian coined the term *animalismo* to denote a new rational and compassionate approach to relating with other species. On that score fascism had brought no revolution: it carried straight on from the liberal era in its approach to the human-animal relationship. Far from considering animals as sentient individuals or beings with rights of their own, Mussolini sought to protect them in the name of 'other' interests, specifically human: autarky and economic efficiency, public morality, the primacy of 'fascist civilization'.

Animal advocacy under fascism thus shows, first of all, the Duce's adroitness in turning the cause of animal welfare to serve the regime's ideological and political programme and moulding public thinking around that theme. Though born in the British world and closely linked to liberal culture, animal protection was taken over by a regime that had sought to eradicate both the values and the legal-political forms of liberalism. Mussolini made use of it in his grand scheme for a self-sufficient authoritarian State. He employed it systematically in building the culture of the Patria and the myth of a 'new man': patriotic, brave, kind-hearted towards animals. Secondly, the work of organization, legislation and propaganda proved long-lasting. The structure of ENPA was not renewed until 1954, campaigns for animal respect in schools were resumed and expanded in the Fifties and Sixties, while for a change in the law on hunting, animal experiments, abuses and the strays issue one would have to wait until the Nineties. All in all, animal protection bears out the

view that the ties and influence, deep or superficial, between the liberal era and fascism and between the latter and the new Italian Republic were very close and in this area, as in others, there was no 'clean break' with the past.

[1] It is not possible here to develop the history of Italian anti-cruelty activism during the liberal age; on this topic see A. Maori, *La protezione degli animali in Italia. Storia dell'ENPA e dei movimenti zoofili ed animalisti dalla metà dell'Ottocento alle soglie del Duemila* (Rome 2016), 16–86; S. Tonutti, *Diritti animali: storia e antropologia di un movimento* (Udine, 2007), 71–82; G. Guazzaloca, 'In the name of justice and compassion. Animal protection in Italy during the Liberal Age (1861–1914)', *Modern Italy*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (2017): 261–74; G. Guazzaloca, 'Una battaglia di civiltà. Il problema della tutela degli animali nel XIX secolo', *Memoria e Ricerca*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (2017): 351-70.
[2] Quoted in H. Reger, *Cinque storie di animali* (Bamberg 1941), 20.
[3] 'Verso il nuovo Ente fascista per la protezione degli animali', *Il Resto del Carlino*, November 26, 1937.
[4] On these continuities in many areas of political life see R. Pergher, *Mussolini's Nation-Empire. Sovereignity and Settlement in Italy's Borderlands, 1922-1943* (Cambridge 2018); G. Melis, *La macchina imperfetta. Immagine e realtà dello Stato fascista* (Bologna 2018); A. Lyttelton, ed., *Liberal and Fascist Italy 1900-1945* (Oxford 2002); P. Garfinkel, *Criminal Law in Liberal and Fascist Italy* (Cambridge 2016).
[5] U. Maggi, *Presentazione*, in M. De Matteis, *Proteggere gli animali* (Brescia 1941), 7.
[6] See, among others, H. Kean, *Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain since 1800* (London 1998), 157–79; Tonutti, *Diritti animali*, 89–92; 'Animals' Rights and the Election', *Manchester Guardian*, October 25, 1924.
[7] On the important role of foreigners in spreading animalist sympathies in Italy, as well as funding protection societies, see L. Nigro, *La protezione degli animali* (Milan 1902), 175–88.
[8] See Maori, *La protezione degli animali in Italia*, 95–110.
[9] G. Gregoraci, *Progetto di legge per la protezione degli animali. Testo unico delle leggi e dei decreti per la protezione degli animali* (Rome 1936), 5–28. See also the documents in the Archivio Centrale dello Stato (hereinafter ACS), Ministero dell'Interno, Polizia Amministrativa e Sociale (hereinafter POLAM), 1907–1986, b. 772, *Colombi – Affari generali*.
[10] G. Gasco, *La protezione statale degli animali* (Rome 1940), 4. Founded in 1926, the journal *L'idea zoofila e zootecnica* was previously the organ of the Lombard Zoophilous Association.
[11] G. Ciaburri, *Relazione morale e finanziaria dell'anno 1930* (Rocca san Casciano 1931), 20.
[12] G. Ciaburri, *La Vivisezione* (Turin 1930) 73–4. Among the 'apostles of the anti-vivisectionist campaign in Italy' Ciaburri mentioned Timoteo Riboli, who founded the Turin Society for the Prevention of cruelty to animals in 1871, the politicians Luigi Luzzatti and Romolo Murri, the philosophers Augusto Agabiti and Roberto Ardigò, the doctor Antonio Cardarelli and the writer Antonio Fogazzaro; here 259.
[13] Here 225–36.
[14] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 782, *Nota per gli agenti delle associazioni zoofile di Innocenzo Cappa*, April 23, 1928.
[15] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 775, *Nota del capo della polizia al gabinetto del Ministero dell'Interno*, August 14, 1938.
[16] See Maori, *La protezione degli animali in Italia*, 103.
[17] G. Bonuzzi, *L'animale questo sconosciuto* (Rocca San Casciano 1956), 78.
[18] Among others see C. Lansbury, *The Old Brown Dog. Women, Workers and Vivisection in Edwardian England* (Madison 1985); J.M. Jasper, D. Nelkin, *The Animal Rights Crusade. The Growth of a Moral Protest* (New York 1992); L. Kalof, *Looking at Animals in Human History* (London 2007); J. Mayer, 'The Nature of the Experimental Animal: Evolution, Vivisection and Victorian Environment', in C. Freeman, E. Leane and Y. Watt, eds., *Considering Animals. Contemporary Studies in Human-Animal Relations* (Farnham 2011); S.J. Pearson, *The Rights of the Defenseless: Protecting Animals and Children in Gilded Age America* (Chicago 2011).
[19] This alleged remark of the Duce's was much quoted in the press and animal protection literature; see, for example, De Matteis, *Proteggere gli animali*, 107.
[20] 'Forme stravaganti di amore per le bestie', *La Gazzetta del Mezzogiorno*, February 18, 1939; 'Gli inglesi sono umani?', *Ambrosiano*, July 30, 1940.
[21] 'Elogio degli animali', *Corriere mercantile*, October 27, 1941.
[22] 'Bisogna far di più e di meglio per le creature che non parlano', *L'Ora*, September 19, 1942.
[23] See for instance 'L'azione della zoofilia', *Corriere della Sera*, June 9, 1938; 'Niente americanate indegne', *L'Eco di Bergamo*, March 8, 1937.
[24] Quoted in 'La propaganda zoofila nelle scuole', *Il Resto del Carlino*, March 6, 1938.

[25] Maggi, *Presentazione*, 8.
[26] G. Gregoraci, *Gli zoofili nella giornata di San Francesco. Conversazione tramessa il 4 ottobre 1933 dall'Eiar di Roma* (Rome 1933), 11.
[27] See, among others, G. Trione, 'La legislazione italiana per la protezione degli animali', *Il Lavoro*, February 6, 1938. Enfpa president Maria Vezzani Bottai recalled in a radio broadcast in February 1938 how the Duce had three beloved dogs and one cat; quoted in Reger, *Cinque storie di animali*, 22. According to his daughter-in-law Maria Scicolone, 'Mussolini loved dogs, provided they didn't bark'; M. Scicolone, *A tavola con il duce* (Rome 2004), 81.
[28] Quoted in Reger, *Cinque storie di animali*, 20.
[29] On this topic and the relation between animal welfare and Nazi ideology see B. Sax, *Animals in the Third Reich*, (Providence 2013); S. Sarkar, *Biodiversity and Environmental Philosophy* (Cambridge 2005). See also R. Dominick, *The Environmental Movement in Germany: Prophets and Pioneers, 1871-1971* (Bloomington 1992); J. Biehl, P. Staudenmeir, *Ecofascism. Lessons from the German Experience* (San Francisco 1995); F. Uekötter, *The Green and the Brown: A History of Conservation in Nazi Germany* (New York 2006); F.-J. Brüggemeier, M. Cioc, T. Zeller, *How Green Were the Nazis? Nature, Environment, and Nation in the Third Reich* (Athens 2005).
[30] See Gregoraci, *Gli zoofili nella giornata di San Francesco*, 5–8.
[31] Dott. Alfa, 'Il nuovo cantico delle creature', *Corriere mercantile*, May 10, 1937. The blessing of animals on the feastday of St Anthony, the abbot, featured regularly in the newspapers. In the Twenties Mussolini had begun strengthening ties with the Catholic Church, culminating in the Patti Lateranensi, and this kind of propaganda campaign was also useful for his rapprochement with the Catholic world.
[32] Quoted in 'Per il rispetto e la protezione degli animali', *L'Isola*, February 14, 1937.
[33] 'La propaganda zoofila nelle scuole', *Le Ultime Notizie*, March 17, 1938.
[34] This was so, for example, in the 1829 anti-cruelty law of New York State; see D.S. Favre, V Tsang, 'The Development of Anti-Cruelty Laws During the 1800s', *Detroit College of Law Review*, No. 1 (1993): 1–35.
[35] *Resoconto dell'assemblea generale tenuta in Firenze il 15 gennaio 1873*, ed. by Società protettrice degli animali in Firenze (Florence 1873), 5–6.
[36] See the works of Emilio Gentile, especially *Il culto del littorio* (Rome–Bari 1993), 155–195 and (ed.) *Modernità totalitaria. Il fascismo italiano* (Rome–Bari 2008).
[37] Maggi, *Presentazione*, 8.
[38] De Matteis, *Proteggere gli animali*, 13 and 130–135.
[39] See the magazine *Diana*, May 15, 1931.
[40] L. Scarampi di Prunetto, 'Caccia e Zoofilia', *La settimana di caccia e pesca*, 8 August, 1938.
[41] See A. Simoncelli, 'Per la protezione della selvaggina', *La settimana di caccia e pesca*, February 3, 1937; E. Barisoni, 'Proteggiamo i nidi', *Sport illustrato*, April 28, 1937; 'L'abbandono dei cani', *Diana*, January 31,1937; 'La protezione della selvaggina e l'esercizio della caccia', *Gazzetta del Popolo*, January 2, 1940. In 1939 a Consolidation Act was issued on hunting, see www.edizionieuropee.it/LAW/HTML/3/zn16_01_007.html#_ART0004.
[42] Even today human-animal relationships are extremely controversial and problematic. Despite the spread of welfare and animal rights movements, economic, scientific and technological developments have made man's domination over nature and other living beings ever more radical and intense. See H. Herzog, *Some We Love, Some We Hate, Some We Eat* (New York 2010). However, during the Twentieth century the field of action of animal advocacy progressively expanded, and today also covers, for example, hunting and slaughtering.
[43] On environmental policies and associations in liberal and fascist Italy see L. Piccioni, *Il volto amato della patria: il primo movimento per la protezione della natura in Italia 1880-1934* (Trento 2014); E. Meyer, *I pionieri dell'ambiente* (Milano, 1995); J. Sievert, *The Origins of Nature Conservation in Italy* (Bern, 2000); A.F. Saba, E. Meyer, *Storia ambientale. Una nuova frontiera storiografica* (Milan 2001); W. Von Hardenberg, 'A Nation's Parks: Failure and Success in Fascist Nature Conservation', *Modern Italy*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (2014): 275-85.
[44] Gregoraci, *Gli zoofili nella giornata di San Francesco*, 15.
[45] Quoted in Kean, *Animal Rights*, 36.
[46] This was the gist of a circular from the General Directorate of Public Security on 20-4-1910, which also noted that 'foreigners […] and the overseas press not infrequently protest in recrimination, and rightly so, it would appear'. Quoted in A. Agabiti, *Il problema della vivisezione* (Rome 1911), 177.
[47] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 771, *Nota della Direzione generale di Pubblica Sicurezza*, October 16, 1941.
[48] Gregoraci, *Progetto di legge per la protezione degli animali,* 87.
[49] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 772, *Nota di Arturo Bocchini*, November 26, 1939.
[50] See for instance 'La protezione degli animali e il suo fondatore', *L'Adriatico della sera*, September 23, 1938.
[51] Gregoraci, *Gli zoofili nella giornata di San Francesco*, 11–12.
[52] 'La protezione degli animali in Italia', *Il Tevere*, May 12, 1938.
[53] Atti Parlamentari, Senato del Regno, Leg. XXVII, *Discussioni*, December 7, 1926.
[54] For the Law 924/1931 see www.infoleges.it/Service0/gazzetta.aspx?numero=180&data=06/08/1931. See also A. Mannucci, 'Animali e diritto italiano: una storia', in A. Mannucci, M. Tallacchini, eds., *Per un codice degli animali* (Milan 2001), 18. The new Italian law was similar to the British 1876 *Cruelty to Animals Act*, which also included waivers on the use of anaesthesia, though they were outlined in greater detail.

[55] See F. Rescigno, *I diritti degli animali. Da res a soggetti* (Turin 2005), 193–195.
[56] See for example 'Cani rubati e venduti per essere vivisezionati', *Il Mattino*, May 9, 1939.
[57] ACS, POLAM, 1940–1975, b. 96, *Relazione del presidente sull'esercizio 1940*.
[58] Words spoken by Maria Vezzani Bottai and quoted in Reger, *Cinque storie di animali*, 21.
[59] Art. 5 of Law 615/1941 stated that monitoring of laboratories was 'under the provincial health authority which used animal protection officials if graduates of medicine or veterinary medicine'. E. Rellini Rossi, 'Protezione degli animali (Ente Nazionale per la)', in *Novissimo Digesto Italiano*, Vol. XIV (Turin 1967), 248.
[60] See Gasco, *La protezione statale degli animali*, 5–6. Art. 500 regarded the spreading of diseases harmful to the rural economy and the zootechnical heritage.
[61] Quoted in Gregoraci, *Progetto di legge per la protezione degli animali*, 93. For a legal analysis of its clauses, see Rescigno, *I diritti degli animali*, 163–67.
[62] On the organization of the fascist State see M. Palla, ed., *Lo Stato fascista* (Milan 2001); L. Di Nucci, *Nel cantiere dello Stato fascista* (Rome 2008); L. Di Nucci, *Lo Stato-partito del fascismo* (Bologna 2009); S. Cassese, *Lo Stato fascista* (Bologna 2010).
[63] Quoted in Gregoraci, *Progetto di legge per la protezione degli animali*, 87–101.
[64] In 1937, for example, the director of the Cremona stockbreeders' association complained that the local animal protection society was 'dishing out fines for alleged, hypothetical or hearsay cases of maltreatment'; see 'Contravvenzioni zoofile', *L'Agricoltore Fascista*, July 31, 1937.
[65] *Relazione del presidente sull'esercizio 1940*.
[66] P.M., 'Quando si abbia il reato di maltrattamento di animali', *Il Giornale d'Agricoltura*, April 16, 1939; 'Il trasporto del pollame e una sentenza di Cassazione', *Il Resto del Carlino*, October 10, 1938.
[67] 'La spiumatura delle oche vive', *Il Sole*, May 10, 1939.
[68] See, for example, 'Maltrattamenti di animali', *Brescia agricola*, June 24, 1940; 'L'autista che uccise malvagiamente un cane', *Il Piccolo*, December 7, 1938; 'Una importante sentenza circa maltrattamenti agli animali', *La Nazione*, June 12, 1939; 'Scuoia vivo un coniglio ed è condannato', *La Gazzetta del Popolo*, January 13, 1940; 'Severe condanne a Novara per maltrattamenti di animali', *La Stampa*, April 6, 1939; 'Maltrattatori di buoi condannati', *Il Resto del Carlino*, April 27, 1940; 'Una questione zoofila in pretura', *La Gazzetta del Popolo*, January 17, 1939.
[69] *Relazione del presidente sull'esercizio 1940*.
[70] G. Gasco, *La macellazione eutanasica od 'umanitaria'* (Lucca 1939), 11–12; the text of decree 20-12-1928 is here reported, 3. See also 'La buona morte degli animali', *Corriere della Sera*, July 7, 1938.
[71] See, among others, 'Il rituale ebraico è vietato da oggi', *La Gazzetta del Popolo*, October 19, 1938; 'La proibizione di un disgustoso e incivile rito ebraico', *Il Piccolo*, October 20, 1938. While fascism banned Jewish-style slaughter after the 1938 racial laws, in Libya the regime's policy was based on respect for local and Islamic traditions, including halal slaughter.
[72] Archivio Storico Enpa (hereinafter ASENPA), b. 485, *Conferenza internazionale per la protezione degli animali – Relazione del commissario Corrado Trelanzi al Ministero dell'Interno*, August 22, 1950.
[73] Gregoraci, *Progetto di legge per la protezione degli animali*, 11–12 and 33.
[74] G. Bonuzzi, 'Il vostro cane può scrivere', *Il Resto del Carlino*, August 28, 1939; I. Bastiani, 'Capiscono e sentono le bestie?', *La Tribuna*, August 18, 1937; V. Sangiuliano, 'Per la formazione della coscienza zoofila', *Il Giornale d'Italia*, December 24, 1937.
[75] A. De Grand, 'Mussolini's follies. Fascism in Its Imperial and Racist Phase', *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2004), 145.
[76] See, among many others, 'Il Consiglio dei ministri per la protezione degli animali', *Corriere Padano*, October 28, 1937; 'Verso il nuovo Ente fascista per la protezione degli animali', *Il Resto del Carlino*, November 26, 1937; 'Una nuova provvidenza del regime', *Il Nuovo Torrazzo*, November 6, 1937; 'In tema di zoofilia', *Il Mattino*, January 20, 1938.
[77] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 776, *Nota del capo di gabinetto alla Direzione generale della Sanità pubblica*, June 2, 1937. See also MP Francesco Angelini's report to the Chamber, in Maori, *La protezione degli animali in Italia*, 126–28.
[78] Gasco, *La protezione statale degli animali*, 8.
[79] Reger, *Cinque storie di animali*, 17.
[80] Atti Parlamentari, Camera dei deputati, Leg. XXIX, *Discussioni*, March 16, 1938; the Bill passed with 340 votes for and 4 against.
[81] a.d.l., 'Per la protezione degli animali', *Agricoltura fascista*, October 24, 1937. 'Animals must support themselves' wrote *Il Resto del Carlino* on 4-8-1938.
[82] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 776, *Norme per l'ordinamento dell'Ente nazionale per la protezione degli animali*, May 2, 1939.
[83] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 775, *Regio decreto*, September 22, 1939.
[84] See ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 776, *Appunto del capo della polizia per l'on. Gabinetto di S.E. il ministro*, January 18, 1939 and *Appunto del capo della polizia all'on. Ufficio del personale*, December 20, 1939.
[85] See art. 25 of *Norme per l'ordinamento dell'Ente nazionale per la protezione degli animali*. The service of animal inspectors, divided into volunteers working for nothing and fixed staff on a payroll, was formally established by decree

in March 1943; ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 782, *Regolamento per il servizio delle guardie zoofile di P.S.*, March 9, 1943.

[86] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 784, *Nota del commissario Ezio Padovani*, June 5, 1945. The same folder contains a note by Vezzani Bottai (7-12-1942) in which she asks the government to supply the agency with a suitable number of automatic pistols.

[87] ASENPA, b. 7, Circolari 1939–1949, *Nota di M. Vezzani Bottai – Soci di razza ebraica*, February 10, 1939 and *Nota di M. Vezzani Bottai – Elenco agenti zoofili*, February 2, 1939.

[88] The circular from Carmine Senise is quoted in S. Gentile, *Le leggi razziali: scienza giuridica, norme, circolari* (Milan 2010), 246.

[89] *Relazione del presidente sull'esercizio 1940*. On the president's interest in styles of slaughtering in public abattoirs, see ASENPA, b. 7, Circolari 1939–1949, *Nota di Maria Vezzani Bottai – Sistemi di mattazione*, February 2, 1939.

[90] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 772, *Nota di Maria Vezzani Bottai – Animali al seguito di accattoni ambulanti*, July 27, 1940.

[91] ACS, POLAM, 1940–1975, b. 96, *Promemoria per il capo della polizia di C. Trelanzi*, November 17, 1943; *Relazione del presidente sull'esercizio 1942*; *Relazione al bilancio preventivo per l'esercizio 1943*, November 30, 1942; *Relazione sull'esercizio 1943*, December 6, 1944. Opening of new premises and delegations was then suspended, though news of the Messina section was given by V. Bianco, 'La protezione degli animali e i compiti che si propone l'ENFPA', *Il Popolo*, January 29, 1941.

[92] Among many instances see 'Flagellati e macellati', *Il Monferrato*, July 27, 1940; 'Maltrattamenti agli animali', *Il Popolo di Pavia*, June 9, 1940; 'Un salvataggio in piazza San Fedele', *Corriere della Sera*, September 4, 1940; 'È lecito strappare la coda ai piccioni?', *La Nazione*, April 1, 1941; 'Un uomo che non è amico degli animali', *La Stampa*, October 1, 1941.

[93] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 773, *Nota del vicepresidente C. Trelanzi al Ministero dell'Interno*, September 19, 1942; *Nota di Maria Vezzani Bottai al Ministero dell'Interno*, February 2, 1943.

[94] ASENPA, b. 7, Circolari 1939–1949, *Notifica dell'Enfpa sulla circolare del Ministero dell'Interno: divieto di uccisione di gatti*, February 28, 1943. See also 'Difesa del gatto', *Giornale di Genova*, March 14, 1943, which reported that skins were being sold at a 50–60 lire each.

[95] ACS, POLAM, 1940–1975, b. 96, *Nota del commissario nazionale Otello Menotti*, February 27, 1945. For a reconstruction of how local sections fared, see Maori, *La protezione degli animali in Italia*, 172–82. Vezzani relinquished the helm of ENFPA in March 1944.

[96] ACS, POLAM, 1907–1986, b. 775, *Nota della Ragioneria Generale dello Stato*, February 24, 1945; *Relazione di Ezio Padovani al Ministero dell'Interno*, March 17, 1945; *Nota del Ministero dell'Interno alla Ragioneria Generale dello Stato*, April 13, 1945; *Nota del Ministero dell'Interno alla Segreteria particolare del Capo della polizia*, November 11, 1945.