Confronting Cruelty

Human–Animal Studies

VOLUME 1

Confronting Cruelty

Moral Orthodoxy and the Challenge of the Animal Rights Movement

by

Lyle Munro

BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON
2005

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Munro, Lyle.
Confronting cruelty: moral orthodoxy and the challenge of the animal rights movement/by Lyle Munro.
p. cm. — (Human-animal studies, ISSN 1573-4226; v. 1)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 90-04-14311-4 (alk. paper)
1. Animal rights movement—United States—History. 2. Animal rights movement—Great Britain—History. 3. Animal rights movement—Australia—History. 4. Animal rights activists—United States—History. 5. Animal rights activists—Great Britain—History. 6. Animal rights activists—Australia—History. 7. Animal welfare—United States—History. 8. Animal welfare—Great Britain—History. 9. Animal welfare—Australia—History. I. Title. II. Series.

HV4764.M87 2005
179'.3—dc22

2004062547

ISSN 1573-4226
ISBN 90 04 14311 4

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To Jenny – my nearest
and dearest

Contents

Acronyms

AAHR	Australian Association for Humane Research
ACIG	Animal Cruelty Investigation Group
AFBF	American Farm Bureau Federation
AHA	American Humane Association
AL (NSW)	Animal Liberation New South Wales
AL (VIC)	Animal Liberation Victoria
ALF	Animal Liberation Front
ANZFAS	Australian and New Zealand Federation of Animal Societies
ARC	Animal Rights Cambridge
ASIS	Animal and Social Issues Survey
AWI	Animal Welfare Institute
BALE	Brightlingsea Against Live Exports
BUAV	British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection
CADS	Coalition Against Duck Shooting
CIWF	Compassion in World Farming
DDAL	Doris Day Animal League
DoW	Defenders of Wildlife
FARM	Farm Animal Reform Movement
HSA	Hunt Saboteurs Association
HSU	Humane Society University
HSUS	Humane Society of the United States
iiFAR	incurably ill For Animal Rights
IPPL	International Primate Protection League
LACS	League Against Cruel Sports
MRAR	Mountain Residents for Animal Rights
NCDL	National Canine Defence League
NSMR	National Society for Medical Research
PETA	People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals

RSPCA	Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
SAPL	Society for Animal Protection Legislation
WFAD	World Farm Animal Day
WSPA	World Society for the Protection of Animals

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation *Beasts Abstract Not: A Sociology of Animal Protection.* Some sections are based on work that I have previously published and on a number of case studies I used in my book *Compassionate Beasts: The Quest for Animal Rights*, Praeger, Westport CT, which have been brought up to date with new material. Thus the case studies in Chapter 5 of three multi-issue and three single-issue animal organizations have been revised for this book. Additionally the case study used in Chapter 7 of the Coalition Against Duck Shooting (CADS) is drawn from two related articles I published on CADS in Munro, (1997a) "Narratives of protest: Television's representation of an animal liberation campaign", *Media International Australia,* 83, pp. 103–112 and Munro (1997b) "Framing cruelty: The construction of duck shooting as a social problem", *Society & Animals*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 137–154.

Most importantly, there are a number of people I wish to thank for their help in the production of this book. The School of Humanities, Communications and Social Sciences (HUMCASS) at Monash University has hosted several forums at which I have been able to present work in progress; I have benefited from these discussions and am grateful to the participants who took an interest in my ideas. HUMCASS also provided a small grant that allowed me to employ Alison Hart who I would like to thank for her careful proofreading and attention to the presentation of the book. My thanks also to Ivo Romein and Kim Fiona Plas at Brill for their patience and professional guidance during the long process of getting the manuscript finally published and to Kenneth Shapiro who initiated the series in which this book found a home. His support and encouragement is greatly appreciated. It goes without saying that I am grateful to the many survey respondents and the 53 interviewees who provided the raw data upon which much of the study is based. Finally, the book is dedicated to Jenny Barlow, who has been my safety net and lifeline during the ten years I've been writing about the animal rights movement.

DANKE SCHATZ

Chapter One

Introduction

Beasts abstract not. (John Locke)

According to Freud, people need love and work to give their lives meaning. Intuitively, the idea is sound and a moment's reflection should convince most people that love and work are central to most people's well being. If love and work help to make people's lives meaningful, then we can expect that people will seek every opportunity to maximise both in their everyday lives, even in their extracurricular activities encompassing such things as leisure and social and political pursuits. I was not consciously aware of the possibilities of the love/work couplet when I began the research for this book. Yet, on reflection, the questions I asked of my informants in the interviews could be seen as an exploration of the relationship between commitment and campaigning, which is a more formal description of the notion of love and work in social movement participation. The focus in the book on the actual work of activists and advocates as they engage in collective action calls for a distinctively sociological analysis of the movement.

The initial research proposal I drew up seeking approval from the University's Ethics Committee was called 'Animal liberationists and their campaigns'. From the outset, the focus was on the individual animal liberationists (their personal background, motives, involvement and commitment to the

movement etc.) and what they did in their campaigns (the actual work involved in being an activist or advocate). The research question which frames the study is 'Why and how do people campaign on behalf of a species that is not their own?' Questions used in the interview schedule focused on the meaning of animal activism and the nature of the key campaigns; the *why* and *how* of social movement involvement are therefore central to the study and correspond to new social movement theory and resource mobilisation theory respectively.

I argue that people support the animal movement because of their abhorrence of cruelty, of what the animal movement labels as speciesism. While speciesism comes in many forms, there are three main practices – vivisection, factory farming and bloodsports – which have been identified by the movement as the worst abuses and hence the seminal campaigns of animal rights activism. Yet these putative abuses are perceived by most people outside the movement as legitimate activities and are labelled less negatively as animal research/experimentation, intensive farming and recreational hunting. Most people, it seems, are only concerned about the welfare of animals when they are the victims of gratuitous cruelty and not the allegedly institutionalised abuse that concern animal activists in the aforementioned practices. Defenders of these practices appear to have majority opinion on their side, that is, animals matter, but not as much as humans, a position which is the norm in virtually all liberal democracies where there is at best, only moderate, lukewarm concern for the welfare of animals. The philosopher Stephen Clark (1997) refers to this norm of moderate concern for animals as 'the moral orthodoxy', a stance he and the animal rights movement regard as morally bankrupt. Animal movement supporters want people to see speciesism and its consequences – the institutionalised abuse of animals – as a social problem not unlike child abuse, spouse abuse or elder abuse; that is, these abuses are morally objectionable because the victims are vulnerable populations of human and non human animals.

Eyerman and Jamieson (1991, p. 56) have pointed out that not every problem generates a social movement, and it is only those social problems that resonate with the public that give rise to social movements. For many people outside the animal movement, the idea that animal experimentation, intensive farming or recreational hunting constitutes a social problem is an alien idea. The core objective of the animal movement is to normalise this alien idea: 'If there is

a telos of social movement activity then it is the normalisation of previously exotic issues and groups' (Scott, 1990). The purpose of the animal movement and its campaigns is to stigmatise the 'legitimate' practices of animal researchers, farmers and hunters as social problems that require a social solution. By problematising activities that are taken for granted by most people, activists seek to change the way people think about animals and their treatment. The animal rights movement therefore challenges people outside the movement to question the moral orthodoxy which underpins our attitudes towards animals, namely, that animals matter, but not as much as humans. This is the norm of moderate concern for animals which characterises relations with them in the case study countries featured in this book. Put differently, while most decent people would be quick to condemn wanton cruelty to cats, dogs, horses and ponies, for example, they are unlikely to be concerned about the welfare of the many non-companion animals who routinely suffer and die in research labs, on factory farms or who are the victims of recreational hunters and shooters.

How social movements achieve their objectives constitutes the second theme in this study. Tilly (1985) contended that a movement is what it does rather than why it does it. The position taken in the present study is that both are important since one needs to know why people act as they do if one is to have a deeper understanding of social movement activism. Even so, Tilly's point is well taken and there is more emphasis in the book on the 'how' rather than the 'why' of animal activism and advocacy. In the case of the animal movement (and other new social movements), activists and advocates engage in social problems work in pressing their collective claims. Social problems work, as conceived in the book, is broadly defined to include the intellectual, practical and affective dimensions of conventional work. Eyerman and Jamieson (1991, p. 161) support the idea of new social movement activism as social problems work when they noted that social movements provide 'public spaces for thinking new thoughts, activating new actors, generating new ideas, in short, constructing new intellectual "projects"'. Similarly, Melucci (1989; 1996) showed how new social movements provide the space for challenging the values and cultural codes of a society. The animal movement does this by raising people's consciousness about cruelty to animals in its various campaigns. The animal movement's challenge – as conceptualised in this book – is prosecuted in three phases: It firstly diagnoses speciesism as a social problem,

the intellectual work of philosophers and animal advocates, and then sets out to find a solution. Secondly, the movement's prognosis, or its strategies and tactics, is to build single and multi-issue social movement organizations, preferably in conjunction with the more expressive campaigns of grassroots activists, to press these intellectual and moral claims. This constitutes the practical dimension of the movement's social problems work. Finally, the affective work of the movement is its call to action in which people's emotions are mobilised for the cause.

Scope and Purpose of the Book

This book focuses on the grassroots activism and organisational advocacy of the animal movement in Australia, the UK and the USA. Why these three countries were chosen needs some explanation. Although legislation to protect animals was first enacted in England, animal protection could be described as an Anglo-American tradition. According to J. Turner (1980), the Anglo-American world in the 19th century was a separate cultural entity within the larger European civilisation. Thus it is not surprising that animal protection in both countries followed a similar pattern. Worster (1977, p. ix) also wrote of a distinctive Anglo-American tradition in the ecology movement in the late 20th century, which while 'never wholly a consensus, but withal a single dialogue carried on in a single tongue'.

Australia's early efforts in animal protection were also part of this dialogue. An Australian RSPCA was established in 1891 and by the end of the 19th century each of the colonies had its own society modelled after the English parent organization. Like its Anglo-American counterparts, the Australian RSPCA consisted of predominantly middle-class urbanites, although in the Australian case, the RSPCA attracted affluent people from rural areas as well. Historically then, the animal movement has been strongest in the UK, the USA and Australia. The present study says little about the old, welfarist organisations like the RSPCA; instead the focus is on the newer animal rights/liberation groups, which developed in the post World War II environment in the case study countries.

One of the first full-length books on the sociology of animal rights was Keith Tester's (1991) *Animals and Society: The Humanity of Animal Rights*, which was based on the author's doctoral dissertation in sociology. While

the book stands out in the sociological literature as refreshingly different in its approach to animal rights, it seemed to me to have seriously misrepresented the movement as experienced by activists, advocates and supporters. Tester argued that the animal rights movement is not about animal well being at all and is only marginally concerned with animals. 'More importantly, it is part of a social project to classify and define humanity. Animals are useful for humans to be able to think human' (Tester 1991, p. 48). In Tester's view, the animal rights movement is profoundly anthropocentric since its members are concerned only with constructing a more attractive identity and a sense of superiority over lesser humans who eat, hunt, wear and generally use other animals. While identity construction is part of the motivation for animal rights activism, it is not the main motive according to animal protectionists themselves. Insider perspectives are missing in Tester's abstract study; for example, he quoted a single source who evidently disliked the sentimental term 'animal lover' as evidence of a fetish which permits people who do not necessarily like animals to campaign on their behalf. Had Tester widened his sample, he may have discovered a whole range of views among animal rights supporters.

Tester's abstract thesis is seriously flawed because it is too speculative and pays little attention to the experience of social movement participants. In a doctoral dissertation on animal liberation, Kew (1999, p. 147) has criticised Tester and argued that his thesis on the movement 'robs it of its sincerity, identity, ethics and politics'. Other critics have described Tester's book as dogmatic and unreflective (Benton, 1992), as crude and insulting (Cooper, 1992) while Singer (1992a) was surprised the book had its origins in a doctoral dissertation. To be fair, Tester did receive the occasional positive review, most notably from C. Bryant (1993) and to a lesser extent from Ritvo (1992). Tester's *Animals and Society* (1991) encouraged me to take an entirely different approach to the animal rights movement, one that is based on the insider accounts of movement supporters, advocates and activists.

It is appropriate at this point to clarify some of the terminology used in the study. Throughout the book, the designation 'animal movement' will be used as an umbrella term for the more specific terms – animal protection movement, animal welfare movement, animal liberation movement and animal rights movement – terms which will be used whenever the specific designation is appropriate. The umbrella term is justified for two reasons: firstly to avoid

the ideological and definitional quibbles which these specific terms have generated (see for example, Francione, 1996) and secondly, the term animal movement is frequently the preferred designation of movement insiders who prefer this term as they hope to avoid these internal disputes as well as to remind outside observers that the animal movement, as an umbrella term for the specific forms mentioned above, is united in its opposition to cruelty. However, according to Francione (1996) there are really two kinds of animal protectionist, the welfarist and the rightist, with the former seeking *regulation* of animal exploitation and the latter its *abolition.* This is far too strict a division as it effectively disenfranchises the many animal protectionists and leaders such as Richard Ryder, Christine Stevens, Kenneth Shapiro and the late Henry Spira who philosophically are inclined towards animal rights and programmatically towards animal welfare or animal liberation, which I argue is the pragmatic middle road between animal rights and animal welfare.

The term animal protectionist, also a widely accepted umbrella term within the movement, encompasses anyone who supports the animal movement on a continuum from animal welfare through to animal rights. I have taken a slightly different perspective to the continuum depicted by Jasper and Nelkin (1992, p. 178), who categorised American animal protectionists as welfarists at one end, fundamentalists at the other, and pragmatists in the middle. My study of animal protectionists in the three main sites of animal movement activity in the USA, the UK and Australia broadly agrees with the Jasper and Nelkin typology with one or two modifications. Their pragmatists at mid point on the continuum correspond to the animal liberationists in my study; they are more moderate than the fundamentalists or abolitionists and more radical than the welfarists. I use the term abolitionist in preference to Jasper and Nelkin's term 'fundamentalist' since it is a more accurate designation for the adherents of the animal rights philosophy espoused by Tom Regan (1984, 1987). All of these animal protectionists (welfarists, liberationists and abolitionists) follow a non-violent philosophy of animal advocacy and activism which should not be confused with extremists such as the Animal Liberation Front, whose use of violent and illegal tactics places them outside the mainstream movement.

There are a number of ways of defining activists in the social movement literature, ranging from generic social movement activism to specific animal rights activism. Oliver and Marwell (1992, p. 252) provided a generic definition

in their description of social movement activists as 'people who care enough about some issues that they are prepared to incur significant costs and act to achieve their goals'. This generic definition has the advantage of breadth and inclusiveness and incorporates Shapiro's (1994) ingredients of care, action and costs or 'tensions' in his terminology. Shapiro's definition was an accurate statement of how his activists experienced activism at a psychological level since 'caring, seeing and seeking' were evidently part of their daily lives. The notion of 'the caring sleuth' is also close to what many people inside and outside the movement perceive as the prototype animal rights activist, namely an individual who is prepared to *do* something, no matter what the cost, about animal suffering.

However the Animals and Social Issues Survey (ASIS) that I devised revealed a further distinction relevant to animal activism. When asked to describe themselves as an activist, an advocate or a supporter in the animal movement, 46 percent chose supporter, 33 percent advocate, and only 16 percent activist; some 5 percent described themselves as animal lover, activist and advocate or activist/supporter or some similar combination of these designations. Thus one-third of the ASIS sample saw themselves as advocates compared to one half of the interviewees who used the designation 'advocate' rather than 'activist' to describe their involvement in the movement. However, with the exception of the one 'supporter' in the sample, all of the interviewees saw themselves as animal protectionists, either in an activist or advocate role. I argue throughout this book that these terms are often used interchangeably within the movement and there is indeed considerable overlap between them. Nonetheless, the terms are useful in distinguishing between those who practice direct action as grassroots activists and the organisational advocates who prefer lobbying and legislation to the more expressive actions of their activist colleagues. I used the terms 'in the streets' and 'in the suites' both literally and metaphorically to refer to activism and advocacy respectively, as the two main forms of animal protection practice in the case study countries.

Overview of the Book

In what follows I provide a thematic overview of the book. The present chapter sets up the key question which frames the study – how and why do people campaign on behalf of a species that is not their own? The analysis of the

'why' and 'how' of animal rights activism is taken up throughout the book in an attempt to explain how the movement sets out to extend people's abhorrence of wanton cruelty involving animals to the institutionalised cruelty inherent in factory farming, vivisection and bloodsports. Chapter 2 outlines the social constructionist perspective on social problems and the conceptual framework for the book. A key concept is the notion of social problems work, which is broadly defined to incorporate the main features of social movement activism and advocacy. The epigraphs to Chapter 3 note that modern literature treats animals as a genuine problem and that the meanings we attribute to animals are social constructions. In order to make up for a deficit in this field, the chapter describes how animals feature in the mainly sociological literature of academic writing. The chapter begins with a discussion of the relevance of social movement theory to the animal problem and how the mainstream movement frames this problem. I argue that there are three main frames in animal movement activism – welfarist, liberationist and rightist – in contrast to Francione (1996) for example, who claims there are two, rights versus welfare. Animal protectionists themselves support the threefold categorisation outlined in the present study and so it is important to theorise animal protection with their concepts and practices in mind.

Throughout the book, the words of the interviewees (or informants) when quoted are given in *italics* to distinguish them from other sources. Occasionally, a comment that was expressed by more than one informant is indicated in inverted commas. Details of how the data were collected and analysed are given in the Appendix.

The remaining chapters are the substantive chapters in the book. Chapter 4 paints a broad picture of the role of cruelty and its opposite compassion in what Margalit (1996) called 'a decent society'. This chapter explains the origins and nature of speciesism and the structures of dominancy of which it is a part. Why people join the animal movement and their reflections on cruelty are explained in a number of personal testimonies. The chapter also introduces the concept of caring in the context of animal welfare and rights/liberation. The concept of animal protection as social problems work is introduced in this chapter. Chapter 5 describes the movement's diagnosis of cruelty in the three seminal campaigns against vivisection, blood sports and factory farming. The role of women, particularly in the campaigns against vivisection and factory farming, seems to be more prominent than the role of men who are

more active in the campaign against recreational hunting. The chapter seeks to explain what activists find objectionable in these socially sanctioned practices and how they challenge the moral orthodoxy which underpins these practices.

One of the things they do is to build social movement organisations (SMOs). The chapter highlights the intellectual work or cognitive praxis performed by animal protectors in both multi-issue and single-issue SMOs in the three case study countries. Profiles of these SMOs suggest that they function as think tanks in carrying out their animal protection work. The chapter examines animal protection as a calling as well as activist commitment to the cause. Chapter 6 describes the strategies and tactics of animal protection work, which range from the more conventional strategies I call publicity strategies (demonstrations, pamphleteering, bearing witness) to more direct interference strategies (hunger strikes, ethical vegetarianism, undercover surveillance) all of which are described in this chapter. The affective work of animal protection is the focus of the last substantive chapter. Chapter 7 explains the animal movement's call to action and how it seeks to mobilise support by emotional appeals, dramatic animal images and advertising stories in the form of 'powerful stories' or 'atrocity tales'. A case study involving the protection of wildlife is used to illustrate the power of television images for mobilising people's emotions. Chapter 8 concludes with a summary of the main themes in the book and some critical reflections on the future of animal protection.

Chapter Two

Animal Abuse as a Social Problem

> *I am sure that as long as our movement continues to grow in this way, there will be a world in which the killing and eating of animals is considered as much a sin as theft, pollution or rape.* (Christine Townend)

This chapter outlines the research question and the theoretical and conceptual approaches taken in the book. It begins with a discussion of the utility of the theoretical orientation used in the book, namely the social construction of social problems/social movements approach, and some possible alternatives to the approach. Next, the chapter discusses social movement theory and locates the animal rights movement within that theory. The animal movement is described as a kindred spirit of the environmental movement with similar strategies, tactics and arguments. More than most causes, animal rights is a social construction. Speciesism is constructed as a social problem by the animal movement in the way sexism and racism are constructed as social problems by the women's and civil rights movements. In explaining the approach known as 'the social construction of social problems', a distinction is made between strict and contextual constructionism. Perhaps controversially, comparisons are drawn between the linguistic disadvantage of very cognitively disabled people and the plight of

non-human animals. The comparison is useful for highlighting the virtual invisibility of speciesism or cruelty to animals in the sociological literature. Finally, the chapter outlines the conceptual framework of the study and explains the key concept of animal protection as social problems work.

New social movements, wrote Burgmann (1993, p. 5), "champion the interests of those who experience social, political and cultural oppression, whatever their economic circumstances – a black person, a woman, a gay man – or the interests of the human race, irrespective of class". The animal protection movement is unique as a new social movement in that its supporters go beyond the species barrier in seeking to promote the interests of non-human animals. Why do people take up the cause of a species that is not their own and how do they prosecute their campaigns on behalf of non-human animals? These are the questions that guide the present study. Social problems theory and social movement theory will be utilised in addressing these issues. It will be argued that although individuals have different motives for supporting the cause of animals, opposition to speciesism is the thread which unites supporters in the three strands of animal protection, namely animal welfare, animal liberation and animal rights. Collectively, the animal movement's diagnostic frame is to construct speciesism as a social problem on a par with societal ills such as sexism and racism or as expressed in the above epigraph. This means that the animal movement seeks to gain social problems status for its concerns about our (mis)treatment of non-human animals in the culturally sanctioned contexts of animal experimentation, intensive farming and recreational hunting.

While much of the movement's diagnostic work is associated with philosophical argumentation by movement entrepreneurs such as Peter Singer and Tom Regan, it is the social problems work of animal activists and advocates that transforms moral ideas into social action. Movement insiders discover, name and frame putative abuses, primarily vivisection, factory farming and blood sports, as social injustices to be outlawed. How this is achieved is largely determined by the intellectual, practical and affective work of movement actors. Social problems work in these domains intersects with social movement theory in diagnosis of the problem and in the movement's campaigns and mobilising efforts. The practical work of animal activism and advocacy is the movement's prognostic frame, that is, how it addresses the issue of agency. Mobilising structures in the iconic form of social movement organisations

have been developed to organise various campaigns 'in the suites' and 'in the streets'. Social movement organisations across the animal protection spectrum seek to develop animal-friendly identities and to mobilise emotions and moral capital on behalf of individual animals.

The social construction of the social problems/social movements approach, which utilises the notion of social problems work, therefore informs the present study. Gergen (1999) has mounted a strong defence of constructionism. He argued that in conflicts over domination of the weak by the powerful, whites over blacks, men over women and humans over animals, the science establishment has invariably favoured the dominant group by supplying the technologies of domination, control and exploitation. Gergen (1999, p. 31) claimed that constructionist ideas provided "the intellectual ammunition for piercing the armour of scientific neutrality – objectivity beyond neutrality".

Thus it seems social constructionism is the most promising way to address the research question of how and why people campaign on behalf of a species that is not their own. The theoretical approach will be described in more detail shortly, but first some possible alternatives are acknowledged. I argue that while some of these alternatives to social constructionism provide many valuable insights about animal rights issues, they do not address the research question as convincingly or resonate as well with the testimonies of the informants in the study. The alternative perspectives include Eliasian theory (Van Krieken 2001), Marxist realism (Dickens 1992; Benton, 1993), feminism and ecofeminism (Vance 1993), critical theory (Vogel 1996) and Actor-Network Theory (Michael 1996). Of these, only the feminist perspective resonates with the testimonies of the people interviewed in this study.

Feminist writing is particularly relevant to animal rights issues, especially the strand known as ecofeminism. There is now a large ecofeminist literature on animals and the environment, which provides an important resource for animal and environmental activists.[1] Cuomo (1998, p. 1) argued that ecofeminism is grounded in the belief "that values, notions of reality, and social practices are related, and that forms of oppression and domination, however historically and culturally distinct, are interlocked and enmeshed".

---

[1] For example, see Vance (1993) for an outline.

Feminist environmentalism, she suggested, begins with noticing similarities and connections between different kinds of oppressions, such as the oppression of women, of animals and of nature more generally. The present study is sympathetic to the ecofeminist critique and explicitly utilises it at various points in the discussion, particularly in relation to animal experimentation and intensive farming. The feminist critique offers a corrective to mainstream animal rights philosophy. For example, Ruddick (1980) has argued that male animal liberation/rights philosophers such as Peter Singer and Tom Regan rely too much on reason or rationalism and need to consider what she called a "maternal epistemology" based on an ethic of care and humility. Similar ideas inform the caring work described in Chapter 4. The next section will consider the theoretical approach that would seem to resonate most with the testimonies and practices of the respondents and informants I surveyed and interviewed for this study.

Strategy and Identity in Social Movement Activism

An action-oriented, social constructionist approach based on concepts derived from both social movement theory and social problems theory informs this study which is not about 'animals' or 'rights' per se, but rather about a social movement which seeks to change the way human beings treat other animals. *How* and *why* do people campaign against cruelty to animals? This book emphasises the 'how' of social movement participation and the 'why', or the motivations for social movement activism, since the two questions are invariably intertwined in the everyday practices of activist/advocacy campaigns. To understand how individuals choose their campaign strategies and tactics, one needs to know what motivates their participation in one cause rather than another. In the literature, on the other hand, these issues of strategy and identity tend to be treated as separate by resource mobilisation theorists and proponents of new social movement theory respectively, despite some attempts at integration (e.g. Eyerman & Jamison 1991; Canel 1992; Ingalsbee 1993–1994).

There has been considerable debate in the literature about the 'newness' of the new social movements of which the peace, women's and environmental movements are the main ones (Canel 1992). Adam (1993) suggested that a good case could be made for tracing the genealogy of several of these contemporary movements to the decades following the French Revolution

and later in the twentieth century when they continued to flourish. The animal movement can be traced back at least to the humane and antivivisection movements of the nineteenth century. Johnston, Larana and Gusfield (1994, p. 9) succinctly described how old movements take on their contemporary identities: "Even movements with old histories have emerged in new forms with more diffuse goals and different modes of mobilisation and conversion". The modern day animal movement for example, unlike its predecessors, has a more diverse range of electronic media at its disposal for the purpose of mobilising supporters and converting bystanders to the cause.

Since the 1970s, research on social movements has been dominated by two perspectives, resource mobilisation theory (RMT) and new social movement theory (NSM). The RMT approach focuses on organisational aspects of social movements such as the role of SMOs and the importance of movement entrepreneurs, leaders and activists (Pakulski 1991, p. 13). In other words, the theory is concerned with 'how' social movements mobilise to achieve their objectives. In the present study, RMT is used because it focuses on issues of strategy, one of the above research questions. According to Pakulski (1991, p. 14), RMT studies "stress the normalcy and rationality of movements, discern their instrumental and rational nature, and, above all, point to their ubiquity and symbiotic relations with conventional politics".

Dalton's (1994) model of Ideologically Structured Action (ISA) was used to analyse how animal SMOs promote the cause of animal rights in the case study countries. This model made it possible to analyse the animal advocacy of key SMOs as distinct from "the possibly amorphous nature of the underlying social movement" (Dalton 1994, p. 7). The model facilitated the study of how the organisational wing of the animal movement performed in terms of mobilising support, developing strategies and tactics and influencing policy. "The existence of a full-time professional staff makes a crucial threshold for an organisation, providing a continuity that enables the group to compete in the long process of policy formation" (Dalton 1994, p. 97). There is a danger however in emphasising an organisational focus of social movements; Pakulski (1991, p. 14) described this as RMT's tendency to "domesticate" and "over-instrumentalise" social movements. Furthermore, as Melucci (1984, p. 821) has pointed out, RMT fails to address the 'why' question in the study of social movements. This issue is the focus of new social movement theory.

New social movement theory is concerned with the role of ideas and cultural

processes in the emergence of social movements. These cultural processes include framing processes and the availability of master frames that a movement can use to mobilise support for its cause. In the case of the animal movement, a 'civil rights' master frame has been used since the 1970s to press the movement's claims, specifically in terms of animals' rights. Melucci (1989) has argued that the *raison d'être* of a social movement is to challenge the dominant values and cultural codes of a society. As a new social movement, the animal rights movement challenges the meanings people attribute to non-human animals as well as the moral orthodoxy that animals matter, but not as much as humans. It is a basic premise in this book that it does this via the collective action of organisations along with the grassroots politics of activists who are intent on changing people's attitudes and consciousness with regard to their treatment of non-human animals. Byrne made a related point concerning the identity-oriented (NSM theory) and strategy-oriented (RMT) dimensions of social movements:

> From the European perspective, a social movement does not have to be particularly active (in the sense of mounting public campaigns, demonstrations, direct action etc.) to be important; even when apparently dormant, movements can have an impact on what is termed "cultural production", that is they can be influencing the way their own adherents and those opposed to them think about how society should be organised (Byrne 1997, p. 38).

In periods of relatively subdued movement activity, a social movement's submerged networks carry on the movement's work in abeyance. "Latency does not mean inactivity. Rather the potential for resistance or opposition is sewn into the very fabric of everyday life" (Melucci 1989, pp. 70–1). Thus the campaign against duck shooting peaks during the duck-hunting season, after which the campaign disappears from public view. Between seasons, however, the campaign continues in the submerged networks of everyday life; activists in the Coalition Against Duck Shooting (CADS) continue their work of studying video footage to improve their tactics, lobbying politicians, fundraising and the like. Whether the issue is saving ducks, whales, farm or laboratory animals, the work goes on even in periods when the issue is invisible in the public domain. As Johnston, Larana and Gusfield (1994, p. 24) pointed out, grievances such as saving whales "are so distant from

everyday life that they can only remain immediate through their ongoing social construction and reassertion in the group context". Moreover, as one particular issue lies dormant, others invariably take their place, for as Scott (1990, p. 26) argued, NSMs are not single-issue movements, "[r]ather, these movements tend to be organised around a range of issues linked to a single broad theme or a broad interest". Thus the broad issue of animal protection embodies numerous campaigns from animal 'actors' in films to captive animals in zoos of which the protests against vivisection, factory farming and blood sports are the most prominent.

Phillips (1994, p. 80) has summarised some of the key writers on new social movements in concluding that NSMs are different from other types of movements in three essential ways. The animal movement is clearly characterised by these distinguishing features: First, NSMs are post-modern and predominantly post-materialist in orientation; the animal movement seeks to change our cultural sensibilities about animals and is more concerned with changing values than are the older materialist movements. Second, NSMs are made up of the new middle class, although they are not driven by class issues; the constituency for the animal movement comes predominantly from the new middle class made up of especially well-educated, urban-based women. Finally, the action repertoires are in the main expressive, unconventional tactics; here the animal movement as described in the present study tends to be marginally different to the conventional NSM in that it consists of both an expressive wing, which utilises non-conventional tactics, and an organisational wing, which favours conventional tactics. For most of the time, it is the latter which carries out the social problems work of animal advocacy.

Animal Rights as a (New) Social Movement

As a social movement, the animal movement is relatively understudied compared to other movements that developed in the West in the second half of this century. According to Marsh (1994, p. 258), there were nine major issue movements that emerged since the 1960s: the women's, peace, environment, consumer, gay rights, animal liberation, ethnic, racial minority, and several 'New Right' movements. With the exception of animal liberation, there is a large, sociological literature on all of these movements that suggests that the issue of animal rights has been neglected by sociologists. On a broader front,

it is only in the last twenty years that issues associated with nature and the environment have been addressed by sociologists (Buttel 1987; Laska 1993). Nonetheless, the animal movement qualifies as a social movement as defined in the sociological literature.

Definitions of social movements abound. An early definition described a social movement as:

> a group of people who are organised for, ideologically motivated by, and committed to a purpose which implements some form of personal or social change, who are actively engaged in the recruitment of others, and whose influence is spreading in opposition to the established order within which it originated (Gerlach & Hine 1970, p. xvi).

According to these criteria, the animal movement is a social movement in that it (a) consists of many grassroots and more formally organised groups which are organised to run specific campaigns; (b) there is a strong ideological consensus in the movement on what constitutes the worst features of speciesism; (c) the animal movement is a way of life and often defines the identity of many of its members; (d) participants are motivated to change their own lifestyles (e.g. via vegetarianism) and are committed to changing the ways humans treat other animals; (e) movement insiders seek to recruit others via personal networks; and (f) activists tend to see themselves as targets of established industries (e.g. agribusiness) and various countermovements.[2]

The animal movement is sometimes seen as a new social movement (NSM) and as part of the environmental movement (Eckersley 1992, p. 54) or eco-pax movements (Pakulski 1991, p. 205). Sutherland and Nash (1994) described animal rights as "a new environmental cosmology" which Smelser (1996) labelled as "neoprimordialism" while Eder (1990, p. 31) included vegetarianism and animal rights as movements against modernity. Sztompka (1993, p. 281) was more circumspect and included animal rights demands for bans on experimentation in his list of reform movements, as opposed to radical movements for social change. Castells (1997) placed the animal movement among the counter-cultural, environmental groups that promote deep ecology and 'the green self'. He suggested that in the last decade of the twentieth

---

[2] I am indebted to Annabelle Sabloff (2001, p. 118) for alerting me to this definition and analysis although I have not followed her descriptions of the movement.

century, the most militant wing of ecological fundamentalism was Animal Liberation in its stance against animal experimentation (Castells 1997, p. 117). Similarly, Alan Wolfe (1993, p. 16), a strong critic of animal rights, argued that the defence of nature represents the most striking political development of the latter half of the twentieth century. He nominated ecological and animal rights issues as the fastest growing political movements in the West. Peter Singer (1992b, p. vii), whose philosophical position is diametrically opposed to Wolfe's, suggested that animal rights and environmentalism are distinct but related issues. All of these writers agreed then, that the animal movement is a significant movement for change and one deserving serious social-scientific study.

Barrington Moore highlighted the significance of movements campaigning against unjust relationships and in doing so, accurately describes the animal movement:

> Any political movement against oppression has to develop a new diagnosis as a remedy for existing forms of suffering, a diagnosis and remedy by which this suffering stands morally condemned. These new moral standards of condemnation constitute the core identity of any oppositional movement (Moore cited in Gamson 1985, p. 616).

Although the animal movement is seen by some social scientists as a political movement (e.g. Garner 1993a, 1993b; Wolfe 1993) and by others as a social and moral movement (e.g. Richards 1990; Jasper & Nelkin 1992), the position I take in the book is that the animal movement, broadly defined, is a movement for social change that incorporates both of these dimensions. Rochon (1998, p. 31) could have been describing the animal movement when he argued that social movements spread new values throughout society while political movements seek authoritative sanctioning of these values in the form of binding laws and regulations.

As I point out in Chapter 3, however, it is possible to associate these dimensions with different strands of the movement, that is, animal welfare (political orientation), animal rights (moral orientation) and animal liberation (social problems orientation). In practice, animal protectionists use both interest group advocacy and grassroots social movement activism to promote their cause. Animal protection advocates 'in the suites' are more inclined to engage in the institutional lobbying associated with party politics, pressure groups

and the like while the grassroots animal activists typically confine their activities primarily to the dissemination of values in civil society. According to Rochon (1998, p. 31), a movement is either political or social depending on whether the legislative route or the strategy of cultural change takes precedence, although in practice "social movements generally have a political agenda and political movements always require manifestations of societal support". Evidence in the present study reinforces this notion. Furthermore, I am in agreement with Kew's (1999) argument that elements of the old and new animal movements share a common 'social problems' orientation. Kew (1999, pp. 88–9) has argued that from the time of Henry Salt in the late nineteenth century up to the 1960s, animal exploitation has been identified as a social problem and as "part of a soulless, technocratic ethos against which many more, especially younger, people were protesting from different platforms". Melucci (1989, p. 46) saw these struggles in new social movements as struggles over identity which "push others to recognize something they themselves recognize; [in doing so] they struggle to affirm what others deny". This is what constitutes the social problems work in animal protection that I describe in the substantive chapters to follow.

The study includes the perspectives of individuals and groups represented on the animal protection continuum. Animal welfarists from organisations such as the RSPCA in the UK and Australia and the SPCA in the USA oppose cruelty to animals but are not against using animals for food, in research, for hunting or for recreation as long as the treatment of animals in these contexts is humane and the animals do not suffer unnecessarily. Animal liberationists espouse Peter Singer's (1975) utilitarian philosophy in seeking a balance between the interests of humans and other animals by advocating the abolition of the most inhumane forms of animal exploitation. Thus factory farming is seen as morally repugnant, but not traditional farming; recreational hunting is condemned but not subsistence hunting by say, indigenous peoples; and in the vexed issue of animal research, animal liberationists seek a compromise with animal experimentalists based on the three Rs – reducing, refining and replacing the use of animals with alternatives. Following Regan (1984; 1987), animal rightists reject the pragmatism of animal liberation and argue instead for the abolition of all practices in which humans use other animals, including pet-keeping. Regan's agenda is uncompromisingly abolitionist and calls for "total abolition of the use of animals in science; the total dissolution of

commercial animal agriculture; the total elimination of commercial and sport hunting and trapping" (Regan 1985, p. 13).

In this study the term animal liberation will be used to designate a political and social movement "to abolish the major Western institutions of animal exploitation, namely animal farming, vivisection and sport hunting" (Luke 1995, p. 203). This book focuses on these three main abuses identified by movement insiders such as Ryder (1996, p. 169) as the worst forms of animal exploitation. However I would qualify Luke's description by inserting "the worst abuses" after "abolish" to distinguish animal liberation activism from the more radical abolitionist stance of the animal rightists.

The main campaigns of the animal liberation movement have been directed against the excesses of animal experimentation, intensive farming and recreational hunting rather than demanding their total abolition. Unlike other practices which the animal movement opposes such as animals in zoos and circuses, in steeple jumping and so on, the triad of laboratory animals, farm animals and hunted animals are the animal liberation movement's most important beneficiaries since these animals suffer and die as a consequence of human intervention. According to Flynn (2001), it is the death and suffering of animals that makes animal exploitation a serious social problem. This is a claim that was supported by the vast majority of movement insiders interviewed in the present study.

Elsewhere I describe how the animal movement emerged in the 1970s after several decades of virtual dormancy.[3] According to Magel (1989, p. x) the term 'rights' was first used in English in relation to animals as far back as 1683. The origins of the modern animal movement can be traced back to changing attitudes toward non-human nature since the sixteenth century (see Thomas 1983) through to the Anglo-American antivivisection and anti-cruelty movements of the nineteenth century. Animal advocacy was transplanted via the RSPCA in Australia during the latter part of the nineteenth century when animal protectionists and conservationists enjoyed a marriage of mutual convenience (MacCulloch 1993). Grassroots animal activism had to wait until the publication of Singer's (1975) *Animal Liberation* for the launching of the modern animal movement (Jasper & Nelkin 1992). In the present study then,

[3] For a more detailed history of the animal movement, see Chapter 1 "A Short History of Animal Protection" in Munro 2001c.

the discussion of the animal movement is confined to what are generally held to be the three main sites of animal rights advocacy and activism, namely the UK, the USA and Australia.

According to Turner and Killian (1987, p. 242), a social movement is inconceivable without a grievance concerning some practice or idea which is thought to be wrong and ought to be remedied: "The common element in the norms of most, and probably all, movements is the conviction that existing conditions are unjust". They noted that the task for social movement scholars is to explain why one deserving case may be seen as unjust and another not, and why the sense of injustice, which may have always existed, emerges when it does. Turner and Killian's (1987) conception of the sense of injustice as an emergent norm in social movements is supported by Gamson, who pointed out that the injustice frame involves a sense of moral indignation from movement adherents, "one that is laden with emotion . . . the righteous anger that puts fire in the belly and iron in the soul" (1992a, pp. 7, 32). Gamson (1992a, p. 32) could have been thinking of the animal movement when he wrote: "[a]t the other extreme, if one attributes undeserved suffering to malicious or selfish acts by clearly identifiable persons or groups, the emotional component of an injustice frame will almost certainly be there". Gamson acknowledged that injustice is so widespread that it may lack explanatory power unless there is an analysis of how "grievances and discontent [are] defined, created, and manipulated by issue entrepreneurs and organisations" (McCarthy & Zald 1977, p. 1215).

One of the two main themes of the present study is to show how issue entrepreneurs are engaged in constructing cruelty to animals as a social problem. It will be argued that despite the ubiquity of social injustice in the world, few social movements encapsulate the sentiments raised by Turner and Killian (1987) and Gamson (1992a) more than the contemporary animal movement. Activists and advocates invariably perceive non-human animals as 'innocents' and their campaigns are driven by a desire to end what they see as massive injustices perpetrated by human beings against other animals. Clearly, the idea of extending rights or social justice to non-human animals is not accepted in some quarters.[4]

---

[4] The Australian philosopher John Passmore, for example, referred to the example of the eighteenth century poet William Cowper as representing the limits of what

Animal protectionists and environmentalists engage in campaigns to defend nature against the claims of human exceptionalism, that humans are *above* nature, neither responsible to it nor for it. The animal movement seeks to construct institutional violence against individual animals as a social problem that is linked to the environmentalists' grievance against the abuse and exploitation of nature as measured by the destruction of species and habitats. Ideological differences between the environmental and animal liberation movements turn on this individual animal versus species focus. For environmentalists, animal liberation's defence of the interests of an individual animal, is disparaged as 'sentimental anthropomorphism'. Animal liberationists maintain that environmentalists concerned only with the survival of a species, demonstrate an indifference to 'the faces in the mob', which borders on ecofascism. Occasionally, these conflicts surface in the media and in popular literature.[5]

---

animal liberationists can hope to achieve in the late twentieth century. According to Passmore the non-vegetarian Cowper would not regard as a friend "the man who needlessly sets foot upon a worm"; but neither would he condemn the individual who destroys a destructive worm. Like Hume, Passmore believed it is one thing to claim that we ought to act *humanely* towards animals, quite another to maintain that we ought to act *justly* towards them; thus while accepting that cruelty is wrong does not mean that animals have a *right* to be treated compassionately (1980, p. 216). Passmore's position was that we are responsible *for* nature, not *to* nature as the deep ecologists argue. His stance represented "shallow" environmentalism on the one hand, and moderate animal welfarism on the other, a position that approximates what the philosopher R.G. Frey (1983) called, the moral orthodoxy.

[5] In early 1993 the Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC TV) screened *Kangaroo: Faces in the Mob*, a nature documentary made by Film Australia. Following the screening, many viewers complained about the ethics of the film crew when they did not intervene to assist a badly injured baby kangaroo. Such was the public response to the programme, the producers felt obliged to compose a six page open letter defending their non-intervention. For the viewing public, it was the suffering of an individual animal that mattered, not the environmentalists' concern for 'the mob'.

A more recent example in the popular domain which highlights environmentalist/animal rightist differences and similarities is the conflict described in *A Whale Hunt* (Sullivan 2000) between the Makah Indians of Neah Bay in the American north-west and animal rights protesters. Although the leading protesters – Paul Watson and the personnel of the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society – claim to be conservationists rather than animal welfarists, their determination to stop the hunting of a single grey whale by the hunters places them firmly in same camp as the individual animal-before-species animal protectionists. It is difficult at times to distinguish in this dispute over the hunting of an individual animal between the species-motivated environmentalists and the animal liberationists whose concerns are for the individual animal, rather than the species.

Yet despite these differences, animal protectionists and environmentalists are really different shades of green rather than different colours of the spectrum. For as Benton and Redfearn (1996, p. 48) pointed out ". . . the new 'green sensibilities' do converge with the politics of animal welfare in their shared rejection of the hitherto hegemonic conception of humans as set apart from and above the rest of nature".

The defence of nature provides both movements with a common goal and both use similar strategies, tactics and arguments in pressing their claims. The animal liberation movement claims that speciesism in its various forms constitutes a social problem in the same way that environmental problems such as pollution, toxic wastes or species extinction are theorised as social problems (Yearley 1992; Hannigan 1995). In short, the animal liberation movement is firmly grounded within a sociological paradigm, the chief features of which I take up in the rest of the chapter.

A Social Constructionist Perspective

In the social constructionist perspective, social problems are understood as being formed by the power of certain groups to define a particular issue as a problem that needs to be remedied. "The social constructionist branch of social movement theory emphasises that all social problems are socially constructed rather than being objective phenomena" (Stevenson & Greenberg 2000, p. 656). A social constructionist approach, which draws on social problems theory and social movement theory, provides the most sociologically promising way to analyse the animal movement. For Mauss (1989), social problems and social movements are one and the same thing or "alternative features of the same reality" (Bash 1995, p. 248), while for Troyer (1989), they are distinct phenomena; and, according to Troyer, it is the differences that enhance their usefulness to sociologists. Troyer's is the more plausible argument, since the units of analysis in social problems and social movement research are sufficiently different to effectively bring into question Mauss's assertion to the contrary. However, Jenness (1995) and McCright and Dunlap (2000) have shown that both traditions have much in common and can be used to complement one another. To paraphrase Jenness (1995, passim), using both theoretical traditions leads to an analysis of how a movement defines reality, forms interest groups and mobilises resources, public opinion and other processes which are crucial

to the study of both social problems and social movements. In the present study, I show how both traditions can be combined using the concept of social problems work to describe the everyday praxis of movement insiders.

The uniqueness of animal rights as a social movement, the focus of which is the liberation of non-human animals, calls for an approach that addresses the question of how and why people in the movement engage in what some see as a utopian, if not impossible, project. Social movement theory, in combination with concepts drawn from social problems theory, will be used to address these questions. The advantage of social movement theory was succinctly stated by Stevenson and Greenberg (2000, p. 654): "Social movement theories avoid the problem of structural determinism by emphasising the actions of those with relatively little power initially who band together . . . to engage in strategies to accomplish goals". Issue entrepreneurs in the animal movement construct speciesism as a social injustice and as morally reprehensible as intraspecies abuse; while racism, sexism and the related phenomenon of hate crimes as well as child abuse and so on are now acknowledged as serious social problems, the death, exploitation and suffering of animals in blood sports, vivisection and factory farming are not. The task for animal liberationists is to convince people outside the movement that animals are sentient beings deserving moral consideration rather than commodification as sporting trophies, 'test tubes on legs', or meat. Put differently, the task is to define this commodification process as wrong and to challenge the countermovements that seek to preserve these culturally sanctioned uses of animals. This study focuses on the animal movement's challenge to speciesism; for reasons of space, it does not address the countermovement backlash to its campaigns, except briefly in the next chapter under the heading "campaigns against cruelty as a social problem".

Social movement organisations are the mobilising structures used by animal liberationists in pressing their claims on behalf of non-human animals. This book will show how the success of the animal liberation movement in challenging anthropocentric and speciesist beliefs and practices, depends on how effective movement entrepreneurs are in constructing speciesism (primarily in sport hunting, animal experimentation and intensive farming) as a social problem within the context of social movement organisations. This approach is based on contextual constructionism which I argue is much more useful than the strict constructionism of, for example, Tester's (1991) *Animals and*

Society which I discuss in the next chapter. Even so, objective conditions alone do not constitute social problems. As Hjelmar (1996, p. 176) pointed out, "the basic point of constructivism is that it tries to demonstrate that social problems are not objectively given". Animal exploitation must be identified and demonstrated as a social problem by issue entrepreneurs in much the same way that environmental problems are increasingly seen as social problems (Yearley 1992; Hannigan 1995). For example, the philosopher John Passmore argued that an ecological problem is a special type of social problem, which like the more conventional social problems of "alcoholism, crime, deaths on the road – we believe that our society would be better off without" (1980, p. 43). Like other forms of abuse that cause suffering and pain to their victims – such as child abuse, elder abuse, and hate crimes against minorities – the abuse of animals has to be constructed as a social problem by issue entrepreneurs before the abusive condition is accepted as such.

The social construction of social problems

Social constructionism came to prominence in sociology when Berger and Luckmann (1966) argued that social reality is constructed when individuals and groups create knowledge by interpreting the world in different ways according to the particular socio-historical context in which meanings are attributed. Their sociology of knowledge represents the classical sociological approach that others have since adapted in disciplines that include anthropology, psychology, environmental history, geography and philosophy (Scarce 1997: 131).

The virtual invisibility of speciesism in the sociological and the social problems literature in comparison to the ubiquity of race, ethnic and gender relations raises further questions about power relations within academic disciplines. For example, how do sociologists attend to the effects of structures of domination and oppression on the most vulnerable of populations such as children, the homeless, the very intellectually disadvantaged and animals? In his advocacy on behalf of very cognitively disabled people, Watson (1996) pointed to a flaw in the discipline's sensibility that renders vulnerable groups invisible. Watson (1996, p. 231) was critical of how extremely powerless groups are neglected in academic sociology and suggested the neglect is due to "sociological sensibility" which is sensitive only to "significant social-historical

forces or processes" (such as the rise of workers', civil rights, women's movements) and oppressed groups who can speak for themselves. Unlike gays, lesbians, ethnic minorities, black women and so on, very cognitively disabled people are unable to do this.

The linguistic disadvantage of very cognitively disabled people has obvious parallels with the plight of non-human animals unable to speak for themselves. It is for this reason animal liberation philosophers and scholars have called for a new sensibility towards animals that emphasises sentience rather than reason as the basis for our ethical treatment of the linguistically disadvantaged, human and non-human alike (Singer 1975; 1990; Martell 1994). While Watson made no mention of non-human animals in his paper, it requires only a moment's reflection to acknowledge that logically, they deserve to be included in his advocacy of the "ethical practice of social and academic problem identification, informed by the notion of caring" (1996, p. 232). Likewise Collins (1989) called for an "overarching ethical framework" where the suffering of the silent (oppressed black women in her study) is treated as a social problem. Similarly, Miller (1993) took up the cause of extremely powerless groups by focussing on invisible "ways of talking" via artful forms of expression such as gossip, music, humour, alternative dress codes and the like. Yet as Watson noted, neither Collins' nor Miller's methods for the defence of the marginalized, dependent as they are on language, can accommodate the needs of very cognitively disabled people. Like these humans, non-human animals are, to use Watson's phrase, "the most silent constituencies" (1996, p. 237). Ironically, in the case of animals, their inability to use language is what draws many animal protectionists to their defence. James Serpell has eloquently described why it is that animals, in spite of being denied moral status because they lack language, mean so much to millions of ordinary people:

> Lacking the power of speech, animals cannot participate in conversation or debate, but by the same token, they do not judge us, criticize us, lie to us or betray our trust. Because it is mute and non-judgemental, their affection is seen as sincere, innocent, and without pretence (Serpell 1986, p. 114).

Serpell's remarks suggested non-human animals may be more advantaged than Watson's very cognitively disabled people, who according to him, are not taken seriously as a social-political force in the way other marginalized groups are. Watson (1996) argued that critical social scientists often act as

supporters and advocates of disadvantaged groups, but use the claims and grievances made by the socially vulnerable themselves. He insisted "they never begin with silence because that would represent a drift from emancipation to paternalism" but rather defer to the 'voice' of their research subjects, such as the disabled, blacks, poor people and so on (Watson 1996, p. 240). For this reason, very cognitively disabled people do not exist as potential subjects of critical sociological research. The spectre of paternalism might also explain the virtual invisibility of animals in sociological research. During the course of my research, it was sometimes suggested by academic colleagues that the animal movement is profoundly paternalistic, since its beneficiaries are unable to accept or decline advocacy on their behalf. My response to this is that animal protection activism and advocacy is necessarily paternalistic, in the same way that the efforts of advocates for the rights of children, the very cognitively disabled or political prisoners are. Animal protectionists, as their name suggests, believe that paternalism, via protectionism, is a lesser evil than moral apathy.

Watson's (1996, p. 241) appeal was for a new sociological sensibility that included the ethic of caring, but again the inherent asymmetries of power in the notion of caring are problematic, given "the dangers of paternalistic objectification of powerless research subjects and the consequent legitimation of brutal interventions". Watson seemed to believe that in the case of very cognitively disabled people, caring does not always have to mean social control or brutal interventions in people's lives. Similarly, many prominent animal rights advocates argue that the most ethical treatment of animals by humans is to leave them alone. Distancing ourselves from animals is of course not the same as neglect or abuse. On the other hand, rank and file animal protectionists believe the 'brutal interventions' of humans in the lives of animals in animal experimentation for instance, is an abuse and a social problem on a par with child exploitation, elder abuse and so on that is a world apart from these humane interventions designed to liberate animals from exploitation. The issue of caring in protectionist praxis is taken up in Chapter 4. In the next section, the conceptual context for the humane intervention of human beings in the lives of animals is outlined.

Conceptual Framework

Sabloff pointed out how the discourses of the animal movement are frequently linked to other human struggles for identity: "In doing so, they grant animals a history, a story, another avenue by which their most muted of experiences can enter the realm of public discourse" (2001, p. 132). The civil rights movement and the women's movement have succeeded in constructing racism and sexism as social problems that represent an injustice to the humanity of those affected by oppressive structures. The animal liberation movement inspired by Singer claims that speciesism is on a par with racism and sexism since they all treat certain animals (blacks, women, non-human animals) differently on the basis of morally irrelevant criteria (race, sex, species). The claims-making activities involved in assembling, presenting and contesting arguments about speciesism are therefore crucial to the success of the movement.

Social problems theory focuses on the claims-making activities of individuals and groups like animal liberationists in relation to how they discover, name and frame speciesism as a social problem that must be remedied in the interests of social justice. The exploitation of animals by humans is long on pedigree, but the most institutionalised forms of alleged animal abuse – intensive farming and animal experimentation – were discovered and named as social problems after the Industrial Revolution. The term 'speciesism' was first coined in the early 1970s by Richard Ryder to describe such practices. Singer (1975, p. 7) borrowed the term and defined it as "a prejudice or attitude of bias toward the interests of members of one's own species and against those of members of other species". He identified the animal research laboratory and the factory farm as the quintessential symbols of speciesism in contemporary society. Elsewhere, Singer (1995a, p. 70) has described wildlife extinction by hunters as "the ultimate form of speciesism". For most animal rights philosophers (for example Luke 1995) and activists (for example Huskisson in McDonald 1994, p. 78; Ryder 1996), blood sports, factory farming and vivisection are the three most important forms of animal abuse that they seek to expose to the public.

Historically, animal protectionists have been engaged in challenging power relations in these main practices in which humans use other animals. In at least two of the main locations of animal rights activism, Australia and the USA, there is a remarkable degree of ideological consensus on what constitutes

the worst forms of speciesism (see Table 4.2 in Chapter 4). An explanation for this can be found in the way animal protectionism developed as an Anglo-American tradition in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. By the late nineteenth century, Australia was also to share this tradition.

Blacks, women and non-human animals share the status of victims when discriminated against on the basis of the morally irrelevant criteria of colour, sex and species. For Elizabeth Clark, pain is the link between these movements: "What these movements had in common [she suggested] is a rejection of not just cruelty between sentient beings, but of cruelty in relationships of power" (Clark, E. 1995, p. 488).

In opposing cruelty, and unnecessary pain and suffering, animal protectionists are following in the footsteps of the reformers in the humane movements of the nineteenth century who sought to reform the legal system which, despite a constitutional ban on 'cruel and unusual punishment', did not protect people in status relationships such as master/slave and husband/wife (see Clark, E. 1995). In the aftermath of these two major liberation movements the revulsion from cruelty against blacks and women, and increasingly against some animals, is now a prevailing norm in most industrialised societies of the early 21st century. Thus while cruel practices have largely disappeared, the discrimination and prejudice associated with racism and sexism have not. Cruelty to animals, on the other hand is still widespread and institutionalised due to the prevalence of anthropocentric thinking, ingrained economic interests, and what has more recently been called 'speciesism', a concept which social problems scholars include along with the more conventional social problems of racism, sexism and ageism (Ibarra & Kitsuse 1993, p. 34). Animal liberationists tend to avoid the inelegant term speciesism for the more euphonious, everyday words 'cruelty', 'abuse', 'exploitation', 'maltreatment', 'injustice' and 'violence' or 'institutionalised violence'. Central to Singer's argument against speciesism is the idea that animals are sentient beings who experience pain during their confinement and treatment in research laboratories and factory farms. According to Martell (1994), Singer's sentient-centric version of animal liberation is located between anthropocentrism and ecocentrism on the environmental continuum:

Table 2.1. Conceptualising the human/animal relationship in the environmental and animal protection movements

Types of environmentalism	Basis of human/ animal relation	Animal protection orientation
anthropocentric	difference	animal welfare
sentient-centric	similitude	animal liberation
ecocentric	sameness/interdependence	animal rights

Source: The column on the left is adapted from Martell (1994)

Luc Ferry (1995, p. xxiii) describes the ideologies in the left column as "the three ecologies", noting that the second perspective, the sentient-centric, is a common feature of the Anglo-Saxon world "where it is the basis of the enormous animal liberation movement". Eckersley (1992) also agreed that animal liberation is a type of environmentalism, but suggests that the central importance of sentience renders it insufficient as a philosophy on which to defend nature in all of its manifestations. Animal liberationists would contend that from their point of view, mainstream environmentalism is deeply anthropocentric and hence unsuitable for challenging speciesism. While environmentalists and animal liberationists are kindred spirits, they see the human/animal relationship in quite distinctive ways as indicated in Table 2.1. In anthropocentric thinking, best exemplified by Wolfe (1993) in *The Human Difference*, humans and animals are perceived as utterly different. In this dominant paradigm, animals deserve kindness rather than rights and their interests are always subordinated to the demands of human welfare. This corresponds to the most moderate form of animal protection as represented by animal welfarism as shown in Table 2.1. For many people outside these movements, the first row in Table 2.1 represents moral orthodoxy which SRL Clark (1997) calls "the 'norm' of moderate concern for animals". At the opposite end of the continuum, ecocentrists associated with deep ecology, emphasise the interdependence of all living things and like animal rights advocates, insist that animals have the same rights as other species (Lovelock 1988, p. 236). But in contrast to animal rightists, they seek to protect species and habitats rather than individual animals. Animal liberationists fall in between by claiming that humans and animals are similar beings in that both are sentient and have an interest in avoiding pain and suffering.

For most of the animal protectionists in the present study, the animal

liberation perspective was the most common position, one that goes further than the moral orthodoxy of animal welfarism but not as far as the abolitionist doctrine of animal rights. While this suggests animal liberationists are neatly positioned midway between the extremes shown in Table 2.1, it does not mean that they prefer 'the middle way' advocated by scientists sympathetic to the wellbeing of animals (e.g. Webster 1994). More important to animal liberationists is the pragmatism of their approach that offers the prospect of finding common ground with like-minded groups in other social movements.[6] To be sure, their emphasis on the importance of sentience excludes moral consideration of mountains, rivers, forests and the like (except as habitats for sentient creatures) which sets them apart from environmentalists. More importantly, however, a sentience-centred approach allows the animal liberation movement to argue that discrimination against animals constitutes an injustice just as it does when women or blacks are the victims of oppression. Pain and suffering have featured prominently in the campaigns initiated by reformers in all three movements to promote "The sacred rights of the weak" (Clark, E. 1995).

Animal liberationists, like Townend in the epigraph to this chapter, also contend that interspecies abuse is no different as a social problem to the abuse of humans by other humans, such as child abuse (see Ascione & Arkow 1999). But while there are virtually no defenders of intraspecies abuse, the abuse of animals is institutionalised in factory farming and animal experimentation and, in the case of blood sports, is innocently labelled 'recreational hunting'. Furthermore, the commodification of animals as meat, fur, research tools, hunting trophies and the like, is widely accepted as legitimate by people who have a vested interest in the exploitation of animals as resources. Animal liberationists seek to stigmatise these 'normal' practices by constructing speciesism as a social problem and by challenging the systems of oppression

---

[6] In "From vilification to accommodation: The making of a common cause movement" (Munro 1999a) I argue that it is possible for existing social movements including environmental, animal rights, ecofeminist, consumer, health and social justice organisations, to form a collaborative coalition as a strategy for challenging certain practices in animal research. The animal protection work of the late Henry Spira highlighted the efficacy of forming collaborative coalitions and in moving from vilifying one's opponents to seeking accommodation with them in projects designed to reduce animal suffering.

upon which the practices are based. Put another way, the animal movement targets the institutional roots of interspecies exploitation by designating factory farming, vivisection and blood sports as cruel and unnecessary exploitation of sentient creatures with serious moral and social consequences for humans.

Animal Protection Praxis As Social Problems Work

Because of the widespread societal indifference to animal cruelty as a social problem noted by Arluke and Luke (1997), the animal protection movement for the past two hundred years has been characterised by a social problems discourse. Animal protection work, it will be argued in this book, is a classic example of social problems work, the purpose of which has been to transform the concerns of individuals troubled by our treatment of animals and indifference to them, into a public issue.

From the early nineteenth century pioneers in the humane and antivivisection movements to contemporary animal protectors in the US, UK and Australia, animal protection campaigns against the exploitation of animals can be read as social problems work. Franklin (1999, p. 197) suggested that in post-modern times particularly, animals provide people with the opportunity to do 'good works' and to engage in morally unambiguous projects such as the provision of animal shelters, animal rescue and rehabilitation and the like. For example, Irvine (2003) analysed animal sheltering in the US as an institution that engages in social problems work when dealing with unwanted pets. According to Irvine, animal shelters 'think' about this issue in a different way to their clients, the people who 'abandon' their pets. The shelters label this more positively as 'surrendering' the animal in order to promote the image of the 'good' client who, rather than dumping the animal on the roadside to fend for itself, gives it up to the shelter. Thus animal shelters have attempted to transform themselves in the public mind from animal 'concentration camps', to resource centres with an expanded social problems work agenda which includes educating the public about animal health, behaviour and training (Irvine 2003, p. 555).

The social problems work of improving the lot of unwanted pets is an example of the 'good works' associated with the animal welfare strand of the movement. However, animal liberation campaigns go beyond the saving of individual animals that is the focus of animal welfarists. For the animal

liberationist, the target is the institutionalised cruelty inherent in the mass, industrialised commodification and production of animals. Unlike the hands-on social problems work of rescue, refuge and rehabilitation associated with individual animals, campaigns against institutionalised cruelty in intensive farming, vivisection and recreational hunting are contested and have spawned formidable countermovements that challenge the legitimacy of the movement's claims. On the other hand, the existence of a movement-countermovement field of conflict further demonstrates the relevance of social problems work in conscience movements where different sides make moral claims about the righteousness of their cause.

Holstein and Miller (1993) and Miller and Holstein (1997) have produced the most comprehensive account to date of the notion of social problems work. They defined this work as "the interpretive activity we undertake to produce a sense of meaningful everyday reality. . . . We accomplish social problems as we communicate about, categorize, organize, argue, and persuade one another that social problems really do exist" (Miller & Holstein 1997, p. ix). Such conversations demonstrate how social issues can be defined as problems or non-problems. The (ab)use of animals is a classic instance of this process since outside the animal liberation movement, the treatment of animals is largely deemed noncontroversial. Hostein and Miller (1993) emphasised that defining what is or what is not a social problem or how particular definitions gain popular currency are only part of the process of social problems work. They suggested a number of ways for analysing social problems work, especially in human service and social control settings. However, they pointed out that while these contexts are rich in the opportunities they provide for social problems work, the concept has application wherever there is dissatisfaction with a putative social condition. They defined social problems work as:

> . . . any and all activity implicated in the recognition, identification, and definition of conditions that are called 'social problems'. Social problems work can be any human activity contributing to the practical 'creation' or understanding of an instance of a social problem (Miller & Holstein 1989, p. 5).

Tesh suggested a number of activities that represent social problems work in the environmental movement. This kind of work occurs when people

> . . . do such things as put recylcing bins out on their curbs for pickup, defend environmentalist principles in conversations with friends and family or wear t-shirts with environmentalist slogans . . . The recycling bins are symbols of environmental problems and solutions. The conversations are lessons. The t-shirts are walking billboards (Tesh 2000, p. 135).

Similar activities are common to the everyday social problems work of people who seek to promote the cause of animals by shopping around for free-range eggs, giving a home to a lost or injured animal, or doing a host of activities from the tactical repertoire of the movement (see Table 6. 1 in Chapter 6). The activities nominated by Tesh are everyday things that individuals do to help the cause. Chin and Mittleman (2001) suggested that this kind of activist engagement is typically found in the submerged networks of emerging alternative values and lifestyles. They gave the example of a family that shops around for 'dolphin-safe' tuna, a product, however, that is problematic for animal rightists.

Another dimension of this kind of social problems work can be found in the alternative lifestyles practised by vegans and vegetarians. McDonald's (2000) interviews of a small sample of this marginal group revealed how people *learn to become* vegans, vegetarians and animal rights advocates, typically through a 'catalytic experience' of seeing cruelty to animals. This triggers both an emotional and an intellectual response such as "reading, thinking, talking, and becoming involved in animal rights or vegetarian-related activities" (McDonald 2000, p. 12). Some individuals in her sample went on to do lobbying and proselytising work for the animal cause, activities which involved quite complex intellectual work which, at the very minimum, involved learning about institutionalised cruelty and more importantly, challenging it in its various contexts.

This process of becoming a vegan is not unlike the transformation of lifestyles that many animal liberationists spoke about in the present study. Many experienced cognitive and affective 'epiphanies' which paved the way to the more practical commitments of liberating farm, lab and wild animals as well as converting others to the movement's cause. Social problems work characterised by intellectual, emotional and practical work is therefore a feature of both becoming a vegan/vegetarian/animal rights practitioner and converting others to the cause.

Many social movements do this kind of social problems work whenever

they seek to change people's attitudes or practices (e.g. Gay Liberation, New Age movements etc.) or to save lives (e.g. Prolife, Mothers Against Drunk Driving etc.). Social problems work can best be illustrated when activists act collectively in social movement organisations in causes such as the environmental justice movement. People in this movement have campaigned against toxic waste dumps by researching public health issues in order to contest dominant interests. This form of social problems work, known as popular or lay epidemiology (Brown, P. 1995; 1997), is close to what many activists do in the animal movement especially in the context of challenging scientific expertise. Social problems work is therefore a feature of many social movements, including the animal movement.

Social problems work broadly defined

In the present study, social problems work is, as described above, broadly defined to include not just intellectual claims making activities, but the practical and affective work that activists do to press their claims. In this way, the redefined, expanded concept of social problems work restores a political edge to a field that has been criticised for its political quietism (Burningham & Cooper 1999, p. 298). Social problems work, so defined, shares many of the characteristics of conventional work in that it has intellectual, practical and emotional components as well as intrinsic rewards, if not always the extrinsic economic rewards of labour. These characteristics, it will be argued, correspond to the social movement advocacy and activism described below: intellectual (diagnosis of the social problem), practical (prognosis) and emotional (motivational frame).

Real work typically means paid work, which would seem to preclude community and political work in new social movements. Yet a case can be made for designating such activities as work. For example, Wadel (1979) has advocated extending the economist's definition of (paid) work to include the hidden work of everyday life. Her concept of work is broad enough to include the notion of work as a source of cultural and social values. In short, work has social worth, since everyday work and political work (discussion, reading newspapers, listening to media reports and making up one's mind about political issues) generates social value and helps maintain social institutions. Wadel (1979, p. 381) argued that work is not just socially constructed, "but . . . work is something that characterises social relations. In

other words, a sociological theory of work must treat work as a *relational* concept". She contended that a new non-economic concept of work would need to include the mutual activities that build personal and private relations and the collective activities that maintain community and other valued institutions. Social problems work is similar to the kinds of work Wadel (1979) described as 'hidden' work, which includes the work that activists and advocates perform when they promote the causes of new social movements. In the present study, caring about and for animals constitutes animal protection praxis, the social problems work that is characteristic of the animal movement.

Thus defined, social problems work is what activists in social movements do when they engage in social change activism such as social justice campaigns against racism, sexism, speciesism and the like. And whenever an issue such as child abuse, environmental degradation, hate crimes against gays and lesbians and so on becomes the focus of a social movement campaign, activists engage in the social construction of the putative problem as a public issue in which the condition is identified and communicated in ways that mobilise support for the cause. This is true also for issues where there are strong countermovements such as in abortion politics, where both sides are involved in the social problems work of naming the problem, attributing blame and mobilising support for the cause. Similarly, the animal movement has spawned virulent countermovements, which contest its claims concerning animal exploitation.

Increasingly, when countermovements emerge, professionalisation invariably follows as the stakes are increased for both sides and the movements cannot rely on amateurs alone. At the very least, movements turn to "organized and professional amateurism" (Meyer & Tarrow 1998, p. 14) to prosecute their claims. There is evidence in the United States of the increasing professsionalisation of the social movement sector (McCarthy & McPhail 1998, p. 100) and elsewhere that ordinary people are mobilised by professional cadres whose 'vocation' it is to persuade individuals to support various causes. In the animal movement, especially in the United States and to a lesser extent in Australia and the United Kingdom, the trend seems to be towards the professionalisation of animal SMOs. During the 1990s particularly, when there were restricted employment opportunities in the labour markets of Western democracies, many young people turned to the non-profit sector for voluntary or sometimes paid work. Several animal protectionists in this study said they

would be prepared to work *gratis* for various animal SMOs, while a number of advocates claimed they could earn more money outside the movement but chose the intrinsic rewards of a vocation in animal protection. As Meyer and Tarrow (1998, p. 14) pointed out, a similar trend is replicated in other social movements as well: "Increasingly, core activists today support themselves through social change efforts, as organizing becomes a career option and social movement-related organizations differentiate".

There is some evidence that social problems work in the voluntary sector will become more prominent in the future. Jones (1982) has called for a revolutionary rethinking towards the way we think about work. He advocated extending the notion of work to areas that would include social problems work. Here we could include environmental protection, care for the old and sick, and antiracist activities that could be performed and recognised as paid work. In the journal *Social Problems,* Daniels (1987), in a similar vein to Wadel (1979), advocated the recognition of 'invisible work' typically performed by women. A more comprehensive argument for broadening the notion of work for women and men is Rifkin's (1995) *The End of Work*. Rifkin called for a reinvigoration of 'the third sector' where voluntary community work creates 'social capital', in contrast to the market and public capital produced by the marketplace and state. He referred to several NGOs, non-profit and civic organisations such as the Peace Corps and Americorps as tools for social reform. Volunteers in these associations are involved in social problems work covering a range of projects concerned with education, the environment, public safety, building shelters for the homeless and the like. Rifkin (1995) believed that socially useful work of this kind offers people the most prospects for employment in a future where jobs and careers will become increasingly scarce.

James, Veit and Wright (1997, p. 311) supported the idea of social capital and widening the definition of work to include activities that are purposeful, involve an intellectual and/or manual engagement with a social and natural world beyond the self, and which make a difference to that world resulting in the reproduction or enhancement of social life. They acknowledged that this 'cultural-ontological' definition involves a reconstruction of the nature of work that will require open political debate. For many people involved in social movements as activists and advocates as well as volunteers in clubs, associations, non-profit and NGOs, that debate is an ongoing process.

Conclusion

This chapter began with a discussion of the animal issue as both a social problem and a sociological problem. It was argued that a social constructionist perspective offers the best way of understanding how and why people campaign on behalf of non-human animals. The conceptual framework and approach to the social construction of social problems in relation to animal exploitation was outlined. More than most causes, animal rights is a social construction since the movement's beneficiaries are unable to protest on their own behalf. It will be argued that the three main instances of speciesism – intensive farming, animal experimentation and recreational hunting – are constructed as social problems by the animal movement against countermovements which seek to normalise these activities. Animal protection work is therefore a classic example of social problems work within the context of social movements that increasingly have become occupational outlets for social activists engaged in campaigns for social change. In the next chapter, I explain the historical, cultural and social contexts of the putative animal problem in Western democracies.

Chapter Three

The Animal Problem in Social Context

> *Modern literature treats animals as a genuine problem.* (Marian Scholtmeijer)
>
> *As social constructions, the meanings of animals seem to be fixed and enduring.* (Arluke & Sanders 1996)

In this chapter I will put the animal problem in its historical and cultural context, describing how a social problems discourse has characterised the history of animal protection during the past two centuries and that a number of seminal texts, mainly in the sociological literature, have constructed the animal problem as either a welfare, rights or liberation issue. I argue that these three main strands of animal protection represent animals as respectively a political, moral or social issue.

Social movement organisations offer new members a 'collective identity' that for many provides the incentive for movement participation. However, as Barnes (1995, p. 157) pointed out, the collective identity must match the self-image of potential recruits. Thus the animal movement believes its anti-cruelty message of compassion and kindness to animals resonates with increasingly large numbers of people. In mobilising recruits against speciesism, the animal movement utilises three main mobilising frames, animal welfare, animal liberation and animal rights. These are framed to attract different

constituencies and to appeal to different aspirations and identities. As explained in the review below, the animal welfare identity is essentially moderate while the identities associated with animal liberation and rights are more radical. According to Foweraker (1995, p. 12), a social movement is always modifying its ideological profile in order to encompass the aspirations of potential supporters. Thus the animal movement frames its campaigns as the political climate requires.

In countries where the animal movement is active, activists seek to mobilise a range of resources to press their claims. Cress and Snow (1996) have suggested a typology of resources – moral, material, human and informational – all of which are evident in the campaigning strategies of the contemporary animal movement. Dalton (1994) has shown how ideology shapes a movement's resource mobilisation strategies. In the case of the animal movement, the different ideological strands in the movement (animal welfare, animal rights and animal liberation) seek to mobilise qualitatively different resources. In the latter part of this chapter, it is argued that animal welfarists mobilise essentially political resources and animal rightists are concerned primarily with moral capital, while animal liberationists, especially the Australian variety inspired by Singer, are mainly concerned with the mobilisation of informational resources or 'verifiable packages of information'. In the *realpolitik* of animal activism, these distinctions are usually blurred. Nonetheless, they are useful in showing the broad links between movement ideologies and the mobilisation of resources in the animal movement.

According to McAdam, McCarthy and Zald (1996, p. 5), much of the most influential work by new social movement theorists focuses primarily on the sources and functions of meaning and identity in social movements. NSM theorists seek to include cultural and ideational dimensions of collective action in their analyses. Essential to this task is the concept of framing which Snow and his colleagues (1986, 1988, 1992) have developed from Goffman's (1974) work in *Frame Analysis.* As used by Snow and his associates, framing concepts capture the interpretive work of social movement activists (Hunt, Benford & Snow 1994, p. 191). In the present study, framing is used in two ways. First, it is argued that animal protectionists have achieved *consensus* mobilisation by framing their campaigns within a social problems discourse that highlights cruelty to individual animals as the movement's central grievance. However, this is not the only construction of animals to have emerged during the last

two centuries or so. The review below outlines two further constructions, namely animals as a social problem, and campaigns against cruelty to animals as a social problem. Second, the three core framing tasks, diagnostic framing, prognostic framing and motivational framing, are seen as interactional accomplishments from which activists derive *action* mobilisation.

It is argued in this book that animal rights as a new social movement constructs speciesism as a social problem and then acts on that construction in ways that are characteristic of new social movements. Johnston, Larana and Gusfield (1994) listed eight such characteristics, most of which apply to the animal rights movement. Among the most important of these are that NSMs are characterised by a pluralism of ideas and values, a focus on issues of identity which are 'acted out' in both individual and collective actions, and in the case of ethical vegetarianism, involve personal and intimate aspects of everyday life such as what we eat, wear and enjoy. New social movement organisations also tend to be 'segmented, diffuse and decentralized' (Johnston, Larana & Gusfield 1994, p. 8) and are non-violent while simultaneously challenging dominant norms of conduct. In the present study, these dominant norms are represented below in the construction of animals as a social problem and in the countermovements, which construct campaigns against animal exploitation as a social problem.

The present study suggests that a social problems discourse can be discerned throughout the recent history of animal protection. For the moment, I outline the different constructions of social problems discourse in the literature: (1) the anthropomorphic perception of animals as social problems; (2) campaigns against cruelty as a social problem for animal industries; (3) the exploitation of animals as a social problem under the aegis of those defending the rights of animals. The first two constructions represent what Piers Beirne (1995) called 'the twin bastions of speciesism', anthropomorphism and anthropocentrism.

Animals as a Social Problem

The historian Keith Thomas pointed out that prior to the 17th century the encroachment of wild animals into human settlements was often seen as a bad omen. Even in Victorian times, he noted, the sight of certain animals in a town 'would make healthy men take to their beds' (Thomas 1983, p. 78). Hilda Kean (1998) stressed the importance of the role of sight in the

relationship between seeing cruelty and creating social change in the cities and towns of the 19th century when animals were an integral and highly visible part of urban life. For most people outside the circle of animal protectionists, animals were a social problem as much as a moral problem. People complained of butchers whose slaughtering of animals in the streets of London fouled the thoroughfares and polluted the water supply (Kean 1998, p. 59). Philo (1998, p. 66) identified a number of discourses in 19th century London – medical, hygiene, organisational and moral – that coded animals as 'impure, polluting, disruptive, and discomforting occupants of city spaces'. In faraway Sydney, city dwellers and visitors alike were confronted with the effluent from animal pens, offal from slaughter yards and animal carcasses that found their way into the waterways. The animal problem was part of the 'mental pollution' of the city which early animal protectors sought to clean up (Hutton & Connors 1999, p. 81).

Anthropologists have compiled most of the work on animals as social problems. This work takes people-wildlife conflict as its focus and covers topics such as animal attacks on people, livestock and crops, competition with humans over scarce resources, infestations and pestilence, and accidents in the air and on the road involving animals. A recent book in this genre by Knight (2000) described these human-animal conflicts in a number of contexts including bear culling in Japan, the killing of wolves by reindeer-herders in Sweden and foxhunting in England. In the latter instance, foxes are seen as the 'natural enemies' of humans because they kill lambs, poultry and game birds owned by humans. In foxhunting, from the perspective of the hunter at least, 'the illegitimate killer becomes an object of legitimate killing' (Marvin 2000, p. 208).

The first sociological study of animals as a social problem, and by today's standards probably the most anthropomorphic in the literature, was by the American scholar E.P. Evans (1998). Published in 1906, his *Criminal Prosecution and Capital Punishment of Animals*, described the practice of putting 'guilty animals' on trial for various offences from the late Middle Ages to the 18th century in various parts of Europe. Animals and their crimes included homicide by bees, bulls, horses and snakes; fraud by field mice; infanticide by pigs; and theft by foxes (Beirne 1994, p. 31). Beirne argued that Evans convincingly demonstrated that both secular and religious authorities in Europe at the time agreed to prosecute and, if need be, punish certain animals as criminally

liable. In his analysis of different explanations of the animal trials, Beirne pointed out that our understanding of them is dependent upon different constructions of concepts like 'animal trials' and 'punishment'. He plausibly suggested that yesterday's medieval courtroom is today's animal shelter where bureaucratic regulations enforced by animal control officers permit animals to be put to death. Furthermore, he noted, while animals today are not executed for crimes perpetrated against humans, they are put to death for the social problems associated with 'homelessness', 'overpopulation' and 'aggression' (1994, pp. 43–4; 1995, p. 24).

Since the early work of E.P. Evans, Piers Beirne and Clifton Bryant have been most prominent among sociologists to have drawn attention to the idea of animals as social problems. Bryant (1979) was the first to refer to the neglect of animals by sociologists in a paper published in *Social Forces*. Noting that virtually no area of social life is untouched by animals, Bryant suggested that sociology should overcome its myopia by adopting a 'zoological connection' in which the human/animal relationship was taken more seriously. For his own part, Bryant saw the animal as creating or causing social problems in a number of ways. First, he argued, the overpopulation of dogs and cats poses serious health, economic, and environmental dilemmas while the ethical restrictions on their supply for use in animal experimentation is itself a social problem: 'The future of large segments of US scientific research may well be imperilled by the current efforts to improve the lot of animals' by animal welfare activists (Bryant 1979, p. 407). Similarly, he referred to the potential crippling of America's agricultural capacity as a consequence of campaigns against the use of battery hen cages. These are just two of the controversies mentioned in the paper which Bryant believed could lead to conflict between animal welfare advocates and their targets. Bryant's purpose seemed to be more about encouraging sociologists to take the 'zoological connection' seriously than defending animal industries. Even so, in his construction of the animal as a social problem, it is the threat posed by the animal movement rather than animals per se, which was highlighted as the social problem.

A related construction of animals as a social problem outlined in Bryant's paper is when they feature in crime as perpetrators, instigators and victims as well as being the object of crime, the motivation for crime, the instrument of or for crime and even the means for the punishment of crime. He identified several instances where people can be prosecuted for zoological crime. These

included crimes against the 'owners' of animals as personal or public property, when the animal is seen as a hazard or nuisance, or in instances of cruelty towards animals, in the illegal trading of exotic animals or threats to endangered species. Crimes of this kind, he said, 'may be as potentially divisive and as disruptive to the social enterprise as any other form of deviancy' (Bryant 1979, p. 417). Again, this construction of the animal as a social problem is more about the uses to which humans put animals – as property to be exploited for profit in illegal trade, as trophies to be hunted, as inappropriate pets that are offensive (keeping a skunk) or dangerous (serpents as suburban pets), and as objects of abuse in bestiality, in dog-fights or cockfighting – rather than cruelty itself, which the animal movement insists is the real social problem.

There is little in Bryant's paper to suggest that it is our treatment of animals, rather than animals themselves, which is the social problem. As in other studies of deviant populations (witches, homeless people, street kids and so on) the approach is to categorise these groups, perhaps unintentionally in most cases, as 'folk devils' (Cohen 1972) rather than to analyse the wider dimensions of the problem.

In his survey of the uses and abuses of animals in criminogenic settings, Beirne (1995, 1999) was more sympathetic to the animal welfare cause than Bryant. He argued that even the most enlightened definitions of crime are profoundly speciesist since to define crime as 'social harm' or 'analogous social injury' seems to leave out the plight of animals as victims of harms and injuries inflicted upon them. According to Beirne (1995, p. 5), the call for the study of animal abuse remains completely ignored by criminologists. When animals do appear in the criminological literature, they do so primarily because they feature in some problematic aspect of human behaviour; '. . . nowhere is the psychological and physical abuse of animals an object of study in its own right' (Beirne 1995, p. 22). Thus in critiquing a discussion of the deviant practices of meat workers who choose not to disclose the ingredients of hot dogs so as to avoid alarming health-conscious consumers, Beirne pointed out that absolutely no consideration is given to the suffering of the animals during the conversion of their body parts into hot dogs. The same charge can be levelled against Bryant's (1991) analysis of cockfighting and elsewhere where he and a colleague defend the blood sport against the cruelty charges of 'vigilante and under-cover' animal rights groups (Bryant & Snizek 1993).

Beirne (1995, pp. 23–24) concluded his review by criticising criminology for casting animals as 'creatures of anthropocentrism and anthropomorphism, those twin bastions of speciesism'. He observed that the untheorised treatment of animals as objects in both the sociological and criminological literatures is 'an embarrassing reflection' of how they are routinely and unthinkingly treated in factory farms, research laboratories and so on. Beirne's (1995, p. 24) concluding sentence puts him firmly on the side of Singer's animal liberationists who equate speciesism with sexism and racism: 'Animals are used and abused by humans in many of the same ways, and for many of the same dominionistic reasons, as males oppress women and whites have enslaved persons of colour'.

Campaigns Against Cruelty as a Social Problem

Alan Wolfe's (1993) defence of anthropocentric values is perhaps the most forthright in the literature by a sociologist. Wolfe (1993, p. 11) argued that the animal rights and environmental movements are unwanted political developments that represent 'one more nail in the coffin of anthropocentrism'. He maintained that because humans are so profoundly different from animals, extending any rights to non-human animals devalues human culture and threatens to undermine our cultural achievements. One essential criterion separates us from other animals, he argued, and that is our capacity for interpretation and the production of meaning: 'our power to use mind to alter the rules that govern us' (Wolfe 1993, p. 53). Humans are empowered to liberate themselves from the constraints of both nature and culture, which, noted Wolfe (1993, p. 91), does not come without unfairness: 'Just as we experiment on animals to keep humans alive, we are sometimes cruel to animals in order to give our lives meaning'. He was critical of animal advocates who seek to prevent ordinary people from using animals to give meaning to their lives:

> Animal rights theorists [he cites Singer and Regan] are thus correct to detect certain patterns of cruelty in the way we use other species to make our own lives richer with meaning. At the same time, if we were to revise the ways in which humans make meaning out of the natural world in such a way as never to be cruel to other animal species, we would live in a world without fantasy, excitement, and creativity (Wolfe 1993, p. 87).

For Wolfe, cruelty to animals is necessary if humans are to live full and meaningful lives. This is not the same as saying that unnecessary cruelty to animals is justified so that any and all human needs and wants can be satisfied, a position Wolfe (1993, p. 90) acknowledged.

As noted above, Bryant (1979) argued that animals need to be taken as seriously by sociologists as they are by animal protectionists, since the latter's campaigns are a threat to animal industries and social harmony. In addition to agribusiness and scientific research, he noted that animal activism has caused the demise of the entire American whaling industry and threatens tuna fishing as well as the recreational use of animals by individuals such as his own academic specialty, cockfighting, which he described as 'a multi-million dollar, clandestine and often illegal, recreational pastime for hundreds of thousands of Americans' (Bryant 1979, p. 413). Elsewhere, Bryant and Snizek (1993) referred to the 'animal rights' movement and environmentalists being at odds with hunters, trappers and cockfighters, among other groups. The authors referred to the public backlash by such groups against restrictions on these activities, noting that one such controversy, the protection of the endangered small darter-fish, had delayed a multi-million dollar dam project in Tennessee. Presumably, Bryant and Snizek saw the threat posed by the 'animal rights' lobby (their quotation marks) to developers, individual hunters and others as something to be resisted or at least deserving of attention by sociologists. They suggested, for example, that 'the Bambi Syndrome' has turned many urban Americans against hunting and trapping, 'and to view animals as loveable humans' (Bryant & Snizek 1993, p. 27).[1] Thus in the conflict over values represented by the allegedly anthropomorphic attitudes of animal defenders and the anthropocentrism of their opponents,

[1] According to Cartmill (1993) the Bambi Syndrome is likely to annoy both sides in the hunting controversy since it respectively stigmatises and trivializes the issue for both hunters and animal protectors. He suggested however, in contrast to Bryant and Snizek, that many hunting writers seem to believe (erroneously), that opposition to hunting would disappear if *Bambi* and other anthropomorphic Disney products were suppressed (1993, p. 180). Even so, Bryant and Sniznek are surely right to argue that controversies involving the use of animals have the potential to be disruptive and even violent. And given the differences in attitudes between Western and Eastern cultures, conflicts over the use of animals may have serious international implications. Recent examples involving the hunting of seals and whales are perhaps the most obvious cases of 'animal wars' (Wenzel 1991; Day 1997; Stoett 1997).

there is potential for social disruption and even violence which, as Bryant rightly pointed out, sociologists have largely ignored.

There are two sociological studies in the literature that focus on controversies that have caused conflict between the main protagonists. In the first study, *Going Wild,* the sociologist and hunter Jan Dizard (1994) provided a detailed case study of an animal rights/hunting conflict in Massachusetts, which reveals the arguments on both sides of the controversy. Dizard's analysis of the debate favoured the hunters as he claimed they have a better understanding of nature than the animal defenders who he dismissed as profoundly ignorant of the natural world. While the hunting controversy takes different forms in the three case study countries discussed in this book, the potential for violence is not as great as in the conflict over animal experimentation. Groves's (1997) ethnography, *Hearts and Minds: The Controversy over Laboratory Animals,* is a more balanced case study than that provided by Dizard although it is restricted to a much smaller sample. Groves only briefly alluded to the violence of extremist animal rights activists and discussed the conflict between activists and researchers in the context of the protagonists' moral dilemmas and the emotional toll of the controversy to both sides. Yet he did indicate that for the animal researchers, their opponents' campaigns against cruelty are potentially destructive. 'Children, they feared, would be discouraged from becoming scientists, or they will be morally polluted by learning the animal rights activists' violent ways' (1997, p. 168). Either way, these researchers view campaigns for the rights of animals as something society would be better off without.

Elsewhere I have critiqued some of the countermovements that challenge animal liberationist campaigns against animal experimentation, factory farming and recreational hunting (Munro 1999b). Similarly, Arluke and Groves (1998) have described the process of countermovement claims making in the issue of animal research. Apart from these studies and Wolfe's (1993) more comprehensive critique of animal rights as a social problem, there is little in the sociological literature on the divisiveness that the movement has generated. The backlash against animal rights has been led primarily by philosophers and this has been directed at the movement's ideology rather than its campaigns per se (see Leahy 1991; Carruthers 1992; Scruton 1996).

Attacks on animal liberationists have been prominent however in the mass media. Kew (1999, pp. 261–62) has shown how the quality electronic

and print media in the UK from 1994 to 1996 portrayed animal liberationists as 'misguided, dubious, irrational, heretical, sinister, dishonest, totalitarian, murderous and treacherous'. His detailed study of the media's representation of animal liberation protests as misguided and misanthropic suggested that a 'speciest media discourse' (p. 173) blatantly supports what he calls 'the animal-using consensus' (p. 177). According to Kew, negative representations of the animal liberation movement are the norm in the British media. He argued that the media unashamedly promote animal use and are therefore implicated in the reproduction of speciesism. In the UK at least, the media frame animal liberation campaigns against cruelty as the acts of violent extremists or misanthropes and in so doing, support the backlash against animal rights as seemingly promoted by Wolfe, Byrant, Dizard and others in the sociology discipline.

The Exploitation of Animals as a Social Problem

In this section, the exploitation of animals as a social problem is put in historical context. We will see how this construction found its way into the work of historians writing about the early humane and antivivisection movements. Resistance against the labelling of animal exploitation as a social problem has also been a feature of the politics of animal protection. Our relations with animals have been characterised by a mixture of compromise and concealment (Thomas 1983). Even so, according to Franklin (1999), in the current period, the subordination of animal to human needs and wants is seriously questioned. Yet it is still uncommon to find a voice for the animals in the extant literature.

In a book on meat processing in small town America, the editors Stull, Broadway and Griffith (1995) and their contributors discussed the impact of pig, poultry, beef and fish processing on the lives of the meat workers and on the small, rural communities in which the plants are located. The book chronicled some of the social problems associated with the meat industry – increasing crime, health costs, homelessness, school overcrowding, housing shortages, cyclical migration and rural poverty – yet, surprisingly, without any reference to the moral issue of animal suffering and exploitation. For animal liberationists, the task confronting them is to make the invisibility of the animals in such contexts, visible as a social problem on a par with these conventional problems. There is, however, a small fictional literature as well

as a growing non-fictional literature, which documents cruelty towards animals as a social problem.

Barker-Benfield (1992) claimed that 18th-century women empathised more with animals than they did with peasants or slaves and suggested that the 18th century was an age of sensibility in which women campaigned against male barbarity: 'From Margaret Cavendish through Francis Power Cobbe, women made the connection between men's treatment of animals and their treatment of women' (1992, p. 232). Cobbe (1822–1904) is the best-known female animal campaigner of the early animal protectionists. In 1878 she wrote an article titled 'Wife-Torture in England' in which she put the abuse of women by men on a par with what she saw as the great evil of vivisection. It was, she argued, akin to the rape, torture and abuse of women. This became a recurrent theme in the work of female fiction (see Ferguson 1998) and non-fiction writers during the 19th and 20th centuries respectively, and there is now a growing sociological literature in this genre (Collard 1988; Adams 1990; Donovan 1993; Birke 1994; Adams & Donovan 1995).

Some of these social problem themes were taken up in non-fictional writing in other disciplines as well. Withington's (1991, p. 199) history of pre-revolutionary America showed how the vices associated with cockfighting and horse racing posed a threat to the values colonists needed in order to resist English tyranny. Both activities were viewed as social problems because they diverted people from work and produced nothing of benefit to society, encouraging instead gambling and the weakening of community cohesiveness. The treatment of animals on both sides of the Atlantic came to symbolise the moral virtues, or lack of them, of the protagonists in pre-revolutionary America. Withington (1991, p. 213) suggested that Virginian planters, fearing the moral effects of slavery on their lives and character, cleansed themselves not by giving up slaves, but symbolically, by abandoning cockfighting and horse racing.

Respectability was also important to the success of the RSPCA, which Harrison (1973) attributed to the strategy of never running too far ahead of public opinion, especially among the more respectable members of society. Historians have generally argued that animal protection embodied the temper of the age (Turner 1980; Ritvo 1987; Kean 1998). Reformers in the RSPCA took advantage of the long-term changes in people's sensibilities during the 18th century including the role of humanitarian reform in the cultural reconstruction

of pain (Haltunen 1995, p. 318). Blood sports, public executions, the treatment of the insane, flogging in the armed services, corporal punishment of children, and sport that caused serious injury, were among the practices targeted by the humanitarians.

The RSPCA focused almost exclusively on the cruel sports of the 'lower orders' or labouring classes. Cruelty to animals was at the time seen as a social problem because it was linked to drunkenness and gambling. People often became quarrelsome and inebriated during bull baiting and cockfighting contests which typically took place in alehouse courtyards. The links between cruelty and social disorder can be seen in the humane societies that were founded in the early 19th century. The Evangelicals set up the Society for the Suppression of Vice in 1802 to campaign against bull baiting and other forms of cruelty. When it was unsuccessful, the first SPCA was established in Liverpool in 1809 to continue the campaign. These early societies had a strong bias of social control that targeted working class habits for improvement (Tester 1991). Although the RSPCA was one of the most important cause groups in the 19th century, it was reluctant to attack the more 'civilised' cruelties of vivisection, foxhunting and killing animals for their feathers or fur.

Members of the Humanitaran League (1891–1919) were more radical than their conservative cousins in the animal protection societies. Founded by the vegetarian socialist Henry Salt, the League is the best example of a multi-purpose, social problems and anti-cruelty campaign at the turn of the century. Its mission included the Poor Law, Criminal and Prison Law reform as well as cruelty to animals in vivisection, in slaughterhouses, the trade in feathers, blood sports and the 'evil trade' that involved the shipping of live cattle abroad (Weinbren 1994, p. 88). Salt knew that working class people's indifference to the plight of animals had to do with their own impoverishment. In 1921 he predicted that 'the emancipation of men from cruelty and injustice will bring with it in due course the emancipation of animals also' (Hendrick & Hendrick 1989, p. 45). Similarly, Lansbury's (1985) history of the *Old Brown Dog* incident was testimony to the willingness of ordinary people, given the right circumstances, to empathise with the suffering of their fellow beings.

In the three main sites of animal protection, namely the UK, USA and in Australia, the animal lobby had virtually run out of steam by the first decades of the 20th century. MacCulloch (1993) argued that the decline of the movement in Australia by about 1914 was due to its transformation from a social reform

lobby to a group of pet enthusiasts. Thus a social problems discourse was replaced by the genteel promotion of kindness to domestic animals, especially cats and dogs. 'This loss of purpose both mirrored and was reinforced by the growing feminisation of the cause. Increasingly, the cause of animal protection was given over to women, and subsequently, children' (MacCulloch 1993, pp. 45–6).

Contemporary animal liberationists, most of whom are women including many with strong feminist leanings, have revived the reforming zeal of their predecessors in the 19th century. Many see the abuse of animals as a social problem no less deserving of moral condemnation than other, more recognised abusive practices such as racism and its offshoots ethnic cleansing, slavery, lynching, hate crimes against people of colour and so on as well as sexism and related violations of bodily integrity including clitoridectomy, rape, wife bashing and the like. Sociologists have been slow in acknowledging animal abuse as a social problem on a par with some of the aforementioned practices. Sociologists who have used a constructionist approach to social problems have done so in relation to specific animal issues: Maurer (1995) on meat, Kunkel (1995) on factory farming, Munro (1997b) on duck shooting and Irvine (2003) on pet abandonment as social problems. Arluke and Luke (1997) suggested criminal justice professionals, lawmakers and much of the general public do not see animal abuse as either a serious or common crime. Nor do they, as many animal liberationists do, think of animal abuse as a social problem. People have less difficulty seeing environmental problems such as pollution and toxic waste as social problems; and some scholars, notably Yearley (1992) and Hannigan (1995), have theorised environmental problems as such.

In a recent study of the sociology of our relations with other animals, Franklin (1999) identified three processes as the most important in defining the post-modern condition of the late 20th century: misanthropy, risk and ontological insecurity. He suggested that the destruction of habitat, the use of animals in research and in commercial agriculture, once justified as necessary for the greater good of humanity, are now seen as spawning unacceptable risks and social problems. While he did not use the term social problems, the processes he identified as post-modern conditions can be read as such. Misanthropy, the view held by some animal rights fundamentalists that humans are bad, sick, dangerous and deranged, clearly suggests that a

disordered humanity is responsible for the societal ills that result from the massive scale of animal exploitation during the last half of the 20th century. The distortions created by science and technology under Fordism, he argued, have created a sense of 'ontological insecurity' (Giddens 1991a, p. 243) and risk (Beck 1992) associated with food scares such as BSE and salmonella. In addition, there are new risks linked to the genetic engineering of plants and animals and genetically modified food. The increasing popularity of vegetarianism, new identities such as 'eco-friendly' vegetarian, animal rights-vegan and Greenie, as well as the growth of new social movements can be seen as a response to these fears. Franklin (1999) referred to these changes as a shift from anthropocentric instrumentality to zoocentric empathy. According to him, the ubiquity of companion animals, zoo visits, wildlife documentaries and the like, are the most obvious manifestations of the love people have for animals in these post-modern times.

Franklin (1999) showed how people now seek more, rather than less contact with animals in contexts as diverse as pet keeping and hunting. Because animal rights advocates seek to do away with all human uses of animals, he believes the animal rights position is doomed to remain a minority position. In this he is surely correct. However, Franklin did not distinguish enough between the strict animal rights ideology and the more pragmatic, moderate line advocated by Singer's followers. He incorrectly observed that Singer's (1975) *Animal Liberation* represented the animal rights case (Franklin 1999, p. 181) that seeks to 'disestablish zoos, ban pet keeping, and illegalise hunting and angling' (p. 175). These are not the main sites of speciesism identified by Singer in his advocacy of animal interests (1975; 1990); and while Singer did not coin the term 'speciesism' as Franklin inferred, Franklin did make the important point that speciesism is the common grievance that unites the various strands of the animal movement. But even here, it would be more accurate to use the term 'animal protection', which includes animal rights, liberation and welfare under its umbrella. The otherwise compelling arguments and findings in *Animals and Modern Cultures* (Franklin 1999) are weakened by the author's failure to distinguish adequately between these different strands of animal protection. In the next section, I describe the relevant literature on these different movement orientations and in doing so, I hope to make it clear that the strands overlap more than they diverge. At least this is the case in the everyday world of animal protection work which activists frame as animal

welfare (political), animal rights (moral) and animal liberation (social problems orientation), although more often than not in ways that blur these distinctions.

Animals as a Political Issue: The Animal Welfare Approach

Animal welfarists are best represented by the RSPCA, the oldest and best known animal protection organisation in the world. For most of its history the RSPCA has sought to achieve moderate improvements in the way domesticated animals are treated. Preventing wanton cruelty to all creatures great and small and the promotion of kindness to individual animals is the organisation's historical mission. As the quintessential animal welfare organisation, the RSPCA in Britain and Australia works within the political system by lobbying governments and political parties to achieve its moderate welfarist agenda. In the United States too, local SPCAs and humane societies are incorporated as law-enforcement agencies with powers equivalent to the police (Garner 1993b, p. 338). Thus the animal welfarist orientation of these animal protection and humane societies allows them access to the state[2] which the more radical animal liberationists and rightists are denied for 'only moderate reforms improving the welfare of animals are considered acceptable by decision makers' (Garner 1993b, p. 346).

According to Alan Wolfe (1993, p. 16) the fastest-growing political movements in the West are social movements concerned with ecological issues and animal rights. As already indicated above, Wolfe was critical of these movements because of the threat they pose to human dominance. As a proud speciesist and advocate of anthropocentrism, he argued a strong case for human exceptionalism and for keeping animals in their place. Animal welfarism, so defined, has become moral orthodoxy, namely, what the public is prepared to tolerate in how animals are used. This is a position not far removed from the RSPCA's traditional stance on animal welfare, that is, animals matter, but not as much as humans. Most animal protectionists, including those who support the most conservative animal protection societies, would reject Wolfe's

---

[2] Garner (1993b, p. 190) pointed out that the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), headquartered in London and associated with the RSPCA and MSPCA in Australia and the USA, is the only animal SMO in the world to have consultative status with the United Nations.

deep speciesism. Nonetheless, his political standpoint is closer to the animal welfarist orientation than it is to animal liberation/rights approaches, which he argued would lead to a life devoid of meaning (Wolfe 1993, p. 87). Yet in demanding the rights of humans to use animals for food, as research tools and as entertainment in zoos and circuses, and 'for the sensual pleasures of violent sport' (Wolfe 1993, p. 89), he was doing no more that asserting the basic principle of animal welfarism. According to Garner (1993b, p. 337) this means 'it is morally legitimate to sacrifice the interests of non-human animals for the benefit of humans'. The doctrine of animal welfarism is thus made acceptable to animal users by this prescription.

Since the late 1970s however, the RSPCA has become less conservative and is today prepared to question the morality of intensive farming, recreational hunting, keeping animals in zoos and circuses, and to oppose some kinds of animal experimentation. A former Chairman of the RSPCA in Britain during this period, the social scientist Richard Ryder, who coined the term 'speciesism', claimed that the animal welfare movement in the 1980s had become increasingly political noting that animal welfare was now part of the 'new politics' (Ryder 1996, p. 169). Ryder's account of the animal movement in the 1970s and 1980s emphasised the development of animal welfare as a political issue. He pointed out that unless animal welfare is treated as a political issue, reforms are unlikely. In the UK at least, 'it is governments which introduce legislation and that without government support no Bill is likely to succeed' (Ryder 1996, p. 171).

However, many animal protectionists believe that working with state authorities to achieve legislative reforms for animals is not productive. Ryder himself noted that during 1994–95 live animal exports attracted unprecedented media attention for an animal welfare issue and forced the government to respond. Yet there had been a continuous campaign against the trade since the early 1970s. Apart from a temporary ban, little had been achieved in those two decades. The grassroots activism that forced the government to act in the mid 1990s had evidently succeeded where conventional lobbying had failed. The moral of the story is that militancy is more effective than moderation in protest campaigns. It is largely because of this that animal liberationists and advocates of animal rights prefer the tactics of new social movements to the pressure group tactics of moderate animal welfare political lobbyists.

In a number of books and papers, the political scientist Robert Garner (1993a, 1993b, 1995, 1996, 1998a, 1998b) has drawn attention to the different

strategies deployed by the moderate and more radical wings of the animal protection movement in the United States and Britain. Garner (1993b) distinguished between the constitutional routes to change pursued by moderate animal welfarists like the RSPCA, and the direct action approach preferred by the more radical animal liberationists. For Garner, legislative reform in animal welfare is more effective than moralising efforts aimed at changing the hearts and minds of people over how they treat animals. He pointed out that most people still eat the products of factory farms and buy cosmetics that have been tested on animals (Garner 1993b).

While Garner suggested that animal welfare moderation, expertise and respectability resonate more with the public and decision-makers than the more radical agenda of animal liberation/rights advocates, he noted that the 'insider status' of the moderates, by itself, is not equivalent to influence (1993b, p. 194). In his most recent analysis, Garner (1998b, p. 235) argued that regulatory performance in the British and American political systems can only be improved by public pressure. Furthermore, he suggested, public pressure is more likely to be sustained when it can be demonstrated that the costs of animal exploitation affect humans as well as non-humans. Thus Garner's analysis of the 'political animals' in the animal protection movement revealed that the exploitation of animals is unlikely to decrease when the issue is framed as a political problem to be resolved by legislation, or as a moral problem that can be left to individual consciences. Elsewhere, Garner (1995, p. 57) suggested environmental and health 'problems', rather than moral arguments for the humane treatment of animals will be more effective in undermining the power of agribusiness and the animal experimentation fraternity. While there is some support in the movement for this view, most of the campaigns in the present study use the moral potency of cruelty as their dominant frame. The moral nature of our relations with other animals is at the heart of the rights perspective in the next section.

Animals as a Moral Issue: The Animal Rights Approach

If historians and political scientists have contributed most to animal welfare scholarship, philosophers have been most prominent in the discussion of animal rights as a moral and ethical issue (Magel 1989; Hogan & Retzel 1995). As Jasper and Nelkin (1992) have put it, philosophers have served as midwives to the animal rights movement. Magel (1989) suggested that 'animal rights'

is an ethical issue within the competence of the moral philosopher. Social scientists have largely accepted this demarcation since few have taken up the topic in their research. Keith Tester (1991) in Britain and James Jasper and Dorothy Nelkin (1992) in the United States were the first sociologists to produce book length studies of the animal rights movement. Tester's theoretical study originated as a doctoral dissertation (Tester, 1989) while Jasper and Nelkin's book was meant for a less academic audience.

James Jasper and his colleagues (1990, 1992, 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999) have argued in several books and papers that the animal rights movement is a quasi-evangelical crusade that frames animal rights as a moral and ethical issue. In their book on the animal rights movement, Jasper and Nelkin (1992) identified three stands in the movement, animal welfarists, pragmatists and fundamentalists, which broadly correspond to the distinctions I make between animal welfarists, liberationists and rightists. The strategies used by these different strands also correspond to the way animal protectionists are conceptualised in this chapter. Jasper and Nelkin pointed out in a summary table (1992, p. 178) that animal welfarists rely principally on protective legislation (cf. animals as a political issue); pragmatists follow Singer's utilitarianism and use negotiation and compromise (cf. animal issues as social problems to be resolved pragmatically); and fundamentalists employ 'moralistic rhetoric' (cf. animals as a moral or ethical issue). In the latter case, I prefer the term 'abolitionists' to describe the goals of the animal rights advocates who seek, by non-violent means as promoted by the rights philosopher Tom Regan, to eliminate all exploitative uses of animals by humans. The term fundamentalist serves better as a label for animal rights extremists who use violent tactics to achieve these goals. Apart from this mislabelling, Jasper and Nelkin's (1992) study of the animal rights movement captured the emotional and evangelical appeal of the movement as a moral protest.

In other papers on the movement, Jasper and his colleagues (1990, 1995) highlighted the use of moralistic rhetoric among animal rights supporters. Jasper's most recent book (1997) on the animal rights and anti-nuclear movements developed the theme of moral protest and a lexicon of more than a dozen morally relevant concepts. Groves (1995, 1997, 2001) too has highlighted the moral dimension of the animal rights movement, noting in particular the neglect of emotion by sociologists in their study of social movements generally.

Protest movements that use the language of rights, as in the debates over abortion or our use of animals, are concerned with communicating moral ideas. Jasper (1997, p. 376) claimed that in such movements, the articulation of moral beliefs is the protesters' most prominent contribution since modern urban societies offer few opportunities for moral communication. For Jasper, moral struggles are important democratic processes that social movements sustain. He concluded his lengthy book by suggesting the importance of moral protesters lies 'more in their moral visions than their practical accomplishments' (1997, p. 379). This applies to animal rights protesters who insist that the abolition of all exploitative uses of animals should be the movement's goal as opposed to the more achievable and moderate agendas of the welfarists and liberationists.

Purists in the animal protection movement such as Gary Francione (1996) claim that strict animal rights advocacy is the only morally authentic position for the movement to adopt. Francione has labelled the more moderate, pragmatic strands in the movement as 'new welfarism' and has criticised their adherents for eschewing a strict animal rights philosophy. Several movement leaders interviewed for this book vehemently rejected Francione's stance as unrealistic and others, particularly rank-and-file members, supported the concept of a three-tiered model upon which this chapter is based; in short, there are welfarists, liberationists and rightists with specific ideological orientations, albeit with overlapping campaign strategies and tactics. Similarly, Regan's (1987) uncompromising abolitionist stand on animal rights as a moral struggle excludes the vast mass of people who support the mainstream movement. The pro-animal advocate and philosopher Mary Midgley (1983, p. 61) suggested that Regan and Francione are misguided since the term 'rights' was already in serious trouble before animals were added to the list of its potential beneficiaries. Mary Glendon (1991, p. xi) has also criticised the ever-expanding catalogue of rights recipients as a threat to democratic values. A tendency to frame nearly every social controversy in terms of a clash of rights (a woman's right to her own body vs. a foetus's right to life) impedes compromise, mutual understanding, and the discovery of common ground (1991, p. xi). 'Rights talk', as Glendon has called it, is too easily parodied when extended to animals.[3] The term 'animal liberation' on the

[3] The Senate Select Committee on Animal Experimentation noted that in Australia

other hand seems to have more credibility and carries greater rhetorical force than legalistic 'rights talk' (Leahy & Cohn-Sherbok 1996).

Yet few activists in the movement are concerned with making a strict demarcation between these labels and it is largely a matter of personal choice whether one rather than the other is used. In a recent book about human-animal relations in the city, Annabelle Sabloff (2001) preferred the term 'animal rights' to describe what she called the prevailing metaphor the movement uses in its campaigns to change the way we treat other animals. This metaphor, she argued, is the notion of animal-as-citizen in which animals are designated as legal persons rather than as things or artefacts. 'By definition, citizenship accords "personhood" to a being, thereby cancelling out its "thingness"' (2001, p. 121). She claimed the animal rights movement uses this metaphor as a guide 'for a new, reordered set of relations between humankind and other species' (p. 123) although it cannot be said to be part of the moral orthodoxy or the habitus of Western civilisation; at least not yet. It is at the most, she argued, an emerging idea. Scruton (1996, pp. 103–104), a prominent critic of animal rights, however went further and suggested that what is remarkable about the animal movement is that it has succeeded in extending 'shadow citizenship' to animals in modern democracies where they have become part of 'the web of public concern'.

Francione (2000) also subscribed to the animal-as-citizen metaphor and has argued in several contexts that animals must be accorded personhood if their interests and rights as sentient beings are to be protected in law. He pointed out, as did Sabloff (2001), that if corporations and ocean-going vessels can be designated legal 'persons', then it is not far fetched to accord that status to living, sentient beings. Francione (2000, p. 101) made it clear he was not arguing animals should be given citizenship rights such as the vote or the right to own property, '[b]ut just as we believe that humans should not suffer from use as the slaves or property of other humans, animals should not be made to suffer from our use of them as resources'. For Sabloff (2001), this is

---

rights talk has become popular because it gives the bearer moral, if not legal, protection and concluded, that each case involving conflict between the rights of humans and animals must be decided on its merits, and not necessarily in favour of humans (Senate 1989: 42). Yet the Committee reflected on the question; 'Would there be specifically animal rights, tiger rights, pelican rights, tape worm rights?' to illustrate the difficulty of establishing consensus on what would be an acceptable hierarchy of animal rights.

the central message of the animal rights movement. For once an animal is thought of as a person rather than as a thing, it becomes difficult to treat 'him' or 'her' as an 'it'. While not all animal rights campaigns use this animal-as-citizen metaphor, some sections of the animal movement have developed 'A Declaration on Great Apes' in which they accord personhood to great apes, chimpanzees, gorillas and orang-utans (Cavalieri & Singer 1993).

The animal-as-citizen metaphor and the concept of animals as legal persons fit in with the strict animal rights perspective of Francione and others who want to go beyond conventional animal welfarism. Nonetheless, the different strands of the movement share the same agenda in seeking to change people's perceptions of animals. 'Seeking to create a society that enlarges the sphere of ethical concern to include nonhuman animals, their most pressing concern is to disrupt and eliminate society's production of the organizing metaphor "animals are artifacts"' (Sabloff 2001, p. 120).

Animal liberation as articulated by Singer (1975; 1990) frames animal abuse as a social problem comparable to sexism and racism and other forms of intraspecies exploitation. While animal welfare and animal rights are framed primarily as political and moral issues, a social problems discourse is implicit in the animal protection work of welfarists and rightists. In the contemporary animal liberation movement inspired by Singer, which is outlined below, a social problems discourse is more explicit.

Animal Exploitation as a Social Problem: The Animal Liberation Approach

According to Pakulski's (1991) reading of one of the pioneers of animal liberation in Australia, Christine Townend, the issue of the humane treatment of animals is seen by animal liberationists as part of a wider problem involving the values of modern capitalist society. Thus Townend and Mowbray (1986, p. 18), in charting a programmatic path for animal liberation as conceived philosophically by Singer, explicitly stated that animal exploitation is endemic to capitalism and called for an approach which goes beyond animal welfare to one which questions the financial relations that underpin speciesism. This places animal liberationists squarely in the camp of those critics of modernity who claim its achievements are built upon 'class, and gender domination, colonialism and imperialism, anthropocentrism and the destruction of nature'

(Emel & Wolch 1998, p. 16). Sztybel (1998, p. 44) made a similar case when he suggested that the animal liberation movement represents a rejection of speciesism as well as 'racism, sexism, homophobia and ableism'.

In *Animal Liberation* (1975, 1990), widely considered to be 'The Bible' of the contemporary animal movement, Singer argued that race, sex and species membership are morally irrelevant criteria upon which to discriminate against other beings. The animal liberation movement seeks to liberate animals exploited and abused by humans in the same way that other social movements attempt to emancipate oppressed racial/ethnic peoples and women. Singer's work was a critique of speciesism in factory farming, in animal experimentation and (later) in recreational hunting.

Opposition to this trio of institutionalised cruelty – commercial agriculture, animal experimentation and blood sports – is the basis for the worldwide animal liberation movement inspired by Singer's writings. According to Weston (1992, p. 79), the most powerful parts of Singer's *Animal Liberation* were the descriptions of the conditions under which animals live and die in factory farms and in research laboratories. This focus on actual objective conditions is also unusual in the philosophical literature on animal rights. As a practical ethicist, it is not however surprising that Singer grounded his arguments upon a solid empirical foundation. It is largely because of the graphic descriptions of the conditions in research laboratories and factory farms that *Animal Liberation* is the most widely read book on the animal movement. It provides the movement with a depth of informational resources (including vegetarian recipes) that activists use in their anti-cruelty campaigns. Singer's arguments for liberating animals do not rely on abstract reasoning as is the case in many other philosophical texts. Regan's (1984) densely argued treatise for example, rarely made any mention of animals at all. Nonetheless, objective conditions alone were insufficient grounds for transforming the moral appeal of Singer's accounts of cruelty into public issues.

In his innovative study of the green movement, Steven Yearley (1992) pointed out that the existence of the inhumane conditions endured by slaves were not enough to turn slavery into a public issue over which people were prepared to do battle. Slavery was not perceived as a social problem until abolitionists succeeded in pressing their claims that the practice of treating humans more inhumanely than domestic animals was an unacceptable injustice (1992, p. 49). Yearley (1992, p. 52) advocated a social problems approach that

recognises the objective conditions of environmental problems such as pollution or species extinction and defined the green movement as 'a collection of agencies making social problems claims'. Yearley showed how social problems scholars could contribute to an understanding of environmental problems, and by extension, animal issues, by explaining how issue entrepreneurs in social movements socially construct them.

The processes involved in the social construction of social problems defined by Spector and Kitsuse (1973, p. 146) as 'the activities of groups making assertions of grievances and claims to organizations, agencies and institutions with respect to some putative conditions' were utilised by Hannigan (1995) in his analysis of a number of environmental problems and animal-related issues. In arguing that social constructionism is a distinctly sociological paradigm, Hannigan demonstrated the utility of a social constructionist perspective in understanding how people's perceptions are socially shaped by the way environmental problems are represented by different groups. He showed how the perspective extends the frontiers of the discipline without embracing either anthropocentrism or ecocentrism.

However, Martell (1994) was sceptical of the social problems/social constructionist theorising outlined above. He took a realist approach, which insists that environmental explanations are as important as sociological perspectives. On the subject of animals, Martell was critical of the strict constructionism inherent in Keith Tester's (1991) study, which he described as 'too sociological . . . in the face of external, objective, material reality' (1994, p. 4). In the first chapter of his book, Tester (1991, p. 16) signalled his intention to explain why people worry about the rights of animals or, to put it differently, that 'animal rights is a social problem'. He wrote in the conclusion 'If the problem of the treatment of animals is a social problem, then it can only be given a social solution' (1991, p. 207). The subtitle of his book, *The Humanity of Animal Rights*, seems to suggest that kindness to animals reflects our need to feel properly human, to become better human beings; that animal rights is only marginally concerned with animals. Thus, for Tester, animal rights and vegetarianism are mechanisms of social control concerned among other things, with eating virtuously, with 'the slim and moral watching over the flabby and violent' (1991, p. 178). Thus while Tester correctly identified our (mis)treatment of animals as a social problem, his thesis indicated a misunderstanding and denigration of the animal movement's defence of

animals. For example, the only contemporary animal protectors discussed in any detail by Tester were those belonging to extremist, violent groups such as the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), the Band of Mercy and the Animal Rights Militia (ARM) which employ car and letter bombs as their main tactics. There was no mention of the mainstream movement, the successors of Salt and the humane movements, in Tester's analysis. Furthermore, as Martell (1994) pointed out, Tester's arguments were *too* sociological; they were the product of a strict constructionism that bore little resemblance to the reality of the animal movement and its campaigns. As noted in the introduction to this book, a number of writers in addition to Martell have criticised Tester's thesis for missing the point of what animal rights as a social movement is all about. Martell's own position is sentient-centric, that is, in between shallow and deep ecology, which puts him firmly in Singer's animal liberation camp (see Table 2.1 in Chapter 2).

In referring to Benton's (1993) socialist theory of animal rights, Martell noted that eco-socialism acknowledges natural limits to human social life but is weak on obligations to nonhumans. 'But on both it shows a capacity to revise its assumptions, even on the latter, where it has been slower, yet on which it can alter its conception of the relation of humans to animals on the basis of a socialist theory of equality and rights' (Martell 1994, p. 153). Eckersley (1992) also noted the potential for a more inclusive socialist practice while Martell was optimistic about eco-socialist alliances in the future. And as I have argued elsewhere (Munro 1999a), such alliances are increasingly necessary for addressing new social problems associated with the exploitation of nature, and specifically with the intensification of the production and consumption of animals associated with developments in genetic engineering. The realism of environmental sociologists such as Martell, and to a lesser extent Benton, appears to be most in accord with the campaign strategies of the contemporary animal liberation movement, which, unlike its animal welfare counterpart, is willing to embrace the broad range of issues outlined in the concluding paragraph below. These issues can be defined as new and old social problems, which have been the focus of animal liberation campaigns since Singer first coined the term 'animal liberation' some 30 years ago.[4]

---

[4] In a recent article in the *New York Review of Books*, Singer (2003) reminded readers that it is now 30 years since the term 'animal liberation' first appeared in the press;

Finally, it would be mistaken to make too much of the differences in orientation within the mainstream animal movement outlined in this review. In the discussion above, I have suggested that the limited literature on the sociology of animal protection can be categorised under three broad orientations: animal welfare's political orientation, animal rights' moral orientation and animal liberation's social problems orientation. This categorisation is not so neatly replicated in the daily activities of animal protection work, where political, moral and social problems/constructionist approaches overlap. What can be said with some confidence, however, is that the campaign against speciesism, as suggested by Franklin (1999) has been the common thread in these three main strands of animal activism and advocacy. In doing animal protection work, activists and advocates have used moral, political, and social problems arguments to raise anti-cruelty, health and environmental concerns within the various strands of the movement. These issues are interrelated, for as Turner (1993, p. 185) has argued, the protection of animals may ultimately contribute to the protection of humans particularly in relation to environmental and other issues mentioned below.

Conclusion

Some of the costs to society of large scale agriculture and the risks associated with new developments in animal research have been identified by a number of writers. It is these social problems, such as the costs of agribusiness to small farmers (Dolan 1986), health (Fraser et al. 1990) and environmental risks to consumers (Rifkin 1992), the spectres of third world hunger (Coats 1989) and genetic engineering (Kimbrell 1994) and finally cruelty and indifference to animals (Woolf 1999 in Philo & Wilbert 2000) which are among the most salient issues of concern to animal liberationists. However, it is cruelty to individual animals on farms, in laboratories and in the wild that remains the defining grievance of the animal movement in the three case study countries. The movement's campaigns against the institutionalised cruelty to animals in these contexts are discussed in the substantive chapters to follow.

---

this was in Singer's New York Review article of 5 April, 1973 which preceded the publication of the book of the same name by two years.

Chapter Four

Cruelty and Compassion in a Decent Society

> *The only political commitments worth making are those that seek to reduce the amount of human suffering in the world.* (Peter Berger)
>
> *Man is the cruellest animal.* (Nietzsche in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*)

This chapter focuses on the themes of cruelty and its opposite compassion. No study of the animal protection movement would be complete without an understanding of what moves people to campaign against cruelty to animals. The chapter therefore begins with an outline of some of the main reasons animal protectors give for joining the movement. These are described as fateful moments or turning points in their lives when they 'converted' to the cause. This section is followed by a broad discussion of cruelty that leads to an explanation of how the animal movement constructs speciesism as a social problem. It has to be understood that such a construction is only possible in a society where it is at least potentially possible for violence against animals to be taken as seriously as other forms of violence. This changing attitude towards animals has emerged in the West only during the last two centuries. Over this period, the animal movement sought to challenge the moral orthodoxy in relation to cruelty to individual animals, as in the welfarist

tradition, as well as the institutionalised cruelty involved in vivisection, factory farming and sport hunting. It is this triad of perceived cruel practices which is the main target of animal liberation and rights groups.

Reflections on Cruelty

According to Ascione (1993) animal cruelty is defined as 'socially unacceptable behaviour that intentionally causes unnecessary pain, suffering, or distress to and/or death of an animal'. Similarly Merz-Perez and Heide (2004, pp. 156–57) identified seven kinds of cruelty to animals in their study of animal abuse and its links with violent criminal behaviour. They listed these forms of cruelty as the 'seven Ps': passive, participatory, perfunctory (careless, unthinking cruelty), parochial (culturally generated cruelty such as cock-fighting), partitive (compartmentalising animals, e.g., cows as food, cats as playthings), psychological (relates to phobic cruelty where people mistreat animals they fear) and predatory cruelty (where animals are killed or abused for the sake of it). The 'seven Ps' of cruelty correspond to what are colloquially referred to as wanton cruelty, which the majority of people in post-materialist societies would object to as ethically and morally wrong.

These conceptualisations by Ascione (1993) and Merz-Perez and Heide (2004) correspond to the norm of moderate concern for animal welfare, which excludes the socially sanctioned and legal activities of animal experimentation, intensive farming and recreational hunting. The norm of moderate concern for animals or the prevailing moral orthodoxy implies that animals matter, but not as much as humans. By the late twentieth century, animal cruelty has come to be defined by movement analysts sympathetic to the cause as 'any act that contributes to the pain or death of an animal or that otherwise threatens the welfare of an animal' (Agnew 1998, p. 179). This definition, which unlike Ascione's more general one is acceptable to animal protectors, includes not only wanton cruelty involving the torture or maiming of individual animals, but also the death and suffering of large numbers of animals in farming, experimentation and hunting.

For the past two centuries much of the work of animal protection organisations has been concerned with promoting compassion for animals in these contexts. In addition to promoting the qualities of compassion and mercy, they also sponsor social movement campaigns against those who

'abuse dominion', Matthew Scully's term for cruelty to animals. 'Cruelty has its own rites, cherished lores, myths, and attachments. These attachments, far more than any needs of ecology or economics, are what drive those who fight attempts to improve the lot of animals in our world' (Scully 2002, p. 25). Thus what hunters call their 'ancient pastimes', anti-hunt activists label ancient cruelties. Similarly, anti-vivisectionists and those opposed to factory farming and the use of animals as commodities in general, claim that these old and more recent practices are attachments to cruelty, or more politely, habits of the heart which most people fail to acknowledge as morally suspect. Thus while ordinary people will be outraged by *wanton cruelty* to individual animals, the same compassion is not evident in the case of the *institutionalised cruelty* of animal experimentation, intensive farming or recreational hunting where massive numbers of animals are routinely ill-treated and killed to satisfy human needs. Yet Matthew Scully (2002), a senior speechwriter for President George W. Bush, claims he *does* feel compassion for the millions of anonymous animals in factory farms and the like, such is his 'devotion' to creatures. Many of the informants in my own study also claimed to feel the same compassion for the battery hen as they do for their dog. Many saw the task of the animal movement as precisely that: to transfer people's empathy for their individual pet to empathy for the suffering of animals in the lab, the factory farm and at the end of a hunter's rifle. Promoting compassion, caring and empathy for animals is one important dimension of social problems work which animal advocates seek to include in their everyday praxis.

This chapter will therefore examine the cruelty/compassion couplet by focusing on the nature of caring and commitment in the animal movement from the perspective of individuals, and of a quintessentially English animal welfare organisation in the UK. I begin with an overview (in Table 4.1 below) of the reasons interviewees gave for joining the animal movement. About half the sample came to the movement gradually for a variety of reasons and about half experienced a sudden transformation, turning point, epiphany or 'fateful moment'.

Giddens (1991b, pp. 202–203) referred to 'fateful moments' as episodes when 'an individual is forced to rethink fundamental aspects of her existence and future prospects'. A few of the interviewees claimed their conversion to the cause came as an epiphany, which Denzin (1989, pp. 15–8) described as 'moments of problematic experience that illuminate personal character' after

which 'the person is never again quite the same'. Thus half the sample could pin point a particular moment when they decided to support animal rights and live accordingly.

Many of the remaining informants said they did not experience an epiphany or a turning point and that they came to the movement more gradually and for more general reasons, typically because of their abhorrence of cruelty. One prominent animal protector, John Bryant (interview, 1996) of the League Against Cruel Sports, claimed that no one would ever know why people join the animal movement. Yet more than two dozen of the interviewees could identify a turning point in their lives when they decided to do something for animals by joining the movement, or in some cases, starting up an organisation of their own.

The responses in Table 4.1 can be divided into intellectual, emotional and practical reasons although there is occasionally some obvious overlap between the categories. For example, while rescuing an animal in distress is often a profoundly emotional experience, the act of rescue itself is a practical one. These particular responses are listed as emotional reasons since the informants narrated the experience as an intensely emotional one. Similarly, an accidental encounter with a healthy vegetarian was an experience that led 'Tina' to read up on vegetarian and animal rights issues so that a practical reason for becoming a vegetarian, the positive impression made by her vegetarian acquaintance, developed into an intellectual pursuit ('Tina', interview, 1996). It is interesting to note that these intellectual, emotional and practical reasons for joining the movement correspond to the three dimensions of social problems work outlined in Chapter 2. It is perhaps not surprising that the motives for joining the movement are closely linked to actual animal protection praxis, as in most cases the interviewees were already engaging in social problems work when they made the decision to change their lives by converting to vegetarianism, starting an animal group, or joining an existing one. The evidence of social problems work is more obvious in some activities – for example, hearing, reading, seeing, rescuing and participating – than in others. Conversion experiences typically mean that people 'are called on to take decisions that are particularly consequential for their ambitions, or more generally for their future lives' (Giddens 1991b, p. 114). This is the first stage of social problems work, when people's intellectual, emotional or practical experiences mean they will never be quite the same again. In a recent book

People promoting and opposing animal rights, Kistler (2002) has put together the testimonies of about thirty advocates and ten critics of animal rights in America who in their own words explain how they became involved in the animal issue. A content analysis of their responses revealed that many of their reasons were very similar to the reasons given in Table 4.1 below. The responses in the Kistler study also divided fairly equally between emotional (14), intellectual (14) and practical (12); and as in the present study, these categories occasionally overlapped.

Table 4.1. Reasons informants give for joining the animal movement

Name	Responses
	Intellectual reasons
Elisabeth Ahlston	Hearing a talk on vivisection
Glenys Oogjes	Reading Singer's *Animal Liberation*
Joyce d'Silva	Reading Gandhi's autobiography
Stephanie Ruddick	Hearing a university class on animal experimentation
Scott Williams	Recognising hot dogs as linked to cruelty
	Emotional reasons
'Milly'	Seeing TV images of cattle lorries
'Lisa'	Seeing her cat suffering
'Alan'	Seeing *Faces of Death* video
Collette Kase	Love of pet rabbit, Mr Charlie
Ann Sparks	Seeing classic pictures of a veal calf
Patty Mark	Seeing goat's head soup in Greece
Mark Berriman	Finding meat 'atrocious' in India
Tamara Hamilton	Seeing a pamphlet on vivisection
Wayne Pacelle	Lifelong antipathy towards people who harm animals
Jenny Talbot	Seeing destruction of animals during tree felling
Jim Roberts	Seeing abattoir trucks loaded with animals
Tim O'Brien	Recognising sheep as individuals who should not be eaten
	Practical reasons
'Sid'	Early childhood experience of the RSPCA
'Casey'	Incongruity of loving animals and eating them
'Tina'	Accidental meeting of a healthy vegetarian
'Sherry'	Participating in a duck rescue operation
'Owen'	Discovering vegetarianism
'Roger'	Participating in a duck rescue operation
Andrew Tyler	Writing about the 'animal problem' for a newspaper
Cathy Liss	Connecting McDonald's with cruelty
Pat Reilly	Rescuing a river otter from a leg hold trap

soyons cruels ! (Graffiti on the walls of the Sorbonne, May 1968)

James Miller (1990) has pondered the meaning of *BE CRUEL!* in the work of Foucault and Nietzsche and suggested that to them, cruelty externalised is better than cruelty internalised. One interpretation of being cruel which Miller (1990, p. 485) believed Foucault would endorse is the idea of giving institutions license 'to foster brutality and public displays of suffering' so that execution, torture, terror, unleashing lust for revenge and even the spectacular deaths of animals could be celebrated. Miller implied that no society would ever accept or even contemplate this kind of regime; nor was he convinced that externalising cruelty is healthier than suppressing such fantasies within the self. Miller pointed out that Foucault's views on power and cruelty raise complex theoretical and practical questions, such as, what would it be like to be free of cruel impulses? This is not the place to address philosophical questions of this kind, suffice it to say that animal protectionists would find nothing of merit in Foucault's response, given his apparent celebration of cruelty.

For animal protectionists, the work of Sue Coe (1995) strikes a more responsive chord. In her art work and graphic descriptions of animal suffering in slaughterhouses, Coe startled and shocked the reader in ways reminiscent of Foucault (1977) in the opening passages of *Discipline and Punish*: 'The feeding lots for cows look like the stocks, an old English device which secured a criminal, whilst the townspeople pelted him with garbage' (Coe 1995, p. 47). Coe was however much more interested in depicting the assembly-line cruelty of the slaughterhouse, which she described, hesitantly, as an animal holocaust:

> This is the longest train I have ever seen. It takes a full thirty minutes to pass by. There are hundreds of cars, packed with thousands and thousands of cattle on their way to slaughter. Six billion animals are killed each year in the United States for human consumption. The suffering of these animals is mute. For the defenceless, the gentle, the wounded, the ones who cannot speak, life consists of indescribable suffering (Coe 1995, p. 63).

The animal protection movement is united in its opposition to cruelty perpetrated either against individual animals or *en masse* as in Coe's example. Surprisingly, however, only three out of the more than two dozen groups sampled in this study (the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty

to Animals, the League Against Cruel Sports and the Animal Cruelty Investigation Group in the UK) refer to cruelty in their logos and letterheads although most refer explicitly to 'animals' and implicitly to their exploitation and suffering. In the interview transcripts however, there were 57 references to cruelty, more than any other code word in *The Ethnograph*, although tactics (55) and strategy (40) were not far behind. Furthermore, cruelty has several cognates of which domination, abuse, oppression, exploitation, pain and suffering among others, are the most common in the animal protectionist's lexicon. To the Australian activist, 'Roger' (interview, 1994) opposition to cruelty is the movement's *raison d'être*: 'There's no excuse for cruelty. I can't think of one. Our society and just about all religions don't accept cruelty. That's a good basis for an organisation'.

From the beginning of the humanitarian movement in the 19th century, opposition to cruelty has been the movement's driving force in both America and England. The forerunners of the modern animal rights movement were first and foremost anti-cruelty movements. And in Australia too, it was the moral potency of cruelty that united the early conservationists and animal protectors (MacCulloch 1993). According to MacCulloch, the animal protection movement's lasting legacy was to shape the means by which communication about nature with the public was possible. This communication was founded on the moral potency of cruelty. MacCulloch (1993, p. 369) described the public's response to this message in the 19th century which still rings true a century later: 'For no matter how affecting, or even tragic, it was to witness the destruction of a single, beautiful tree or scenic area, it lacked the pathos of cruelty to animals. A tree was a living thing but it did not bleed, it did not suffer, it did not have babies'.

Cruelty to individual animals evokes strong emotions in most people, especially when the animal is as affecting as the koala. Increasingly, other, less 'appealing' animals are being described sympathetically in the public domain. For example, a cover story in *The Economist* featured a battery hen on the cover under the heading 'What we owe to animals'. The editorial opened with a description of the bird:

> She is confined to a tiny cage with four or five others for her entire adult life . . . squeezed into a space about the size of the picture on our cover, barely enough to move. She may exercise her pecking instinct by pecking

> out her neighbour's feathers, unless her beak has been cut off with a red-hot blade, probably causing pain for life (*The Economist*, 19 August, 1995).

In this editorial, the issue of animal rights is discussed as a noble but futile project, since 'without agreement on the rights of people, arguing about the rights of animals is fruitless'. Animal liberationists would counter by appealing to people's compassion. The question, 'does a hen have a right to her beak?' forces people to consider the issue of animal rights in a confronting way. Phrased like this, it is no longer a philosophical question, but rather a matter of compassion and humanity. People are more readily able to identify with the issue when it is put in terms of an animal's bodily integrity, for this is how many animal protectors conceive of cruelty, as an assault on an animal's telos.

Informants defined cruelty in both general and very specific terms. For three of the sample, cruelty was everywhere: *It's not possible to walk on this earth without being cruel to animals* (J. Court, Animal Rights Cambridge (ARC), interview, 1996); *the amount of cruelty is overwhelming* (P. Mark, Animal Liberation Victoria (ALV), interview, 1994); *you don't have to look far to find it* (C. Liss, Animal Welfare Institute (AWI), interview, 1996). More informants however claimed cruelty was hidden behind closed doors, with one activist noting *the incredible juxtaposition that there's all this space* [in the countryside] *and they're all shoved inside a shed for the rest of their lives* ('Owen', Australian activist, interview, 1997). Cruelty for some was defined very specifically and graphically: *it's not legitimate to abuse, mutilate, slaughter, electrocute, burn people, but of course it is legitimate and there are rewards for doing so in respect to animals* (A. Tyler, Animal Aid, interview, 1996). For Mike Huskisson of the Animal Cruelty Investigation Group (ACIG), (interview, 1996), the cruelty that Tyler describes, is much worse in vivisection and blood sports because it is largely hidden from the public's view.

Gratuitous cruelty by ordinary people also offended the Australian activist Patty Mark (interview, 1994) who related how her pet cat had been killed: *Someone had poured petrol all over her and set her on fire . . . and she came home before she died. It was really horrible and I was really upset and angry . . . something stirred about the injustice, about the fight for animals as well.* Mark described this kind of cruelty to individual animals as *a real sickness in our society which people can see and not see*. By this she means what her colleague Glenys Oogjes

(Animals Australia, interview, 1997) describes as *the institutionalised cruelty that people get away with, particularly if they've got an economic interest in it.* Such people, according to the Australian activist 'Gaynor' (interview, 1999), *have no conscience to guide them because they see animals as a commodity. They don't see them as feeling beings that can feel pain or distress or anything. They're just a commodity.* Several activists claimed that meat eating was the most common manifestation of cruelty to animals. According to the Australian activist, 'Owen' (interview, 1997), *that's the one example of cruelty that people are involved in everyday.* Others like 'Sherry' (interview, 1999), saw links between child abuse and cruelty to animals via the habit of meat eating: *I've always hated cruelty. I could never stand to see children or animals mistreated in any way . . . I never realised that meat – there was so much cruelty involved with meat.*

These testimonies provide a snapshot of how animal protectionists perceive speciesism as both cruelty to individual animals and *en masse* in practices such as factory farming and vivisection. The philosopher Tom Regan believes that confronting people with the suffering of animals in different cultures is an effective mobilising strategy:

> *I think the thing that I would do over and over again (as a strategy) is to show people how in Korea, in China and so on, 'pets' (so called) are chosen, thrown in boiling water, skinned alive, thrown in vats, drowned, then cooked. And then I would show them what happens to hogs at slaughter. I think the connection just stares you in the face. The only thing that's different is that in Korea and China they're more honest about what they do. It's more public. In the USA and other so called 'advanced' nations, it's hidden behind closed doors* (T. Regan, interview, 1997).

Strongly expressed sentiments of this kind serve as atrocity stories that are intended to shock as Regan here, and Tyler mentioned above, acknowledge. Speciesism, on the other hand, does not have the same power as explicit forms of cruelty such as those described by Tyler and Regan.

Speciesism, defined by Singer (1975, p. 7) as 'a prejudice or attitude of bias toward the interests of members of one's own species and against those of members of other species', is a term rarely used in the movement. It is primarily employed by movement analysts and philosophers who wish to convey a sense of the interconnectedness between the animal movement and other liberation movements. Thus Singer's argument that speciesism is a morally

reprehensible practice on a par with racism and sexism, explicitly makes the link between animal liberation and movements to liberate women and oppressed ethnic and racial minorities.

For most people the idea that the consumption, exploitation and mistreatment of non-human animals deserves the same moral condemnation as attacks against racial groups or women is quite alien. Animal rights activists, by contrast, want to change the way people perceive other animals by linking the exploitation of animals with the oppression of women and racial minorities. La Follette and Shanks (1996, p. 227) put the position as follows: 'Animal liberationists compare speciesism with racism to focus our attention on the human tendency to unreflectively accept contemporary moral standards'. They do so by constructing speciesism as a social problem, in much the same way that the Civil Rights and women's movements campaign against racism and sexism as social injustices. The following critique by a prominent animal liberation philosopher clearly identifies speciesism as a moral problem, if not a social problem:

> Morality is a goal-directed activity which aims at making the world a better place in terms of reduced suffering and frustration, increased happiness and fulfilment, a wider reign of fairness and respect for others, and enhanced presence and effectiveness of such virtues as kindness and impartiality. Through our exploitation of non-human animals we detract from all of these moral goals. Factory farming, fur trapping and other exploitations of non-human animals increase the suffering and frustration in the world and reduce happiness and fulfilment – the exact opposite of all these moral goals. . . . Consequently . . . our goal of making the world a morally better place will be more effectively pursued by liberating from human exploitation all those capable of suffering and happiness and of being treated fairly and virtuously (Sapontzis, 1993, p. 270).

Peter Berger, quoted in the epigraph to this chapter expressed the same sentiments as Sapontzis, minus his focus on non-human animals. Sapontzis emphasises the goal of 'making the world a better place', or 'a decent society' in the words of Avishai Margalit (1996). In his recent book Margalit argued that a decent society is one free of humiliation; people are subjected neither to humiliation by other people nor by institutions such as welfare agencies or prisons. Margalit however, believes that humiliation runs a close second

to the greatest evil, namely physical cruelty, especially the suffering inflicted by other human beings. 'Torturing the body causes more acute pain than torturing the soul' (1996, p. 264). A decent society presupposes that physical cruelty has been eliminated. Although he suggested that cruelty toward man or beast is wrong, it is the suffering of human animals not non-human animals that concerned Margalit. This is clearly implied in his explanation of humiliation as the treatment of humans as if they were animals, objects or machines. Here the author of *The Decent Society* relegates non-human animals to an inferior species, just as people do when they talk about deviant individuals 'behaving like animals'. This expression of moral outrage is usually directed at people whose actions offend our collective sensibilities. In such cases, the label 'animal' is used in a derogatory way to question the offenders' humanity by drawing attention to their animality. Margalit repeats this convention and in doing so affirms the moral orthodoxy or norm of moderate concern for animals; that is, animals matter, but not to the extent that they be permitted to undermine human wants and needs.

Human animals, we are told by Margalit, are the only animals that suffer mental cruelty or humiliation. For Margalit, then, humiliation can only be directed at human beings and only humans can suffer humiliation. Thus in the case of the close confinement of humans in conditions approximating a battery cage, the incarcerated humans suffer physically and mentally while a hen might be expected to be spared the latter. But this is by no means clear. If the result of humiliation, in this case the humiliation of intensive confinement, is unnatural behaviour such as cannibalism, then it must be possible for battery hens or tethered sows to suffer anguish and mental cruelty, if not the shameful, demeaning humiliation that confined humans experience.

Margalit was skeptical of societies that preach the extension of respect to all living creatures since he claimed that these societies do not always respect human beings. Nazi Germany was the most grotesque example of this phenomenon for it produced progressive animal protection laws in the same breath as its genocidal policies towards the Jews and other 'outcasts' (see Ferry 1995; Arluke & Sax 1996). But only the most unreasonable of critics of the animal movement would want the moral standing of animals to be compromised by the barbarity of the Nazis.

In noting the contrasting views of Sapontzis and Margalit towards making the world a morally better place, it is clear that only Sapontzis was prepared

to include non-humans in the moral community. Philosophers generally have not been willing to extend the circle of compassion to animals, and some like Leahy (1991) have strenuously argued the case against animal liberation. For these and other reasons to be discussed below, animal liberationists have labelled their opponents 'speciesists' and have identified speciesism as the basis for what they see as the unjust oppression of one species by another.

Reflections on speciesism

For the moment, I want to suggest that the word 'speciesism' is a modern term for a very old problem. Few animal liberationists use the awkward-sounding term when they talk about our treatment of animals, preferring instead more euphonious and everyday language such as cruelty, oppression, exploitation and abuse. However, as Eckersley (1992) has pointed out, speciesism is what distinguishes the animal liberation movement from the other main streams of environmentalism. It is the animal movement alone that uses humanity's mistreatment of non-human animals as the symbol for all that is wrong with anthropocentric thinking. The notion of speciesism is useful also in that it broadens the movement's protest against cruelty to individual animals – a position that puts them at odds with environmentalists – with reference to interspecies discrimination. Speciesism is useful in allowing animal protectionists of different persuasions to see their cause in the context of a broader social movement agenda in which animals are listed along with exploited women, blacks, ethnic minorities, children, the disabled, and gays and lesbians; in short, a social problem which generates palpable consequences in the form of societal conflict and individual suffering.

While speciesism is the term that most broadly identifies the animal movement's diagnostic frame, cruelty has greater resonance, which different social movement organisations within the movement recognise and exploit. In the public mind, cruelty to individual animals has an emotional force which speciesism lacks. Some groups like the Farm Animal Reform Movement (FARM) use terms like 'eco-friendly eating' or 'cruelty-free living' to promote a more positive message; others like the Guardians (an Australian group which campaigns against vivisection) have replaced their predominantly animal welfare frame with a human welfare focus. Other groups however recognise the dangers inherent in watering down the cruelty frame; the

Coalition Against Duck Shooting (CADS) has rigorously stuck to its anti-cruelty frame and has refused to broaden it to include, for example, a pro-vegetarian or an anti-gun dimension. Thus while some groups have used different means to promote their issues, no animal protection organisation or campaign can afford to abandon the opposition to cruelty and speciesism as its primary purpose without devaluing the movement's unifying ideology. Animal protection organisations therefore typically invoke speciesism by designating as cruel, particular abuses such as factory farming and animal experimentation, as well as hunting and trapping and a host of other practices which are the focus of particular campaigns by movement organisations.

An 'index of speciesism' for the USA and Australia is represented in Table 4.2. The results offer some important comparative data on items (1–15) concerning attitudes toward animals. Respondents were asked to rate on a seven point 'extremely wrong (1) to not at all wrong (7)' scale a range of human uses of animals. The mean scores for both samples indicate an identical ranking order by respondents in Australia and the USA. The table offers a useful snapshot of how animal protectionists in two countries perceive speciesism or cruelty. Thus hunting and trapping as well as experimentation, which uses animals for both product testing and for medical purposes, are seen as much more objectionable than eating meat or keeping animals in a zoo.

What is most striking about this cross-national comparison of attitudes is the identical ranking of the respondents, which suggests an unexpectedly high degree of ideological consensus on what constitutes cruelty for animal rights supporters in Australia and the US. As the survey was completed by only a small number of people in the UK, it is not possible to say with certainty if the consensus applies to them as well, although the limited data reveal more similarities than differences. It is also evident from directories of animal organisations in these three countries that all of the (ab)uses of animals listed from 1–10 are the focus of various campaign groups, including vegetarian organisations and groups opposing circuses and zoos. The remaining five practices have not been taken up as causes by any mainstream animal protection group.

Table 4.2. Mean scores of Australian and American activists' attitudes toward the uses of animals

Human uses of animals	Australia ANZFAS (1995) n=347 Mean Score	T-test at 95% C.I. *t value*	*Sig. (2 tailed) p value***	USA Richards n=853 (1990) Mean Score
1. Using steel-jawed leg-hold traps to capture wild animals	1.02	*–3.161*	*0.002*	1.06
2. Using animals in cosmetic and beauty product experiments	1.05	*–4.424*	*0.000*	1.13
3. Killing an animal to make a fur coat	1.16	*–0.407*	*0.684*	1.17
4. Selling unclaimed dogs from animal shelters for use in medical experiments	1.19	*–2.791*	*0.005*	1.29
5. Hunting wild animals with guns	1.32	*–4.115*	*0.000*	1.49
6. Exposing an animal to a disease as part of a medical experiment	1.33	*–6.192*	*0.000*	1.62
7. Raising cattle for food in feedlots	1.34	–8.771	*0.000*	1.75
8. Using horses for jump/steeple racing	1.79	–13.083	*0.000*	2.68
9. Eating meat	2.81	*0.737*	*0.461*	2.74
10. Keeping animals in zoos	3.08	*0.721*	*0.472*	3.02
11. Raising cattle for food on open range or pastures	3.48	*1.592*	*0.112*	3.31
12. Killing rats in residential area	4.93	*7.409*	*0.000*	4.24
13. Killing cockroaches in a residential area	5.35	*0.062*	*0.950*	5.34
14. Keep a dog or cat as a pet	6.30	*–3.270*	*0.001*	6.49
15. De-sexing a pet	6.64	*0.470*	*0.639*	6.62

** If the value of $p < .05$ then the difference between the means for USA Richards (1990) and Australia (1995) is significant.

Note: rating scale values range from 1 (extremely wrong) to 7 (not at all wrong).

The origins of contemporary speciesism

Richard Ryder, an English animal welfare advocate and clinical psychologist, coined the term 'speciesism' in 1970. Ryder used the word to describe 'the widespread discrimination that is practised by man against other species' adding that speciesism, racism and sexism disregard the suffering of others (1983: 5). Peter Singer (1975) gave the term prominence in his *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals* in which he acknowledged Ryder as the originator of the term. Singer identified speciesism as the injustice from which animals had to be liberated, since one's species, like one's race or sex, is seen by animal liberationists as a morally irrelevant criterion upon which to judge a being's worth. During a symposium at Trinity College, Cambridge in August 1977, some 150 individuals signed 'A Declaration Against Speciesism', which in part read:

> We do not accept that a difference in species alone (any more than a difference in race) can justify wanton exploitation or oppression in the name of science or sport, or for food, commercial profit or other human gain. We believe in the evolutionary and moral kinship of all animals and we declare our belief that all sentient creatures have rights to life, liberty and the quest for happiness. We call for the protection of these rights (Paterson & Ryder 1979, p. viii).

Singer has reflected that in a hundred years historians may well identify the Trinity College meeting as the starting point for the modern animal rights movement (Singer, 1978, p. xii). And yet the origin of speciesism as a perceived social problem can be traced back two centuries earlier.

In the introduction to a new edition of a book by Humphrey Primatt (1992), Ryder explained how in 1976 while browsing through some old texts in an Oxford library, he came across Primatt's *The Duty of Mercy and the Sin of Cruelty to Brute Animals*. When Ryder read the book, he was astonished by how modern the ideas were for a dissertation that was written two hundred years earlier in 1776. In the Preface for example, Primatt (1992, p. 15) argues that

> *justice* is a rule of universal extent and invariable obligation. We acknowledge this important truth in all matters in which man is concerned, but then we limit it *to our own species only* . . . (emphasis added). Misled with this prejudice in our own favour, we overlook *some* of the brutes, as if they were mere excrescences of nature.

Quite probably, this was the first recorded argument for compassion towards non-human animals that was based on a critique of speciesism. In addition to the references to the prejudice and implied injustice of our treatment of other species, Primatt's Preface condemns 'wanton cruelty and oppression' as well as extolling 'mercy to brutes' as 'a doctrine of divine revelation, as it is itself reasonable, amiable, useful, and just' (Primatt 1992, p. 17). Apart from the religious overtones, the language in this dissertation is immediately familiar to the modern-day student of animal liberation. Primatt's thesis, summed up in the following paragraph, would be taken up by Ryder himself two centuries later:

> Pain is pain, whether it be inflicted on man or on beast; and the creature that suffers it whilst it lasts, suffers *evil*; and the sufferance of evil, unmeritedly, unprovokedly, where on offence has been given, and no good end can possibly be answered by it, but merely to exhibit power or gratify malice, is cruelty and injustice in him that occasions it (Primatt 1992, p. 21).

Ryder's (1989, p. 325) words echoed those of Primatt's when he argued that pain and pleasure should be the bedrock of our morality: 'Pain is pain, regardless of the species suffering it'. According to Ryder (1983, p. 8), who also coined the word 'painism', 'pain is the quintessence of evil' and it is therefore our moral duty not to cause suffering to human and non-human sentients alike.

For Primatt, cruelty was a sin because it harmed brutes and men alike. As early as 1776 he anticipated twentieth century arguments by Singer and others that speciesism was on a par with racism: 'And if the difference of complexion or stature does not convey to one man a right to despise and abuse another man, the difference of shape between a man and a brute, cannot give to a man any right to abuse and torment a brute' (Primatt 1992, p. 23).

Ironically, Primatt's masculinist tone was accurate in so far as the perpetrators of cruelty towards animals were largely working class men and their more educated betters in the scientific and medical fraternities. Women, on the other hand, then and now, were more likely to be among the growing band of animal protectors, who by the middle of the 19th century had become a powerful lobby for people who cared about animals. The next section looks at the role of caring and compassion in the contemporary animal movement and how these concepts constitute social problems work in what is a female-dominated social movement.

Caring: Animal Protection As Social Problems Work

This section describes the nature of animal protection work as caring work and the motives that inspire individuals and organisations to care about animals. It also suggests that animal protection work is real work in the sense of a vocation. It is a calling for some, while for others it is experienced as work that needs to be done for either intrinsic or extrinsic reasons.

Most of the advocates in this study served their apprenticeship in small grassroots groups and most are practising vegetarians or vegans. What distinguishes the advocates from the activists is that the former are paid and tend to pursue the instrumental goals of the organisation rather than the expressive goals of the grassroots activist. However, these orientations often overlap in the everyday world of animal protection praxis. What the activists and advocates in this study have in common is a commitment to the cause of animals, although the resources available to them vary according to whether their organisational affiliation is strong or weak. Thus, organisational advocates in the suites tend to use the tools of the information age, such as computers, e-mail, data bases, in-house media, professional expertise and so on, while grassroots activist groups rely more on practical aids, such as the video camera, banners, street theatre and the like, in their 'hands-on' style of animal protection work. Emotion work, however, is integral to both and furthermore cannot be easily separated from the intellectual and practical dimension of social problems work. The affective side of animal protection praxis can be detected in activist testimonies that describe the way many of them say they were 'called' to the cause of animals.

Answering the call of animals

It was striking how many interviewees saw their involvement in animal protection work as a 'calling'. Like the environmentalists in Dalton's (1994) study, these individuals viewed their social movement involvement as a vocation. For some animal protectionists, caring about animals is a labour of love, sometimes with spiritual connotations. Most see their work in mainly intrinsic terms, rather than as deriving only extrinsic satisfaction. All of the informants in the study describe their activities on behalf of animals as real work which gives their lives meaning; in the case of the paid advocates, animal protection work provides extrinsic monetary rewards as well as intrinsic meaning.

At 76, Joan Court is the oldest female animal activist in this study. With a tertiary degree and a background in social work, she works voluntarily as a children's advocate and in her spare time runs Animal Rights Cambridge. Like several others in the sample, she believed her involvement in animal rights activism was a response to animal suffering, *as if the animals are calling us* (J. Court, interview, 1996). She explained that a sheep had once looked her in the eye at a market and was in no doubt that this was why she joined the campaign against live exports.

It was this issue in the UK in the mid 1990s that was responsible for 'Milly' becoming an activist. The 40-year old London social worker is a first-time animal rights protester, although she has been a passive supporter for about a decade. Unlike Joan Court, she felt that the call came from ordinary people who were outraged by what they saw as cruelty in the name of commerce: *It was a bit like a clarion call to like-minded individuals. I think people saw that there was an opportunity for the average person in the street to do something positive and people came from all over England and Scotland too* ('Milly', interview, 1996). She specifically mentioned the sight of animals in transports and the television images of the live export trade as a catalyst which mobilised many people.

Herzog's (1993) study of animal rights activists, aptly titled 'The movement is my life', captured the kind of commitment to the cause felt by most of the informants in the present study. One of the English activists spoke of his conversion to the cause of animal rights as if it were a religion:

> *I mean it's my career and I think it is a life-long commitment that people take on board and I think its sort of passed on to their children and their friends and family we hope. But we would like to think that it – we don't want to generate too much fanaticism into this sort of thing. We want people to think that it's an easy lifestyle to live with* (M. Huskisson, interview, 1996).

At the time of interview, Jenny Talbot, an Australian activist, ran her own bookshop specialising in New Age and alternative literature. Talbot's fateful moment, like Joan Court's, had a spiritual connection. The calling came in a 'great dream' in 1970: *. . . I actually had, really I would have to say the truest sense of being called in my whole life . . .* (J. Talbot, interview, 1996). In *Whales* (1981), a book she designed and illustrated in her own stylised handwriting (as a self-proclaimed Luddite, she prefers to avoid the typewriter), Talbot told the story of the founding of Project Jonah in Victoria. The book is important for what it reveals about the meaning and politics of grassroots activism for an

individual with a cause. Talbot believed she had found her calling with whales and was the right person for the task of establishing Project Jonah in Australia.

Like Talbot, Patty Mark felt she had been called to liberate battery hens. Mark (interview, 1994), who founded Animal Liberation (Victoria) pointed out with a laugh that she gets nervous if she's double-parked, but when it comes to animals, *if you find something suffering, then you have to help it*, all the inhibitions dissolve. Mark grew up on a farm and many of her relatives are farmers and she insists she is not anti-farmer, but is opposed to the big multi-national farms of agribusiness, which have little concern for the plight of individual animals in factory farms. Like many activists in the movement, she keeps lots of pets because she learns so much from 'knowing' the animals. *I've studied hens quite a lot, and I've kept them now for six or seven years, which is the best thing to do – if you really want to know an animal, live with them!* (laughing) (P. Mark, interview, 1994).

Mark has touched here on an issue that concerns other campaign spokespersons, namely the degree of expertise one is expected to have on various issues. Increasingly, it is necessary for campaign directors to have a deep knowledge of animal research, agribusiness and wildlife rather than simply a love of animals and a desire to protect them.

Like many activists, Mark derives pleasure from working with animals: *I feel really indebted to animals, to be honest, I feel they've given me so much, 'cause they teach so much. I think they're so amazing, and the more you know them, the more you learn* (interview, 1994). Along with other activists mentioned thus far, Mark pointed out that her animal liberation activism is a full-time job to her: *It's a real job, in the pure sense of the word, it's work, it's stressful work.* She claimed to have been 'obsessed' in the early days of Animal Liberation in Australia, putting in ninety to a hundred hours a week. She is no longer so driven and realises the organisation cannot do everything.

Commitment equals passion and pragmatism

Turner and Killian (1987, p. 299) have emphasised the importance to a social movement's broad strategy of the distinction between the principles of the strategic and the expressive; the strategic principle concerns the selection of tactics using the criteria of effectiveness and costs while the expressive principle is evaluated more for its symbolic value. A similar analysis was provided by

Schlosberg (1995) on communicative praxis in new social movements. He pointed out that the process of activism itself, not the goals, becomes the prime concern for grassroots activists. Advocates in the suites, on the other hand, are more interested in achieving the organisation's goals. However, Schlosberg warned of the dangers in privileging instrumental over expressive concerns when one is dealing with communicative and intersubjective processes. Process versus ends is particularly important within the direct action movement, for as Schlosberg (1995, p. 307) observed, participants are often changed by the experience and many develop for the first time a strong sense of self and others. Thus, in the case of Brightlingsea Against Live Exports' (BALE) sustained confrontation with the British government described in Chapter 6, participants were profoundly radicalised by the experience of their dealings with the state.

While grassroots activists see the work of their advocate counterparts in the suites as important, others disparage it as 'just another day at the office'. Activism in the streets is less constrained and many activists believe it avoids several inevitable pitfalls of organisational advocacy work (see for example Flacks 1988, pp. 196–97). Although Flacks's focus was on the American Left, what he described as 'the dilemmas of organization' (1988, p. 193) are familiar to all social movement activists and advocates. Essentially, many activists reject the bureaucratic, hierarchical, organized professionalism of the suites (the 'CEO culture') for the spontaneity of the streets. Even so, movement entrepreneurs would argue that both professional advocacy and amateur activism are needed for building a movement strong enough to defend the welfare of animals. Put differently, commitment to a social movement means a healthy combination of passion and pragmatism; passion without pragmatism can lead to activist burnout, while pragmatism without passion is likely to be unattractive to potential supporters.

Andrew Tyler (interview, 1996) of Animal Aid believes that defending the rights of animals takes a heavy toll on individuals, himself included: *It consumes me.* To Tyler, animal advocacy-activism is more than just another '9 to 5' day at the office. He spoke of people burning out and suffering from depression as a consequence of their involvement in emotional campaigns. However, most animal protectionists in the study believed that their commitment to the cause meant satisfaction rather than sacrifice. Holly Hazard (interview, 1996) of the Doris Day Animal League (DDAL) for instance, said she lives

a very normal middle class life that allows her to distance herself from the frustrations of dealing with animal cruelty. Apart from differences in personality, the leaders of these two organisations differ in the way they see their roles. While both have demonstrated a strong commitment to the animal cause, Tyler is a radical, passionate activist while Hazard is perceived as a respectable, pragmatic animal welfare advocate. One philosophy invites ridicule and condemnation: *we are mocked, we are called extremists and mad people,* (A. Tyler, interview, 1996) the other, represented by household names like Doris Day in the US, suggests respectability and glamour. Movement insiders tend to see the difference between animal advocacy and activism in terms of daily bread and daily meaning, the distinction between another day at the office and a consuming passion. Joan Court, the 76 year-old activist, for instance, described how she still works in the courts on children's cases but worries about *forgetting the animals for half an hour to an hour . . . at the back of my mind is this awful feeling that I ought to be giving my entire life to animal rights* (J. Court, interview, 1996).

More than organisational advocates, grassroots activists spoke of guilt in not doing enough for the animals. Committed activists like the English activist 'Milly' (interview, 1996) warn their colleagues about the dangers of burnout and getting too caught up in the movement:

> *It – it really – it almost becomes obsessional – it can take over your life and therefore for those of us who have other commitments you have to try your best to pace yourself because what we are in is in a marathon not a sprint. And it's very easy to get burnt out too quickly too soon, if you try to do too many things too quickly.*

It is clear from these individuals' statements, that their desire to be social movement activists derives from fundamental beliefs and values associated with the animal cause, rather than any extrinsic meaning such as job security. In short, 'the causes of activist careers arise from commitment and ideology' (Oliver 1983, p. 303). Commitment takes many forms, from individual acts of conscience to collective action. In his study of political activists in America, Teske (1997) chose to bypass the tensions associated with the debate between altruism versus self-interest for an approach that focused on identity construction as the moral basis for activism. Identity construction 'points to the qualitative concerns and the desires activists have that certain qualities be instantiated in their actions and lives' (1997, p. 121). Teske identified four

themes in this process, most of which are cognitive concerns relevant to animal activists and their lives. According to Teske's first theme, 'the most important form of character development consisted of a disposition to act when confronted with morally troubling situations' (1997, p. 123). Animal activists, more so than advocates or supporters felt inclined to do something for the animals typically by giving up eating meat – which is seen as 'the least one could do' as an individual – to collective action in animal rescue campaigns and the like. Like many of Teske's activists, animal protectionists such as Patty Mark had learned to develop skills that allowed them to do things, such as public speaking, which they otherwise found difficult to do.

For many activists, the moral meaning of activism (the second of Teske's themes) was reaffirmed by the sense of belonging to a movement, to something bigger than oneself. Virtually all of the interviewees in this study felt that they were not alone and their actions on behalf of animals were part of a world-wide movement. While I did not ask informants to reflect as Teske did on an imaginary end-of-life perspective (the third theme that asks 'was the activism worthwhile?'), many did remark how they had little choice in taking up the cause of animals. Time and again, informants claimed their involvement in the movement was 'something I had to do' (the last of Teske's themes concerning the necessity of acting), in order to be true to oneself and one's commitments. Indeed, there were striking parallels between animal activists' involvement stories and those of Teske's pro-life activists in the way each constructed their sense of identity through activism. How people develop an activist identity in various social movements is suggested by Piven and Cloward (1977, pp. 3–4) and illustrated most vividly by 'Milly' in the excerpt below.

Piven and Cloward's analysis of how individuals experience a transformation of consciousness suggested that changing the way people think about themselves involves three distinct processes: (1) they lose faith in the legitimacy of 'the system'; (2) ordinary fatalistic individuals begin to assert 'rights' that imply demands for change; (3) people who normally feel helpless learn they are not (the rationale for action and ultimately the individual's cognitive liberation). Experience of these stages is reflected in the description of the way 'Milly' and others were radicalised by the live animal export issue in the UK during the mid 1990s. The numbers refer to the stages as outlined above:

> *(1) I feel that since I have become actively involved in the animal welfare movement or animal activist or whatever you want to describe it, I feel more positive about life because I feel that there is nothing more debilitating than feeling that you are a victim and you are on the receiving end of a lot of ridiculous decisions made by parliament or by politicians. (2) Once you have reclaimed your own power and start saying, 'hang on a minute I'm a tax payer, I've got a voice, I'm entitled to be heard and I want these people to do what we are asking them to do, to listen to what we are saying', then it's actually quite liberating in a personal sense as well. (3) . . . I think it has made a difference, especially in Britain, because we stopped the trade at Shoreham, we stopped it at Brightlingsea and we stopped Coventry and Plymouth as well and therefore the number of animals being exported has dropped significantly. Now we were told right at the very beginning 'oh no you won't stop this trade, its been going on for years' and to a certain extent that's right because of the vested interests, of very powerful vested interests behind this trade. But we <u>have</u> – we may not have killed it outright but we have certainly seriously wounded it* ('Milly', interview, 1996).

When individuals pass through all three stages of this process, they may be said to have experienced 'cognitive liberation' (McAdam 1982, p. 51). McAdam elsewhere emphasised that these cognitions are most likely to occur in 'mobilization contexts', by which he means among groups of people who collectively create the meanings that empower them to act. 'In the absence of strong interpersonal links to others, people are likely to feel powerless to change conditions even if they perceive present conditions as favourable to such efforts' (McAdam 1988, p. 137). Women, more than men, have built up networks in the animal movement based on what one activist described as *caring about blood, flesh and pain.*

Women and the labour of love

According to Erickson, 'labours of love'[1] include the labours of people who

> derive their main sense of vocation and calling from the way they . . . engage in activities that pay them little or nothing but provide them with their most

[1] Freidson (in Erickson, 1990, p. 151) focused on work that is the opposite of alienated labour. He called this kind of work 'labours of love' or the voluntary work, which he noted Marx and most other writers have overlooked. Daniels (1987) called such

> significant investments of self, their most meaningful forms of work, their principal niches in life (Erickson 1990, pp. 6–7).

Erickson had in mind not just poets and artists, but hobbyists and amateurs, as well as volunteers 'who keep parishes alive and hospitals humane' (1990, p. 6). Also applicable to this kind of work is the social problems work of activists and advocates in various social movements, including the animal protection movement.

One of the most striking features of the animal movement is the massive over representation of women from the nineteenth century onwards. Wendy Kaminer's (1984) study of volunteering showed how women deprived of career opportunities worked as volunteers in cultural activities, moral reform and social service. Animal protection societies and antivivisection groups attracted more women than men, although men often occupied the leadership positions in organisations such as the RSPCA. Conventional norms in the nineteenth century decreed that women should not work for money or compete in a man's world. Working women were by definition not 'ladies'. Virtuous women worked as career volunteers for charitable associations in Christian temperance and anti-vice societies as well as in campaigns against slavery designed for the social betterment of the less fortunate. 'Religion-inspired service work also provided a satisfying and even consuming career alternative for gentlewomen who would not or could not marry' (Kaminer, 1984, p. 26). Religious work vindicated the militancy of some of their campaigns but when they spoke out in public, this was viewed as contrary to nature and against 'The Cult of True Womanhood' (Kaminer 1984, p. 22).

In the early 1970s, some critics such as the National Organisation of Women, came to condemn voluntary work as career volunteering. Kaminer (1984 p. 47) however, argued that volunteering was a form of work experience for married women which 'gave them work to do in their communities and a sense of usefulness'. She suggested that women in voluntary organisations often drew the public's attention to 'low visibility' issues and gave the example

---

activities 'invisible work' because they are not part of the institutionalised aspects of life represented by salaried careers and jobs. Her sample consisted of women in civic projects who did fundraising, public relations, organisation building and maintenance and lobbying as advocates of various causes. In the case of animal protection advocacy and activism, both women and men do this kind of work, which is more often than not underpaid or not paid at all.

of the battered women's shelter to make the point (1984, p. 6). Similarly, the idea of animal protection had to be promoted by issue entrepreneurs, many of whom were women. 'A century ago volunteering laid the groundwork for women's suffrage and the emancipation of women by bringing them out of the home and into the world of politics, civics, and social affairs . . .' (Kaminer 1984, p. 11).

According to Thomas (1999), for many 19th century theorists, including Marx, work was the defining feature of the human species. Beavers might build dams and birds nests, but these activities were done instinctively rather than as in the case with humans, on the basis of a conscious plan. Thomas pointed out there is no single, objective, universally acknowledged definition of work; the *Oxford English Dictionary,* he noted, gives close to forty different meanings for the use of the term as both a noun and a verb. From the latter part of the seventeenth century onwards, the absence of purposeful work for women meant a loss in both physical and emotional needs, as well as economic deprivations for those without work. In the nineteenth century, enforced idleness amongst middle-class women prompted Florence Nightingale to remark on their sufferings and frustrations due to 'the accumulation of nervous energy, which having nothing to do during the day, makes them feel every night, when they go to bed, as if they were going mad. . . .' (Thomas 1999, pp. xix–xx). For many such women, involvement in causes such as prison reform, anti-slavery campaigns, temperance movements, child welfare and animal protection provided the only outlet for this 'nervous energy'. These causes, then and now, provide women and men with the opportunities for doing social problems work. Minus the economic component, social problems work in new social movements represents real work with practical, intellectual and emotional dimensions.

Caring work is not be confused with emotional labour (Hochschild 1983), although emotions feature prominently in the movement's seminal campaigns. While Hochschild's concept accurately describes the commercialisation of feelings in many service occupations, especially in the 'personality market' (Mills 1951), it does not apply to the kind of work performed in the caring professions of nursing, social work and the like. In these professions, and in the social problems work of new social movements such as animal welfare, compassion cannot easily be faked. Furthermore, emotional labour, as conceived by Hochschild, refers to how an organisation requires its workers, typically

in the service industry, to manage their emotions in ways that will maximise the organisation's productivity. With caring work, the focus is on resolving or ameliorating problems in the human services, including our relations with other animals.

Caring About and For Animals

While caring is a common thread in a number of social movements, such as Amnesty, child protection and ecopax movements, it is at its most salient in the animal movement. Yet for a social movement whose most fundamental motivations are identified by some writers as caring and compassion (e.g. Wynne-Tyson 1990; Finsen & Finsen 1994; Shapiro 1994), it is curious that concepts of compassion, empathy and caring appeared only rarely in the transcripts of interviews with the 53 animal protectionists in this study. Undoubtedly this is because such concepts are integral to the work of animal protectors and are generally not made explicit. It is also partly a reflection of the inadequacies of reporting spoken language, which, even with the aid of computer-assisted data processing, may fail to pick up the nuances of meaning and flashes of feeling that the interviewer can recall when listening to the tapes. For example, the printed word does not do justice to the passion expressed in the following reply to my question about animal protection work, which I remember as one of the most heart-felt responses in the entire study: *Certainly emotions are an important part of it, because we have our hearts involved. You need to keep your heart in something I think to be effective and if it's something that you believe in you'll be more effective* (T. Hamilton, Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), interview, 1996).

Hamilton did not specifically mention caring, compassion or empathy, but they are implicit in her reply and in the remainder of the interview. In this short excerpt, she expressed the idea of caring about (*keep*[ing] *your heart in something*) and taking care of (being *effective*) animals, two of the main forms of caring identified by Tronto (1993) who argued that care implies extending concern beyond the self to others, which will lead to some kind of action. Tronto (1993) identified the main kinds of care as caring about, taking care of, care-giving and care-receiving and suggests that powerful people tend to be associated with the first two types of care, while less powerful people are more likely to give and receive care. These four dimensions of caring suggest

an ethic of care based on attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness (Tronto 1993, p. 127). Each of these dimensions can be applied to the work of animal protectionists which also involves the related concepts of empathy/compassion and protection.

Empathy/Compassion: Attentiveness and responsibility

Being attentive to the plight of others is the first requirement of an ethic of care. Tronto (1993, p. 129) suggested 'it is probably more morally reprehensible to ignore wilfully that which is close to one's own actions than to fail to be aware of a distant consequence of one's actions'. Thus the failure to assist an injured or sick animal that wanders into one's backyard, seems more heartless than an unwillingness to care about the plight of a thousand intensively reared farm animals when one buys meat at the supermarket. *Caring about* implies an acknowledgment that care is necessary; because people know their cat needs food or the dog needs a walk, they can be said to care about their companion animals. People know these things through empathy, an awareness which one of my informants described in an experience she had with her cat:

> *I was in a small flat, he was on his own during the day and then when I got home in the evening I noticed how lonely he was; then a few weeks after getting him, he came down with the cat flu and it sort of struck me that these animals suffer just the same as we do and that was the turning point* ('Lisa', interview, 1992).

According to Candace Clark's (1997, p. 28) research on the etymology of the term, 'compassion' in Latin-related languages, suggests the idea that we cannot look on coolly as others suffer; or we sympathize with those who suffer; in other European languages, empathy, or the idea of 'co-feeling', is used to convey the same meaning. Animal lovers have little difficulty seeing companion animals as part of a primary relationship that entitles them to the rewards the bonds of friendship demand. On the other hand, being willing to take care of, or have any responsibility for the plight of millions of intensively farmed or hunted or laboratory animals is usually not seen as part of an individual's moral brief. This is the work of animal rights/liberation organisations. *Taking care of* lost or abandoned animals is a basic service of animal welfare organisations like the National Canine Defence League (NCDL) discussed below, while the issues of factory farming, vivisection recreational

hunting and the liberation of captive animals are the province of the more radical animal rights/liberation groups. The act of taking care of (in the form of campaigns against the exploitation of animals) is the equivalent of the animal movement's prognostic frame. Put differently, taking care of animals in the sense of doing something for them (in campaigns against vivisection, factory farming and blood sports) is achieved collectively through the work of animal activists and advocates in social movement organisations.

Animal protectionists see it as their responsibility to take care of animals by taking action on their behalf wherever animal exploitation and abuse occurs. Haskell (1999, p. 21) has traced the evolution of the concept of responsibility to as recently as 1788 and explained 'once an evil is perceived as remediable, some people (not all, certainly) will be exposed to feelings of guilt and responsibility for suffering that was previously viewed with indifference or, at most, aroused only passive sympathy'. He argued that modern societies with high rates of social and technological change foster an expansive sense of agency whereby 'people cannot feel responsible enough to do anything about ending suffering as long as they cannot imagine any practicable course of action that will reliably lead to that outcome' (1999, p. 22). Haskell was mainly concerned with slavery as one of many cruel and exploitative practices. He noted 'the startling recency of the humanitarian phenomenon' and pointed out that there was no serious opposition to slavery before the eighteenth century (1999, pp. 22–3). Similarly, cruel practices perpetrated against animals were not seriously challenged until the latter part of the 19th century. Only since the mid-20th century has there been an expansion of agency via collective action that has demonstrated the possibility of successfully challenging and preventing animal exploitation in factory farming and the like.

The remaining two dimensions of care giving and care receiving involve direct contact with animals which most animal protectionists do not experience beyond their relationship with companion animals. *Care-giving*, which 'involves physical work, and almost always requires that care-givers come in contact with the objects of care' (Tronto 1993, p. 107), can best be described in the context of the professional work of veterinarians, animal technicians and the like. *Care-receiving* implies that the recipient of the care will respond to it and that caring needs have actually been met. In the case of veterinary care, for example, we would expect the animal's ailments to be remedied.

While Tronto's typology of caring made no mention of non-human animals, the ethic of care that she advocated applies equally well to them with some modifications. When she suggested that care-giving and care-receiving typically occur within less powerful social groups, this takes a different form in the case of animal protection. Tronto argued that competence and responsiveness are the essential ethical ingredients of these kinds of caring. I suggest that the ethical equivalent in the animal movement is the concept of protection.

Protection: Competence and responsiveness

Caring work must be competently performed. The veterinarian unable to restore a sick animal to health as a consequence of faulty treatment, or who is not concerned with the outcome of the treatment, is acting incompetently. The vulnerability of animals to abuse by humans means 'responsiveness requires that we remain alert to the possibilities for abuse that arise with vulnerability' (Tronto 1993, p. 135). For many social critics, the idea of protecting vulnerable humans is deeply suspect. W. Brown for example, asserted that women have good reason for being wary of the politics of protection:

> Historically, the argument that women require protection by and from men has been critical in legitimating women's exclusion from some spheres of human endeavour and confinement within others. . . . Indeed, to be 'protected' by the same power whose violation one fears perpetuates the very modality of dependence and powerlessness marking much of women's experience across widely diverse cultures and epochs (W. Brown 1995, p. 170).

Although it is sometimes claimed that the idea of institutionalised animal protection is paternalistic, it would be far fetched to suggest that these caveats apply to the protection of non-human animals when it is done competently by people who care about their vulnerable charges. Animal protectors see paternalism as a lesser evil than indifference to animal suffering.

Caring about the well-being of animals is the mission of every animal protection organisation in this study. In the case study below and elsewhere in the book, I look at a cross section of animal protection and humane groups and organisations in Australia, the UK and the USA. The first example is from England, the birthplace of animal protection organisations in the West.

This particular organisation was chosen because it represents the hands-on caring work of an animal welfare organization that also helps disadvantaged people care for their companion canines.

Caring for canines and homeless people at the National Canine Defence League (NCDL)

No study of the animal protection movement would be complete without reference to the 'hands-on' work of animal shelters, refuges and the like. These are the animal rescue activities of organisations such as the RSPCA and the NCDL. It is perhaps the English disposition towards animals and their reputation as an animal-loving nation that explains the existence of the NCDL. The organisation was established as a charity in 1891 and has the Queen as its patron. It exists 'to protect and defend all dogs from abuse, cruelty, abandonment and any form of mistreatment, both in the UK and abroad' (NCDL flyer). While the NCDL's first priority is to dogs, it has demonstrated a strong commitment during its history to the welfare of the poor and needy. In the 1930s, for example, it helped fund refugees and their pets who had fled Nazi Germany. And in its *Annual Report* of 1933, it drew attention to the bond between a destitute man and his dog who, it said, '. . . was probably better fed and groomed than his owner. . . . Yet he cannot part with his dog' (Kean 1998, p. 184).

The charity launched its Hope Project in 1994 to assist thousands of homeless people and their unvaccinated dogs who were roaming the streets of England's big cities in the 1990s. Hope provides dog owners with a number of services: the opportunity to have their dogs vaccinated and cared for by a vet; finding 'dog-friendly' accommodation or advice on rehoming and temporary care for the animal; and finally, assisting dog owners facing eviction because of their pets.

The NCDL believes all dogs should be cared for by responsible owners and that no healthy dog should ever be destroyed. The organisation claims that in their experience homeless people look after their dogs because they value 'the unconditional love and friendship that a dog can provide' including 'for those who sleep rough . . . the added benefit of physical warmth at night' (undated NCDL information sheet). The sheet also referred to people who are squatting, travelling or living in hostels using the NCDL's services for their dogs.

A tour through the NCDL's headquarters in London reveals portraits of dogs on every wall and hundreds of dogs in residence. Hope's coordinator, Colette Kase spoke enthusiastically about the organisation's devotion to dogs:

> *. . . I'm very pro-companion animal (and) we are a pro-dog organisation. Some of the very well-known animal rights organisations would rather see the end of all domestic animals; they take an abolitionist stance. We would <u>never</u> want to see (that); we <u>love</u> dogs and want to keep dogs going, but we want them to have wonderful lives* (C. Kase, interview, 1996).

It is not surprising that NCDL, as the largest dog protection society in the UK and possibly in the world, is critical of the extreme animal rights approach to companion animals, namely that pets represent 'both slavery and imprisonment of innocents' (Bryant 1982, p. 9). It is a position not held by the majority of the animal movement's supporters, most of whom keep companion animals. Yet Bryant pointed to the contradiction of a so-called animal-loving nation, with an estimated dog population of six million, deliberately killing 600,000 young dogs every year. According to the NCDL, this is precisely why it has been campaigning over the past century for the right of dogs to life.

In stark contrast to the strict animal rights position, the NCDL believes in the desirability of pets in society:

> All responsible pet owners derive some benefit from their pets. The animals can help to develop a social life, for example, because people will very often talk to others who have animals. . . . Loneliness is a scourge of modern society; for many people an animal may be their only friend (Pathway document 1996, p. 4).

Human welfare and human needs clearly take precedence over animal welfare in this statement of what the document calls 'the human/animal bond' and about which much has been written, for example, the work of the International Society for Anthrozoology. As an umbrella group made up of some of the leading animal welfare SMOs in the UK, *Pathway* seeks to encourage housing providers to accept pets where facilities for their proper care exist. As the document makes clear, this is an issue concerning the rights of pet owners rather than an animal welfare issue as such. As Kase pointed out:

> *The Hope Project is a classic example of where we aren't just looking after dogs, we are helping the owners as well. For example, we do a lot more* [human welfare work], *women escaping domestic violence is one example. If people want to go into detox units and they have a dog obviously what are they going to do with their dog? So we look after their dog so they can go into detox, things like that* (C. Kase, interview, 1996).

It is the recent inclusion of the dogs of the homeless that adds a different dimension to the NCDL's caring work. This is a classic example of frame bridging, which Snow et al. (1986, p. 467) defined as 'the linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem'. Caring work of the kind achieved by the NCDL and other organisations such as the American Humane Association (AHA) and its work with children is one of the animal movement's most effective arguments against the charge that it is misanthropic and indifferent to human concerns.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the meaning of cruelty and compassion to animal protectionists and the importance to the animal movement of the concept of speciesism. Caring work is the animal movement's response to achieving a decent society in which human and non-human animals can live free of exploitation. Much of the caring in the animal movement is done by women who understand perhaps more than men, the meaning of *blood, flesh and pain.* Caring is social problems work involving intellectual, practical and emotional resources which animal protectors draw on in caring about and taking care of animals. It is related to, but is not the same as, emotional labour that is a feature of work in many service industries. This chapter told the story of the National Canine Defence League and its work with animals and homeless people. While this kind of caring work is characteristic of animal welfare agencies, the campaigns against vivisection, blood sports and factory farming are associated with the activities of the animal rights/liberation movement. These campaigns are the subject of the next chapter, which examines the movement's diagnostic frame in the context of the movement's seminal issues. The remaining chapters focus specifically on the intellectual (Chapter 5), the

practical (Chapter 6) and the affective (Chapter 7) dimensions of animal protection praxis. These chapters highlight the everyday activism and advocacy or social problems work in the contemporary animal movement.

Chapter Five

Diagnosing Cruelty: Intellectual Work in Animal Advocacy

> *And they were so very human in their protests – and so perfectly within their rights.* (Upton Sinclair describing animals about to be slaughtered at a meat works)
>
> *[T]he cruel treatment of animals seems to me to be one of the great unaddressed legal problems of our time.* (Sunstein 2000)

The activist testimonies in the previous chapter reveal that animal protection work is a calling and life-long commitment for some and for others little more than another day at the office. While some activists see their commitment as emotion-laden, most advocates in the study regard their work as primarily intellectual, that is, providing a reasoned voice for animals, or in the language of one of the activists: *speaking up for all animals.* 'In this mode', writes Sabloff (2001, p. 130), 'activists rely primarily on logical argumentation, both philosophic and scientistic, and on the marshalling of mountains of diverse, and usually highly accurate, data'.

All of the activists and advocates featured in this chapter are driven by beliefs and values associated with the cause of individual animals; much of their work is intellectual in nature. This intellectual work corresponds to the movement's diagnostic framing work outlined below in the seminal campaigns

against vivisection, factory farming and blood sports. The cognitive praxis or core identity of three national, multi-issue animal protection organisations is also analysed in order to highlight the role of movement entrepreneurs and the intellectual work involved in the day to day running of the organisations. This intellectual work (as distinct from the abstract argumentation of movement philosophers) includes assembling, presenting and contesting claims, producing verifiable packages of information and education materials, writing submissions and reports for government authorities and ideological maintenance work within the movement itself.

As suggested in the previous chapter, animal protection work involves intellectual, practical and emotional commitments, which in the everyday world of movement activities, are integrated rather than compartmentalised. However, just as movement leaders in the case study countries differ according to the emphasis they give to various styles and combinations of activism/advocacy, so too do organisations vary in the emphasis given to the three dimensions of animal protection work. Similarly, some organisations focus on a specific issue while others, like those profiled in this chapter take on a multi-issue agenda.

Cognitive Praxis in Social Movement Organisations

The intellectual/practical division of social problems work corresponds roughly to the advocacy/activist division of labour I identify as animal protection praxis 'in the suites' and 'in the streets'. Other writers have described the division in terms of knowledge-based versus grassroots epistemology (Eyerman & Jamison 1991). While attempts to compartmentalise animal protection SMOs in this way are essentially artificial, the use of these ideal types is helpful for the purposes of analysis.

This section is guided by the theoretical analysis of social movements employed by Eyerman and Jamison (1989; 1991) who use the terms 'cognitive praxis' and 'movement intellectuals' as their key concepts. Cognitive praxis refers to the core identity of a social movement as a knowledge producer and as a bearer of new ideas. Eyerman and Jamison (1991, p. 56) argued that movement intellectuals 'formulate the knowledge interests of the emergent social movement' in ways that are crucial to the success of the movement's cause. In this study, the term 'movement intellectual' is reserved for the

movement's philosophers such as Singer and Regan; the term 'issue entrepreneur' is perhaps a more accurate description of the role of the organisational leaders outlined in this and other chapters. More significantly, Eyerman and Jamieson (1991, p. 100) contend, 'the use of professionals in social movements reflects a shift in intellectual life itself, a shift from the classical amateur, cultivating intellectual pursuits as an avocation or calling, to the modern professionals, for whom intellectual work is a vocation'. The intellectual work of the three multi-issue SMOs described towards the end of this chapter confirms this analysis.

New social movements engage in 'a form of advocacy which challenges the "reality" of dominant values. It is a process of making an alternative form of knowledge count' (Harries-Jones 1991, p. 5). The remainder of this chapter focuses on the way animal protectors in the USA, the UK and Australia challenge existing ideas and attitudes about animals by using intellectual resources in their advocacy work, particularly in the diagnosis of cruelty as the movement's core identity.

In the next section, the three main anti-cruelty campaigns against animal experimentation, recreational hunting and intensive farming are examined. According to Benton (1998, p. 171), it is within intensive farming regimes and in research laboratories that 'the largest-scale and most systematically organised abuses of non-human animals occur'. The theme of the following section is to show why animal protectionists have named these particular practices and recreational hunting as social, moral and environmental problems. Unlike most other uses to which humans put animals, these three practices involve the killing of large numbers of animals for purposes for which animal protectionists insist there are alternatives. According to Jasper (1999, p. 78), from the Western perspective that recognises animals as having inherent value and rights, it is possible to reframe these practices as violence against animals. This is a concept that would have been unthinkable just two centuries ago.

The practices of animal experimentation, recreational hunting and intensive farming involve institutionalised, normalised violence in that they are widely perceived as normal, legitimate activities. The violence that animal protectionists seek to dramatise in practices associated with the death of animals in laboratories, in the wild and in slaughterhouses, is normalised or hidden away behind closed doors by the vested interests carrying out these activities. Moreover, as a result of the processes of economic globalisation, these activities

have become internationalised in ways which allow huge multinational companies in the meat and pharmaceutical industries and subsidiary companies like McDonald's, to dominate the markets of individual nation states. Furthermore, industrial agriculture and biomedical research are increasingly overlapping enterprises. Both are creatures of the mid-twentieth century (Rollin 1998, p. 159). The development of antibiotics, vaccines, hormones and pharmaceuticals serve both enterprises and have the unprecedented effect of inflicting significant, albeit unintentional, suffering on animals.

When animal liberationists like Patty Mark (interview, 1994) speak about 'the rights of a hen to own a beak', they want to remind people of the fate of individual animals in mass production industries. The reference to owning a beak forces people to think of the individual hen, and in some cases to empathise with the animal. This is the heart of Regan's rights-based philosophy as he explains in the following excerpt:

> *On any notion of animal rights, animals have the right to bodily integrity; they have a right not to have their limbs ripped off and the like. So if people say we need to brand cattle, well, that's a bodily disfigurement and that's a violation of that animal's rights. . . . Any person who's going to claim that animals have rights is going to say that they have a right to freedom of movement and to exercise their natural inclinations in an adequate environment. They can't do that in battery cages obviously* (T. Regan, interview, 1997).

Bodily integrity is therefore a fundamental concept in all strands of the animal protection movement. It is a concept that allows animal protectionists to link violence against animals to violence against women, minorities and other vulnerable groups and even across national borders. Keck and Sikkink (1998, p. 224) made this clear when they argued that 'campaigns against practices that involve bodily harm to populations perceived as vulnerable or innocent are most likely to be effective transnationally, especially where there is a short and causal chain or story assigning responsibility'. While they do not include animals in their idea of vulnerable populations, animal liberationists do. The harm done to individual animals in animal experimentation, recreational hunting and intensive farming featured in many of the interviews in this study. It is especially evident in the testimony of anti-hunting advocates discussed in this chapter who draw attention to what Regan calls 'bodily infringement': Laurie Levy's reference to *wounded birds – birds that have been*

shot through the back of the eye, through the back of the head, through the wings; Wayne Pacelle's image of wanton cruelty of *somebody hitting a dog over the head with a bat*; and in one English anti-hunt activist's testimony of *a stag being shot and injured, it's jaw being blown off and the stag's still running.* These graphic images are meant to serve as moral shocks (Jasper & Poulsen 1995) or as devices to mobilise people to support the activists' cause.

The aforementioned terms – animal experimentation, recreational hunting and intensive farming – are used by the animal industries and individuals supporting the practices to describe what they see as legal and legitimate forms of animal use. However, in seeking to stigmatise the practices, animal defenders use the labels vivisection, blood sports and factory farming since these terms suggest a degree of violence and cruelty that is less evident in the terms used by the animal industries. Negative labelling, either of the practitioners or the practices themselves, is typically the first step in the animal movement's campaigns against cruelty.

The next section examines the framing of campaigns against vivisection, blood sports and factory farming as social problems. Needless to say there is considerable overlap between the framing of these issues in their social, moral and environmental dimensions. For example, the issue of duck shooting in Australia has been framed primarily as a social problem with moral, legal and environmental implications (Munro 1997a, 1997b). Likewise, the dominant frame in antivivisection campaigns and arguments against factory farms is a moral one, although health and environmental concerns are increasingly prevalent in these campaigns. These issues are especially salient in the controversy over the genetic engineering of animals described below.

Dissecting vivisection

From the 1890s to the 1970s, the number of animals used in animal research grew exponentially as did the industries that used animals, such as chemical and pharmaceutical plants and universities. While it is difficult to accurately estimate the numbers involved, it has been estimated that worldwide about 100 million animals each year for the past two decades have been used in testing and research (Jasper 1999, p. 83).

The first major campaign seeking to protect animals against cruelty was the antivivisection movement in Victorian England which reached its peak

in the 1870s, making the humane and anti-vivisectionist movements of the nineteenth century the longest-running campaigns in the animal protection movement (Finsen & Finsen 1994). 'What elevated antivivisectionism from a mostly latent sense of outrage into a ferocious pubic agitation was the large-scale importation of experimental physiology into Britain and the United States after 1870' (Turner 1980, p. 89). At first, British vivisectors were able to escape condemnation because the practices involved in using animals in experiments on the continent appeared to be much worse. After 1870, however, this was no longer the case and the pressure to ban animal experimentation grew (French 1975, p. 35). Scientists, other professionals and activists centered much of the debate on 'science versus suffering' arguments.[1]

The early demands for the reform of animal experimentation came from female anti-vivisectionists like Francis Power Cobbe. Cobbe and her supporters held that cruelty deliberately inflicted on innocent animals was the most heinous of crimes. Scientists who knowingly inflicted pain on creatures in their experiments were seen as more evil than people who got pleasure from killing animals for food or for entertainment. Like many of her supporters, Cobbe was not a vegetarian and consequently, using animals for food was not viewed with the same revulsion, as was animal experimentation. To the predominantly female anti-vivisectionist, scientific medicine was overwhelmingly a male domain in which women as much as animals were the victims. As a metaphor of medical science's invasion of women's bodies, rape became a dominant

---

[1] The history of the long-running dispute between scientists and animal protectors is described in Deborah Rudacille's (2001) *The Scalpel and the Butterfly: The Conflict between Animal Research and Animal Protection,* University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. This controversy has featured prominently in leading scientific journals from the 1970s when Singer's (1975) *Animal Liberation* reinvigorated the contemporary animal movement.

A computer search of *Scientific American* articles on animal research uncovered 90 pieces between December 1983 and December 1996 of which only three, all in 1987, dealt with the politics of animal welfare. By comparison, the coverage of animal experimentation issues in *The New Scientist* has been much more extensive. Elston's (1992) content analysis of the magazine between 1970 and 1991 revealed that it had published close to 400 articles on the vivisection debate in which about two-thirds of the writers were explicitly for or against the use of animals in research; just over half of the total were critical of some aspect of animal experimentation. And of the nearly two dozen editorials, only two attacked animal rights excesses while the dominant message was to urge scientists to seek constructive dialogue with their critics. A cover story in *Scientific American* on February 1997 therefore can be seen as a sign of the issue's importance at the end of the 20th century.

theme in the anti-vivisection literature, both fictional and nonfictional, from the 1880s onwards (Lansbury 1985; Elston 1990; Ferguson 1998).

In the 21st century, it is the invasion of animal bodies and the capacity and readiness of scientists to alter the telos of an animal that are most disturbing to animal protectors. The genetic engineering of animals raises complex intellectual and moral issues for society that have thus far not been adequately debated. The philosopher R.G. Frey (1983) has called for 'a jury of concerned individuals' to debate the ethical, welfare and social issues associated with this new development in animal experimentation. Frey is a supporter of the moral orthodoxy in our treatment of animals, which means that animals matter but not as much as humans. However he seems sufficiently alarmed at the potential risks posed by the spectre of genetic engineering to both animals and humans to insist on a rational public debate on the issue. At the very least, the question of whether the genetic engineering of animals presents a new social problem (Rothman 1995) needs to be addressed, for as Rothman has argued, the issue is as much social as biological and ethical.

The controversy over genetically modified organisms has the potential to unite animal protectionists and environmentalists in a common cause movement. The rights of animals as advocated by animal protectors and the 'precautionary principle' of the environmentalists are fundamental perspectives to be considered in this debate. Both perspectives are part of Reiss and Straughan's (1996) scepticism about science's capacity 'to improve on nature'. They argue that each case of genetic engineering has to be decided on its own merits and that the satisfaction of trivial human needs should not be a criterion for altering the telos of an animal; they cite the example of engineering more productive turkeys by breeding out their broody behaviour as a case in point (Reiss & Straughan 1996). Theologians, social scientists, philosophers and others will need to contribute to Frey's jury of concerned individuals if the controversy over the issue is to be resolved satisfactorily.

Feminist perspectives are also relevant to the debate. Birke (1997) has described several contradictions in the way scientists perceive animals. In a number of books and papers Birke (1991a, 1991b, 1994) has argued for a new, ecofeminist ethic in science's treatment of non-human animals. Similarly, Ruddick (1980) has called for 'a maternal epistemology' in the work of scientists, one that respects the rights of animals as sentient beings. This may be wishful thinking, for as Birke (1994, p. 136) has suggested, science is driven by 'the

profit margins of commercial companies testing cosmetics; competition between companies; the pressures to get a large grant to fund research; the social pressure to conform to an ideal of unemotional detachment'. Birke and Michael (1992a, 1992b) have described in detail the attitudes of scientists to animals as well as to antivivisectionists. Scientists invariably perceive themselves as more rational than their opponents. Although Birke (1994, p. 140) conceded that she had seldom met a scientist with a cruel streak, she claimed nonetheless that respect for animals is not a major part of the scientific narrative and that there is 'a denial of empathy in the process of becoming a scientist'. This attitude seems to persist with experienced scientists, for according to Arluke (1992), it was rare for scientists and vets in his sample of 400 people who work with animals, to feel uneasiness about the treatment of laboratory animals in their care.

Historical and contemporary abolitionists contend that vivisection is morally flawed because animals endure suffering and death for the sake of a dubious science. They also make links between the treatment of animals and the oppression of women and in this way highlight the issue of animal experimentation as a social problem as much as a moral problem. As a social problem, animal experimentation has a social solution, which for moderates in the movement means the three Rs: reduction, refinement and replacement. Abolitionists, however, contend that there are non-animal alternatives (Langley 1998, pp. 4–5) that can be used immediately, without invoking the three Rs. In the meantime, animal experimenters pay lip service to the three Rs since this is more congenial than the prospect of doing research minus the animal subject. Like the debate over animal experimentation, the issue of factory farming has generated considerable controversy, since agribusiness is seen as the practice that involves the greatest amount of animal suffering.

Agonising over farm animals

Unlike household pets, domestic animals such as cattle, pigs, horses, sheep and poultry were not kept for sentimental reasons. It was not until the twentieth century that they became beneficiaries of the kinship that people felt towards their pets. Thomas (1983, pp. 93–4) pointed out that battery farming, far from being an invention of the twentieth century, was used in Elizabethan times for raising pigs, geese, poultry and game birds in confinement. But the

nature and size of the concentration of animals was small-scale compared to the intensive farming of the twentieth century. Webster (1994, p. 35) pointed out that for most of the past 10,000 years traditional farmers allowed the animals to range freely on the farm; only in the last 60 years, when the rate of change was greater, were traditional farming methods replaced by intensive farming. He claimed that the most dramatic changes were due to economic forces and occurred between the 1950s and the 1970s. Jasper (1999, p. 82) noted for example, that the number of laying hens in an average facility increased in this period from 20,000 to 80,000.

These post-war developments included improved mechanization of agriculture, increased profitability of livestock production, increasing consumer demand for meat and other animal products, the relatively lower cost of mechanization compared to labour costs and various outcomes from increased investment in agricultural research which permitted even greater degrees of intensive farming (Webster 1994, p. 135). Intensification of farming was aided and abetted by the increased use of agro-chemicals such as fertilizers and pesticides, as well the increased use of water for irrigation and increasing reliance on mechanized farming methods (Huby 1998, p. 57). While the negative impact of these developments on the environment has been great, animal advocates have tended to focus on the cruelty issues and the impact on human health (see for example, O'Brien 2001).

While the intensification of meat production peaked in the second half of the 20th century, the assembly-line conversion of animal to food for human consumption had begun a century earlier. Cockburn (1996) cited modern methods of food preservation and the vast cattle herds that appeared in Argentina, Australia and the USA in the middle of the 19th century as the signals for the change. Travellers to the USA commented on the efficiency and heartlessness of the mass slaughter of farm animals for food in places like Cincinnati and Chicago. Cockburn (1996, p. 26) asserted that precisely between 1807 and 1865 with the opening of the Union Stockyards in Chicago, 'was perfected the production-line slaughter of living creatures, for the first time in the history of the world'. Worldwide, around one billion animals (not including poultry) are killed for food each year (Jasper 1999, p. 82). It is the massive scale of factory farming and the cruelty involved which outrages animal rights supporters and which has induced activists and writers to take to their pens. Contributions to the cognitive praxis of animal liberation have come

from a variety of intellectual sources: literary (Sinclair 1905), citizen science (Harrison 1964), academia (Lawrence 1991) and activism (Townend 1981).

Upton Sinclair's 1905 novel *The Jungle*, described the harsh working conditions in the Chicago packing plants and was meant to arouse the sympathy of the American public for the predominantly migrant blue-collar workers. People's stomachs were turned instead by the descriptions of the unhygienic condition of the meat in the packinghouses (Stull, Broadway & Griffith 1995, p. 41). Public disquiet led to the establishment of a federal food inspection agency that monitors the safety of meat for human consumption. However, few people appeared to be concerned with the plight of the animals in the slaughterhouses or could 'hear the hogsqueal of the universe', as Sinclair called it: the hogs 'were so innocent, they came so very trustingly; and they were so very human in their protests – and so perfectly within their rights!' (quoted in Cockburn 1996, p. 27). Farm animals would have to wait for more than a half century before their protests would be taken up, first in England and the USA and later in Australia.

Ruth Harrison's (1964) pioneering exposé of agribusiness, *Animal Machines: The New Factory Farming Industry*, is widely acknowledged as the first book to diagnose intensive farming as a hazard to human and nonhuman animals alike. It was the book that launched the campaign against factory farming (Singer 1990, p. 254). For the first time, evidence was assembled which forced the British government to appoint an expert committee to investigate the conditions of animals kept under systems of intensive husbandry. *Animal Machines* included a 24 page pictorial summary of how factory farms work and how they are different from traditional farms. Figure 2 (1964) for example, shows a large field consisting of a line of trees and open pasture in the background while in the foreground, a sheepdog, resting in the grass and wild flowers, watches over a flock of sheep outside the farmer's house. The farmer can be seen at the centre of the picture with the tools of his trade in the sheds behind him. 'The farmer's image' is described in the accompanying text as part of

> the visual pleasure of the countryside . . . that is also a pleasant environment for the animals. On the good traditional farm there is a sense of unity between the farmer and his stock, he is a farmer because farming is in his blood, and profits are a secondary, if important, consideration (Harrison 1964).

In Figure 3 the factory farm presents a stark contrast to this idyllic picture:

> The buildings jar on the eye and rob the countryside of much of its charm. These long sheds are completely utilitarian, each with its giant feed hopper to meet the needs of the animals permanently enclosed within. The new type of farm is a factory run on completely commercial lines by people who are businessmen rather than farmers (Harrison 1964).

The pictorial summary then focuses more on the way animals are treated in the factories with occasional reminders of their more humane treatment on good traditional farms. There can be little doubt that Harrison's diagnosis of the factory farm as 'animal machines' was an oxymoron that shocked many people. *Animal Machines* was for the animal movement what Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962) was for the environment movement. The Brambell committee established to investigate the issue, supported most of her claims. According to Singer (1990, p. 141), the committee rejected the industry's claims that productivity is a reliable indication of the absence of suffering and that close confinement does not cause suffering because the animals are either bred for it or are used to it. The committee went on to recommend that an animal should at the very least 'be able without difficulty to turn around, groom itself, get up, lie down and stretch its limbs' (quoted in Singer 1990, p. 142).

Beef City, an integrated feedlot of about 800 hectares on the Darling Downs in southern Queensland, was set up in 1974 by Elders, a large Australian pastoral company which uses intensive farming methods based on the industrial production line developed by Henry Ford. The entrance to Beef City describes the operation, in which the company slaughters over 350 cattle every day, as 'Custom Feeding for Profit'. Australian farmers, however, are not the main beneficiaries of the profits from meat production. According to Lawrence (1991, p. 81), for most of the 1980s farmers' costs exceeded their incomes and about 3,000 were forced off the land annually. During the early 1950s, the farming sector accounted for 30 per cent of Australia's gross domestic product; by 1991 it had fallen to 3 per cent while the number of farms had been reduced by about half (Milliken 1992, p. ix). In 1991 Elders sold a controlling interest in its meat processing operation to foreign investors including Nippon of Japan, the American giant, ConAgra and Angliss of the UK.

Intensive farming is the term agribusiness uses to describe the system of

production where animals are converted to meat in the abattoir and packinghouse, where it is graded, chilled and packed for sale. Animal welfarists refer to the intensive confinement of animals as 'factory farming' whereby:

> instead of having the animals graze upon open pasture, the feedlot encloses as many as 50,000 head of cattle in small holding bays and then force feeds them with a concoction of highly nutritious grains and feed supplements laced with a variety of veterinary chemicals (Lawrence 1991, p. 92).

Aside from the animal welfare concerns, the confinement of as many as 50,000 cattle in one place puts an intolerable stress on an already ecologically fragile environment. Lawrence (1991, p. 93) pointed out that a 20,000 head feedlot produces effluent to match that of a large inland Australian city, adding that intensive farming 'could turn our rivers into a giant agroindustrial waste system for Japan'. He also points out that animal liberationists and environmentalists who criticise these developments become 'enemies' of embattled farmers struggling to make a living from the land. Yet the real threat to farmers lies in the 'wider structural forces marginalising their activities' (1991, p. 98). Lawrence argues that the solution, which most animal welfarists and mainstream environmentalists would support, is to return to more sustainable forms of agriculture along the lines of a decentralised, co-operative farming system. In contrast to the factory farm model favoured by agribusiness, traditional farming methods according to Berry (1996), offer more sustainable and humane outcomes for both humans and the natural world. Animal Liberation branches in Australia have been preoccupied with making this distinction in their campaigns during the past two decades.

According to one of the pioneers of farm animal welfare in Australia, Christine Townend (1981), the early Animal Liberation branches in Australia were reluctant to do anything that might brand them as extremists. Their first demonstration was a protest against the export of Australian horses to Japan. But it was the live sheep export trade to the Middle East in the early 1980s that became the biggest issue for the fledgling Animal Liberation movement in Sydney. Cruelty has been the primary grievance of the animal movement since it began its campaign more than two decades ago, although the government has been reluctant to improve the conditions of animals in the live export trade. Opposition to this trade peaked in the mid 1990s in England when grassroots activists took to the streets in massive demonstrations that had no equivalent in Australia or elsewhere. It is perhaps not surprising that

the most militant animal activism should be located in England, the birthplace of animal protection. The next section will consider the campaign against blood sports, which especially in England, appears to have the best prospects for victory.

Killing animals for fun

After vivisection, opposition to blood sports is the longest-running campaign in the animal movement. Like the issues of animal experimentation and intensive farming, recreational hunting generates a great deal of emotional energy on both sides of the issue. Emotion, or sentimental anthropomorphism, is usually dismissed as the protesters' main tool of defence against the more reasoned arguments of the hunting lobby. However, many animal protectionists see anthropomorphism as entirely consistent with the new ecological sensibility they seek to promote. Feminist scholarship appears to be a contributing factor to the respectability of sentimental anthropomorphism among some female scientists and writers (Rodd 1990, p. 63; Donovan 1993; Birke 1994). Sentimental anthropomorphism is of course not monopolised by women, for as Thomas (1983, p. 119) has argued, pet keeping by both men and women, 'created the psychological foundation for the view that some animals at least were entitled to moral consideration'. Furthermore, in contrast to the predominantly female leadership of the campaigns against factory farming and vivisection, most of the leaders and spokespersons of the anti-hunting groups I studied were men. This may have implications for recruitment to the movement, for according to Groves (1995) men were a source of status among the animal activist groups he studied and a resource for overcoming emotional deviance, that is, for legitimating emotions like anger and compassion.

Groves pointed to a difference between contemporary animal rights with its focus on justice and rights for animals and the humane tradition of the nineteenth century's association with heightened compassion, women and the domestic field. In the present study where it was more common to encounter combinations of compassion, caring and social justice issues in the testimony of the activists, these differences were less apparent. Thus, in the anti-hunting campaign, leading male activists spoke of 'standing up for compassion' as well as of 'hating injustices'. The leaders of the anti-hunting lobby in the three case study countries virtually speak with one voice in their protests against different forms of recreational hunting. All four leaders are men and all four

have used the print and electronic media to dramatise hunting as a moral issue. John Bryant (UK) and Wayne Pacelle (USA) at the time of their interviews were the media spokespersons for their respective organisations; Mike Huskisson (UK) publishes a regular newsletter which documents the activities of the main protagonists in the hunting controversy; and Laurie Levy (Australia) makes effective use of television images to dramatise what his organisation claims is a cruel, violent and outmoded 'sport'. Their interviews reveal the importance of the visceral in what motivates them to oppose recreational hunting in their respective countries. It is what Wayne Pacelle (interview, 1996) of HSUS and Mike Huskisson (interview, 1996) of the ACIG identify as *a reflexive, emotional response* that drives the campaigns against different kinds of hunting. Laurie Levy (interview, 1994) of CADS asserts that he has *always hated to see the powerful and strong exploit or kick around the weak, whether this be humans or another species.* John Bryant (interview, 1996) of the League Against Cruel Sports (LACS), on the other hand, acknowledges that he ate meat for 30 years of his life: *I've got plenty of blood on my hands; I can't go around lecturing people.*

Bryant is a pragmatist and believes in the psychology of small wins. In other words, if you can get one person to support the cause of animal rights, for example by joining a demonstration or donating money to a campaign, then that is a win. He believes it is unrealistic to expect people to reinvent themselves overnight, for example by converting to vegetarianism or by taking up the anti-hunting cause:

> *So the trouble is, it's no good us in the League trying to say fox hunting is the most important animal welfare issue in the country. There are far worse problems. There is the problem of factory farming which involves millions of animals, there's the problem of vivisection, which involves millions of animals. But my philosophy is this, if we can't get legislation to outlaw killing animals for fun, which is also associated with great suffering, then we're never going to be able to make a dent on these other areas where at least there's an argument for it, like cheap food or human health or whatever* (J. Bryant, interview, 1996).

In common with other seminal animal liberation campaigns, the anti-hunting lobby in the USA, the UK and Australia uses practical, emotional and intellectual resources to prosecute its campaigns. In this section, the focus is on the intellectual work – the assembling, presenting and contesting of claims –

which is a feature of the hunting issue in all three case study countries. Although opposition to cruelty is the predominant motive of anti-hunt protesters in these countries, the issues which offend campaigners are all different: in the UK the main protest is against fox hunting, while in Australia the most high-profiled campaign is against duck shooting; in America, the protests are concerned with banning 'canned hunting' and trophy hunting.

In the UK, the protests are led by animal SMOs that represent the main strands in the movement: LACS takes a liberal governance approach via the legislative route and organisational advocacy, while its sister organisation ACIG, run by Mike Huskisson, is more grassroots, with activists being encouraged to take video footage of the Hunt as a mild form of direct action; the Hunt Saboteurs Association (HSA) prefers more aggressive tactics in disrupting and confronting hunters and uses a critical governance strategy in its attempts to ban hunting with hounds. The HSUS and CADS, like LACS/ACIG, prefer to work within the system, the former adopting a classic advocacy style and the latter a hands-on, activist approach in its duck-rescue operations. Yet all of these SMOs use knowledge as an organisational weapon (Eyerman & Jamison 1989). Even the smallest of these SMOs, CADS, maintains an Internet website where it defends wildlife on moral, environmental and legal grounds. While the CADS campaign is media-driven and based on creating emotive media images, it can best be described as 'hot cognition' (Gamson 1992a), a term which captures its affective and intellectual work.

The countermovements which defend hunting have constructed a number of strong claims which the anti-hunt advocates must challenge. Hunting has been defended by many intellectuals, including in recent years the sociologist Jan Dizard (1994), the philosopher Roger Scruton (1996), the psychologist James Swan (1995) and the writer Ortega y Gasset (1994).

One of the strongest claims hunters make to defend hunting wildlife, including shooting captive animals in 'canned hunting' (the killing of confined animals for trophies) is that it is an issue of personal liberty. Alan Wolfe's anthropocentric arguments in defence of human culture as a counter to the challenge of animal rights, deep ecology and Gaia, are in line with this thinking. Wolfe (1993, p. 87) argued that if humans were prevented from being cruel to other animal species, the result would be 'a world, without fantasy, excitement, and creativity'. Animal advocates reject this as the worst kind of speciesism; in the case of anti-hunting SMOs, leaders like Bryant, Huskisson,

Levy and Pacelle all challenge the personal liberty claim as morally bankrupt. *Killing animals for fun*, argues Bryant, cannot be defended with appeals to human rights over animal rights.

Bryant's (1982) *Fettered Kingdoms* is a defence of animals from an animal rights perspective. His activist colleague in the ACIG, Mike Huskisson, publishes a regular newsletter, which among other things encourages supporters to collect hunting magazines and hunt reports in the media in order to study the tactical repertoires of the opposition. These are examples of the basic intellectual work animal activists do in most of their campaigns. Thus, among other things, the ACIG offers supporters advice on how to capture on camera cruelties perpetrated by hunters which can be used against them in a court of law.

Large and wealthier animal SMOs go much further in educating their supporters about campaigning skills. The HSUS, like its counterpart anti-hunting SMOs in the UK and Australia, maintains an Internet website which offers detailed material on the organisation's many campaigns, providing potential supporters with comprehensive information that can be used to defend animals. The HSUS is unique as an animal protection SMO in that it has its own university, the Humane Society University (HSU), which offers on-line education and skills training in animal protection. It also provides links to established universities and colleges in North America where people can pursue courses on animal protection issues from a variety of social-scientific perspectives (HSUS website). One of the aims of this initiative is to enhance the intellectual work of future leaders in the animal movement. This is an innovative example of how anti-hunting SMOs in the case study countries use knowledge as an organisational weapon in media releases, books and articles, films and videos, magazines and flyers, and more recently via the Internet.

Similar resources are increasingly part of the toolkit of most animal SMOs, including those profiled in the next two sections. The case studies suggest that multi- and single-issue animal SMOs in the age of the Internet function as think tanks. According to Weaver and McGann (2000, p. 3), the roles of think tanks include: (1) playing a mediating function between the political system and the public; (2) identifying, articulating and evaluating emerging issues; (3) transforming ideas and problems into policy issues; (4) acting as an expert and independent voice in policy debates; and (5) providing a forum

for the exchange of ideas between stakeholders in policy debates. These roles are frequently carried out by some of the advocacy organisations profiled in the following sections. Perhaps the term 'advocacy networks' is a more accurate description of these animal SMOs since 'while maintaining formal independence, [they] are linked to particular ideological groupings or interests' (Weaver & McGann 2000, p. 7). However, I prefer the more generic term 'think tank' to this lesser-known derivative.

Multi-issue SMOs as Think Tanks

The core identities of the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) in the United States, Animals Australia/The Australian and New Zealand Federation of Animal Societies (ANZFAS) and Animal Aid in the United Kingdom correspond to the broad philosophies of animal welfare, animal liberation and animal rights respectively. Issue entrepreneurs like Ruth Harrison in factory farming and Christine Stevens from AWI in animal experimentation, were among the first to diagnose cruelty in these practices. Stevens's pioneering work in the USA in the 1950s and 1960s led to some of the most important reforms for laboratory animals in that country. Her organisation, the Animal Welfare Institute, as the name implies, is dedicated to seeking improvements in animal welfare via conventional lobbying. Animals Australia/ANZFAS is perhaps one of the best examples of an animal SMO that has followed Singer's animal liberationist stance. Because its member organisations represent a wide variety of philosophies and programs, it is of necessity pragmatic in its programmatic and ideological work. Finally, the radical vegan-animal rights organisation, Animal Aid in the UK is a classic example of an abolitionist activist group which adheres to Regan's strict version of animal rights. As these three multi-issue animal SMOs represent different points on the continuum of moral philosophy as applied to our treatment of animals, a brief description of their activities merits telling.

The AWI's 50 years of campaigning

The AWI celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 2001. The main campaigns that the AWI has sponsored include the three seminal animal liberation issues of farm animals, laboratory animals and wild animals. This SMO began in 1951

with its campaign against animal experimentation and immediately attracted the hostile attention of the National Society for Medical Research (NSMR) which attempted to demonise the animal welfare organisation by comparing its work to the activities of Machiavelli, Stalin and Hitler (AWI, 2001). Fifty years on, the AWI is seen as a moderate lobby for animals, while animal rights groups in the UK, the USA, Australia and elsewhere are attacked by their enemies, as extremists and terrorists.

Christine Stevens founded the AWI so as to provide a voice for laboratory animals whose fate was being debated between the 'no holds barred' medical extremists in the NSMR and the equally intransigent abolitionists in the antivivisection movement. The AWI's policy was to offer a 'middle ground' alternative to these two extremes. Under Stevens's leadership, the AWI has achieved many important improvements in the treatment of laboratory and other animals including anaesthetisation prior to slaughter (except for kosher slaughter) in 1958, minimum standards of care and housing for laboratory animals in 1966 and exercise for laboratory dogs in 1991.

Factory farming has always been a focus for the AWI's campaigns to improve the conditions for confined and transported animals, as well as to outlaw cruel methods of slaughter and more recently to fight corporate hog factories, whose proliferation the AWI claims to have halted in Poland. One of the AWI's longest-running campaigns has been to outlaw the steel jaw leghold trap which animal activists everywhere see as an exceedingly cruel device to trap wild animals. As early as 1955 the AWI branded the trap as 'one of the cruellest inventions of man' and two years later published its *Facts About Furs* which Jasper and Nelkin (1992, p. 150) note has been an influential weapon against the fur trade.

What distinguishes the AWI from other comparable animal welfare groups is the organisation's intellectual work in animal protection. In this work, the AWI and its sister organisation, the Society for Animal Protection Legislation (SAPL) function as a think tank which produces high-quality publications and media on a whole host of animal welfare issues. SAPL was founded in 1955 at a time when there had been only two federal animal welfare laws enacted in America (one in 1906 and the other in 1948) both of which aimed at protecting animals during transport. The long gap between these laws is an indication of the paucity of activity on behalf of animal welfare, both in

government and civil society. Since then SAPL has been involved in achieving the enactment of fifteen additional laws designed to protect both domestic and wild animals.

The Society uses the liberal governance strategy of lobbying legislators and government officials to improve the plight of animals wherever they endure unnecessary suffering. With the help of the AWI, it provides members of Congress and their staffs with information packages on animal welfare issues and encourages members of the public to write to the Congress and newspaper editors. Some of the publications are provided free to other animal organisations, police departments and other government instrumentalities. More than most animal welfare organisations the AWI believes in assembling, presenting and contesting their claims along the lines suggested by Hannigan (1995). Books such as *Alternative Traps* (Garrett 1996) and the influential *Facts About Furs* (AWI 1957) are among the best-known of the AWI's output; the organisation also reprinted the seminal work on the three Rs, *The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique*, when it went out of print some years ago. More recently, the AWI's intellectual work has included the challenges posed by globalisation; staff at the think-tank scoured thousands of pages which made up the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to determine what impacts these treaties would have for animal welfare issues. The research revealed that hard-won animal welfare reforms such as protecting dolphins in tuna fishing and bans on the steel jaw leghold trap, were endangered or weakened by these treaties.

For a small, national, multi-issue organisation, the AWI is one of 'the most politically successful of all animal welfare organisations' (Orlans 1993, p. 45). When I interviewed the AWI's staff in 1996, Christine Stevens explained the group's success by its willingness to occupy the niche between the hard-line animal industries and their equally intransigent critics on the other side. By positioning the AWI's policies somewhere between the animal rightists and the hardliners in the animal user industries, the moderate AWI has been able to capture 'the middle ground' of American public opinion. This has allowed the Institute to function as an animal welfare think tank which uses its intellectual resources to codify public sentiment into laws that will protect more animals from exploitation. A similar strategy of liberal governance is followed by Animals Australia profiled below.

Animals Australia/ANZFAS: A regional federation of animal societies

ANZFAS has been campaigning for over 20 years on all of the main animal issues represented by the 35 animal organisations that make up its federation. ANZFAS changed its name in 1996 to Animals Australia and has identified its main campaign targets as livestock, domestic pets, animals in research, wildlife, animals in sport and entertainment, and nonindigenous feral animals. Because the establishment of ANZFAS was inspired by the philosophical work of its former President Peter Singer, the organisation's broad ideological orientation is liberationist, although the existence of groups in its federation such as the Australian Wildlife Protection Council and the NSW Animal Welfare League, along with antivivisectionists, vegetarians and environmentalists, means that its campaigning style is more pragmatic. Put differently, ANZFAS, under the leadership of its Director Glenys Oogjes, is seen as a moderate lobby group that is acceptable to state and national governments in Australia. Singer has described it as 'the real voice of the community of animal welfare organisations' (ANZFAS 1994–95). Oogjes (interview 1997) sees her role as *a conduit for information* and in this sense, ANZFAS/Animals Australia operates as a think tank, providing packages of information in 'fact sheets' and the like for its member organisations.

Like the AWI, Animals Australia follows the strategy of liberal governance, working within the system rather than the more radical stance of critical governance which seeks to challenge moral orthodoxy by demanding an entirely new system of governance (Newell 2000). For example, the organisation has representatives who serve on Animal Ethics Committees, a policy that does not satisfy the antivivisectionists in the lobby group. As in the USA with the formation of the HSUS and in the UK with the founding of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV), the Guardians (a group opposing vivisection) broke away from Animals Australia because activists felt their abolitionist cause was not being represented by the leadership. The present position of Animals Australia is to continue to campaign against vivisection while at the same time have its members serve on Animal Ethics Committees in the hope that more humane practices towards animals will result.

A recent initiative of Animals Australia is to make more extensive use of communications technologies to promote their aims. Up until 2001, the SMO relied on its quarterly magazine *Animals Today* to communicate with its

members. The magazine is still used for writing substantial articles on animal issues and for keeping the membership informed of its campaigns. However, late in 2001, the organisation developed its outreach potential by issuing its press releases as well as cross listing news from other animal organisations via the Internet. Using the email in this way, Animals Australia is following what is now a common practice of social movement activists everywhere. For example, it recently posted details of the International Network for Humane Education (InterNiche), which aims to replace animal experimentation in biological science, veterinary and human medicine with non-animal alternatives (Animals Australia, 2003). Although the coordinator of InterNiche, Nick Jukes, is based in Leicester, England, the Website (Interniche – International Network for Humane Education) allows activists everywhere access to numerous contacts and links associated with humane alternatives to vivisection. The Website has links to a dozen or more animal defence organisation in the UK, the USA, Australia and Europe, with further contacts in more than 30 countries. This is a good example of how many contemporary animal SMOs do much of their intellectual work via the Internet. Thus InterNiche has many of the usual Web facilities including a discussion list designed to educate people about the advantages of non-animal alternatives to vivisection.

Animals Australia and the AWI, through its sister organisation the Society for Animal Protection Legislation, work within the system via the legislative route. The intellectual work of Christine Stevens in testifying before the US Congress, and Glenys Oogjes's submissions to the Australian Senate have resulted in moderate reforms and incremental improvements to the lives of animals. Both Oogjes and Stevens would probably agree with what Karl Weick (1984) called 'the psychology of small wins' as these modest victories set precedents for other animal advocates to build on.

Animal Aid's critical governance strategy

Such a piecemeal approach is however unattractive to the activist leader of the UK based radical animal rights/vegan organisation Animal Aid. Andrew Tyler (interview, 1996) would prefer the animal movement to be like it was in the late 1980s when it was *young, provocative, imaginative and challenging . . . and did strange things and shocked.* Tyler is quick to point out that he is not advocating extremism or violence but rather *creative, principled, dynamic action.* He believes

the animal rights movement should stick to its undiluted objectives, which is the abolition of all vivisection, factory farming and recreational hunting and the promotion of veganism. Tyler wants Animal Aid to fundamentally change people's habits, such as meat eating, angling, visiting zoos and circuses etc., and is not prepared to accept the status quo, or what has been called 'the moral orthodoxy' (S. Clark 1997). Clark argues that 'public moralism' – the norm of *moderate* concern for animals – is morally bankrupt. Tyler, like many other abolitionists in the movement is critical of welfarist organisations like the RSPCA which are perceived as taking the safe and comfortable path to animal advocacy, or accepting the norm of moderate concern for animals, which comes down to the belief that animals matter, but not as much as humans.

Moderate, welfarist and liberationist organisations like the AWI and Animals Australia often benefit from 'the halo versus horns' effect when they are compared by policy makers to more radical animal rights groups like Animal Aid and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). For example, Animal Aid has been a strong critic of the Blair Labour government for its alleged 'betrayal' of animals in the three seminal issues of hunting, vivisection and animal farming. The organisation claims that Labour has tried to criminalize and marginalize peaceful animal rights activists in the UK (Animal Aid press release, 29 May, 2001). Faced with abolitionist demands and trenchant criticism of animal rights groups like Animal Aid, governments tend to accept the moderate reforms sought by more 'respectable' animal SMOs like the AWI. Tyler (interview, 1996), although remaining sceptical of the reasonable demands of welfarist groups, is nonetheless ready to accept them as limited progress: *We must also work for, and take encouragement from, incremental advances.* In this way, radical SMOs like Animal Aid and their more conservative colleagues in the AWI and Animals Australia can often work productively together, despite their ideological differences. Like these other SMOs, Animal Aid functions as a think tank for activists who are supplied with what Tyler calls *verifiable packages of information* that can be used to undermine the arguments and practices of the animal industry.

Primary school teacher Jean Pink founded Animal Aid in 1977 as a pressure group to speak up for factory and laboratory animals. Since then it has widened its focus to include all the main animal rights campaigns from anti-fur protests to campaigns against zoos. It is unique as an animal rights SMO

in its uninhibited promotion of veganism. Whereas many of the members and supporters of the welfarist AWI and the liberationist Animals Australia would be meat eaters, it is unlikely that this would be the case in Animal Aid where veganism is enthusiastically promoted. This is what Tyler means when he talks about *living without cruelty*:

> [But] *the public itself is in a state of ignorant bliss, so we have to force the argument, force people to recognise first of all that suffering takes place, that most people are complicit whether wilfully or out of ignorance. And once we have that recognition we can talk specifically about how to redress it, what measures can be taken politically, economically and what people can do in their own lives. And we have a message which is about living without cruelty, which is very personal one. This is the unique thing about this movement and about our message* (A. Tyler, interview, 1996).

Single-issue SMOs and Computer-mediated Communication

In this section, three single-issue SMOs in each of the case study countries will be profiled. Defenders of Wildlife (DoW) is a Washington based group which follows an animal welfare approach and the Australian Association for Humane Research (AAHR) is an animal rights group based in Sydney. The third, an English group, Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) lies somewhere in between and is more liberationist than welfarist or rightist, but closer to the former in its style of campaigning. These organisations are representative of groups which campaign against the three practices that constitute the heart of the animal movement's core constituency – wild animals (DoW), farm animals (CIWF) and laboratory animals (AAHR). Like most other animal protection SMOs, these groups now rely heavily on computer-mediated communications technologies (especially the Internet and email), to promote their respective causes to wider audiences.

Defenders of Wildlife

Defenders of Wildlife have been campaigning since 1947 against the exploitation of all American wildlife in the interests of animal welfare and biodiversity. When I visited the SMO's headquarters in Washington DC in 1996, I was struck by the group's logo featuring a wolf which it displays on a large plate-glass door. Six years later, I was struck by the comprehensive website the

organisation maintains detailing its mission, strategies, campaigns and the intellectual advocacy work it does on behalf of wildlife.

For the past half-century or more, Defenders have pursued the liberal governance strategies of education, research, litigation, legislation and advocacy in prosecuting their claims against their opponents, particularly on the issues of endangered species and wildlife conservation. The SMO claims to have had many achievements in all of its campaigns and in the fiscal year of 2001 it listed its ten top successes as:

1. Defeated weakening of the Endangered Species Act.
2. Safeguarded wolves across America.
3. Stopped special interests from destroying the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve.
4. Enacted the historic Lands Legacy Conservation Initiative.
5. Rescued and restored imperilled species to their former homes.
6. Forced the Federal government to maintain a meaningful 'dolphin-safe' tuna labelling program.
7. Created a proactive predator conservation fund.
8. Defeated anti-wildlife initiatives in Alaska.
9. Launched first Carnivore Conservation conference.
10. Established offices in Canada and Mexico.

('Defenders Top 10', Defenders of Wildlife, 2001)

This list indicates the range of campaigns initiated by DoW and suggests the complex intellectual advocacy work that would be involved in their execution. These issues and others are usually described in DoW's quarterly magazine or on its informative and comprehensive website. In its Annual Report (2001), the Defenders' chairman suggests that new communications technologies have now become the SMO's main campaigning tool: 'We use the most powerful advocacy tool of our time – the Internet – to inform and mobilize millions of people on behalf of conservation'. A good example of this outreach via communications technology is the provision on the DoW website of its publications, newsletters and magazine (most of which can be downloaded), including a book-length critique of the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), *Amber waves of gain* (April, 2001). This publication argues the case against agribusiness on the grounds that it is against the interests of the

environment and animal welfare. DoW claims that AFBF has deliberately set about fostering enmity between farmers and environmentalists, two groups which the SMO believes are potential allies, at least in the case of family farmers and ranchers. DoW have sought to counter the influence of the Farm Bureau by exposing its dark side in this online book which is available to potentially millions of readers.

The head of species conservation at DoW, Robert Ferris, explained the SMO's tactics when dealing with its opponents:

> *Well lobbying is a big part of our action and a lot of what we do. But the thing is, it depends on the issue, it depends on what's needed at the time and we have a media person here who does nothing but media and we have a couple of people that work on that. It depends on what the issue is, who the involved parties are and what we feel is the life of this thing and how imminent is the danger. . . . But our tendency has been . . . that we will start first with negotiations and go that route and if somebody says 'screw you, we're not going to work with you, get the hell out of here!' – then you know, we'll say 'well you know here's the other option you can deal with the Species Conservation division or you can deal with the Legal division and the Media division'* (R. Ferris, interview, 1996).

Like other comparable animal welfare SMOs, Defenders confront massive opposition to their campaigns with much more limited resources than their adversaries. The Farm Bureau for instance, claims to have 4.9 million members and is one of the most powerful lobby groups in the USA. Similarly, in the next case study, CIWF uses its modest resources to challenge much more powerful agricultural interests in the UK and Europe.

Compassion in World Farming

CIWF began as a small affinity group when Peter Roberts, a dairy farmer, started up the group in England in 1967. Roberts received an MBE for services to farm animal welfare in 2002. By this time, CIWF had expanded its activities to Ireland, Holland and France with contacts in several other countries as well. Its most successful campaigns to date have been in getting legislation to outlaw veal crates and battery cages in England and elsewhere. CIWF focuses on improving the welfare of farm animals in a variety of contexts: on the farm, at market, during transport, in the slaughterhouse and more recently, in genetic engineering. CIWF has about 20 staff who work in these

different divisions. Educational work is set up as a separate charity called the CIWF Trust since in the UK organisations cannot have charitable status and campaign to change the law at the same time. This dimension of the CIWF's work is close to the think tank activities of similar animal SMOs. In the CIWF's case however, the organisation employs a full time education consultant who works with schools and colleges and is responsible for disseminating up-to-date information to the public on all of the farm animal issues of interest to people. One of the most useful resources it makes available to schools and colleges is the video *Farm animals and us*; the stills of the film are also featured on the CIWF's website and include segments designed to be used in a range of school subjects such as English, science, media studies, citizenship education, geography and religious studies (CIWF internet site). The CIWF believes this is a very attractive and user-friendly way to instil empathy and respect for farm animals.

When I visited CIWF's headquarters in Petersfield in 1996, the main campaign issue was the live animal export trade which had led to massive street protests throughout England. Tim O'Brien, the head of research and communications at CIWF, explained how this issue turned the attention of some media outlets to the plight of farm animals in the UK:

> *We have become their first port of call, whenever there's a murmur of an issue about animal welfare or anything related to farm animals; for example BSE which the media have largely not considered to be an animal welfare story but a public health story. Nevertheless as soon as news breaks our telephones start ringing with journalists at the other end asking for comments and asking for information* (T. O'Brien, interview, 1996).

Later in the interview, he explained how research and communications were intertwined:

> *It's one department, what we call the information department and the two things come together very largely in terms of putting out information and in terms of retrieving information; we use computers to issue out press releases, fax them automatically by a computer, so then we've got directories of journalists on our computers who will receive those press releases direct from the computers. And we use access to the Internet both to put out information and to retrieve information and on-line commercial databases to search for information. We find that very, very effective, very, very cost effective. Whenever I get asked to do a literature search on*

> *a particular topic, I can sign onto an on-line data base and search the entire scientific literature on a particular topic in maybe five minutes or ten minutes and I'll have the abstracts of all those papers sitting on my computer in five or ten minutes at a cost of maybe £3.00* (T. O'Brien, interview, 1996).

CIWF, which works within a liberal governance strategy, had to tread a careful path between its usual advocacy role 'in the suites' and the clamouring of demonstrators 'in the streets' who were dissatisfied with the animal movement's progress in getting the live animal export trade outlawed. The director of CIWF, Joyce D'Silva was quoted in the press as having distanced herself and the SMO from the 'radicals' who smashed a lorry window during the protests. CIWF uses political lobbying as its main strategy and advises supporters on how to lobby politicians and public servants, in short, how to navigate the political process. When I asked D'Silva to explain the organisation's advocacy work, her response was a far cry from the critical governance strategies of grassroots activists:

> *Lobbying involves providing briefings, suggesting amendments to proposed Directives, arranging meetings with MEPs and officials, holding press conferences at the European parliament, sometimes small peaceful demonstrations like photo opportunities say with a veal crate and MEPs come and get photographed with it to express their support for our campaign to get the veal crates banned in Europe and so on* (J. D'Silva, interview, 1996).

Australian Association for Humane Research

The final case study of a single-issue animal think tank is the antivivisectionist AAHR based in Sydney. The group was set it up in 1979 by Elizabeth Ahlston as one of the few antivivisectionist SMOs in Australia. She explained in her interview how she had been inspired by the early pioneers of antivivisection, noting that despite the intellectual opposition of some of the Victorian age's most celebrated luminaries, vivisection is still practised:

> [The movement] *started with the 1876 Cruelty to Animals Act, with only about three to four hundred animal experiments a year and with great Victorians speaking out against it – even Queen Victoria was against it, and Gladstone and Ruskin and Lord Shaftsbury and Cardinal Manning they all spoke out strongly against it from the ethical and moral point of view – and it made no difference whatsoever.*

> *The animal research industry grew and grew and at its peak, I think they were doing about five and half million experiments a year* (E. Ahlston, interview, 1997).

Ahlston sees the whole animal experimentation debate as *a huge issue,* which is both *nasty and fascinating.* She claims there is a constant supply of new evidence proving how 'crazy' vivisection is, but still it goes on. Anti-vivisection organisations like AAHR spend most of their time collecting, presenting and contesting material to support their cause. Ahlston enjoys this kind of intellectual work because *you never stop learning.* Abolitionists like Ahlston are engaged in the environmentalists' equivalent of popular epidemiology or citizen science. According to the originator of the concept, popular epidemiology involves lay people collecting data, alone or in collaboration with experts, on issues of public health (Brown 1995, p. 92). This is also called 'citizen science' (Irwin 1995) or simply lay science as opposed to professional science. Typically, popular epidemiologists are environmentalists campaigning against toxic wastes, pesticides, asbestos and so on, or women involved in campaigns against unnecessary hysterectomies, sterilisation abuse and other health issues.

Animal liberationists are involved in similar work when they contest the claims of scientists engaged in animal experimentation. Michael (1996, pp. 96–7) claimed that scientists seek to dictate the form and ground rules of the animal experimentation debate by insisting that it be characterised by civility, non-violence and rationality. Irrationality, the scientists pointed out, encompasses a multitude of sins including 'inappropriate emotionality', 'being ignorant' and 'being unreasonable rather than reasonable'. Michael's (1996) interviews with animal experimenters revealed that they have a major concern with the emotionality of lay responses to vivisection, as well as with the public's understanding of science in general. Ahlston has herself experienced attempts by medical students to discredit her as an unreliable expert so as to disqualify her from debating the issue. She explains that when she reflects on how a dubious science from the late nineteenth century is still being used today, the reaction from scientists is hostile:

> *I gave this talk at Sydney University and I think they thought I was going to be meek and mild and so on. It was to honours and post grad medical students, and of course they tried to put me down, you know, the way they always do. Some pipsqueak of a young man who had just qualified in medicine asked: 'Do you have*

> *a degree, have you got a PhD?', and I said 'No I haven't but I can tell the difference between a rat and a human'* (laughing) (E. Ahlston, interview, 1996).

Antivivisectionists in the animal movement contest the claims of professional science in the same way that lay epidemiologists do in their environmental campaigns. Brown (1995) pointed out how lay involvement in popular epidemiology changes the nature of scientific inquiry in two ways: It identifies cases of 'bad science' such as animal experiments to study foetal alcohol syndrome (FAS), and it shows up the limitations of 'normal science'; the case of FAS is a classic instance of bad science posing as 'normal science'.[2] Brown argued that these two roles of popular epidemiologists lead activists to distrust professional science and to come up with alternatives; in doing so, they often yield valuable data that would otherwise be unavailable to science. Instances of this are probably rare in the animal experimentation debate, although antivivisectionists like Ahlston insist that animal models for human illnesses are totally inappropriate. At every opportunity, she confronts animal researchers with the question:

> *Why are you using the same tools that you used over a century ago? and I mean, to maintain that a quadruped that is uncomplicated emotionally and psychologically as well as different physically is a model for humans, it's just . . . when are we going to wake up?* (E. Ahlston, interview, 1997).

Conclusion

This chapter has focussed on cruelty as the diagnostic frame of the animal movement's three central campaigns against vivisection, blood sports and factory farming. I have argued that these practices are diagnosed as social and moral problems by animal protectionists, because they are seen to result in the unnecessary suffering and death of massive numbers of sentient creatures. While many animal rights fundamentalists see animal exploitation as 'a crime of stupefying proportions', to use a phrase from one of Coetzee's (1999) fictional characters in *The Lives of Animals*, most simply believe that it is a public issue with profound societal consequences, including environmental

---

[2] The issue of animal experimentation associated with FAS is discussed more fully in Munro (1999a).

and health problems, the impact of agribusiness on small farmers and hunger in the third world, and the unforeseen risks associated with genetic engineering.

For animal protectors, the institutionalised cruelty of animal experimentation, intensive farming and recreational hunting constitute the worst forms of speciesism that the movement must confront. For the three main strands in the movement – animal welfare, liberation and rights – opposition to speciesism is the common thread in their campaigns. Nonetheless, the testimony of individual animal protectionists reveals different motives for their participation in these various campaigns. The importance of gender in explaining these motivations is evident in the historical and contemporary accounts of animal protection work alluded to in this chapter. However, the movement's diagnosis of speciesism as a social problem and its anti-cruelty frame cannot be reduced to a single dimension such as gender, race or class. Societal ills, labelled by animal protectionists as cruelty, torture, pain, suffering, injustice, exploitation and the like, are universally abhorred as structures of domination, at least in the context of human rights. In the issue of animals' rights however, the norm of moderate concern for animals prevails; it is this moral orthodoxy which the animal movement seeks to challenge.

This chapter described the work of three national, multi-issue SMOs in the case study countries: the Animal Welfare Institute (USA), Animals Australia and Animal Aid (UK). These SMOs cover a vast territory of animal issues close to the heart of animal protectionists from the welfarist, liberationist and abolitionist traditions. Similarly, the work of the three single-issue SMOs, Defenders of Wildlife (USA), the CIWF (UK) and the AAHR (Australia) focused on wildlife, farm animals and lab animals; like the multi-issue SMOs profiled in this chapter, these single-issue groups represented the main ideological strands in the movement, welfarist, liberationist and abolitionist respectively.

Intellectual work is crucial to virtually all animal SMOs. It is the cognitive praxis or core identity of the groups and their issue entrepreneurs profiled in this chapter. These three multi-issue and single-issue national groups illustrate the cognitive praxis of animal protection work – lobbying politicians, litigation in courts and legislative work, and producing formal submissions and verifiable fact sheets or packages of information, as well as books and monographs, films and Internet websites on the full range of animal issues. And finally, whatever the differences between these three animal protection

SMOs, they each use knowledge as an organisational weapon against what they see as cruel and unnecessary practices involving nonhuman animals.

Animal protectionists describe these problems in different, though connected ways: animal experimentation as 'dirty work'; as the symbolic vivisection of the planet (Sperling 1988); as concerned with the fate of vulnerable species in reprehensible forms of recreation; as associated with the slippery slope of killing animals for 'fun'; as 'perfecting the production-line slaughter of living creatures' (Cockburn 1996, p. 26) and as an environmental and health hazard. In recent times, environmentalists and animal protectors have added food contamination scares, notably the 'mad cow disease' outbreak and the genetic engineering of plants and animals to their list of grievances against those who seek to 'improve on nature'.

For many of the animal protectionists quoted in this chapter, cruelty to animals is experienced as a private trouble, shared only with like-minded individuals inside the animal movement. The task of turning these private anxieties about out treatment of animals into public issues is central to the social problems work of animal protection activism and advocacy. While the remaining chapters focus on the practical and emotional dimensions of social problems work, it should be understood that along with intellectual work they are inextricably linked in the everyday praxis of animal protection.

Chapter Six

Practising Animal Activism: Exposure and Interference Strategies

> *Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.* (Attributed to Margaret Mead)
>
> *It's challenging. I like the strategy. I absolutely love the strategy of figuring out how to do something . . . I guess I like the politics of it.* (Adele Douglass, AHA)
>
> *I mean sitting chained up to a pig stall for seven hours is very tiring and there's not a great deal of excitement in it.* (an Australian animal liberationist)

In line with Tilly (1985), this chapter is based on the view that a social movement is what it does, as much as why it does it. Thus the focus will be on the movement's strategies and tactics, the prognostic components of animal protection work which have been developed during the long history of animal protection from the RSPCA to PETA, as well as the motives of the activists behind the various campaigns; after all, it is people who have objectives, rather than organizations per se. My studies suggest the animal movement is dedicated to non-violent direct action, which incorporates the two broad strategies of gaining publicity for the movement and disturbing the status quo in regard to the way we treat other animals. These approaches correspond to what Newell (2000) called liberal governance strategies and

critical governance strategies; the former refers to strategies that seek reforms within the system while the latter "tend not to compromise" (Newell 2000, p. 127). The chapter also explains why movement insiders reject violence in campaigning for the ethical treatment of animals; instead, activists draw on a variety of non-violent tactics borrowed from the repertoire of the nineteenth century humane movement as well as from more recent social movements.

According to Doherty (2000, p. 62), tactical repertoires as learned and shared understandings of how to protest, are shaped by the values of the movement. The power in the movement (Tarrow 1994, 1998) for animal protectors is the capacity to combine various forms of collective action from direct mail to direct action. Tactics highlighted in the chapter are pamphleteering, bearing witness and demonstrations (publicity strategies) and hunger strikes, ethical vegetarianism and undercover surveillance (interference strategies). Clearly, there is some overlap in the objectives of publicising an issue and how it might subvert the status quo; a hunger strike, for example, is at first glance a classic illustration of a publicity stunt yet it is highly subversive in intent. Similarly, a demonstration, depending on its size, is used by activists to publicise an issue as well as to disrupt life in its immediate vicinity. These particular tactics will be highlighted in this chapter because they were popular among the activists and because, as is suggested below, they are representative of the tactical repertoires I observed in various movement campaigns.

According to Rucht, the difference between strategy and tactics is stressed more in Europe than in the USA. Rucht (1990, p. 174) noted that tactics may change from one situation to another and are not necessarily part of a general strategic concept. It is perhaps useful to think of strategy as the 'broad organizing plans' for acquiring and using resources to achieve the movement's goals (Turner & Killian 1987, p. 286) while tactics refer to the specific techniques for implementing the strategy. Tactics are sometimes referred to as 'forms of action' (Rucht 1990), 'action technologies' (Oliver & Marwell 1992), 'claim-making repertoires' (Tilly 1993/94), 'action repertoires', 'repertoires of contention' or as a 'tactical repertoire' (Tarrow 1994). Rucht (1990, p. 164) defined the action repertoire as "the range of specific kinds of action carried out by a given collective actor in a cycle of conflict, usually lasting from some years to some decades" while Tilly (1993/94, p. 3) sees social movements as "a cluster of performances" which include the kinds of action repertoires listed in Table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1. Strategies and tactics of non-violent action by animal protectors

Publicity Strategies		Interference Strategies	
Persuasion strategy	Protest strategy	Non-cooperation strategy	Intervention Strategy
Petitions	*Demonstrations*	*Civil disobedience*	*Animal rescue*
(Celebrity) speeches	*Picketing*	*Boycotts*	*Sit-ins*
Direct mail	*Vigils*	*Legal obstructions*	*Blockades*
Publicising surveys, opinion polls	*Parades, marches and rallies*	*Occupations*	**Undercover surveillance*
	**Bearing Witness*	*Ethical vegetarianism	
Information stands	Mock awards	Animal sanctuaries	*Nonviolent sabotage*
Displaying symbols & caricatures	Street theatre etc	*Seeking imprisonment	Exposure of animal abuser's identity
Posters and banner hanging	Mock funerals	*Hunger strikes	Litigation
*Pamphleteering	Burning effigies		Lobbying
*Writing books, articles, poems	*Renouncing honours		*Ethical investments
*Art exhibitions, media presentations			
*Submissions and reports to inquiries			
*Writing letters			
*Bearing witness			

Source: Adapted from Ackerman and Kruegler (1994, p. 6) as cited in Lofland (1996, p. 271; figure 9.2) * denotes mainly actions by individuals and words in *italics* represent direct action activities. Tactics underlined are described in detail below.

A Social Movement's Prognosis: Strategies and Tactics in Animal Protection

Turner and Killian (1987) have identified four tactical mechanisms (persuasion, facilitation, bargaining, and coercion) which have been used at one time or another by activists and advocates in their campaigns on behalf of animals. These tactical mechanisms can best be thought of as a continuum with persuasion as the most moderate tactic at one end and the more direct confrontational tactic of coercion at the other end. I have selected a representative sample of these tactics, as space does not permit an account of more than a few iconic tactics from the animal movement's action repertoire. Persuasion (e.g. pamphleteering, bearing witness, demonstrations) and facilitation (e.g. ethical vegetarianism) tend to be the preferred tactics of

organisational advocates 'in the suites', while bargaining (e.g. hunger strikes) and coercive tactics (e.g. undercover surveillance) are usually more commonly observed in grassroots activist campaigns. The tactics underlined in Table 6.1 above have been selected as representative of Turner and Killian's tactical continuum.

Persuasion, involving the use of strictly symbolic manipulation and the raising of issue consciousness, is one of the most important ways in which ideology is produced and continuously modified (Turner & Killian 1987, pp. 297–298). Although consciousness raising has been derided as "social change through banner hanging" (Wapner 1995), it is nonetheless an important tactic in the animal movement for changing the way people think about animals. The late animal activist Henry Spira has famously used close relatives of persuasion – facilitation and bargaining – although not without criticism from more radical elements in the animal movement (Munro 2002).[1] Nonetheless, persuasion, facilitation and bargaining remain the staple approaches of the mainstream movement.

There are also many instances in which coercive tactics of various kinds have been deployed, particularly by grassroots activists, to achieve improvements in animal welfare. These range from the use of 'nuisance' tactics to more disruptive tactics including the violent actions of radical animal rights activists. Coercion then, can be thought of as a continuum ranging from the mild forms of coercion used by activists like Spira to the threats and acts of violence made by extremist groups such as the Animal Liberation Front, the Animal Rights Militia and the Band of Mercy (see Tester & Walls 1996). Violence is eschewed by the mainstream movement and very few of the fifty activists I interviewed favoured extreme or violent action under any

[1] I have described Spira's style of activism in "The animal activism of Henry Spira (1927–1998)", *Society and Animals,* 10, 2, pp. 173–91. It is argued in the article that Spira's style of animal advocacy differed from conventional approaches in the mainstream animal movement in that he preferred to work with, rather than against, animal user industries. To this end, he pioneered the use of 'reintegrative shaming' (Braithwaite 1989) in animal protection, an accommodation strategy which relied on moralising with opponents as opposed to the more common approach in animal advocacy of adversarial vilification, and hence disintegrative shaming. The article describes the framing of some of Spira's best-known anti-cruelty campaigns and his use of Braithwaite's theory of reintegrative shaming to induce animal users to change their ways.

circumstances. This was even more evident in the results of larger samples of animal rights supporters who overwhelmingly favoured legal, moderate protest actions over illegal, violent ones (Munro 1995a; Richards 1990).

Non-violent movement strategies are represented in the four strategies – protest, persuasion, non-cooperation and intervention – and related forms of action in Table 6.1 above. The publicity strategies are the legal, mostly non-violent institutionalised strategies, which Newell (2000) called 'liberal governance' strategies and Tarrow (1994) labelled as 'conventional' social movement action repertoires. I qualify the tactics as 'mostly non-violent', as demonstrations, for example, can often turn violent. Interference strategies correspond to Newell's concept of 'critical governance' and what Tarrow referred to as 'disruption'; these are non-institutionalised, unconventional tactics, which are again mostly non-violent forms of direct action. All of these action repertoires and the related strategies – protest, persuasion, non-cooperation and intervention – have been deployed in recent animal rights campaigns I observed in three different continents during the 1990s.

In many animal rights campaigns, media coverage is essential for giving the movement legitimacy and publicity. As Glenys Oogjes of Animals Australia explained: *I'd have to say that the most successful strategy, if you can call it that, was when we've had successful media coverage of an issue* (interview, 1997). Some of the tactics highlighted in this chapter – demonstrations, hunger strikes, undercover surveillance – were chosen by activists for their headline potential while the remainder, ethical vegetarianism and pamphleteering were adopted with complete indifference to whether or not *the whole world is watching*, the apt title of Gitlin's (1980) classic which highlighted the media's importance to social movement activists. Yet activists know the media are always interested ~~in dramatic~~ news stories, which many direct action campaigns provide. Rochon (1990) claimed that the power of a movement resides in its militancy, size and novelty while Koopmans (1993) suggested that it is violence that attracts the media's attention. Thus the media-movement relationship, which can mean the kiss of life or death to a cause, is accurately summed up by Van Zoonen's apt term 'a dance of death' (1996). On the one hand, animal rights activists need the media to promote their call for the compassionate treatment of animals; on the other, the media need dramatic footage and headlines which violence and threats of violence provide, albeit, as we will see below, at a moral cost to the movement.

The Disavowal of Extremism and Violence in Progressive Social Movements

Animal rights and anti-roads protesters were among the main dissenters in the UK during the 1990s. While many of these protests were militant rather than violent, the representation of the activism in the mass media was of violence and extremism (Kew 1999). In the case of the animal rights protests against the live export of animals, a single incident involving a brick through a lorry window provoked a moral panic about "the loopy and violent Animal Rights Militia" (*The Economist*, 1995), IRA-style urban terrorists and the like. Activists I interviewed often used the language of war when describing their campaign strategies in Brightlingsea and Dover, but none supported the violence favored by some extremist groups.

Tilly (1978, p. 55) has provided some insights into why activists in new social movements eschew violence. There are essentially three factors: success, repression and facilitation, which activists and bystanders consider before they commit themselves to a campaign. In the case of the success factor, many people now believe violence is counterproductive and indeed will invite repression from the authorities. As John Bryant (interview, 1996) claimed, *the one thing the state can do better than anyone else is violence*. Finally, social movement goals will only be facilitated by elites in government and the media if they are non-violent. For these reasons then, social movement activists, including the majority of animal activists, favour non-violent means to achieve their goals. Kitschelt (1986, p. 61) has also argued that movements need to appeal to widely held norms if they are to succeed and that the strategy of non violence is crucial for the emergence of protest and the building of broad mobilizations in Western democracies.

Gurr (2000, p. 156) supported this view and noted how non-violent movements of the late twentieth century differed in at least three ways from previous movements. First, non-violent resistance gives protesters a moral advantage, a point frequently made by Peter Singer and other leaders of the mainstream animal movement. Second, because the tactics often prove to be creatively disruptive of public order and economic activity, authorities are compelled to respond in ways that put them at a moral and political disadvantage to the protesters. The large-scale protests in England in the mid 1990s against live animal exports were a good illustration of the effectiveness of non-violent civil disobedience. Third, recent non-violent protests have used

the mass media to send their images and messages well beyond the immediate sites of conflict to "a distant but potentially sympathetic public comprised of people who might be enlisted as allies and agents of reform" (Gurr 2000, p. 156). Gurr argued that this outreach was not available to the nineteenth century activists.

Given these arguments for rejecting violence, it is therefore not surprising that Rucht has identified a decline in violence in contemporary new social movements and a corresponding increase in civil disobedience (1990, p. 159). Doherty also claimed that there has been an increase in non-violent direct action in the twentieth century (2002, p. 180). He identified a number of factors which explain why violence is not popular in small environmental and animal rights groups: an expanded repertoire of non-violent tactics; much greater access to the mass media; and lack of public support for violence. In the case of animal rights, however, there is at least a perception in some sections of the media that violence has been increasing in the last decade or so. These media reports followed an admission from an animal rights extremist in 1994 that he had sent six letter-bombs to companies involved in the live animal export trade in the UK (Jordan 2002, p. 68).

Jordan distinguished between activism! and activism, noting that the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) has become emblematic of the former. He contended that the ALF's 'terrorist' actions are a component of the mainstream animal liberation movement, which primarily uses non-violent direct action in its campaigns (Jordan 2002, pp. 67–68). Not surprisingly then, in the public mind the animal rights movement is often associated with violence, especially in the UK where the ALF has been most active. Even in Australia, birthplace of the leading advocate of non-violent animal liberation, Peter Singer, peaceful animal activists have been unfairly labelled 'terrorists' and 'extremists' and their campaigns linked to those of the ALF (Munro 1999b, pp. 43–44). That there are violent and extreme elements on the fringes of the mainstream movement cannot be denied; yet they are a minority who evidently do not accept the non-violent stance of the mainstream movement.

Turner and Killian (1987, pp. 303–304) noted how non-violence is often found alongside terrorism rather than in association with the more conventional persuasive and bargaining tactics, an idea which at first blush seems counterintuitive. However, as they explained it, terrorism requires only a small group of well-disciplined participants to prevail, while non-violence

cannot be sustained without a mobilizable amount of sympathy for the cause and the presence in the constituency of an ethos that values both non-violence and self-sacrifice. In line with Merton's (1968, p. 140) famous typology, there is sometimes a tension between the compassionate goals of the animal movement and the means to achieve these goals, which is resolved by deviant means. When peaceful animal rights protests fail, activists become frustrated and are tempted to turn to more aggressive tactics. Thus while the vast majority of respondents to ASIS (Munro 1995a), a survey of several hundred animal protectors, favour peaceful and legal means to achieve improvements in the treatment of animals, many activists become disgruntled when their conventional lobbying and years of campaigning fall on deaf ears. Violence and extremism are then rationalized by some perpetrators as necessary evils, with both positive and negative unintended consequences.

When activists engage in more extreme actions, policy makers sometimes accord their more moderate colleagues more respect. In practice, this means that radical actions in the movement often have the effect of creating a niche for more moderate voices. This phenomenon was first identified by Haines (1984) as 'the radical flank effect', which is concerned with how radical groups affect the bargaining chances of moderates. According to Haines, this can either be negative or positive. When there is a negative radical flank effect, the moderates get tainted with the same brush as the radicals; this was the media's reaction to the peaceful protests associated with the live animal export trade in the UK in the mid 1990s. An example of a 'positive radical flank effect' has been noted in the US Congress where the radical and dramatic tactics of PETA have made the moderates in the animal movement a more congenial group with which to bargain. The phenomenon was confirmed by the experience of Adele Douglass of the American Humane Association:

> *I know for fact that the 1985 amendments to the Animal Welfare Act would never have been passed without the PETA protests and all the stuff that they were doing. Because then – and it helps us I have to say from the perspective that we're at – when you have extremists and then we come in and where the extremist say "we want research ended this afternoon," and we say "we want the animals treated humanely," they pay attention to us because that's the other option . . . I don't think the laws since at least the 1980s would ever have gotten this far without those organisations* (A. Douglass, interview, 1996).

A similar case was made by Haines who argued that moderate civil rights groups in the USA in the 1960s were the beneficiaries of a positive radical flank effect when elite white groups were prepared to financially support moderates in order to neutralize the extremists. Haines's findings are supported by a number of contemporary movement watchers who have suggested that the extreme actions of radicals can have the effect of legitimating and strengthening the bargaining position of the moderates (McAdam 1988, pp. 718–19; Scarce 1990, pp. 6–7; Dalton 1994, p. 211). On the other hand, at least one writer (Godwin 1988, p. 48) has argued that Greenpeace's dramatic actions mobilize financial and moral support from people who 'vicariously' participate in the actions by responding to Greenpeaces' direct marketing campaigns. He also pointed out that threats on the lives of Christian Right leaders have encouraged people to send money to the evangelicals in the hope of discrediting their extremist enemies. People therefore seem prepared to support dramatic, non-violent actions as in the case of Greenpeace and to register their disapproval of violence and threats of violence as in the case of the Christian Right.

Violent actions by animal rights extremists, such as damaging property, sabotage, sending letter and parcel bombs, planting car bombs and making violent threats and intimidation (see Tester & Walls 1996), make the actions listed in Table 6.1 seem moderate. For most of the informants in this study then, violence is seen as counterproductive to the goals of the movement. For John Bryant and LACS, violence is a tactical disaster as well:

> *We're supposed to be a humanitarian cause and in a democracy we have a duty to use every militant but peaceful avenue up to the level of and including the level of civil disobedience – but any violence, intimidation, threats, abuse, particularly when it's targeted at individual researchers or individual huntsman and people like that, then if we go down that way there's no way back* (J. Bryant, interview, 1996).

Finally, according to Tarrow (1994, p. 112), violence can "chill the blood of bystanders, give pause to prospective allies and cause (early enthusiasts) to defect". Tarrow also made the point that conventional forms of collective action are advantageous in that they are familiar, easy to employ and enjoy cultural resonance. Indeed for some activists, the use of militant, confrontational tactics is unattractive. Patty Mark of ALV for example, speaks for many activists when she describes the frustration of being forced into militant forms

of direct action as a consequence of official indifference to their more moderate claims:

> *What do you do? . . . You've gone to the police, you've gone to the Minister, you've gone to the RSPCA, you've done everything legally viable, and nobody does anything. Then I think I have a moral responsibility to individually go in and help those animals. And , so I'll be straight, at the same time, I don't want to do that, I don't like to do that, it's nerve-racking!* (P. Marks, interview, 1994).

Thus, some prominent social movement analysts (Doherty, Gurr, Kitschelt, Tarrow, Tilly, among others) as well as leading activists like John Bryant in the UK and Patty Mark in Australia, see violence as counterproductive as a social movement strategy. This was the view of virtually all of the 53 advocates and activists interviewed for this study; furthermore, it is the overwhelming belief of animal defenders surveyed in the USA and Australia that legal, non violent protests are both more justified and more effective than illegal, violent activities.

Survey respondents in both the United States and Australia agreed that all five legal efforts to improve the treatment of animals were virtually of equal importance and 'always justified' (see Table 6.2 below). There was also agreement that liberating animals from labs and farms, although illegal, was more justified than causing damage to property where animals were badly treated. It seems that with illegal tactics, activists see animal rescue actions involving unauthorised entry as morally justified but this does not extend to actions which damage or destroy property, and by extension, to those which might harm humans.

The results in Table 6.3 below summarise respondents' views on the effectiveness of tactics designed to improve animal welfare. As shown in this table, both American and Australian respondents agreed that liberating animals from labs and farms was more effective than damaging or destroying property where the animals were housed. As with attitudes toward the justification of illegal tactics, the results indicate that legal efforts are seen as more effective than illegal tactics in improving the treatment of animals in both countries. However, respondents in both countries agreed that peaceful demonstrations while always justified, were usually ineffective in getting their animal welfare message across.

Table 6.2. Australian and American respondents' perceptions of the justification of certain measures to improve the treatment of animals

	Australia ANZFAS (1995) *n = 437*				USA Richards (1990) *n = 853*
	Mean Score		T-test at 95% C.I.		
				Sig. (2 tailed)	
Justification of efforts	Transformed	*	*t value*	*p < .05* **	Mean Score
Justification of legal efforts					
Developing animal awareness education programs	1.02	(6.97)	*–1.531*	*0.126*	1.05
Campaigning to change the law	1.04	(6.95)	*–3.531*	*0.000*	1.10
Peaceful demonstrations	1.08	(6.90)	*–1.859*	*0.064*	1.13
Media promotions such as television	1.09	(6.90)	*–2.445*	*0.015*	1.15
Boycotting businesses involved in cruelty/filing legal suits	1.09	(6.90)	*–7.535*	*0.000*	1.31
Justification of illegal efforts					
Taking or releasing animals from research laboratories	2.41	(5.54)	*–0.058*	*0.954*	2.41
Taking or releasing animals from farms	3.09	(4.80)	*–1.206*	*0.228*	3.21
Destruction or damage to research laboratories	4.13	(3.76)	*1.793*	*0.074*	3.93
Destruction or damage to farm property	4.62	(3.25)	*–0.352*	*0.725*	4.66

Note – * For the purposes of comparative analysis with the USA Richards study, Australia (1995) sample mean scores have been transformed. Original mean scores are shown in brackets.
** If the value of $p < .05$ then the difference between the means for USA Richards (1990) and Australia (1995) is significant.

The Art of Do-It-Yourself (DIY) Direct Action

Tarrow (1994) has identified three major types of publicly mounted collective action: violence, disruption caused by non-violent direct action and conventional actions primarily via organized public demonstrations. In Table 6.1, I have labelled the strategies of disruption and convention 'interference' and 'publicity' respectively in the case of the animal movement's strategic praxis. All three forms of collective action (publicity, interference and violence) have been

Table 6.3. Australian and American respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of certain measures to improve the treatment of animals

	Australia ANZFAS (1995) *n = 437*				USA Richards (1990) *n = 853*
	Mean Score		T-test at 95% C.I.		
Effectiveness of efforts	Transformed	*	*t value*	*Sig. (2 tailed) p < .05* **	Mean Score
Effectiveness of legal efforts					
Developing animal awareness education programs	1.72	(6.28)	*1.955*	*0.051*	1.62
Media promotions such as television	1.89	(6.11)	*1.221*	*0.223*	1.82
Campaigning to change the law	2.05	(5.95)	*0.867*	*0.387*	2.00
Boycotting businesses involved in cruelty/filing legal suits	1.99	(6.01)	*–5.826*	*0.000*	2.32
Peaceful demonstrations	2.80	(5.20)	*4.639*	*0.000*	2.50
Effectiveness of illegal efforts					
Taking or releasing animals from research laboratories	3.79	(4.21)	*5.781*	*0.000*	3.27
Taking or releasing animals from farms	4.25	(3.75)	*4.407*	*0.000*	3.85
Destruction or damage to research laboratories	4.96	(3.04)	*7.279*	*0.000*	4.32
Destruction or damage to farm property	5.32	(2.68)	*5.156*	*0.000*	4.91

Note – * For the purposes of comparative analysis with the USA Richards study, Australia (1995) sample mean scores have been transformed. Original mean scores are shown in brackets.
** If the value of p < .05 then the difference between the means for USA Richards (1990) and Australia (1995) is significant.

enacted by the animal movement, although violence is a strategy only of groups outside the mainstream movement. For the supporters of Singer and Regan in the animal welfare and liberation/rights strands of the movement, the strategies of conventional lobbying and non-violent direct action are used in preference to violence (Garner 1993). Tarrow (1994) pointed out that one of the major powers of the modern social movement is its capacity to combine variousforms of collective action. Tilly (1999, p. 262) supported the idea that action repertoires are enacted "cumulatively over many simultaneous and/or repeated meetings, demonstrations, marches, petitions, statements, and other interactions with objects of claims".

Virtually every informant interviewed for this study acknowledged the importance of getting favourable publicity via the media for their different campaigns and many believed that the best way of attracting the media was by provocative, dramatic actions such as hunger strikes, animal rescue operations and other 'interference' tactics. Most of the tactics in Table 6.1 are usually deployed collectively, although some like those denoted with an asterisk, lend themselves more to individual or DIY actions. Tilly (1978) has pointed out that social movements use quite a small number of tactics considering the vast number that have been used throughout history. Thus, in a series of books on non-violent protest, Sharp (1973) described approximately 200 such activities.

How do activists choose from the available repertoire? Jasper (1997) suggested that activists exhibit 'tactical tastes', that is, they choose the tactics that match their habitus or disposition to act in a particular way. Thus trade unionists tend to go on strike, students 'sit in' and so on. Jasper (1997, p. 237) also argued that tactics express protesters' political identities and moral visions. To go on a hunger strike or to raid a battery farm says different things about personal identity. The identity of an animal activist might be as a radical vegan, an animal rescuer, a conservationist or as someone who goes on marches or writes letters to the editor. "A taste in tactics persists partly because it shapes one's sense of self" (Jasper 1997, p. 246). These 'tastes' determine whether an activist chooses a dangerous style of activism such as undercover surveillance, a more passive role as pamphleteer or someone who silently bears witness, or the more personal commitment of a hunger strike or converting to a vegetarian lifestyle.

Dalton's (1994) Ideologically Structured Action (ISA) framework predicts ~~that tactics~~ will be determined by a group's political identity. Applied to the animal movement, animal welfare groups (e.g. RSPCA) are likely to avoid unconventional actions (protest, non cooperation and interference) which might threaten their support base. Similarly, animal rights and liberation groups tend to favour these more unorthodox tactics as they resonate with their goals, identities and membership. Thus, working with government agencies or commissions would generally be viewed unfavourably by more radical animal groups and vice versa. Such groups favour more dramatic, unorthodox, non-violent tactics, for as Dalton (1994, p. 196) pointed out, "reliance on such direct-action techniques is also linked to the participatory

values of new social movements that stress methods of direct democracy". These unconventional repertoires are also favoured because they attract the attention of the media. It is therefore not surprising that most of the activities listed in columns 2–4 in Table 6.1 are natural 'media events' (Pakulski 1991, p. 42) that are attractive to journalists and reporters.

Dalton's model is based on the idea that the tactics a group chooses will be influenced by its resources, organisational characteristics, opportunity structures and ideology. Interviews with staff of animal welfarist, liberationist and rightist groups support the model. For example, welfarist groups in the UK which rely on government support for their resources were unlikely to be critical of the hunting fraternity; action-oriented animal liberation coalitions, like CADS are able to be more provocative since they derive their financial support from fund-raising. Organisational structures also influence strategies. A radical vegan group like Animal Aid in the UK has a uniquely decentralised structure that is "more likely to adopt participatory direct-action methods" (Dalton 1994, p. 199). Political opportunity structures also shape the broad strategies of social movement organisations. I argue elsewhere (Munro 2001c, pp. 208–9) how animal protectionists in Australia, the UK and the USA use different combinations of advocacy/activist strategies in conducting their campaigns. These can be summarised as follows: USA: *Advocacy* > *Activism*; UK: *Activism* > *Advocacy*; Australia: *Activism* + *Advocacy*.

Animal protectionists in the USA are primarily interested in codifying public sentiment in the law via the constitutional route of organizational advocacy. By contrast, the grassroots mobilisation of public opinion and moral capital appears to be more characteristic of English animal protectionists. Their Australian counterparts tend to prefer a hybrid style of activism/advocacy in which the building of moral capital and animal welfare improvements in legislation go hand in hand. Finally, ideological factors are an important influence on tactical decision making. These interact with opportunity structures when for example, advocacy 'in the suites' is associated with conventional lobbying while grassroots activism 'in the streets' is associated with more expressive, unorthodox tactics.

As space does not permit an analysis of each of the tactics listed above in Table 6.1, I have selected a sample (underlined in the Table) of the most commonly used and representative action repertoires (in the context of Turner and Killian's (1987) typology) in the contemporary animal movement. These

are among the most popular forms of DIY direct action in the animal movement: the demonstration, pamphleteering and bearing witiness (publicity strategies) and the hunger strike, ethical vegetarianism and undercover surveillance (interference strategies). These tactical repertoires are described below.

Publicity Strategies in Animal Protection

Publicity strategies come in a variety of forms as shown in Table 6.1. However, for reasons of space only three of these strategies are described below. These particular strategies are none-the-less among the most widely used in the animal movement.

Demonstrations

The demonstration is the most widely used protest strategy in the social movement's repertoire. Demonstrations have become institutionalised and constitute "the classical modular form of collective action" (Tarrow 1994, p. 107). While Melucci implied demonstrations require a minimum of organisation, organisers themselves claim otherwise (Mondros & Wilson 1994, pp. 165–66).

Tarrow (1994, p. 100) noted demonstrations can be used to express the existence of a group or its solidarity with another group or to celebrate a victory or mourn the passage of a leader. Yet for many animal movement leaders, the demonstration is seen as a risky venture. John Bryant, the co-chair of LACS for example, cautions against its use as it can prove to be counterproductive: *If the demonstration turns violent, and somebody puts a brick through a window, then it becomes a tactical disaster* (interview, 1996). Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) experienced this when one of its peaceful ~~demonstrat~~ions was hijacked by extremists who smashed the window of a lorry carrying live animals for overseas export. The media ignored the animal welfare issue behind the demonstration and focussed on 'the brick through a window' story, which featured pictures of men in balaclavas smashing the window of a lorry (Erlichman 1995). Yet demonstrations remain the quintessential form of protest for social movement activists who as individuals or as members of collectivities can enact the several kinds of demonstrations listed in Table 6.1 under protest strategies. These include a large number of options ranging from the collective actions of parades, marches, rallies etc. to the DIY activism of renouncing honours.

Pamphleteering

John Bryant advocates social change via leafleting and noted in his *Fettered Kingdoms* that the great strength of the animal rights movement lies with the supporters who hand out leaflets every week: "The leaflet is our media. In nearly twenty years in animal welfare and rights I have rarely found a campaigner who did not join the movement after being handed a leaflet – usually in the street" (Bryant 1982, p. 88).

Time and again in this study, when I asked what it was that got informants started in the movement, the response was that it came in the form of a leaflet, advertisement or an arresting image. Tarrow (1998, p. 45) claimed that it was in the form of the pamphlet that the democratic implications of print first became known. The leaflet is therefore one of the oldest tactics in the social movement's repertoire. For many activists like John Bryant, it is *the* media of the animal movement. The political potency of the leaflet can be gauged by its impact in the McLibel episode when vegetarian, animal rights activists distributed a short critique of McDonald's in the form of a leaflet which subsequently led to the widely publicized libel trial in London's High Court in 1996. A close relative of pamphleteering is the act of bearing witness.

Bearing witness

Della Porta and Diani (1999, p. 178) described the logic of bearing witness as a social movement's attempt "to demonstrate a strong commitment to an objective deemed vital for humanity's future". They emphasised the importance of the force of commitment in this form of action, which is typically characterised by activists willing to run personal risks to demonstrate their convictions, rather than to achieve their objectives or win a particular issue. Doherty et al. (2000, pp. 1–2) suggested that bearing witness is meant to demonstrate the moral superiority of the protesters' position as well as to indicate, that despite the activists' lack of power, their adversary must be opposed. By bearing witness in vigils, symbolic hunger strikes, mock funeral marches, demonstrations and the like, protesters seek to change individual consciousness by demonstrating the commitment of just 'being there'. When Patty Mark and a handful of supporters conducted a peaceful vigil outside the Department of Agriculture in Melbourne to protest against battery hen cages, few people noticed the silent protest on that cold winter's day in 1994.

Nor did the media find anything of interest to report in an action that lacked the ingredients of news worthiness, which Rochon (1990, p. 108) identified by the movement's size, novelty and its level of militancy. Nonetheless, the activists insisted that they had to do something about the plight of battery hens; being there outside the government department with their banners and hen paraphernalia was important to them if not to the mass media. Bearing witness is therefore concerned with demonstrating commitment to the cause, rather than flexing the movement's muscle or winning an issue. Elshtain (1981, p. xii) captured the meaning of bearing witness for activists like the animal protectors in this study when she wrote: "One who bears witness voices the discontents of society's silenced, ignored, abused, or invisible members. The witness proffers reasons for that suffering in order that the silenced may find a voice, cry out for justice, demand to be seen".

Interference Strategies in Animal Protection

In the above section I have outlined three of the liberal governance strategies associated with getting publicity for the movement via persuasive communication; in this section, the critical governance strategies of hunger strikes (bargaining strategy), ethical vegetarianism (facilitation strategy) and undercover surveillance (coercion strategy) will be discussed. Each of these repertoires is a further example of DIY activism that has the potential to subvert, if not disrupt the status quo. According to Tarrow (1994, p. 108) in its contemporary form, disruptive tactics have three main purposes; first, disruption concretely expresses a movement's determination (e.g. sit-ins); second, it obstructs the routine activities of opponents, bystanders and authorities (e.g. blockades); and third, disruption broadens the field of conflict by posing a risk to law and order and drawing the state into the conflict (e.g. Brightlingsea Against Animal Exports' (BALE) street demonstrations discussed below). Yet despite frequent reference in the literature to direct action, the animal movement, like the environmental movement, tends to avoid direct action in the strong sense of forced entry, occupations and the like (Tilly 1999, p. 267).

Unlike conventional publicity strategies, interference strategies in the animal movement are characterized by direct action and more militant forms of activism. Table 6.1 lists several such strategies, but only three of the more representative interventionist actions are described below.

Hunger strikes

English ports used in the live sheep export trade in the mid 1990s became the scene for some of the biggest demonstrations seen in the UK since the miners' strike a decade earlier. The new year in 1995 began with British newspapers trumpeting a moral panic with headlines about 'animal rights siege', 'single issue hooligans' and 'bunny-huggers do battle'. An editorial in *The Times*, headed "Cuddly Terrorism", described the animal liberation protesters as "on a par with the IRA" (*The Times*, 8 February, 1995), a claim that was often repeated in the media during the mass protests that year. To be sure, the occasional animal welfare theme also featured in the mainstream press although the law and order story was the predominant frame for most of the time. Under these conditions, the idea of a hunger strike was certain to invite further derision, or indifference, from a cynical mass media. However, one regional newspaper at least seemed to have a grudging respect for the willingness of the activists to bear witness. In the lead up to the hunger strike in London, the *Cambridge Evening News* (22 July, 1996) wrote:

> The usual Cambridge cranks will be among the loonies in a hunger strike next week . . . True, history will eventually recognise these cranks and loonies as heroes in the long struggle against cruelty to exported farm animals. History will see their dotty little gesture outside the Ministry of Agriculture as one of the few significant steps towards real civilisation in an otherwise benighted age.

Activists from Animal Rights Cambridge proudly displayed this clipping on their noticeboard at their regular meetings and at BALE's post-mortem of the hunger strike I attended in the Brightlingsea community hall. With this 'dotty little gesture', the hunger strikers hoped to shame authorities into bargaining over, if not banning, the animal export trade.

The campaign against live exports in England was primarily motivated by anger over the cruelty involved in transporting animals long distances by road and sea. It was an animal welfare protest, not a strict animal rights campaign in which the rights of animals not to be slaughtered for food was prominent. While most of the leaders of the grassroots groups like BALE and the more structured advocacy organisations such as CIWF were vegetarians or vegans, most of the rank-and-file protesters were not. Indeed, a large placard hanging from a Colchester pub explained: "You Don't Have To Stop

Eating Meat To Care – Ban Live Exports". Even so, inside the animal movement, the distinction is made between those who eat meat and those who do not. While meat avoidance is not a high priority for just over half of the movement's supporters in ASIS (Munro, 1995a), it is seen by many inside the movement as the measure of one's commitment to the cause of animals. Vegetarianism, as the quintessential form of DIY activism, is discussed in the next section.

Ethical vegetarianism

According to Mary Douglas (2000) the contemporary vegetarian movement is driven by compassion for animal suffering. Indeed, a popular animal rights maxim is "Don't eat anything with a face". Most of the vegetarians in this study were motivated by a number of factors, although the most important was their opposition to cruelty involved in the production of meat. For example, FARM in the United States seeks to promote vegetarianism in a climate in which the American media have not been sympathetic to animal rights and anti-cruelty issues for most of the twentieth century (Jones 1996). The activists at FARM have used innovative strategies and tactics to publicise a health education message that the US press finds difficult to ignore. When FARM began its animal advocacy in 1976 it was called the Vegetarian Information Service; five years later it focused more on cruelty issues associated with factory farming. FARM's most prominent campaign, "The Great American Meatout", tends to downplay the cruelty issues in preference to the positive message of a vegetarian lifestyle. Jones (1996) believes that this, along with FARM's potential as an ally of environmental groups, explains its recent success in the media. For example, it has been very effective in the strategy of 'mobilising information' (Lemert 1984) whereby its issues and campaigns are advertised free of charge in the mass media.

Its campaigns give activists hands-on, practical ways to get FARM's message across. World Farm Animals' Day (WFAD) (on Gandhi's birthday, October 2) is promoted as a non-violent educational event. In the WFAD campaign, bearing witness, by the observance of this tradition, appears to be more important than getting media attention, although a media kit is available to activists who want to issue press releases and the like.

Similarly, a kindred organisation in Australia, Mountain Residents for Animal Rights (MRAR) has used unconventional, eccentric and exhibitionist tactics to attract the media's attention. Like FARM's success in the national

media, MRAR have been successful in 'mobilising information' in the local media. They have achieved this by dramatic, ecofriendly tactics and messages that appeal to the media as well as animal protectors, environmentalists and vegetarians. Unlike FARM's strident 'Meat or Murder' rhetoric, MRAR has adopted a 'Transforming McDonald's' campaign in which the fast food giant has been asked (unsuccessfully) to convert to a vegetarian diet. MRAR used street theatre and 'the world's biggest vegie burger' to promote its campaign to transform McDonald's; a 'non-sexist, eco-friendly clown' in the form of Regie McVegie was created as an alternative to Ronald McDonald. While the campaign did not achieve the publicity of the McLibel trial in the UK, it did for a brief time put vegetarianism on the public agenda in the Sydney-Blue Mountains area.[2]

These animal SMOs have in their different ways utilised various media to promote the cause of farm animals by using the positive message of a vegetarian lifestyle. For many animal activists, the ultimate boycott is to live a vegan or vegetarian lifestyle. In Singer's view, vegetarianism is a prerequisite to effective animal activism for "the moral obligation to boycott the meat available in butchers' shops and supermarkets today is . . . inescapable" (Singer 1992b, p. 174). There is however much ambivalence in the animal movement associated with ethical vegetarianism as revealed in ASIS (Munro 1995). Nonetheless, many people inside the movement would agree with Adams (1990) that meat eating is the most extensive and institutionalised form of violence against animals. FARM's Scott Williams (interview, 1996) for example, pointed out: *if you can eat them, what can't you justify*?

One of the factors identified in ASIS (Munro 1995) which distinguished animal rights activists from advocates and supporters of animal welfare was the respondents' dietary habits. As expected, only a small percentage of activists were meat eaters. At the other dietary extreme, vegans were much more prolific among activists (32 per cent) than among either advocates (12 per cent) or supporters (3 per cent). Respondents with weaker attachments to the animal movement were much more likely to eat meat; supporters were

[2] Towards the end of 2003 McDonald's introduced a vegie burger to their range in Australia. The publicity campaign featured a young man with dreadlocks (no doubt to appeal to alternative youth groups) and expounded the virtues of 'vegie' burgers and low fat salads, apparently directed more at the health conscious than the animal movement.

four times more likely than activists to be meat eaters while the percentage of meat-eating advocates was double the percentage for activists.

The conclusion we can draw from these data is that the more active members (according to their self-designation as activist, advocate or supporter) practise meat avoidance. Thus the habit of meat avoidance is for many animal protectionists the single most important thing an individual can do for animals. For many activists, animal rights and vegetarianism are different sides of the same coin. Committed animal rights activists believe that eating meat devalues the movement's philosophy that animals should be left alone. For them, the avoidance of meat is the most basic prerequisite to movement commitment and credibility even if this involves personal sacrifice. 'Sherry', for example, admitted to missing meat:

> *I used to love the taste of meat, and I do miss it. Every now and then my mouth will water when I think of it, but then I look at the animals and I think, well basically every type of meat you've got, I used to own as a pet at one stage or another and I just can't do it* (interview, 1994).

Vegetarianism, whether motivated by gustatory, health, environmental or animal welfare concerns, is a profoundly radical tactic for a social movement to practice, since it disrupts and challenges one of society's predominant constructions of animals as meat to be eaten. It is also a tactic that individuals adopt to demonstrate their commitment to the animal rights cause, "to attest personally to the sincerity of our concern for non-human animals" (Singer 1975, p. 175). Seen in this way, it is the quintessential form of DIY activism. And inside the animal movement one can sometimes detect a hierarchy of credibility in the gradations of virtue attributed to carnivores, semi-vegetarians, vegetarians, vegans and fruitarians.

Vogel (1996, p. 153) claimed that the leading contemporary social theorist Juergen Habermas sees vegetarianism as an irrational taboo. Elias's analysis of increasing thresholds of repugnance towards meat eating when one is reminded of the animal origins of the meat dish, suggests that he is less derogatory than Habermas of vegetarians whose dietary behaviour he describes in these terms: ". . . from more or less rationally disguised feelings of disgust [vegetarians] refuse to eat meat altogether. But these are forward thrusts in the threshold of repugnance that go beyond the standard of civilized society in the twentieth century, and are therefore considered abnormal" (Elias 1978,

p. 120). Elias's theory would seem to predict that there is a trend towards "the civilizing of the appetite" (Mennell 1991) and that consequently vegetarianism is the long-term dietary future of humanity. And while a vegetarian lifestyle is inherently subversive of dominant eating norms, it is less dramatic as an interference strategy than covert direct action in the form of undercover surveillance.

Undercover surveillance

While vegetarianism involves increasing numbers of people in what is a mild form of direct action in the private sphere, undercover surveillance is a more assertive form of DIY activism which is typically enacted by one or two committed individuals. Undercover surveillance is one of the oldest tactics in the animal movement's repertoire.

In the case of the LACS, undercover surveillance is a philosophy which successfully combines the grassroots activities of activists equipped with cameras and the political skills of the organisational advocates who spend their time drafting animal welfare legislation. Thus, Mike Huskisson's ACIG has formed an alliance with LACS so as to engage in lawful, covert operations designed to break the back of the hunting fraternity. Huskisson's grassroots, anti-cruelty surveillance work with the League is a good example of effective advocacy/activist cooperation in animal protection. The ACIG was founded by Huskisson, a former hunt saboteur, who now works alongside John Bryant to expose animal cruelty, lawfully and by non-violent means. The ACIG provides detailed tips to its 1 700 supporters throughout the country on undercover surveillance in which people are encouraged to video violations of the Animal Welfare Act and expose the cruelty of hunting.

Huskisson is a legend in the UK animal movement for his undercover work in the Feldberg case (McDonald 1994). He maintains that video activism is more effective in reforming animal abusers than violent and illegal activities which, he says, *led to people like myself and others ending up in prison because there wasn't any other outlet* (interview, 1996). The direct actions listed in Table 6.1 are preferred by 'caring sleuths' like Huskisson because they are legal, non-violent forms of direct action and are more effective than mere publicity stunts. Melucci defined direct action as

> . . . a form of resistance or collective intervention which possesses a minimum of organisation; which breaks the rules of the political game and/or the norms of the organisation without, however, undermining the foundations of the system of domination; which does not involve the deliberate use of violence; and which seeks to change the rules of the political game and/or to intervene in the political system (1996, p. 378).

The most famous case of undercover surveillance in the animal movement's history was the exposé of animal experimenter Edward Taub by Alex Pacheco in Silver Spring in 1981. The police raid on the Institute of Behavioral Research was televised thus giving maximum publicity to the animal movement. This episode – which involved exposing experiments on surgically crippled monkeys – is one of the most well documented in the movement's history (see Orlans 1993, pp. 176–79; Fraser 1993; Blum 1994, Ch. 5; Rudacille 2001).

The English equivalent to the Silver Spring's episode was initiated by the ACIG undercover operation in 1990, when its founder Mike Huskisson and another animal rights activist, Melody McDonald gained access to the laboratories of Professor Wilhelm Feldberg and for a period of five months videoed the 89-year-old researcher at work. The tapes, which ran to over 30 hours, revealed breaches of the 1986 Act concerning animal experimentation. A subsequent governmental inquiry confirmed that apart from failing to properly anaesthetise experimental animals, Feldberg had broken the law by continuing with experiments he had been told to terminate. Once the video-taped evidence was made public, Feldberg's experiments were ended within 24 hours by the Home Office.

From the perspective of vivisectors, the exposé would no doubt be seen as an unethical deception since Huskisson and his accomplice had posed as researcher and biographer respectively, thus duping Feldberg into believing they had no ulterior motives. Undercover surveillance raises some interesting moral questions for a movement that promotes the ethical treatment of animals. Is it ethical to use deception to gain access to an organisation for the purpose of exposing wrongdoing in that organisation? Most animal activists believe they are morally obliged to do whatever they can within the law to save animals' lives. In the Feldberg case, activists would claim the deception involved was justified given the apparent laxity of government controls over scientists like Feldberg. Deception was necessary if the activists were to expose what they saw as the greater evil of cruelty to animals perpetrated by scientists

funded by taxpayers, most of whom would object to the research if they knew the facts. Huskisson claims the ACIG had the public's support for what they did and argues that undercover surveillance is lawful, justified and non-violent as opposed to more extreme forms of animal rights activism, which he condemns:

> *We secured the film and within a day of showing it to the Home Office that experiment was ended. The man's licence to experiment was taken away; the Medical Research Council had an investigation and if he'd been a younger man he'd have been prosecuted. That ended that experiment dead. Now we did that and we had public support and there was anger directed against the laboratory. If someone had parked a vehicle outside and blown the place to smithereens it would have been the same result but the public would have said "How could they do that? That's an outrage, there's that man doing his work, his lifetime work to end suffering to humans and these cowardly scum come out of the dark and they destroy a laboratory." Same effect, but public anger would have been rightly directed against our side, so we have to use our brains to get in amongst the opponents and put an end to it lawfully. That's what we do* (M. Huskisson, interview, 1996).

Like the Silver Spring case, the Feldberg exposé has become one of the most celebrated in the movement. Huskisson uses it to promote the virtues of undercover surveillance. He advises young people attracted to animal protection to *get a video camera, get yourself a job in a research place, get yourself a job in a hunt kennels, go out there and get the film and you're not breaking the law, but you're breaking the back of the opponents* (interview, 1996).

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on how the animal rights movement strategises its various campaigns. It does this via the non-violent strategies of publicity and interference in campaigns to save animals' lives. Only a small number of publicity strategies (demonstrations, bearing witness and pamphleteering) and interference strategies (hunger strikes, ethical vegetarianism and undercover surveillance) were described in this chapter. They were chosen because they are among the most common in the animal movement; moreover, they are newsworthy (e.g. demonstrations) and appeal also to DIY activists ranging from the moderate (e.g. pamphleteering) to the more radical (e.g. ethical

vegetarianism, hunger strikes and undercover surveillance). These tactics are also representative of Turner and Killian's (1987) typology of tactical mechanisms deployed by social movements: persuasion (pamphleteering, bearing witness, demonstrations), bargaining (hunger strikes), facilitation (ethical vegetarianism) and coercion (undercover surveillance). These tactical repertoires can be enacted by individuals or collectively in various campaigns. Furthermore, they resonate with Turner and Killian's claim that social movement activists choose tactics that are familiar, available and likely to guarantee a (positive) response from their targets. Various theorists have argued that non violence is the most effective mobilization strategy in Western democracies for social movements to adopt (Doherty, Gurr, Kitschelt, Tarrow, Tilly). For mainstream animal activists, too, violence is seen as counterproductive to the movement's goal in promoting the compassionate treatment of non-human animals. Thus the animal movement's philosophy of non-violence as advocated by movement leaders such as Singer and Regan is largely endorsed by rank-and-file members.

While compassion, as the opposite of cruelty remains the dominant motif of the movement, *passion* for the cause of animals is the emotional glue that holds the movement together. In the next chapter, we will see how various emotions function as mobilizing appeals for new supporters as well as resources for energizing veteran activists. As foreshadowed above, the role of various media in the movement is given more prominence in the next chapter.

Chapter Seven

Mobilising Emotions: Affective Work in Animal Protection

> *Philosophy can lead the mind to water but only emotion can make it drink.* (Tom Regan, animal rights philosopher)
>
> *Animals are not affected by how we feel but what we do.* (John Webster, professor of animal husbandry)

This chapter addresses the third framing task of social movements identified by Wilson (1973) and Snow and Benford (1988) as the motivational frame or how the social movement attempts to mobilise people to take action on behalf of its cause. Motivational framing is an "elaboration of a call to arms or *rationale for action* that goes beyond the diagnosis and the prognosis" (Snow & Benford 1988, p. 202). It will be argued that much of the appeal of the animal protection movement, from its beginnings in the nineteenth century up to the present century, comes from the movement's ability to utilise the moral potency of opposition to cruelty in its various campaigns.

Affective work in animal protection, as discussed in Chapter 4, is concerned with caring for and about animals. In the present chapter, the focus is on affective work that is concerned with building support for the movement. It will be argued that this is achieved by the management of appropriate emotions

within the movement and the building of a movement identity in the sense of a 'we' feeling, as well as emotion mobilisation among prospective supporters outside the movement. As Somerville points out, social movement members 'have a greater emotional commitment to the movement through which they derive an experiential belonging and common sense of identity' (1997, p. 674). This is one of the key elements in Melucci's (1989) analysis of new social movements, namely the emotional commitments that enable social movement participants to construct a 'we' feeling or a collective identity. Social movement scholars, who tend to privilege cognitive components of motivational framing, often neglect emotions that create affective bonds. More significantly, however, as Jasper suggested (1998, p. 420), most social scientists have a tendency to denigrate emotions as the opposite of rationality. Yet, as Jasper (1998, p. 413) pointed out, emotions may be the key to social movement participation: 'I accept a friend's invitation to a rally because I like her, not because I agree with her. It is affective ties that preserve the networks and give them much of the causal impact they have'. This seems to be the case for most new social movements. Emotion and identity are close companions in such movements. Eyerman and Jamieson's comments seem especially pertinent to the animal movement:

> *All social movements, by definition, bring about some kind of identity transformation. On one level, they do this by setting new kinds of problems for societies to solve, by putting new ideas on the historical agenda. On another level, they do this by proposing new cosmologies or 'values' which enter into the ethical identities of individuals* (Eyerman & Jameison 1991, p. 166).

In this chapter, the role of the media in a number of animal rights campaigns is analysed. A New Social Movement like the animal movement is highly dependent on the mass media:

> It constitutes a mass spectacle in which appeals combine with symbols and icons, where images rather than discursive statements determine outcomes, where captivating drama may be more effective and more important than systematic analysis, and where anxiety may overshadow calculation as a spur to collective action (Crooke, Pakluski & Waters 1992, p. 148).

These elements of mass spectacle, the use of symbols, icons, images, drama and even anxiety are features of the social movement organisations profiled in this chapter. The chapter begins by noting the ambivalence of movement

insiders to the media despite their heavy dependence on journalists and reporters for promoting the issues and campaigns that constitute their cause. The chapter profiles two social movement organisations and the politics that inform their relationships with the electronic media. In the first case study, the *ad hoc* group BALE was the subject of a media blitz in England in which the group's animal welfare concerns were almost entirely overshadowed by the media's law and order frame. The activists were compelled to produce their own version of what their protest stood for so as to counter the media's dominant frame. In the second case study, the Coalition Against Duck Shooting (CADS) has succeeded in managing the media in a way which is advantageous to their campaign. The director of CADS, Laurie Levy, was formerly a TV cameraperson and is adept in using the media to promote the cause of endangered wildlife.

Frame Alignment in Animal Protection Campaigns

Buechler (2000, p. 41) suggested that a social movement's frame is successful when it translates vaguely felt dissatisfactions into well-defined grievances that prod people to do something about the grievances. Frame alignment is the means by which this is achieved.

According to Snow and Benford (1988) the success of the motivational frame depends on how well they function as 'prods to action'. Consensus mobilization, they pointed out, does not of itself lead to action mobilization, individual or collective; 'it follows that frame alignment is a necessary condition for movement participation' (Snow et al. 1986, p. 464). The term frame alignment matches the frames of individuals and movements in such a way as to ensure that 'individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary' (1986, p. 464). Snow et al. identified four dimensions in the frame alignment process, which in roughly ascending order of difficulty for issue entrepreneurs, are: frame bridging, frame extension, frame amplification and frame transformation. Rochon (1998) has simplified these processes by designatinag bridging, amplification and extension as value connection, and using frame transformation in the sense of either value creation or value conversion. Each of these dimensions, individually and in combination, has been used in the various campaigns by the animal groups described in this and the previous chapter.

Frame bridging refers to 'the linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem' (Snow et al. 1986, p. 467). In attempting to achieve its goals of 'saving animals' lives, saving finite resources, and promoting a more gentle way of living' (Elliott 1992, p. 15), MRAR has sought to bridge various issues including animal rights, environmentalism and vegetarianism. Most activists would see these issues as structurally unconnected but congruent ideologically. Activists in MRAR use the concept of 'eco-friendly eating' to bridge these otherwise distinct issues in their Transforming McDonald's Campaign.

Frame amplification is concerned with 'the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue. . . .' (Snow et al. 1986, p. 469), such as when values or beliefs are amplified in mobilization appeals. Values like peace, a clean environment, indigenous land rights and kindness to animals were all used to invigorate MRAR's campaign to save the local neighbourhood from encroachment by McDonald's in the Blue Mountains west of Sydney. Saving the pristine environment from the developers represented a revitalization of the conservation ethic that for many residents is synonymous with the Blue Mountains.

Snow et al. (1986) identified several kinds of belief amplification in the social movement literature: first, beliefs about the seriousness of the problem such as when animal rights activists claim that 'meat is murder'; in the aftermath of the BSE crisis activists were in a position to amplify the meaning of the slogan from its original animal referent to include humans. Second, beliefs about who or what is to blame for a particular grievance corresponds to a movement's prognostic frame; in the meat example, for instance, animal rights activists blame the profit driven practices of factory farming for the increasing dangers agribusiness poses for human and animal health. Third, stereotypical beliefs about the movement's antagonists abound over issues involving matters of life and death (see Vanderford 1989); both sides of the animal rights controversy have used stereotypical labels to denounce their opponents; in the English protests against live animal exports, the rhetoric of vilification that characterised the vivisection debate in the nineteenth century, was resuscitated to castigate the protesters as 'crazed spinsters' and the like. Fourth, movement leaders frequently amplify beliefs about the efficacy of action and the possibility of change in order to sustain membership commitment; in the live animal export protest, for example, when the 'Save

Our Sheep' hunger strike attracted little interest from authorities, the strikers' post-mortem embellished the event with stories of solidarity and individuals' courage and commitment. The belief in the efficacy of protest is tied to the fifth kind of belief amplification in which activists emphasize the importance of 'standing up' for the cause; the importance of 'bearing witness' was frequently cited by activists I met during protests in England and Australia. Sometimes the idea was expressed by people with Quaker connections, but more typically it was an idea that appeared to be inspired by the moral imperative of 'doing something' or 'being counted'.

Frame extension occurs when 'the movement is attempting to enlarge its adherent pool by portraying its objectives or activities as attending to or being congruent with the values or interests of potential adherents' (Snow et al. 1986, p. 472). Thus Kunkel (1995) used the term 'rationale expansion' to describe how FARM expanded its anti-cruelty frame to include health and environmental frames when it found that these resonated more effectively with its targeted audience.

Frame transformation suggests that 'new values may have to be planted and nurtured, old meanings or understandings jettisoned, and erroneous beliefs or "misframings" reframed' (Snow et al. 1986, p. 473). This form of alignment occurs at two levels, which Snow et al. (1986, p. 474) referred to as domain-specific and global interpretive frames. Domain-specific changes refer to 'fairly self-contained but substantial changes in the way a particular domain of life is framed, such that a domain previously taken for granted is reframed as problematic and in need of repair'. Converting to a vegetarian diet was for many of the activists in the present study the most common experience of this kind of lifestyle change. Because dietary habits are specific to just one part, albeit an important part of people's private lives, they are relatively easy to change compared to the more profound transformations required of people when global interpretive frames are involved. Conversion here is much more fundamental since the change affects the individual's entire being. In some cases, every domain of the person's life ranging from interpersonal relationships to attitudes towards globalisation is realigned to fit the movement's ideology. This occurred for many BALE activists who had been radicalised by their experiences in the campaign. I spoke to several ordinary protesters who claimed that their lives had been dramatically transformed during the yearlong protests against live exports. Interestingly, many had not converted to

vegetarianism but rather saw the transformation in terms of a shift in status and role from housewife or retiree to social activist. For many of these protesters, it was not animal welfare concerns that drove the transformation, but rather the experience of protest itself, specifically, the experience of police brutality and the State's authoritarianism. For others, like 'Milly', the experience of protest has meant that – *I feel more positive about life (and) it's actually quite liberating in a personal sense as well* (interview, 1996).

This matter-of-fact statement hides what is really a dramatic and life-changing transformation for many ordinary people whose lives were changed by the experience of the live animal protests. Activists spoke of the animal export protests as a seminal event in their lives; one informant compared it to his involvement in World War II, such was the intensity of the experience for him (field notes, Brightlingsea, 1996). McAdam's study of the impact of activism on activists' lives reinforces the transformative experiences of activists in the present study. McAdam's (1999, p. 121) review of the most important studies of the impact of movement participation on biographies indicates that the experience of sustained and intense activism has a powerful and enduring effect on the later lives of activists. This review also revealed gross discrepancies between the reality of activists' lives and their representation in the mass media. In the next section, the views of movement insiders on the role of the media in their campaigns are briefly discussed.

The media must "shock mesmerise and entice" (Andrew Tyler, interview, 1996)

Virtually every activist in this study recognised the importance of having the media on side, and in getting journalists to take their message seriously. And that message is that the animal movement is *an overwhelmingly peaceful and compassionate movement*, in the words of Andrew Tyler of Animal Aid (interview, 1996). Yet this is not how the public see the movement as portrayed in the mass media. Kew's (1999) dissertation on animal liberation contains two long chapters on the role of the media in the UK from 1994–1996 and concludes that the quality media were overwhelmingly hostile to the movement. As head of the English activist group, Tyler is therefore wary of dealing with the mass media: *I think you have to try to make the agenda but also follow the agenda set by the media and the public, and the public and the media are capricious, they stampede in all sorts of directions* (Andrew Tyler, interview 1996). Tyler's

ambivalence, and Kew's findings, are supported by several theorists who warn social activists of the dangers of relying too much on the media (Rootes 1984; Herman & Chomsky 1988; Gamson 1992b; Tarrow 1994; Smith, McCarthy, McPhail & Augustyn 2001). In this last mentioned reference, Smith et al. (2001, p. 1398) pointed out that even when a social movement succeeds in attracting the media's attention, the coverage typically neutralises or undermines the movement's agenda.

Some animal protection SMOs like the ACIG have set up their own media production units as a more reliable means for getting their message across to the public. Virtually every animal protection SMO of any significance in the USA, the UK and Australia use their own in-house media to mobilise moral and financial resources for their campaigns against vivisection, intensive farming and hunting. The tactics range from undercover exposés of cruelty to the publication of 'soft' (anthropomorphic) and 'hard' (atrocity stories) images of animals in SMO brochures and magazines.

Yet activists know that they need the media more than the media need them. As one Australian animal liberationist put it: *We can reach our members, but we can't reach the public as a whole without media support* ('Gayle', interview, 1996). Jim Roberts, the president of Animal Liberation Victoria, was adamant that the movement could not survive without favourable media coverage:

> [The media is] *crucial, it's crucial. Again, we – I as an individual don't like the mass media and it's general advertising message, but I do think that people are so locked into what message it is conveying that it's fatal for us not to try and embrace the media, particularly the television, and it will be the way we achieve change in the future. You know, it's purely by the number of people we get the message on to, and because it's such a persuasive medium* (Roberts, interview, 1996).

It is for this reason that animal activists and organisations seek to establish a good working relationship with media personnel. Effective media publicity is important to the success of new social movements seeking to change people's values, and even more so for a movement which challenges the deeply entrenched habits of speciesism. According to Sabloff (2000), most of the animal movement's tactics take into account their reception by the media, especially television. Virtually all the tactics listed in Table 6.1 in the previous chapter: demonstrations, mock funerals, picketing, street theatre, boycotts, sit-ins and so on, depend for their ultimate success on favourable coverage

in the mass media. Most of the tactics in Table 6.1 have been used by the animal protection groups described in the remainder of the chapter. These organisations each had a different relationship with the media which influenced the way their campaigns were represented.

Referring to the experience of environmental SMOs, Barry (1999) makes a distinction between institutionalised organisations and grassroots direct action groups. The former, he argued, 'have highly developed networks of contacts with the mass media and the institutions of political administration. In this way they can operate to effect changes in policy in a manner unavailable to those engaged in direct action' (Barry 1999, p. 87). In the case of CADS (which is discussed below) the group is structured to incorporate both an advocacy and an activist dimension; moreover, the experience of the Coalition's leader as a TV cameraperson gives the group an insider's understanding of how to appeal to the media. In the next section, we see how SMOs in the animal movement use the media to *shock and mesmerise and entice,* and in the words of Animal Aid's Andrew Tyler, *to tell powerful stories about the suffering of animals, and what animals really are when they are not molested and confined* (interview, 1996).

Emotional Appeals and Moral Shocks

Jasper and Poulsen (1995) argued that more than any other factor, 'moral shocks' are responsible for the recruitment of strangers to the animal movement because animals have extraordinary potential as condensing symbols. By this they meant 'visual and verbal images that neatly capture – both cognitively and emotionally – a range of meanings and convey a frame, a master frame or theme' (1995, p. 498). These animal images are as important to movement insiders as they are to the recruitment of strangers for they reinforce and build movement solidarity. For example, a particular image or condensing symbol was found to resonate with one sample of animal liberators who saw the animal as victim as 'a symbol of both humanity and nature besieged [in the] vivisection of our planet' (Sperling 1988, p. 39). It is this kind of image of the animal and the planet as victim, which both shocks people and prods them into action.

For Tamara Hamilton of HSUS, it is emotion that motivates her commitment to the animal movement:

> *. . . the use of animals in laboratories for me is very near and dear to my heart . . . . Certainly emotions are an important part of it, because – we have our hearts involved. You need to keep your heart in something I think to be effective and if it's something that you believe in you'll be more effective* (interview, 1996).

Time and again in this study, it was *a reflective, emotional response* to animal suffering (to use a phrase by Wayne Pacelle of HSUS) which drove people to support the animal cause. Because the meanings of animals are socially constructed, people respond differently to various animals. Tamara Hamilton, for example, explained how she had been drawn into animal protection work when she saw a pamphlet that discussed the use of rabbits in animal research. She was immediately sympathetic to the plight of rabbits in labs because she had a pet rabbit called Edison and *if it would hurt Edison* [she thought], *it would certainly hurt the other rabbits too.* However, it would be rare to find this kind of sentiment for rabbits in Australia, where the animal is widely perceived as a pest. Animals therefore invoke different feelings in people depending on the cultural context. Thus dogs are privileged in Western countries as companion animals while in Korea they are eaten as a delicacy.

Animals are socially constructed to suit the cultural context when for example they are 'advertised' in scientific journals by animal breeders to appeal to experimental researchers. Arluke's (1994) study of approximately 90 advertisements in two leading biomedical journals revealed that in these publications the lab animal is constructed as a 'fantastic' animal that is both object-like and human-like. There were three main types of representation: the animal as 'classy chemicals' (a kind of pure breed), 'consumer goods' (designer animals or taylor-made) and 'team players' (cooperative animals 'on the side' of researchers).

Similarly, Kruse (c. 1996) has shown how animals are portrayed both as 'heroes' and 'victims' by animal rights supporters and their opponents. Kruse described five images of animals, both human and non-human, which are used in the campaigns of protagonists in the animal experimentation debate. He showed how image 'keying' allows new meanings to be attached to particular images. For example, a picture of a rat carries the caption 'a cure for cancer' which changes the meaning of the rat as animal to that of a research tool responsible for medical advances and improvements in human health. In the second illustration, the image of a severely restrained, 'crucified' monkey suggests the animal liberationists' immorality frame of the animal as victim.

What emotions are such images meant to evoke? Representations of the animal as hero or victim evoke such emotions as pride, enthusiasm, hope (hero) and anger, grief, hostility, shame, suspicion (victim). Jasper (1997) has identified a number of emotions that he argues are potentially related to protests over issues like animal rights. These are listed in Table 7.1 below; a representative sample of these emotions is contained in the following excerpts from interview transcripts:

Andrew Tyler (Animal Aid) on depression, anger and rage:

> *One of the issues I brought up which is neglected is the tremendous toll this thing (cruelty) plays upon our physical and emotional health; people suffer, people get to build up anger and massive depression, they turn it in on themselves, they turn it on their families, they turn it on the groups which is why we've got so much, one of the reasons we have so many splits and feuds within the groups is displaced anger and rage. And we have to find a way – if we want this movement to be healthy – of discharging that anger and depression etc; and supporting each other, 'cause as I say it's not just a question of having to cope with these extraordinary scenes of violence and exploitation that we physically see and read about, but it's the fact that it's denied and that we are mocked , we are called extremists and mad people* (interview, 1996).

Roger on emotional outpourings such as rage, grief, loss and sorrow:

> *It's an amazing sight on that duck campaign when a rescuer picks up their first bird and that result, whether it's dead or alive, it has an effect. The effects may be different if that duck is dead. You see rage, you see horror, you see emotions pouring, crying over this one shot bird. There could be another 10,000 laying in the water around on a big lake, but it's that one bird that that person has* (interview, 1994).

Jenny Talbot (Project Jonah) on hatred and suspicion:

> *I have to work very hard at compassion, to try and think love, because I regard humans as the most vicious and evil force that's ever walked the face of the planet, and I suspect a lot of animal people and conservation people would feel the same way. Just look around you and it's destruction, destruction* (interview, 1996).

In this last excerpt, the tension between love and hatred is very clear. The common emotion in the above excerpts, and the negative emotion which largely drives the animal activists in this study, is anger. The problem for many activists, as explained by Andrew Tyler, is to find a way of *discharging*

that anger and depression. This is one of the most important features of the affective, social problems work of activists who 'work hard to create moral outrage and anger and to provide a target against which these can be vented' (Jasper 1998, p. 409).

Given the strength of these negative emotions, compassion is seen as something that can be difficult to attain, as Margaret Bowman (WLPA) explains below. In the following excerpts, some of the more positive emotions from Table 7.1 are described.

Table 7.1. Some emotions potentially relevant to protest

Negative emotions	Positive emotions
Anger	Compassion, sympathy, pity
Cynicism, depression	Enthusiasm, pride
Envy, resentment	Joy, hope
Fear, dread	Love
Grief, loss, sorrow	Resignation
Hatred, hostility, loathing	Trust, loyalty
Outrage, indignation	(Solidarity)
Shame (guilt)	(Respect)
Suspicion, paranoia	(wonder)

Source: Adapted from Jasper 1997: Table 5.1 p. 114.
Note: Emotions in parenthesis have been added to the original list

Margaret Bowman on joy, love, enthusiasm, pride and compassion:

> *It can be a very difficult area to work in . . . but I think the joy or the catharsis in the end does outweigh it . . . I think having compassion all the time is very exhausting and a very wearing thing. I think you have to have a kind of joy in discovering things and you have to have a joy and love for animals, which does include compassion. But there's a lot of enjoyment as well – it's a kind of a joy in certain rewards and results that you get sometimes, for the animals and plus you have your own growth from it as well. This is the way to experience life at the raw edge of things* (interview, 1997).

Holly Hazard (DDAL) on enthusiasm and pride:

> *I have a very normal middle class life . . . I love doing what I* [do]; *people talk about being a deep sea diver or being an astronaut or being an entertainer and saying 'I get to do this and I get paid for it.' That's the way I feel about what I do. . . . I have not been subsumed by the frustration of having to deal with this day after day* (interview, 1996).

'Milly' on enthusiasm, hope and pride:

> *I don't see it* [animal protection work] *as a sacrifice, because I find it life enriching. I mean I feel that since I have become actively involved in the animal welfare movement. . . . I feel more positive about life because I feel that there is nothing more debilitating than feeling that you are a victim and you are on the receiving end of a lot of ridiculous decisions made by parliament or by politicians. Once you have reclaimed your own power . . . then it's actually quite liberating in a personal sense as well* (interview, 1996).

And earlier in the interview:

> *I've met lovely people through this movement. It has re-enforced my faith in human nature. Up until that point I was beginning to think that humanity was going down the pan really, that people wouldn't stand up for what they know to be right. . . .* [But] *there are still people around prepared to, you know, to put themselves on the line and stand up for what's right* ('Milly', interview, 1996).

Both sides of the animal rights issue use evocative images of animals to press their claims and to evoke these kinds of emotional responses in both prospective supporters and movement insiders. For example, the late Henry Spira (1927-1998) used striking images of animals with imaginative captions to pressure animal industries to reform their practices. Spira focused on the 'invisibility' of animal suffering behind the closed doors of the factory farm and the laboratory to expose these hidden worlds to the general public. In an age of visual overload, pictures which startle, surprise, shock or otherwise arouse people's emotions are likely to be used by both sides of the animal rights debate. One such image used by Spira's coalition, Animal Rights International (ARI), led to immediate improvements in the treatment of farm animals. Spira's advertisement appeared in the *New York Times* on March 15, 1994 and depicted the cruelty involved in face branding cattle by the US Department of Agriculture.

In an essay entitled 'Photographs of Agony', John Berger (1990) described violent war pictures as 'arresting' – we are seized by them. It is no exaggeration to say that Berger's comments apply equally well to the images of face branding in the ARI advertisement: 'As we look at them, the moment of the other's suffering engulfs us. We are filled with either despair or indignation. Despair takes on some of the other's suffering to no purpose. Indignation demands action' (Berger 1990, p. 42). For the 'caring sleuth' (Shapiro 1994)

there is both sorrow and anger in seeing these images of animal suffering. The purpose of the face-branding image was to mobilise the indignation of insiders as well as of those outside the movement. And to demand action. This was explicit in the caption that accompanied the picture: 'This is what USDA policy looks like. Can you imagine what it feels like?' (*New York Times* 1994). Here we see the use of 'moral shocks' to prod people into action (Jasper 1997; Jasper & Poulsen 1995). According to Singer (1998, p. 162), a thousand readers had complained to the USDA shortly after the advertisement appeared in the *New York Times*. By December that year, as a result of public pressure, the USDA was forced to discontinue the practice.[1]

Similarly, critics of animal rights use graphic images and messages to provoke an emotional response in people to support their cause. Images of innocent children make good television and print copy as *Newsweek* demonstrated in its cover story (26 December 1988) 'The Battle over Animal Rights: A Question of Suffering versus Science' which featured a young mother, Jane McCabe and her nine-year-old daughter Clair who was suffering from cystic fibrosis. McCabe's personal story made a strong, emotional appeal for animal research. According to her mother, Clair would not be alive without the enzymes from the pancreas of pigs and antibiotics tested on rats. Clair's mother responds to the animal rights bumper sticker – 'Lab animals never have a nice day' – by asking 'Why is a laboratory rat's fate more poignant than that of an incurably ill child?' (McCabe 1988). The incurably ill have been used by animal researchers in testimonials that support animal experimentation. The organisation incurably ill For Animal Research (iiFAR), which is funded by the American Medical Association, provides testimonials from people in wheelchairs and on life-support systems willing to speak up for animal researchers.[2]

Thus both sides in the animal experimentation debate use compelling emotional appeals in their respective campaigns which frame animal researchers as either heroes or villains. Animal rights activists are invariably labelled as too emotional to understand the benefits of animal research, while animal experimenters are castigated as unfeeling brutes by animal protectors.

---

[1] The above paragraphs are based on Munro (2002) which describes Henry Spira's style of animal activism. His use of advertisements as 'atrocity tales' or shaming devices is discussed in detail in this paper.

[2] This paragraph is based on Munro (1999a) where I describe the battle over image making in the animal experimentation controversy.

Vilification from both sides has characterised the vivisection debate from the nineteenth century to the present (Munro 1999a). In another study, Groves sums up the emotional nature of the debate when he concluded that 'Whereas animal rights activists rationalise their emotions, pro-researchers emotionalise their rationality' (Groves 1997, p. 14).[3] Similarly, other issues in the movement are characterised by a combative element which Collins (2001, p. 41) claimed gives social movements their emotional energy and sense of solidarity.

Female Activists and the Movement's Emotional Tone

Thus contrary to conventional wisdom, scientists and not just animal protectors are disposed towards using emotional images and messages in their campaigns. However, because the membership of the animal movement is overwhelmingly female, the claims of the movement are invariably labelled by its critics as 'too emotional'. This has been the continuing refrain of the animal industries against activists in the early antivivisectionist and humane movements in the nineteenth century up to the present day. Stereotypes associated with labels such as 'sob sisters', 'crazed spinsters' and 'idle, muddle-headed women' continue to be used against the 'emotional' arguments of women in the movement who oppose the 'rational', mainly male endeavours of science, hunting and agriculture. Yet it is true that women, more than men, are drawn to the animal cause.

A number of recent papers by Wells and Hepper (1997) and Kruse (1999) have listed studies that report on greater female affinities with animal issues. These demonstrate that women more than men:

> . . . express concern about the treatment of animals; oppose animal-based research; are more likely to be members of animal welfare groups and to become active in movement organisations; are more inclined to abstain from

[3] I witnessed an incident where scientists attempted to emotionalise their rationality at an animal welfare conference in Melbourne in 1993, which I subsequently wrote up in (Munro 1993). The incident occurred during a heated debate in which Peter Singer spoke against animal experimentation; an angry scientist jumped to his feet and exclaimed that scientists had feelings and were not the overly rational brutes that animal liberationists made them out to be. It was then that he asked the audience of mainly scientists to put up their hands if they had pets. And on cue, most did.

This suggests that scientists are capable of using emotion when it is appropriate, but for their critics, they don't go far enough. For example, many ecofeminists insist

> eating meat or other selected animal produce; hold anthropomorphic views regarding animals; support animal rights and report that they are more likely to take action to promote animal welfare (Wells & Hepper, 1997).

Where does this leave female scientists who experiment on animals? An activist associated with the International Primate Protection League (IPPL) spoke of some female scientists like the American biologist Jay Fitzpatrick who she said had changed her view of scientists ('Lisa', interview, 1996). Others, such as an Australian experimentalist (name withheld), puzzled her. She described the researcher's good husbandry and ostensible love of animals but in the final analysis:

> *she experiments on them . . . When it comes to the crunch, they can cut off their emotions and distance themselves from it, whereas people in the animal rights movement can't, can't cut our emotions off like this and we find that we can't distance ourselves from the problems* ('Lisa', interview 1992).

How can we explain why women, more so than men, are prominent in the animal protection movement?[4] That women have good standing in the contemporary animal movement can be seen in the increasing number of women taking up leadership roles in animal protection organisations which in the nineteenth century were simply not available to them. Of the 27 animal protection organisations I studied in Australia, Britain and the United States, slightly more than half were led by women, although only three of these were large, prominent organisations with relatively well paid staff. Similarly, in the anti-environmental organisations listed by Deal (1993), men headed most; the industries they were defending were, not surprisingly, male dominated ones like the extractive industries.

These different workplaces engender different emotional experiences or at least provide differential opportunities for the expression of various emotions. Thus, the emotions we would expect to find in the pre-school will be quite different to those of the timber mill. With its predominantly female membership

---

that 'a maternal epistemology' involving caring and even anthropomorphism represent the 'different voice' that women bring to debates about the rights of animals. Ecofeminists believe that if scientists adopted this stance, they would eschew animal experimentation.

[4] I have attempted to answer this question in Munro (2001a) 'Caring about blood, flesh and pain: Women's standing in the animal protection movement', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 43–1.

(Richards 1990; Jasper & Nelkin 1992; Munro 1996), the animal movement may be characterised by an 'emotional energy' (Collins 1990) that are unique to the movement. Collins argued that long-lasting emotions constitute what he calls emotional energy. Thus, emotions such as those expressed by the activists above, constitute the emotional tone of the movement, the majority of whom are women. Collins described this phenomenon succinctly:

> Members share a common mood . . . The model posits an emotional contagion among the persons present, for they are focusing attention on the same thing and are aware of each other's focus; they have become caught up in each other's emotions. As a result, the emotional mood becomes stronger and more dominant; competing feelings are driven out by the main group feeling (Collins 1990, p. 32).

We can see how this works in the heat of protest. In the campaign against live animal exports in England in the mid 1990s, a television documentary[5] revealed the frustration and anger of the mainly female protesters against the authorities and the animal industries involved in what the protesters called 'the evil trade'. These emotions were shared by all the activists in the protest; the protesters were caught up in what could be described as a contagion of feeling directed at the alleged animal abusers. The model described by Collins above also applies to the everyday interactions of activists inside the animal movement. This was clearly illustrated in a comment by a member of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), at a meeting I attended in Cambridge in 1996. He advised the members of Animal Rights Cambridge (ARC) to give up their 'righteous anger' and to have 'a bit of fun'. He noted that animal activists had a reputation for being 'angry' and that they were being written off by potential supporters as 'too serious' or simply 'mad' (field notes, Cambridge 1996).

There is no evidence in this anecdote that the mainstream animal movement is characterised in the public mind in this way. Historically, however, there is evidence that the early animal protectionists and antivivisectionists were

---

[5] This BBC documentary 'Animal Wars' was broadcast on the ABC's *Landline* in 1996. The coverage of the campaign against live animal exports revealed how the protesters had begun to target the homes of the lorry drivers who took the animals to market. The compere saw this as a new development in 'animal welfare' and condemned the protesters as 'radical and vicious'.

denigrated as 'too emotional', and overly sentimental (e.g. MacCulloch 1993). And there is some evidence that the animal movement itself has undergone a change in its image and emotional tone since the nineteenth century. According to Groves, in the animal rights movement today,

> the emotional rubric of justice and rights for animals represent a break from its nineteenth century counterpart in the humane tradition [since] . . . emotions in the animal rights movement took on a different meaning when men, as opposed to women, adopted them; sympathy or caring for defenceless victims became objective, rational and legitimate (Groves 1995, pp. 458–59).

Groves pointed out that men's participation was a useful resource for overcoming the emotional deviance experienced by most of the activists in his study which was concerned with the role of emotions in the animal movement. Groves's study highlighted the neglect of emotions in social movement research. He showed how activists in the animal rights movement engage in what Hochschild (1983) called 'emotional labour', 'emotion work' or 'emotion management'. In the present study, emotional labour that is performed for a wage, is not typical; emotion work, defined by Hochschild (1983) as 'the emotion management we do in private life', is however, a prominent feature in the private lives of many animal activists. As 'Rhett' explains in regard to whether membership in the movement has an effect on relations with close friends and family:

> *Ah . . . well it might, it just so happens that most people I associate with have similar sympathies or they're at least tolerant and they understand. I don't really know. I went out with a woman a few months ago briefly and she said to me, 'Would it upset you if I ate meat?' (laughing) and I said, 'No', but it was a lie and she knew it and that was about the end of it! (laughing)* ('Rhett', interview, 1994).

Groves's (1995, p. 439) study is unique in that it reveals how activists in the animal movement manage emotions in order to arrive at 'the correct emotional tone of the movement'. Activists do affective work in managing deviant emotions or 'paying emotional dues'. This latter activity was achieved by one activist who watched an animal rights video in the full knowledge that the experience was a painful, though necessary one. Another activist chose to read Regan's complex *The Case for Animal Rights* so as to reinforce the notion of animal rights as a philosophical, rational concept rather than an emotional one. Activists in Groves's study also learned to manage emotions in their

dealings with movement outsiders, something that many activists in the present study said they did. One of the most important findings for the present study was that this emotion work gave activists a sense of career. Activists progressed 'from being someone who was too emotional about animals, to someone who could be detached, rational and objective' (Groves, 1995, p. 457). Put differently, animal activism is a form of work from which one derives a sense of identity, as in the case of 'Sherry' who campaigns against duck shooting in Victoria. Asked if she regarded this as a kind of career, she responded:

> *Yes, I do. I've never had a career. I brought up kids, that was it, my two boys, and I was always very shy, I couldn't talk to people. It's done incredible things for me now; I can talk to the media . . . (I) do interviews and I love it with a passion that I've never loved anything before, except my children. Yes, I'm committed to the end, so I believe it is a career and for that reason . . . I don't want to get a full-time job because I know it's going to take me away from the ducks and I can't afford to let that happen. So yes, it is a career* ('Sherry', interview, 1994).

Parkinson (1996: 676) argues that emotions are largely social, that is, they are communicated interpersonally and are often determined by a particular audience. 'We get emotional in order to notify some audience that they should acknowledge one of our concerns, and behave in accordance with the conveyed evaluative position with respect to this concern'. This analysis by a psychologist confirms the interpretation of affective work by the animal activists described above who set out to find an appropriate level of emotional energy in communicating their concern for animals to relevant audiences both inside and outside the animal movement.

This above section has described the role of emotions inside the animal movement. It has attempted to capture something of the movement's emotional tone and the activists' emotional energy. The next section describes how animal images and imagery have been used to mobilise the emotions of prospective supporters outside the movement as well as to reinforce the solidarity of those inside the movement.

Advertising Stories: Powerful Stories and Atrocity Tales

In the animal movement emotions are used as a resource and as a call to action. This is achieved using advertising stories and compelling animal

images in media-driven campaigns designed to mobilise people's emotions in the cause of animal protection.

Powerful stories have been used in the animal protection work of the early pioneers in both fictional (e.g. Sewell's *Black Beauty*) and non-fictional (e.g. Lansbury's (1985) *The Old Brown Dog*) accounts. These function, as in the iconic case of the old brown dog riots of 1907, as 'advertising stories'. Advertising stories can be read as either atrocity tales or powerful stories and they appear in non-fiction as well as in what Lansbury calls "the truths of fiction" (Lansbury, 1985). Early female animal advocates wrote stories that provided an outlet for moralising against various atrocities from slavery to vivisection (Ingram & Patai, 1993; Ferguson, 1998).

Ferguson's book *Animal Advocacy and Englishwomen* features five female writers between 1780 and 1900, who the author claimed, 'represent landmark studies in support of the humane treatment of animals' (1998, p. 4). These writers, who include Anna Sewell and Frances Power Cobbe, tell stories where the animal features as a metaphor for imperial predation. Atrocities against animals – torturing dogs and cats, baiting bulls, the ill-treatment of horses and sheep and cattle at market, the practice of pinning insects, hunting with hounds and vivisection – were among the 'barbarities' that were addressed in these stories, of which *Black Beauty* is the best known. This novel sold over one million copies in the first two years after its publication in 1876 and remains one of the great advertising stories in the animal protection movement. George Angell, the founder of the MSPCA, called it 'The Uncle Tom's Cabin of the Horse', for the book draws obvious parallels between slavery and cruelty. *Black Beauty* was largely responsible for the banning of the bearing rein, a device used to keep the horse's head upright and one that caused the animal much pain. The book was energetically promoted by animal protection and antivivisection societies and became an approved school reader for generations of children. It also inspired dozens of literary imitations that taught the principle that the greatest of all virtues was kindness to animals (Lansbury 1985, p. 76). *Black Beauty* remains today a classic advertising story, which is both an atrocity tale and a powerful, uplifting morality tale.

We have to shock and mesmerise and entice, tell powerful stories about the suffering of animals, and what animals really are when they're not molested and confined (A. Tyler, interview, 1996). Tyler's idea is for people to be able to draw comparisons between animals when left alone and animals that are abused. He cites one such story told by a sheep farmer's wife:

> I was standing on the block the other day and some sheep were coming through and one came running up to me and licked my hands and I said to my husband, 'Why is he doing that?' and he said, 'You should know, you fed him on the bottle three years ago.' They're quite wonderful really; they've got tremendous memories. I can't bear to see a sheep suffering. They don't make a fuss at all, they're a gentle sort of animal, very under-rated. And I wonder if it's all worth it really, I ask myself, have we got the right? That's my problem (A. Tyler, personal communication, 1996).

Stories of this kind are meant to remind people that animals like sheep are individuals with life spans and personalities, and names such as Midnight (aged 10), Fergie (20), and Helga (also 20). Bookstores these days are well supplied with attractively illustrated publications that promote this theme, especially in relation to dogs and cats. More serious academic titles such as Erica Fudge's (2002) *Animal* and Roger Grenier's (2000) *The Difficulty of Being a Dog* are increasingly available to serious animal lovers. Books like these are what Tyler (interview, 1996) calls *powerful stories of what animals are like when they are left alone*.

Animal rights advocates everywhere use anthropomorphism as a deliberate device to widen people's affection for their pets so as to include animals lower down on the hierarchy of human concern such as sheep, chickens and lobsters. Animal Liberation Victoria used the dramatic headline '330 million adolescents murdered in the breeding sheds' to publicise the plight of broiler chickens whose natural life is about

> . . . raking the soil for treasures, bathing rapturously in the dust. . . . There's mating games and proud roosters holding court over their flock, nests to build, mothers-to-be religiously warming eggs for weeks, then courageously guarding new born chicks against lurking dangers (*Animal Liberation Action*, 1996, p. 8).

A similar story is told by Lobster Liberation in the UK which asks diners to consider that the lobster boiled alive for their benefit "have a very long childhood and an awkward adolescence . . . They flirt, their pregnancies last nine months and they can live to be over 100 years old" (from Lobster Liberation in *PETA News*, 1989). What critics would ridicule as sentimental anthropomorphism, animal rights advocates call empathy. Films such as *Babe, Free Willy, 101 Dalmatians* and *Chicken Run* are celebrated in in-house magazines

by animal advocates who use their anthropomorphic content to promote the cause of animals.

Australian animal liberationists have referred to the confinement of pigs in 'rape sheds', a term that links these contemporary animal liberators with their Victorian counterparts in the antivivisection movement. Antivivisectionists, dating back to Frances Power Cobbe, have been the most prolific and graphic in writing atrocity tales of animal torments. Cobbe was aware of the links between vivisection, pornography, rape and the condition of Victorian women. According to Ferguson (1998, p. 111), 'antivivisection literature foregrounded the contention that medical science and medical practice were metaphorical rapes'.

Atrocity tales alert the public that a social problem exists. According to Best, the selected atrocity is meant to typify the issue and act as a referent for public discussion of the problem (1990, p. 28). In the following excerpt, the atrocity tale is used by Laurie Levy to morally prod people into doing something against the destruction of wildlife. Levy adopted a classic animal liberationist position on the suffering of individual birds when he explained on television the Coalition's opposition to duck shooting:

> We brought out a record number of wounded birds; birds that had been shot through the eye, through the back of the head, through the wings. And here's a young signet and it's been shot through the neck and this is a magnificent, beautiful, young bird. You know, duck shooting, the brutality that we see out there every year is just unacceptable. Duck shooting is not sport, it's cowardly, it's violent and it's anti-social, and that's why duck hunter numbers are dropping so dramatically (Munro 1995b, Story 18).

Likewise, the League Against Cruel Sports used similar images and descriptions to demonstrate the cruelty of the Hunt. The video of an incident that was publicised in the national news resulted for instance in Prince Charles's hunt, the Quorn hunt, being banned.

> *So we film the transgressions, we expose the lie. . . . Animals being seen on film to be torn apart. . . . We've seen photographs for instance of the stag being shot and injured, it's jaw being blown off and the stag's still running and at the end of the day the stag having to be drowned in a river with a man putting his foot on its neck pushing it under water. And this is illegal; this is against the Hunt rules. The Hunt say for instance in this area where we are talking now, where stag hunting*

> *is rife, they say it is a 'clean kill'. As I say, we have film of the stag's jaw being blown off and the stag getting up and running away* (LACS supporter, Interview 1996).

Video films of these cruelties are then used to shock people into supporting the anti-hunting cause. The emotion-laden content of these images transforms animal cruelty into a hot cognition issue, one in which reason and emotion combine (Gamson 1992a).

Animal Images: Obnoxious or Nice?

Images and stories about animals are vitally important to the mobilisation of both financial and moral resources in the animal movement. Animal protection SMOs must be sensitive to the way their publications represent animals if they are to resonate with the readership. A recent example illustrates the emotional significance of what Baker (1993) called 'picturing the beast'. The American Humane Association (AHA) produced an eye-catching poster of a cat-child face to promote its dual function of caring for animals and children. The poster suggests the child and the cat are identical except for the whiskers and facial hair so that cruelty to either is one and the same thing. It is an image which evidently many people found disturbing and objectionable. The poster's dramatic achievement is that it turns anthropomorphic sentimentalism upside down by transforming the child into an animal's form. According to Baker (1993, p. 224), this is more accurately known as therianthropism, which he explains, 'appears only to operate successfully when used as a means of discrediting or demeaning other people . . . [It] does pictorial violence – symbolic violence – to the image of one's rivals or opponents'. Baker (1993, p. 232) suggested that such troubling connotations could be exploited by animal protection SMOs for their shock value; in this way, 'cute anthropomorphic imagery' is appropriated in order to unsettle the observer and more importantly, to modify cultural representations of the animal.

Baker acknowledged that this is an uncertain undertaking but believes it a strategy worth trying if people are to be shaken out of their complacency and the options kept open for 'picturing the beast' most effectively. The AHA's cat-child poster does at least problematise the whole idea of what it is to be a human vis-a-vis an animal. Whether or not this works to the advantage of the animal movement we cannot say with any certainty. But in an age of

visual overload, pictures which startle, shock or otherwise attract people's attention, may ultimately be more useful to the movement in changing people's attitudes about animals than the cute clichés of the coffee table variety.

The AHA seeks to include both the obnoxious and the nice by producing its own print and electronic media such as informative *Guides* and attractive videos. In AHA's Washington DC office, Director Adele Douglass exhibits the covers of *Advocate*, a glossy magazine of its animal protection division. Douglass noted that the covers with their gorgeously photographed animals were designed to be appealing, although the contents of the magazine often contained disturbing pictures of animals in distress. Both forms of representation are controversial in the animal protection movement. Many animal lovers are repelled by the graphic pictures of animals caught in traps and the like while others see the representation of the eternally 'cute' animal as a form of anthropomorphism which trivialises the reality of animals' lives. Visualising animals always poses a dilemma for animal protection SMOs seeking to raise funds and at the same time attempting to educate and mobilise supporters in their campaigns.

While animal protection organisations are able to publish powerful images in their own media like posters and magazines, the mass media in the public arena are less willing to use material which might offend their audiences or more importantly, their advertisers. Animal Liberation in Australia, for example has had a running battle with the Advertising Standards Council (ASC) over some of its newspaper and poster advertisements. Early in 1983 it placed an advertisement in the now defunct *National Times* which showed eight piglets in a wire pen below which was the caption: 'If you treated your dog the way they raise pigs, you could be thrown in jail'. The advertisement described some of the inhumane practices of intensive pig farming and called on readers to boycott all ham, bacon and pork until the pig industry mended its ways. Within five months of publication, the ASC wrote to Animal Liberation (NSW) informing them of a complaint they had received about the advertisement from the Australian Pork Producers Association (APPA), which claimed the advertisement distorted the facts. The ASC supported the APPA and asked the Media Council to instruct all media outlets under its jurisdiction to refrain from publishing the pig advertisement.

One conclusion we can draw from the media coverage of animal welfare issues is that social movements can never rely on mainstream media for

publicising their campaigns either in the form of paid advertisements or as news features. Animal protection SMOs are therefore obliged to produce their own media, for as Rootes (1984) observed, it is unlikely that marginalized groups will ever have the capacity to dictate how the media represent their grievances. Yet some animal protection organisations, despite the limitations of their size and power, do succeed in using the mass media to promote their cause. In the previous chapter we have seen how media-SMO relations were crucial to the conduct of individual campaigns. In the campaigns run by FARM and MRAR, the SMOs made effective use of national and local media outlets for what Lemert (1984) calls 'mobilizing information'. What these small grassroots groups lacked in size and militancy, they made up for in novelty; by taking advantage of the media's appetite for the dramatic and sensational, they ensured their message reached an audience much larger than they could ever hope to engage using the conventional techniques of small-scale activism like leafleting or letter writing. Similarly, the small, grassroots animal rights/conservation group in Victoria, CADS, has succeeded in having its grievances incorporated in the electronic media. The Coalition's media campaign, aimed at mobilising anti-hunt emotions, is discussed in the remainder of the chapter.

Duck Wars: A Media-Driven Campaign

For almost two decades, duck rescuers have been confronting duck hunters on the wetlands of Victoria, the home of duck shooting in Australia. In 1986, a small group of Victorian conservationists confronted 95,000 duck shooters in an attempt to draw media attention to the alleged indiscriminate slaughter of Australian wildlife. By 1994, the number of shooters had been culled to 21,000, then to 3,000 in 2001 and to a further drop of 1,000 in 2002 according the SMO's website. The Coalition attributes the changing status of the duck-shooting fraternity to that of an endangered species, to the success of its media campaign, particularly the television images which bring home to viewers every duck season the Coalition's duck-rescue operation. Early in the year during the lead up to, and in the first week or two of the opening of the duck-shooting season, 'Duck Wars', as the media have dubbed it, featured nightly in the news broadcasts.

All social movement organisations and interest groups seek to use the mass media for gaining public support (Ryan 1991). Klandermans (1992, p. 88)

argued that social movement organisations profoundly affect media discourse by framing the issues, defining the grievances and staging the collective actions that attract media attention. The Coalition's close to total reliance on the media for the success of its campaign runs the risk of its message being distorted or ignored all together. Several theorists have warned activists in other interest groups that utilise the media in their causes of the dangers inherent in media-driven campaigns (Rootes 1984; Herman & Chomsky 1988; Gamson 1992; Tarrow 1994). However, as a former television cameraperson, the Coalition's director Laurie Levy understands how the medium works as well as how to exploit the camera so as to maximise the emotional appeal of animal rescue images. In this, the Coalition is perhaps unique as a grassroots social movement organisation in that its leader is a former media professional adept at using the media to the advantage of the activists.

According to Kielbowicz and Scherer (1986), the media are important to social movements in three crucial ways: first, the media are needed in building public support (mobilisation of consensus) and in attracting new supporters to the movement (mobilisation of action); both audiences are targeted by the Coalition as it seeks to win moral support from the general public as well as to mobilise new campaigners to take part in the duck-rescue operations. Second, media coverage provides symbolic links with other actors, for example, by putting pressure on policymakers. Levy places great store in favourable newspaper editorials because *the only way you influence government in this country is by having the public on your side. . . . And of course, it's only with those sorts of editorials that governments really start to take action* (L. Levy, interview, 1994). Finally, the movement's internal relations benefit (for instance, in the boosting of morale) when activists see that the media take their issues seriously. Levy understands and exploits these benefits by giving the media what they want: the dramatic, emotion-laden images of animals in distress. According to Levy two contrasting images turns the tide in favour of the rescuers:

> *One, a duck shooter dressed up as a soldier carrying a semi-automatic shotgun or a pump-action shotgun, shooting down a small defenceless bird. The other image is of the rescuer coming out with a wounded bird over his or her arm. That second image, that one of compassion, concern, kindness, courage, will always beat an act of violence in the eyes of the public, and it doesn't matter how many PR companies that the shooters pay to put their point of view, that's the image that they can't beat* (interview, 1994).

By placing their bodies metaphorically and sometimes literally between the hunters and the ducks, the duck liberationists remind viewers that wildlife has a right to live, that the birds have intrinsic value rather than being objects or trophies. A duck rescue action, like Greenpeace's dramatic whale rescue operations, is an 'image event' (quoted in De Luca 1999). According to one-time director of Greenpeace Robert Hunter (1999, p. 18), an image event is a 'mind bomb [that] explodes in the public's consciousness to transform the way people view their world'. What is striking about the contrasting images that Levy alludes to is the vulnerability of the duck rescuers as they confront the heavily armed shooters. Doherty (2000) has argued that 'manufactured vulnerability' is part of the tactical repertoire of contemporary eco-activists who engage in tree-sits and lock-ons and put their bodies on the line when they use tunnels and tripods in direct action campaigns. Duck rescuers are also vulnerable to assault when they seek to thwart angry duck hunters in pursuit of their quarry. In carrying out this tactic of 'manufactured vulnerability', activists inevitably attract the attention of the media who are in search of dramatic images of confrontation.

Getting the Media's Attention: Duck Shoots Man!

In the televising of environmental and animal rights issues in Australia, excluding nature programs, only ecological disasters or calamitous threats to wildlife attract serious media attention. Only high profile, spectacular stunts such as those staged by Greenpeace achieve the level of publicity needed to keep environmental issues in the public eye. More mundane stories therefore are of little interest to television journalists, either as themes in prime time television soap operas (Rissel & Douglas 1993) or in news bulletins. What the electronic media have dubbed the 'Duck Wars', is an exception to this indifference. It is axiomatic that whatever the cause a single-issue movement seeks to promote in the media, it must be newsworthy. In choosing between the narratives of duck-shooting and duck-rescuing, 'man shoots duck' will not appeal to the networks in the way that the metaphorical 'duck (liberationist) shoots man' does. This latter story suggests the unexpectedness and difference that are essential to a good news story (Van Zoonen 1996, p. 208).

In the 1993 and 1994 seasons there were approximately 50 stories (46 news and four feature) on local and national commercial as well as state-funded

television. These stories, recorded by media monitoring company Rehame Australia for its client the Coalition, represent a complete record of the television coverage of the 1993–1994 duck-shooting seasons in Victoria. The comprehensive coverage provides an insight into how the emotive issue of cruelty to animals is framed in television news and feature stories.

The main grievances against duck-shooting are identified in the Coalition's campaign literature: first, it allegedly causes cruelty and suffering to water birds; second, it results in rare and protected birds being illegally shot; and third, lead pollution damages the environment (Levy 1989, p. 6). Social justice, the connecting thread to these moral, legal and environmental concerns, is according to Finsen and Finsen (1994, p. 281), the basis for the worldwide animal rights movement. Put differently, blood sports, like vivisection and factory farming are perceived as social problems that can only be remedied by collective action and the mobilisation of support in the public arena.

Television's demand for drama and conciseness means that there is little attempt to explain what motivates the social justice issues that drive the duck rescuers. Of the 50 news stories analysed for this book, only two avoided the 'narrative of protest' theme; these two stories actually took the rescuers' themes of cruelty and animal welfare seriously and even vegetarianism was discussed, albeit in a jocular tone. Yet Levy claims it is the dramatic images, not the description of the protest, which attracts people to the movement.

There were three distinct phases in the Duck Wars: in the pre-opening stories and in the description of the opening weekend to the duck season, the media framed the coverage as a law and order issue in which the police prevented violence between two adversaries whose anger and frustration were the dominant emotions in the stories. The coverage that described the opening weekend continued the adversarial frame of the pre-season bulletins until it became clear that the predicted dangers to life and limb were unfounded. The non-violence was interpreted by the media as the 'system works' frame that was used to reinforce the continuity of the pre-season's law and order narrative. In the final news stories of the narrative, the dominant imagery was of the 'slaughter' and 'carnage' inflicted on wildlife in the aftermath of 'the war on the wetlands'. Yet despite the media's distortion of the activists as protesters rather than animal rescuers, the Coalition believes that its cause is effectively promoted by the television images of 'the slaughter of innocents', which play on people's emotions. That this is a realistic expectation is borne

out by Mazur and Lee (1993) who argued that what the television audience remembers and is influenced by is the image rather than the content. And according to Lewis (1991, p. 140), media insiders agree that TV stories are seen rather than heard by audiences.

The emotional impact of the rescuers' frame

> *The visual pictures of what we do are stronger than reading it in black and white or hearing about it on the radio; nothing could compare to those (television) pictures, particularly . . . wounded birds being rehabilitated. Things like that, it touches most people* (Coalition activist, interview 1994).

This statement is testimony to the fact that the images of Duck Wars are *felt* viscerally rather than experienced as intellectual responses, for as Szasz (1994, p. 63) said of the news consumer, 'the strong visual and emotional components dominate; attitude formation takes place without much need for detail in the cognitive component'. More than at any stage in the media's representation of Duck Wars, the Coalition's shaming rituals that followed the opening weekend highlight the duck rescuers' denouncement of duck shooting as morally, legally and environmentally reprehensible.

In the last phase of the coverage, the law and order narrative is superseded by atrocity stories, which the Coalition knows will resonate in a culture in which cruelty to animals is abhorred. Images of slaughtered animals are used by animal rights activists to function as 'moral shocks' in an appeal to the viewing public's moral intuitions (Jasper 1990, p. 25). Images in this context are more potent than words. De Luca (1999) has criticised the tendency in communication and rhetoric studies of television to focus on the words rather than the images. In what follows, I draw attention to the images which the Coalition contends are what drives their successful mobilising efforts. The images are derived from my content analysis of the television coverage of the 1993 and 1994 duck shooting seasons (Munro 1995b). The first news bulletin in the third and final phase of the coverage that reported the Coalition's ritualistic display of dead protected birds follows:

> Levy holds a dead bird to the camera while other protesters display dead birds outside the Premier's office. In the background are members of the public and camera crews filming the scene. Then there is a shot of dozens of dead birds on the footpath; some are held up to the camera by different

> protesters. The dead ducks are lined up in neat rows in the fashion of the war dead. A large stain of dried blood is clearly visible on the footpath. Footage then crosses to a lake scene where a shooter carries a dead bird from the water and another shooter successfully downs a duck, which skims across the water as it falls. The shooter wades out to retrieve the bird. Three protesters – two female and one male – follow suit.[6]

The meaning of these images of death was discussed in a later feature program. The feature ran for four minutes during which a sympathetic reporter interviewed Levy and another activist at length. The format of this infotainment program, unlike regular news bulletins, gave the Coalition an opportunity to highlight the cruelty of duck season. Levy and a female rescuer were filmed holding dead or injured birds as they spoke.

The Coalition rightly believes that images of 'the innocent victims' of recreational hunting elicit powerful emotional responses from people who abhor cruelty to animals. The sight of the 'casualties of war' being laid to rest in the manner of the war dead is intended to function as a 'moral shock', a shaming ritual that is repeated after the opening of every duck season:

> Levy in a kneeling position prepares to lay out a large swan. The camera shows protesters laying out the birds as members of the public look on. There are close-ups of the ducks as Levy displays one for the camera and delivers his message in a voice over: 'Duck hunting is a dying activity and duck hunters themselves have become an endangered species.' (Munro 1995b).

In these visual sequences, the recurring images of 'Duck Wars' (hunting, rescuing and policing) were seen in the context of the aftermath to the duck-shooting season. The display of dead birds in close-up was one of the powerful moments in the coverage that the Coalition used to mobilise support for banning duck shooting. For most people, it would seem, the image of birds as "subjects who feel the world" to use Charles Birch's[7] apt description, is

---

[6] These descriptions of the TV images are from my content analysis of the 'Duck Wars' as covered by the electronic media in Victoria during the duck seasons of 1993 and 1994 in Munro (1995b).

[7] Charles Birch is an eminent Australian scientist and author of *Regaining compassion for humanity and nature* (1993) and *Feelings* (1995). He used the phrase in a radio broadcast to promote his latest book.

preferable to the carnage of recreational hunting which the Coalition presents after the opening of every duck season in Victoria.

Activists believe that these images of slaughter juxtaposed alongside the sequences of duck rescue, serve as prods to action by mobilising people to support their cause. According to Levy, many people contact the Coalition offering support after these images are televised. The Coalition claims the image of compassion (duck rescue) in contrast to the image of violence (duck shooting) resonates with a public that has come to see the killing of wildlife for 'sport' as another unwanted feature of an increasingly violent society. Thus, for duck liberationists, the fleeting images of animal rescue and rehabilitation provide a dramatic emotional message when contrasted to the sights and sounds of hunters shooting and retrieving their quarry. The Coalition believes that these opposing images, rather than the words of the actors in Duck Wars, cause many people to support and join their animal- rescue campaign. While the verbal narratives distort the nature of the Coalition's campaign by representing it as a law and order issue, the visual images graphically reflect the activists' protest as an animal liberation campaign against cruelty in which shame, anger and compassion feature as the dominant emotions. As director of the Coalition and its principal spokesperson, Laurie Levy skilfully provides the media with newsworthy images and sound bites that largely determine how the campaign is framed in the television news.

Hot cognition in the framing of Duck Wars

In waging its campaign against duck shooting, the Coalition has opted for a media-driven campaign to promote its cause as a rescue operation designed to appeal to viewers' emotions. Activists study media reports of their campaign, particularly Rehame's television footage, so as to mobilise people to take action on behalf of their cause. For the Coalition, the key mobilising strategy is to promote their campaign as a duck-rescue operation rather than simply as an anti-duck shooting protest. 'Rescue', and its association with saving (animals') lives in the tradition of Noah's Ark and the Red Cross, strikes a responsive chord in a culture which values kindness to animals. Levy knows that duck rescue has an emotional appeal which conventional protest lacks and that the idea of duck liberation is sufficiently novel to attract media attention.

The Coalition seeks to construct its protest as a choice between compassion and violence, between justice and injustice. These universal themes are translated in the cliché of television coverage as an emotional issue between human protagonists whose emotions are said to be running high. Interestingly, Levy does not see this as a case of the media trivialising the basic principles of the animal rights movement. On the contrary, he believes that the success of the Coalition's rescue operation depends on how much emotional energy it generates because *there's a lot of emotion tied up with the electronic media . . . Television is the most powerful of them all, mainly because of the visual aspect and the emotional side of it* (L. Levy, interview, 1994).

The metaphor of 'rescue in a war zone' allows Coalition activists to frame their anti-duck shooting protest in a way that will motivate people to join, or at least support their cause. Animals, as many animal protectionists and conservationists realise, have extraordinary appeal to ordinary people. Jasper and Poulsen (1995), pointed out how animals function as condensing symbols and how images such as caged puppies, wounded wildlife and 'crucified' monkeys are presented by animal protectionists as a 'suffering of innocents' master frame in order to convey the 'moral shock' needed for the first stage in the recruitment of strangers. Television news stories and features are well equipped to produce the kinds of images described earlier. As we have seen, these images have the character of 'a hot cognition' – images that move people to act against a perceived injustice.

Conclusion

Throughout this book supporters of animal rights have explained in their own words why they were drawn to the animal movement and what continues to motivate their commitment to the cause of animal welfare. This chapter has focused on the affective work of activists, how they shape and mobilise the emotions of both insiders and outsiders. This is the movement's 'call to action' which appeals to people's moral sensibilities and values. Emotions are important in the animal movement's motivational frame, for values 'are cognitions fused with emotion' (Collins 1990, p. 27). Emotions are mobilised through advertising stories, powerful stories and atrocity tales in both fictional and non-fictional forms, which animal protectionists have used during their

movement's history. The detailed discussion of the Coalition's campaign against duck shooting is a classic example of a media-driven protest that relies on the power of images to prod people into action. Emotion is central to that campaign as it is in others discussed in this study.

It is appropriate to end these thematic chapters with an analysis of this anti-hunting campaign. In ancient times, ducks were described as 'prophets of the wind', perhaps a suitable metaphor for the duck-rescue operation in Victoria and for the anti-hunting campaigns in the UK and the USA. Of the three campaigns discussed in the present study, the campaign against recreational hunting is the most likely to be won in the short term. Several movement leaders described it as a 'winnable issue', which unlike the campaigns against vivisection and factory farming has widespread public support. More so than these other campaigns, the campaign against blood sports is primarily media driven and emotionally charged. However, all three seminal animal campaigns illustrate how activists and advocates engage in social problems work in prosecuting their claims. The campaign against blood sports for example, while characterised in this chapter as media-driven affective work, nonetheless includes intellectual and practical work. There is perhaps no need to labour the point that defending ducks on moral, legal and environmental grounds requires cognitive skills of the highest order. Similarly, the practical work of duck protection – harassing duck hunters, using light aircraft to frighten off the wildlife, manoeuvring kayaks and avoiding physical abuse, injury or arrest – is basic to the duck rescue operation. But most important for this campaign and others discussed in the book, is the notion of affective work which is concerned with the mobilisation of people's negative emotions, especially anger, grief, shame and guilt as well as compassion, respect and love on the positive side. It is for this reason that opposition to cruelty, and the emotional responses it generates, continues to be the activists' main weapon in the quest for animal rights. The next chapter sums up the main themes of the book.

Chapter Eight

Conclusion

> *People who care about animals and are prepared to politicise that caring, care about blood, flesh and pain.* (Rheya Linden, President of Animal Liberation Victoria)

How and why do people campaign on behalf of a species that is not their own? This question guided the research for the book. Why people are passionate about animal welfare has to do with the love/work couplet that was mentioned in the opening sentence to the introduction. Love corresponds to the commitment to the cause of animal welfare that activists demonstrate in the various campaigns described throughout the book. Time and again, many informants interviewed in the study professed their love of animals, while for others, it was their opposition to cruelty that drove their activism. Thus activists were motivated by a compassion for, or a caring about, 'the brute creation' and a desire to care for individual animals. The need to care for animals was satisfied by a minority of informants in the 'hands on' context of animal welfare organisations like the RSPCA and the National Canine Defence League, which run refuges and shelters and sometimes hospitals for domestic animals.

For the vast majority of people in the present study however, caring for animals was made possible by the activist and advocacy work they did in grassroots

groups and more formal social movement organisations. One of the activists in the study described her colleagues as *people who care about animals and are prepared to politicise that caring*. This caring work was conceptualised in the book as social problems work, which like conventional work, involves intellectual, practical and affective dimensions. Social problems work, as defined in the present study, is profoundly political as it challenges our dominant cultural codes and the moral orthodoxy in relation to non-human animals. This is the case whether the issue is animal rights, the environment, peace activism, feminism or any issue in the new social movement sector. Social problems work is what activists in contemporary movements do when they seek to initiate social change by solving social problems. One of the initiatives in this study is the use of this concept to link the social construction of a social problem (speciesism) to social movement theory. Speciesism, or more colloquially, animal abuse, is diagnosed as a social problem by movement entrepreneurs in the same way that civil rights activists and feminists construct racism and sexism as societal ills. Social problems work in the animal movement starts with learning about cruelty and then doing something about it. The social problems work of *confronting cruelty* is typically carried out by individuals in DIY actions or as participants in social movement campaigns. For the committed animal activist, the 'caring sleuth' to use Shapiro's (1994) term, this means going beyond the 'good works' of rescue, refuge and rehabilitation to changing one's lifestyle, for instance, by avoiding meat and other animal products, and participation in collective actions of various kinds.

It was argued in the book that the animal movement frames its grievances on three levels. First, the diagnostic frame is the movement's analysis of what is wrong with speciesism, specifically in vivisection, factory farming and blood sports, the three seminal campaigns of the mainstream animal movement. Detailed answers to this question from the perspective of movement insiders and campaigners, individuals who are often overlooked by social movement theorists, were provided throughout the study. As indicated in Chapter 3, a social problems discourse has characterised animal protection throughout its history; contemporary animal liberation constructs animal exploitation as a social problem in contrast to less sympathetic interests, who perceive the animals themselves as the problem and the animal-using industries, which claim the animal movement's campaigns against cruelty are divisive and a threat to human rights. Chapter 4 highlighted the meaning of

cruelty for sympathisers to the animal movement, both historically and contemporaneously. It was also shown how people join the movement for intellectual, emotional and practical reasons and that these motivations constitute the main dimensions of social problems work they perform on behalf of nonhuman animals.

The movement's cognitive praxis or core identity was analysed in Chapter 5 by using three representative case studies of multi-issue SMOs: the Animal Welfare Institute (welfarist tradition), Animals Australia (animal liberationist tradition) and Animal Aid (animal rights tradition), and three single-issue SMOs: Defenders of Wildlife (welfarist), Compassion in World Farming (liberationist) and the Australian Association of Humane Research (abolitionist). These representative social movement organisations were used to explain the intellectual work of the movement and to show how movement entrepreneurs make alternative forms of knowledge count. With the exception of Animal Aid, all of the SMOs in this chapter function as political think tanks with close links to the legislative processes in their respective countries. The legislative route to animal welfare reform is the respectable side of animal protection, in contrast to the more participatory activities of grassroots activists outlined below. A single-issue movement such as animal liberation probably needs both to be successful.

Second, the movement's prognostic frame was described in Chapter 6, which outlined the broad strategies of publicity and interference that are characteristic of the early and contemporary animal movements. Following Tilly (1985), this book emphasised what the movement does, rather than why it does it, although this too featured in the testimonies of the informants in the study. In explaining the movement's action repertoire as the tactical mechanisms of persuasion, protest, non-cooperation and intervention, the study demonstrated that the mainstream animal movement is overwhelmingly non violent, despite conventional media opinion. Furthermore, it is rare in the social movement literature for scholars to focus on what Tilly (1985) described as the 'action repertoire', namely the movement's strategies and tactical mechanisms. This book suggests that the animal movement uses the two broad strategies of interference (persuasion and protest) and publicity (non-cooperation and intervention) to press its claims. Many of the tactics are deployed both by individuals in DIY actions and in the collective action of the movement's seminal campaigns.

Third, the movement's motivational frame or call to action was analysed as affective work in which emotions played an important part. An attempt was made in Chapter 7 to describe the emotions of protest and the emotional tone of the animal movement. It was argued that the animal movement is characterised by an emotional energy based on participants' emotional commitments, 'animal' identities and affective bonds. Throughout the book, the reliance of social movements on the mass media for achieving their objectives was emphasised; in the penultimate chapter this issue was analysed within the context of a campaign to protect Australian wildlife from recreational hunters. This case study revealed the dynamic relationship that exists between a social movement organisation and the electronic media, which Van Zoonen (1996) called 'the dance of death'. The analysis demonstrated how dramatic television images help to mobilise people's emotions and prod them to support the cause. Other media are also important in attracting people to the animal cause; these are the advertising stories, the 'powerful stories' and 'atrocity tales' which are told by movement sympathisers, and the books and films that saturate the popular culture such as *Babe*, *Free Willy* and so on. As Franklin (1999) has observed, this has tended to make people in the early twenty first century want to have more, rather than fewer, contacts with animals. While this trend goes against the strict animal rights position that animals should be left alone, it may mean that more and more people will become animal-friendly in the way that keeping pets psychologically prepared people in earlier times to respond positively to anti-cruelty campaigns (Thomas 1983).

In keeping with this anthrozoological trend, the sociology of animal rights, whilst not a growth area within the discipline, is now considered a worthy topic for doctoral dissertations although the number of scholars completing theses in this area remains small. To my knowledge, apart from myself, there are only six sociologists (Tester 1989; Richards 1990; Scarce 1995; Einwohner 1997; Kew 1999; Walls 2000) who have followed this path. As indicated in the introductory chapter, it was Tester's imaginative, but highly speculative thesis that inspired my own dissertation. I wanted to challenge Tester's claims that the animal movement is not about animal welfare at all, but rather about people attempting to classify humanity and define themselves as superior human beings. By allowing movement insiders to speak for themselves, the present book contributes to a more authentic account of what constitutes the contemporary animal movement's ideology and practices. The above studies

were written with a focus either on the United Kingdom (Tester, Kew, Walls) or the United States (Richards, Scarce, Einwohner). The present book compares the perspectives of activists in these two countries and for the first time, adds an Australian dimension. This is long overdue given that Australia is home to Peter Singer and the earliest animal liberation branches that were established to implement his philosophical ideals.

One of the most surprising findings from the survey data is that there is a high degree of ideological consensus in the case study countries, particularly in what the movement sees as the most objectionable human (ab)uses of animals. Another important related finding concerns the levels of social movement advocacy/activism in the case study countries which are represented as follows: USA: *Advocacy>Activism*; UK: *Activism>Advocacy*; Australia**:** *Activism+Advocacy*.

Despite these differences in the campaigning styles, the movement is united in its programmatic campaign against the worst features of speciesism. While the movement ideologically is divided between welfarist, liberationist and rightist traditions, these different strands are held together by the movement's central campaign against speciesism. This book has argued that the origins of opposition to speciesism can be found in Humphrey Primatt's (1776) treatise *The Duty of Mercy and the Sin of Cruelty.* The present study suggests that the three main strands of animal welfare, liberation and rights have been shaped by a social problems discourse that goes back at least as far as Primatt in the eighteenth century. The animal movement is therefore united in its critique of speciesism as a social problem that society would be better off without. Yet this remains a minority position in a society where the moral orthodoxy is that animals matter, but not as much as humans.

An assumption in the book has been that the success of new social movements cannot be measured by their immediate political efficacy. Their more decisive achievement is that they challenge cultural codes and open up new areas for cultural contestation. In the case of the animal movement, activists and advocates have succeeded in transforming a previously exotic philosophical issue into a social problem that is taken seriously by increasing numbers of people, at least in Western democracies. At the turn of this century, animal rights has been identified as one of 'the best ten ideas' of the 1990s (Appleyard 1995, p. 19) and prompted the historian E.S. Turner to comment on the extraordinary progress of the movement in the last two hundred years:

> It is astonishing how many creatures, from whales to hedgehogs, now have their own pressure groups. In the face of traditional mockery, vegetarianism has made extraordinary advances, not least among the young. The cause of animals has disturbed the calm of company boardrooms, sown self-doubt in universities, driven airlines and airports to show respect for their animal freight, rattled the defenders of ritual slaughter, and caused unwonted and unwanted, rifts in bodies like the National Trust (Turner 1992, p. 318).

Garner (1998, pp. 463–64) however has argued that the countermobilisation of agribusiness, the animal research industry and the hunting lobby has probably reduced the effectiveness of animal rights campaigns. Even so, there is also the argument that the existence of these countermovements is a sign of the animal movement's strength. Yet it has to be acknowledged that the concept of animal rights remains a predominantly Western phenomenon and a hotly contested one, even in the West. Despite this, the animal movement can claim important achievements in its main campaigns. Perhaps its most significant achievement has been to disturb the moral orthodoxy, the norm of moderate concern for animals, and replace it with an alternative vision of a world in which animals matter as much as humans.

Ironically, the contentious issue of genetic engineering may be the trigger that will eventually turn this vision into a reality. The spectre of genetically engineered animals in laboratories, on farms and in the wild (not to mention the dinner table) may so alarm ordinary people that a new breed of animal activist will emerge to challenge what the conservationist John Muir denounced as 'Lord Man's creativity'. It is surely possible that the idea of altering an animal's telos, often for dubious reasons, will unite animal lovers, environmentalists, consumer and health advocates, as well as ordinary God-fearing carnivores and the spiritually-inclined, into a common cause movement. Such a movement would dwarf existing movements representing new green sensibilities that challenge moral orthodoxy concerning our treatment of both wild and domestic animals.

Appendix: Interview and Survey Data

Interviews

In this appendix, a brief account is provided of how I collected the data for the book. The study began with a survey of Australian animal protectionists (Munro 1995a) which provided a broad profile of the animal activists and advocates in Australia. These quantitative results were compared to a similar cohort of American respondents. Qualitative data in more than 50 interviews involving key informants including rank-and-file activists in Australia, the UK and the USA, provided rich, descriptive background information on the lives of the informants.

Access to the 53 informants in the study was facilitated by three individual movement leaders in the case study countries, Glenys Oogjes (Animals Australia), Joan Court (Animal Rights Cambridge) and Adele Douglass (American Humane Association). Once I had explained my research project to these individuals, and had interviewed one or two individuals in the relevant countries, the process snowballed. A snowball sampling technique, also called 'network sampling' (Wiersma 1991, p. 266) or 'opportunistic sampling' (Burgess 1984, p. 55) is a useful technique when the target population is scattered (Burgess 1982) or inaccessible (Eckhardt and Ermann 1977, p. 253). It was especially helpful in accessing potentially reluctant informants during a tight research schedule in the USA and the UK. In the case of the Australian interviewees, a modified snowball technique is a more accurate description of the process, as most of the informants were recruited via their host organisations.

One unintended consequence of soliciting interviewees via key informants was that these people often referred me to the leaders of various organisations, some of whom proved to be more guarded and practised in being interviewed than their staff members. I tried to overcome this problem by asking to speak to someone else in the organisation who had first hand experience in a recent campaign. More often than not, I was able to do this with the concurrence of the organisation's head.

While interviews and surveys were important in answering my research questions, other data were indispensable in forming a picture of the world of animal activists and advocates. These included a collection of various campaign documents and movement paraphernalia, video films both favourable and unfavourable to the movement, a radio and TV broadcast as well as annual reports and other materials such as magazines from the two-dozen or so organisations studied for the project. Secondary research material in the form of books and articles written by some of the informants were also an important resource for the study; all of these materials constituted the data used in the study. 'Data are what we see, hear or read: no more but certainly no less' (Melia 1987, pp. 34–5). According to Melia, whose doctoral dissertation relied heavily on qualitative analysis, albeit in a different field, the best we can hope for in using different data is that it tells a plausible story:

> Whatever high – flown rhetoric is adopted about uncovered meanings and understandings of discourse and narratives, what is required for a discussion of empirical work is some means of translating data from the field – interviews, observations, documents – into an explanation of the topic in hand which can be conveyed to others and understood by others (Melia 1987, p. 35).

Thus my purpose in selecting various data for the book was that it was compatible with the lived experiences of the animal protectionists in the study; my hope being that movement insiders would see the study as 'a plausible story' in the way suggested by Melia (1987). For each interview I referred to a list of ideas/topics, which I phrased as questions or used as prompts to elicit data on (a) individual experiences and (b) on organisations.

From the outset I wanted to treat the interviews as semi-structured conversations in which I hoped informants would be willing to discuss openly and freely any ideas they had on the project's working title 'Animal

liberationists and their campaigns', that is, the 'why' and 'how' of animal rights activism. This boiled down to two sets of questions. The first set consisted of questions about the informants themselves – their personal interest in animals, motivations, beliefs and lifestyles; the second set of questions focused on their involvement in specific campaigns using Shapiro's (1994) definition of the prototype animal rights activist as a person who cares about animals, is conscious of their suffering and does something about it, and whose activism is an integral part of his or her life. Thus the questions tapped into the personal stories about why people cared about particular animals and how they campaigned against perceived cruelty to animals in different contexts.

During the research it became clear there existed another type of animal protectionist that did not fit Shapiro's 'caring sleuth' description of the animal activist. These were people who saw themselves as animal advocates rather than activists. Many of the individuals who were employed by animal protection organisations described their work as animal advocacy and thought that their role resembled the political lobbyist more than the social movement activist. Phillips (1994) has referred to this division in new social movements as different routes to representation and participation. She contends that both require different resources, types of knowledge and tactical repertoires but both are needed in the interests of pragmatism and passion and for the success of the movement. The present study takes a similar approach by focusing on the organisational, advocacy wing (representation) and the grassroots, activist wing (participation) of the animal movement. I refer to these respectively as advocacy 'in the *suites*' and activism 'in the *streets*', terms which both literally and metaphorically, suggest different styles of campaigning.

There are some risks in giving space to representation as distinct from participation in the analysis of a social movement. For many people, a social movement cannot be 'tamed' by a focus on the organisational dimension of its activities, which conventionally are not associated with more expressive and dramatic forms of activism. However, a feature of the politics of animal protection is the tendency towards organisational specialization, which means that organisations often work on single issues, produce expertise and a division of labour on these issues, and employ issue specialists accordingly. Phillips (1994, p. 64) pointed to the pressures for institutionalisation when specialisation grows in social movements, and described what typically

occurs in the animal movement in the interaction between organisational advocate and grassroots activist: 'These specialists can compete in conventional politics based on expertise and then share their technological knowledge with the other organisations whose emphasis remains focused on participation and spontaneity'. This kind of partnership between animal advocacy (representation) and activism (participation) is a feature of animal protection praxis as described in this book.

As shown in Table A.1 there were 53 interviewees of whom 26 described themselves as activists and 27 as advocates. However, most of the Australian activists and half of the American and English cohorts can be more accurately designated as activist/advocates as they were often affiliated with an animal protection organisation that seemed to be more advocacy-oriented than grassroots. What is more important perhaps is the fact that many of the animal protectionists in this study were typically activists before they graduated to becoming advocates 'in the suites'.

The above individuals were asked a range of questions as individuals and as members of animal protection organisations. As noted above, two broad areas were explored in the interviews: first, the interviewee's motivations for activism and second, what interviewees actually did during a campaign cycle. A different set of questions was asked of the organisational advocates as explained below.

About Animal Protection Organisations

Buechler (2000) claimed that the resource mobilisation approach to social movements has had a resurgence in recent years. Using a similar approach, Dalton's (1994) analysis of environmental SMOs in Western Europe compared the different ideologies, organisational structures, resources, strategies and tactics of the groups he studied.

In the present study, I asked the organisation's spokesperson broad questions for each of the components in Dalton's model, including questions about the SMO's ideology/identity, its resource base and structure, how it mobilizes members, selects issues, forms alliances and generally conducts its campaigns in terms of preferred strategies and tactics.

Table A.1: Animal protectionists interviewed in the case study countries

Activists

Australia (12)	UK (9)	USA (5)
'Casey'	Adrew Tyler (Animal Aid)	'Alan'
'Gaynor'	'Gary'	Christine Stevens (AWI)
Jim Roberts (ALVic)	'James'	Scott Williams (FARM)
Laurie Levy (CADS)	Joan Court (ARC)	Wayne Pacelle (HSUS)
'Leslie'	Mike Huskisson (ACIG)	'Tina'
'Lisa'	'Milly'	
'Owen'	'Morry'	
Patty Mark (ALVic)	'Phyllis'	
'Rhett'	Tim O'Brien (CIWF)	
Rheya Linden (ALVic)		
'Roger'		
'Sherry'		

Advocates

Australia (10)	UK (5)	USA (12)
'Al'	'Barbara'	Adele Douglass (AHA)
Carole de Fraga (WSPA)	Collette Kase (NCDL)	Ann Sparks (AHA)
Elizabeth Ahlston (AAHR)	John Bryant (LACS)	Carter Luke (MSPCA)
Joan Papayanni (WLPA)	Joyce d' Silva (CIWF)	Cathy Liss (AWI)
Glenys Oogjes (ANZFAS)	'Kaye'	Gus Thornton (MSPCA)
Jenny Talbot (Proj Jonah)		Holly Hazard (DDAL)
Margaret Bowman (WLPA)		Pat Reilly (MSPCA)
Mark Berriman (AVS)		Stephanie Roderick (WSPA)
'Sid'		Tamara Hamilton (HSUS)
'Sue'		Vicky Kysar (WSPA)
		Tom Regan
		*Robert Ferris (DoW)

* Denotes that this interviewee preferred the designation movement 'supporter'. First names only are pseudonyms for individuals who preferred not to be identified.

I interpreted political ideology to mean the organisation's core set of values, that is, whether it saw itself as having an animal welfare, animal liberation or animal rights orientation. An SMO's political ideology is closely related to its political identity, a fact Dalton confirmed: 'The distinct political values of the core activists and the history of the organization define its political identity' (1994, p. 11).

While this line of questioning yielded important data on the organisational wing of the animal movement, it needs to be understood that this kind of data offers only a partial perspective on the movement. As Tilly reminded us, social movement organisations do not constitute social movements just as music schools do not constitute the world of classical music or galleries the world of painting (1993/94, p. 6). Yet the organisations listed in Table A.2 below do constitute an important part of the movement that cannot be ignored. While by no means comprehensive, the list is a representative mix of activist and advocacy organisations in the animal movement in the case study countries. These two-dozen organizations represent single and multi-issues as well as some specifically targeted campaigns as shown in Table A.3 below.

Most of the organisations in the study followed an organisational charter that was usually written down in their promotional literature. An organisation's charter establishes the limits of legitimizable action. 'In some sense, a charter can be said to represent the constraints on a member's freedom of action that he or she experiences or depicts as exterior, objective and given' (Dingwall & Strong 1997, pp. 146–47). Thus to be a staff member in the radical vegan-animal rights organisation Animal Aid, means that one has to be committed to a vegan lifestyle, something which for animal welfare and some of the liberation organisations listed in Table A.2 is not applicable. However, staff members of most of the prominent SMOs would generally be expected to be vegetarian, if not vegan. Thus, of the 53 interviewees in the study, 10 were organisational leaders, of whom four were vegan, four were vegetarian and the remaining two were designated as either semi-vegetarian or carnivore.

Survey of Animal Protectionists

The Animal and Social Issues Survey (ASIS) was used to find out how Australian animal protectionists compared to their Anglo-American counterparts on a number of specific issues. Thus ASIS focused on the attitudes and beliefs of animal rights supporters on a number of issues relevant to the protection and welfare of animals in Australia by incorporating some of the questions used by Rebecca Richards (1990) who surveyed subscribers to *Animals' Agenda*, an animal rights group in the United States. A comparable animal welfare group in Australia, ANZFAS/Animals Australia, was willing to participate in the survey. They have about five hundred members in

Table A.2: Programmatic orientation of select animal protection organizations in the case study countries

Animal welfare	Animal liberation	Animal rights
(RSPCA) MSPCA/World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA)	Animal Welfare Institute (AWI)	Animal Aid
National Canine Defence League (NCDL)	Animal Liberation (Vic)	Animal Rights Cambridge (ARC)
Defenders of Wildlife	Animal Liberation (NSW)	Animal Cruelty Investigation Group (ACIG)
	Project Jonah	Farm Animal Reform Movement (FARM)
	Compassion in World Farming (CIWF)	Coalition Against Duck Shooting (CADS)
	League Against Cruel Sports (LACS)	Guardians
	American Humane Association (AHA)	Australian Association for Humane Research (AAHR)
	Humane Society of the United States (HSUS)	British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV)
	Australian and New Zealand Federation of Animal Societies (ANZFAS)	Mountain Residents for Animal Rights (MRAR)
	World League for the Protection of Animals (WLPA)	Brightlingsea Against Animal Exports (BALE)
	Australian Vegetarian Society (AVS)	(People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) (PETA)
	Doris Day Animal League (DDAL)	(Hunt Saboteurs Association) (HAS)

Australia and represent approximately thirty animal welfare/rights organisations throughout the country. Every member in Australia was asked to complete the nine-page questionnaire and 87 per cent did so. The data from ASIS revealed a number of basic facts about animal protectors and their campaigns: what they regard as the worst forms of speciesism; the reasons for and the level of their involvement in the movement; what they consider effective and justifiable actions to protect animals against cruelty; their dietary

Table A.3: Animal protection organizations by issue or focus

Issue or focus of organisation	Animal protection organisation
Multi-issue groups	Animal Aid, Animal Rights Cambridge, Animal Welfare Institute, Humane Society of the United States, Doris Day Animal League, American Humane Association, Animals Australia, World League for the Protection of Animals, World Society for the Protection of Animals
Specialist or focussed campaigns	Animal Cruelty Investigation Group (mainly cruelty to lab or wild animals); Animal Liberation in Australia, Mountain Residents for Animal Rights, Brightlingsea Against Live Exports (mostly farm animals); SPCA/ MSPCA, National Canine Defence League (domestic animals)
Single-issue groups	Wild animals – Coaliton Against Duck Shooting, League Against Cruel Sports, Project Jonah, Defenders of Wildlife; Laboratory animals – British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, Australian Association for Humane Research, Guardians; Farm animals – Farm Animal Reform Movement, Compassion in World Farming.

habits and patterns of pet 'ownership' and finally personal background issues such as marital status, income and so on. Together with the interview data, these data from the survey provided a sociological profile of animal protectionists and their campaigns against vivisection, factory farming and blood sports in Australia, the USA and England.

Bibliography

Ackerman, Peter and Kruegler, Christopher (1994) *Strategic non-violent conflict: The dynamics of people power in the twentieth century,* Praeger, Westport, CT.

Adam, Barry (1993) 'Post-Marxism and the new social movements' in William K. Carroll (ed.) *Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association*, August, 30:3, pp. 316–35.

Adams, Carol (1990) *The sexual politics of meat: A feminist-vegetarian critical theory,* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Adams, Carol (1995) 'Comment on George's "Should feminists be vegetarians?"' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Sociey,* Autumn, pp. 221–25.

Adams, Carol and Donovan, J. (1995) *Animals and women: Feminist theoretical explorations,* Duke University Press, Durham.

Agnew, R. (1998) 'The causes of animal abuse: A social-psychological analysis', *Theoretical Criminology,* 2, 177–209.

Animal Aid press release (2001) 'Labour's betrayal: What chance protection for animals in the new parliament', issued 29 May, 2001, website: www.animalaid.org.uk

Animals Australia (2003) website, http://www.animalsaustralia.org/, accessed June 2003.

ANZAS (1994–95) Annual Report of the Australian and New Zealand Federation of Animal Societies, Melbourne.

Appleyard, B. (1995) 'A moral life in this godless world', *The Independent,* 13 (November), 19.

Arluke, Arnold (1992) 'Trapped in a guilt cage', *The New Scientist,* 4 April, pp. 33–35.

Arluke, Arnold (1994) '"We build a better beagle": Fantastic creatures in lab animal ads', *Qualitative Sociology,* Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 143–58.

Arluke, Arnold and Groves, Julian (1998) 'Pushing the boundaries: Scientists in the public arena', In L. Hart (ed.) *Responsible conduct in research,* Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.

Arluke, Arnold and Luke, Carter (1997) 'Physical cruelty toward animals in Massachusetts 1975–1996', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 5, No. 3, October, pp. 195–204.

Arluke, Arnold and Sanders, C.R. (1996) *Regarding animals,* Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Arluke, Arnold and Sax, Boris (1992) 'Understanding Nazi animal protection and the Holocaust', *Anthrozoos,* 5: 6–31.

Ascione, Frank (1993) 'Children who are cruel to animals: A review of research and implications for developmental psychology', *Anthrozoos*, 6, (4), 226–47.

Ascione, Frank and Arkow, Phil (1999) *Child abuse, domestic violence and animal abuse: Linking the circles of compassion and intervention,* Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Indiania.

AWI (2001) Commemorating 50 years, The AWI's commemorative issue, Animal Welfare Institute, Washington, DC.

Baker, Steve (1993) *Picturing the beast: Animals, identity and representation,* Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Barker-Benfield, G.J. (1992) *The culture of sensibility: Sex and society in eighteenth-century Britain,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Barnes, Barry (1995) *The elements of social theory,* UCL Press Limited, London.

Barry, Andrew (1999) 'Demonstrations: Sites and sights of direct action', *Economy and Society*, Volume 28, Number 1, February, pp. 75–94.
Bash, Harry (1995) *Social problems and social movements: An exploration into the sociological construction of alternative realities*, Humanities Press, New Jersey.
Beck, Ulrich (1992) *Risk society*, Sage, London.
Beirne, Piers (1994) 'The law is an ass: Reading E.P. Evans, The medieval prosectution and capital punishment of animals', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 27–46.
Beirne, Piers (1995) 'The use and abuse of animals in criminology: A brief history and current review', *Social Justice*, Vol. 22, No. 1, Spring, pp. 5–31.
Beirne, Piers (1999) 'For a non-speciesist criminology: animal abuse as an object of study', *Criminology*, Vol. 37, No. 1, February, pp. 117–47.
Benford, R. and Snow, D. (2000) 'Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 26, pp. 611–39.
Benton, Ted (1992) 'Review essay of animals and society: The humanity of animal rights', *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 5, No. 2, May, pp. 123–30.
Benton, Ted (1993) *Natural relations: Ecology, animal rights and social justice*,Verso, London.
Benton, Ted (1995) 'Animal rights and social relations' in Andrew Dobson and Paul Lucardie (eds.) *The politics of nature: Explorations in green political theory*, Routledge, London.
Benton, Ted (1998) 'Rights and justice on a shared planet: More rights or new relations?' *Theoretical Criminology*, Vol. 2 (2): 149–75.
Benton, Ted and Redfearn, R. (1996) 'The politics of animal rights: Where is the left?', *New Left Review*, 215.
Berger, John (1990) 'Photographs of agony' in *About looking*, Vintage International, Vintage Books, New York.
Berger, Peter and Luckman, Thomas (1966) *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*, Double Day, New York.
Berger, Peter and Neuhaus, R.J. (1970) *Movement and revolution*, Archer Books, New York.
Berry, Wendall (1996) *The unsettling of America: Culture and agriculture*, Sierra Club Books, San Fransisco.
Best, Joel (1989) *Images of issues: Typifying contemporary social problems*, Adline de Gruyter, New York.
Best, Joel (1990) *Threatened children: Rhetoric and concern about child-victims*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Best, Joel (1995) *Images of issues: Typifying contemporary social problems*, Adline de Gruyter, New York.
Birke, Lynda (1991a) 'Science, feminism and animal natures: I: Extending the boundaries', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 14, 443–49.
Birke, Lynda (1991b) 'Science, feminism and animal natures: II: Feminist critiques and the place of animals in science', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 451–58.
Birke, Lynda (1994) *Feminism, animals and science: The naming of the shrew*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
Birke, Lynda (1997) 'Science and animals, or why Cyril won't win the Nobel Prize' in *Animal Issues*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Department of General Philosophy, University of Sydney, Sydney, pp. 45–55.
Birke, Lynda and Michael, Mike (1992a) 'The researchers' dilemma', *The New Scientist*, 4 April, 25–28.
Birke, Lynda and Michael, Mike (1992b) 'Views from behind the barracade', *The New Scientist*, 4 April, 29–32.
Blum, D. (1994) *The monkey wars*, Oxford University Press, New York.
Braithwaite, John (1989) *Crime, shame and reintegration*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Brown, Phil (1995) 'Popular epidemiology, toxic waste and social movements' in Jonathan Gabe (ed.) *Medicine, health and risk: Sociological approaches*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Brown, Phil (1997) 'Popular epidemiology revisited', *Current Sociology,* Vol. 45(3), July, pp. 137–56.
Brown, Wendy (1995) *States of injury: Power and freedom in late modernity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
Bryant, Clifton (1979) 'The zoological connection: Animal-related human behavior', *Social Forces*, Vol. 58, pp. 399–421.
Bryant, Clifton (1991) 'Deviant leisure and clandestine lifestyle: Cockfighting as a socially devalued sport', *World Leisure and Recreation*, 133(2), 17–21.
Bryant, Clifton (1993) A review of Keith Tester's 'Animals and society: The humanity of animal rights', in *Contemporary Society,* Vol. 22, No. 4, July, p. 557.
Bryant, Clifton and Snizek, William (1993) On the trial of the centaur, *Society*, Vol. 3, No. 3, March-April, pp. 25–35.
Bryant, John (1982) *Fettered kingdoms,* Fox Press, Manchester.
Buechler, Steven (2000) *Social movements in advanced capitalism: The political economy and cultural construction of social activism,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Burgess, R.G. (1984) *In the field: An introduction to field research,* George Allen & Unwin, London.
Burgmann, Verity (1993) *Power and protest: Movements for change in Australian society,* Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
Burningham, Kate and Cooper, Geoff (1999) 'Being constructive: Social constructionism and the environment', *Sociology*, Vol. 33, No. 2, May, pp. 297–316.
Buttel, F.H. (1987) 'New direcions in environmental sociology', *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol. 13, pp. 465–88.
Byrne, Paul (1997) *Social movements in Britain*, Routledge, London.
Canel, E. (1992) 'Social movement theory', in W. Carroll (eds.) *Organising dissent: contemporary social movements in theory and practice,* Garamond Press, Toronto.
Carruthers, Peter (1992) *The animals issue*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Cartmill, M. (1993) *A view to a death in the morning: Hunting and nature through history,* Howard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Castells, Manuel (1997) *The information age: Economy, society and culture,* Vol. 2, The power of identity, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
Cavaliera, Paola and Singer, Peter (1993) *The great ape project: Equality beyond humanity*, St. Martin's Press, New York.
Chin, Christine and Mittelman, James (2001) 'Conceptualizing resistance to globalization' in Barry Gills (ed.) *Globalization and the politics of resistance,* Palgrave, Hampshire and New York.
Clark, Candace (1997) *Misery and company: Sympathy and everyday life*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Clark, Elizabeth (1995) ' "The sacred rights of the weak": Pain, sympathy and the culture of individual rights in antebellum America' in *The Journal of American History*, September, pp. 463–93.
Clark, S.R.L. (1997) *Animals and their moral standing,* Routledge London.
Coats, C.D. (1989) *Old McDonald's factory farm*, Continuum Publishing, New York.
Cockburn, Alexander (1996) 'A short, meat-oriented history of the world: From Eden to the Mattole', *New Left Review,* No. 215, January/February, pp. 16–42.
Coe, Sue (1995) *Dead meat,* Four Walls Eight Windows, New York and London.
Coetzee, J.M. (1996) *The lives of animals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NY.
Cohen, Stan (1972) *Folk devils and moral panics,* Martin Robinson, Oxford.
Cohen, Jean (1985) 'Strategy or identity: New theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements', *Social Research,* Vol. 52, No. 4, Winter, pp. 663–716.
Collard, Andre with Contrucci, Joyce (1988) *Rape of the wild,* The Women's Press Ltd, London.
Collins, Patricia (1989) 'The social construction of invisibility: Black women's poverty in social problems discourse' in James Holstein and Gale Miller (eds.) *Perspectives on social problems: A research annual,* JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
Collins, Randall (1990) 'Stratification, emotional energy, and transient emotions' in Theodore Kemper (ed.) *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions,* State University of New York Press, New York.

Collins, Randall (2001) 'Social movements and the focus of emotional attention' in Jeff Goodwin, James Jasper and Francesca Polletta (eds.) *Passionate politics: Emotion and social movements,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
Cooper, David (1992) A review of Keith Tester's 'Animals and society: The humanity of animal rights', in *The Sociological Review,* Vol. 40, No. 1, Feb, pp. 165–67.
Cress, D.M. and Snow, D.A. (1996) 'Mobilization at the margins: Resources, benefactors, and the viability of the homeless social movement organisations', *American Sociological Review,* 61, 1089–1109.
Crooke, S., Pakulski, J. and Waters, M. (1992) *Postmodernization: Change in advanced society,* Sage Publications, London.
Cuomo, Chris (1998) *Feminism and ecological communities: An ethic of flourishing,* Routledge, London and New York.
Dalton, Russell (1994) *The green rainbow: Environmental groups in Western Europe*, Yale University Press, New York.
Daniels, Arlene Kaplan (1987) 'Invisible work', *Social problems*, Vol. 34, No. 5, December, pp. 403–15.
Day, David (1997*) The whale war*, Grafton, Hammersmith, London.
Deal, Carl (1993) *The greenpeace guide to anti-environmental organizations*, Odonian Press, Berkeley, California.
Della Porta, Donatella and Diani, Mario (1999) *Social movements: An introduction*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
De Luca, Kevin (1999) *Image politics: The new rhetoric of environmental activism*, Fulford Press, New York.
Denzin, N.K. (1989) *Interpretive interactionism*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California.
Diani, Mario (1992) 'The concept of the social movement', *The Sociological Review,* Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 1–25.
Dickens, Peter (1992) *Society and nature: Towards a green social theory,* Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
Dingwall, Robert and Strong, P.M. (1997) 'The international study of organizations: A critique and reformulation' in Gale Miller and Robert Dingwall (eds.) *Context and method in qualitative research,* Sage Publications, London.
Dizard, Jan E. (1994) *Going wild: Hunting, animal rights, and the contested meaning of nature*, University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.
Doherty, B. (2000) 'Manufactured vulnerability: Protest campaign tactics', in B. Seel, M. Paterson and B. Doherty (eds.) *Direct action in British environmentalism,* Routledge, London and New York.
Doherty, B. (2002) *Ideas and actions in the green movement*, Routledge, London and New York.
Doherty, B., Paterson, M. and Seel, B. (2000) 'Direct action in British environmentalism', in B. Seel, M. Paterson and B. Doherty (eds.) *Direct action in British environmentalism,* Routledge, London and New York.
Dolan, E.F. (1986) *Animal rights*, Franklin Walts, New York.
Donovan, J. (1993) 'Animal rights and feminist theory', in G. Gaard (eds.) *Ecofeminism: woman, animals, nature,* Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
Douglas, Mary (2000) 'The flesh is weak', a review of ethical vegetarianism: From Pythagoras to Peter Singer, in *Times Literary Supplement,* 8.
Eckersley, Robyn (1992) *Environmentalism and political theory: Toward an ecocentric approach,* UCL Press, London
Eckhardt, K. and Ermann, M.D. (1977) *Social research methods,* Random House, New York.
Economist, The (1995) 'People and animals: Also part of creation', 19 August, pp. 17–19.
Eder, Klaus (1990) 'The rise of counter-culture movements against modernity: Nature as a new field of class struggle', *Theory, Culture and Society,* November, Vol. 7, pp. 21–48.
Einwohner, Rachel (1997) *The efficacy of protest: Meaning and social movement outcomes (animal rights, culture, identity),* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Washington.
Elias, N. (1978) *The civilising process, Vol. 1, The history of manners,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Elliott, Anne (1992) 'People working for animals', *Animal Liberation Magazine*, No. 42, October-December, pp. 14–16.
Elshtain, Jean (1981) *Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
Elston, Mary Ann (1990) 'Women and antivivisection in Victorian England 1870 to 1900' in Nicholaas Rupke (ed.) *Vivisection in historical perspective,* Routledge, London and New York.
Elston, Mary Ann (1992) 'Victorian values and animal rights', *New Scientist*, 23 May, pp. 28–35.
Emel, Jody and Wolch, Jennifer (1998) 'Witnessing the animal moment' in Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel (eds.) *Animal geographies: Place, politics, and identity in the nature-culture borderlands,* Verso, London and New York.
Erikson, Kai (1990) 'Introduction' in Kai Erikson and Steven Peter Vallas (eds.) *The nature of work: Sociological perspectives*, American Sociological Association, Presidential Series and Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
Erlichman, James (1995) 'Rent-a-mob forces end to animal welfare protests', *The Guardian*, 5 January.
Evans, E.P. (1906/1998) *The criminal prosecution and capital punishment of animals,* The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd. Union, New Jersey.
Eyerman, Ron and Jamieson, Andrew (1989) 'Environmental knowledge as an organizational weapon: The case of Greenpeace', *Social Science Information,* 28(1) 99–119.
Eyerman, Ron and Jamieson, Andrew (1991) *Social movements: A cognitive approach,* The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Pennsylvania.
Ferguson, Moira (1998) *Animal advocacy and Englishwomen 1780–1900: Patriots, nation and empire*, The University of Michigan Press, Michigan.
Ferry, Luc (1995) *The new ecological order,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Finsen, Lawrence and Finsen, Susan (1994) *The animal rights movement in America: From compassion to respect*, Twayne Publishers, New York.
Flacks, Richard (1988) *Making history: The American left and the American mind,* Columbia University Press, New York.
Flynn, Clifton (2001) 'Acknowledging the "zoological connection": A sociological analysis of animal cruelty,' *Society & Animals*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 71–87.
Foucault, Michel (1977) *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison,* Harmondsworth, Penguin.
Foweraker, Joe (1995) *Theorising social movements,* Pluto Press, London.
Francione, Gary (1996) *Rain without thunder: The ideology of the animal rights movement*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.
Francione, Gary (2000) *Introduction to animal rights: Your child or the dog?* Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
Franklin, Adrian (1999) *Animals and modern cultures: A sociology of human-animal relations in modernity,* Sage, London.
Franklin, Adrian (2002) *Nature and social theory,* Sage Publications, London.
Fraser, Caroline (1993) 'The Raid at Silver Spring' in *New Yorker*, April 19, pp. 66–84.
Fraser, L., Eawistowski, S., Horwitz, J. and Tukel, S. (1990) *The animal rights handbook,* Living Planet Press, Los Angeles.
Freidson, Eliot (1990) 'Labors of love in theory and practice: A prospectus', in Kai Erikson and Steven Peter Vallas (eds.) *The nature of work: Sociological perspectives*, American Sociological Association, Presidential Series and Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
French, Richard D. (1975) *Antivivisection and medical science in Victorian society*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
Frey, R.G. (1983) *Rights, killing and suffering: Moral vegetarianism and applied ethics,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
Fudge, Erica (2002) *Animal*, Reaktion Books, London.
Gamson, William (1985) 'Goffman's legacy to political sociology', *Theory and Society*, pp. 605–622.
Gamson, William (1992a) *Talking politics,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gamson, William (1992b) 'The social psychology of collective action', in A.D. Morris, and M.C. Mueller (eds.) *Frontiers in social movement theory*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
Garner, Robert (1993a) 'Political animals: A survey of the animal protection movement in Britain', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 46(3), pp. 333–52.
Garner, Robert (1993b) *Animals, politics and morality,* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Garner, Robert (1995) 'The politics of animal protection', *Society & Animals,* 3(1) 43–60.
Garner, Robert (1996) *Animal rights: The changing debate,* New York University Press, New York.
Garner, Robert (1998a) 'Defending animal rights', *Parliamentary Affairs,* Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 458–69.
Garner, Robert (1998b) *Political animals: Animal protection politics in Britain and the United States*, Macmillan Press Ltd.
Garrett, Tom (1996) *Alternative traps,* Animal Welfare Institute, Washington D.C.
George, Kathryn Paxton (1994) 'Should feminists be vegetarians?' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Sociey,* vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 405–34.
Gergen, Kenneth (1999) *An invitation to social constructionism*, Sage Publications, London.
Gerlach, Luther and Hine, Virginia (1970) *People, power, change: Movements and social transformation*, Bobb-Merrill Co. Indianapolis.
Giddens, Anthony (1991a) *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in late modern age*, Polity, Cambridge.
Giddens, Anthony (1991b) *The consequences of modernity,* Polity Press, Cambridge.
Gitlin, Todd (1980) *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*, University of California Press, Berkeley, NY.
Glendon, Mary Ann (1991) *Rights talk: The impoverishment of political discourse*, The Free Press, New York.
Godwin, R.K. (1988) *One billion dollars of influence: The direct marketing of politics*, Chatam House, Chatham, NY.
Goffman, Erving (1974) *Frame analysis: An essay on the organisation of experience,* Northeastern University Press, Boston.
Goodwin, Jeff, Jasper, James and Polletta, Francesca (eds.) *Passionate politics: Emotion and social movements,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
Grenier, Roger / translated by Alice Kaplan (2000) *The difficulty of being a dog,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
Groves, Julian (1995) 'Learning to feel: The neglected sociology of social movements', *The Sociological Review,* 43(3) pp. 435–61.
Groves, Julian (1997) *Hearts and minds: The controversy over laboratory animals,* Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
Groves, Julian (2001) 'Animal rights and the politics of emotion: Folk constructions of emotion in the Animal Rights movement' in Jeff Goodwin, James Jasper and Francesca Polletta (eds.) *Passionate politics: Emotion and social movements,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
Gurr, Ted (2000) 'Nonviolence in ethnopolitics: Strategies for the attainment of group rights and autonomy', *PS: Political Science,* Vol. XXIII, No. 2, June, pp. 155–60.
Haines, Herbert (1984) 'Black radicalization and the funding of civil rights: 1957–1970', *Social Problems*, 32(1), 31–43.
Haltunen, K. (1995) 'Humanitarianism and the philosophy of pain in Anglo-American culture', *The American Historical Review,* 100(2) 303–34.
Hannigan, John (1995) *Environmental sociology: A social constructionist perspective*, Routledge, London.
Harries-Jones, P. (ed.) (1991) *Making knowledge count: Advocacy and social science,* Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
Harrison, Brian (1973) 'Animals and the state in nineteenth century England', in J.M. Wallace-Hadrill and J.M. Roberts (eds.) *The English Historical Review,* Vol. LXXXVIII, (349) 786–820.

Harrison, Ruth (1964) *Animal machines*: *The new factory farming industry*, London, Vincent Stuart Ltd.
Haskell, Thomas (1999) 'Responsibility, convention, and the role of ideas in history' in Peter Coclanis and Stuart Bruchey (1999) *Ideas, ideologies, and social movements: The United States experience since 1800,* University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, South Carolina.
Hendrick, George and Hendrick, Willene (1989) (editors) *The savour of Salt: A Henry Salt anthology*, The Centaur Press, Fontwell, Sussex.
Herman, E. and Chomsky, N. (1988) *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media,* Pantheon, New York.
Herzog, Harold (1993) 'The movement is my life: The psychology of animal rights activism', *Journal of Social Issue*, 49, pp. 103–19.
Hjelmar, Ulf (1996) 'Constructivist analysis and movement organizations: Conceptual clarifications', *ACTA Sociologica,* Volume 39, pp. 169–86.
Hochschild, Arlie Russell (1983) *The managed heart: The commercialization of human feeling,* University of California Press, Berkeley.
Hogan, Walter and Retzel, Elizabeth (1995) 'Ethical treatment of animals', *Choice*, September, pp. 59–72.
Holstein, James and Miller, Gale (1993) 'Social constructionism and social problems work' in Gale Miller and James Holstein (eds.) *Constuctionist controversies: Issues in social problems theory*, Aldine de Gruyter, New York.
Huby, Meg (1998) *Social policy and the environment,* Open University Press, Buckingham.
Hunt, Scott, Benford, Robert and Snow, David (1994) 'Identity fields: Framing processes and the social construction of movement identities' in Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston and Joseph Gusfield (eds.) *New social movements: From ideology to identity*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
Hutton, Drew and Connors, Libby (1999) *A history of the Australian environment movement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Ibarra, Peter and Kitsuse, John (1993) 'Vernacular constituents of moral discourse: An interactionnist proposal for the study of social problems' in Gale Miller and James Holstein (eds.) *Constructionist contoversies: Issues in social problems theory*, Aldine de Gruyter, New York.
Ingalsbee, Timothy (1993/94) 'Resource and action mobilization theories: The new social-psychological research agenda', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 38, pp. 139–55.
Irwin, Alan (1995) *Citizen science: A study of people, expertise and sustainable development,* Routledge, London and New York.
Irvine, Leslie (2003) 'The problem of unwanted pets: A case study in how institutions "think" about clients'needs', in *Social Problems,* Vol. 50, No. 4, pp. 550–66.
James, Paul, Veit, Walter and Wright, Steve (1997) *Work of the future: Global perspectives,* Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, NSW.
Jasper, James (1990) 'Moral dimensions of social movements', Paper presented at the American Sociological Association annual meeting, Cincinnati, August 1991, 1–31.
Jasper, James (1997) *The art of moral protest: Culture, biography and creativity in social movements,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Jasper, James (1998) 'The emotions of protest: Affective and reactive emotions in and around social movements', *Sociological Forum,* Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 397–424.
Jasper, James (1999) 'Violence toward animals', *Encyclopedia of violence, peace, conflict*, Vol. 1, A–E, pp. 77–88, Academic Press, San Diego.
Jasper, James and Nelkin, Dorothy (1990) 'The mentalite of the animal rights movement: Sentimental anthropomorphism and the critique of instrumentalism', *Paper presented at the American Sociological Association annual meeting*, Cincinnati, August 1991, 1–31.
Jasper, James and Nelkin, Dorothy (1992) *The animal rights crusade: The growth of a moral protest*, The Free Press, New York.
Jasper, James and Poulsen, J. (1995) 'Recruiting strangers and friends: Moral shocks and social networks in animal rights and anti-nuclear protests', *Social Problems,* 42(4) 493–512.

Jenkins, C. (1983) 'Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 9, pp. 327–53.
Jenness, Valerie (1995) 'Social movement growth, domain expansion, and framing processes: The gay/lesbian movement and violence against gays and lesbians as a social problem' in *Social Problems*, Vol. 42, No. 1, February, pp. 145–70.
Johnston, Hank, Larana, Enrique and Gusfield, Joseph (1994) 'Identites, grievances and new social movements' in Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston and Joseph Gusfield (eds.) *New social movements: From ideology to identity*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
Jones, Barry (1982) *Sleepers wake! Technology and the future of work*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Jones, Dena (1996) 'The media's response to animal rights activism: Tracking print coverage for three annual events', *Centre for Animals and Public Policy,* Tufts University, School of Veterinary Medicine, North Grafton, Massachusetts July, pp. 1–24.
Jordan, Tim (2002) *Activism! Direct action, hacktivism and the future of society*, Reaktion Books Ltd., London.
Kaminer, Wendy (1984) *Women volunteering: The pleasure, pain, and politics of unpaid work from 1830 to the present,* Anchor Books, New York.
Kean, Hilda (1998) *Animal rights: Political and social change in Britain since 1800*, Reaktion Books Ltd., London.
Keck, Margaret and Sikkink, Kathryn (1998) 'Transnational advocacy networks in the movement society' in David Meyer and Sidney Tarrow (eds.) *The social movement society: Contentious politics for a new century,* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Lanham, Maryland.
Kew, Barry (1999) *Fearsome truths: The challenge of animal liberation,* Unpublished PhD thesis in sociology, University of Durham, Durham.
Kielbowicz, R.B. and Scherer, C. (1986) 'The role of the press in the dynamics of social movements', in K. Lang, G.E. Lang and L. Kriesberg (eds.) *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, Greenwich, CT, JAI Press, pp. 71–96.
Kimbrell, Andrew (1994) *The human body shop: The engineering and marketing of life*, Harper Collins, San Francisco.
Kistler, John (2002) *People promoting and people opposing animal rights: In their own words,* Greenwood Press, Westport, CT and London.
Kitschelt, Herbert (1986) 'Political opportunity structures and political protest: Anti-nuclear movements in four democracies,' *British Journal of Political Science*, 16, 57–85.
Klandermans, Bert (1992) 'The social construction of protest and multiorganizational fields', in A.D. Morris and C. McClurg Mueller (eds.) *Frontiers in social movement theory*, New Haven, Yale University.
Knight, John (ed.) (2000) *Natural enemies: People-wildlife conflicts in anthropological perspective,* Routledge, London and New York.
Koopmans, R. (1993) 'The dynamics of protest waves', *American Sociological Review*. 58, pp. 637–58.
Kruse, Corwin (c. 1996) 'Sentient beings or research tools? Images, framing, and the construction of the animal experimentation debate', Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota.
Kruse, Corwin (1999) 'Gender, views of nature and support for animal rights', *Society & Animals*, 7, pp. 179–98.
Kunkel, K. (1995) 'Down on the farm: Rationale expansion in the construction of factory farming as a social problem', J. Best (ed.) *Images of issues: Typifying contemporary social problems,* Aldine De Gruyter, New York.
LaFollette, H. and Shanks, N. (1996) *Brute science: Dilemmas of animal experimentation*, Routledge, London.
Langley, Gill (1998) 'Alternatives to animal experimentation', pp. 4–5 in Marc Bekoff with Carron A. Meaney (eds.) *Encyclopedia of animal rights and animal welfare*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.
Lansbury, Coral (1985) *The old brown dog: Women, workers and vivisection in Edwardian England,* The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin.

Laska, S.B. (1993) 'Environmental sociology and the state of the discipline', *Social Forces,* Vol. 72, 1, pp. 1–17.
Lawrence, Geoffrey (1991) 'Agribusiness and inequality: Changes in the bush', in J. O'Leary and R. Sharp (eds.), *Inequality in Australia: Slicing the cake*, William Heinemann, Australia, Melbourne.
Leahy, M. (1991) *Against liberation: Putting animals in perspective,* Routledge London.
Leahy, M. and Cohn-Sherbok, D. (1996) *The liberation debate: Rights at issue,* Routledge, London.
Lemert, J.B. (1984) 'News context and the elimination of mobilizing information: An experiment', *Journalism Quarterly,* Summer, pp. 243–49.
Levy, Laurie (1989) 'Towards an end to gun lobby violence against Australia's native water birds', *Weapons and violence in Australia*, Coalition Against Duck Shooting, Melbourne.
Lewis, Justin (1991) *Ideological octopus: An exploration of television and its audiences,* New York, Routledge.
Lichterman, Paul (1996) *The search for political community: American activists reinventing commitment,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Lofland, John (1996) *Social movement organisations: Guide to research on insurgent realities*, Aldine de Gruyter, New York.
Lovelock, James (1988) *The ages of Gaia: A biography of our living earth*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Luke, B. (1995) 'Solidarity across diversity: A pluralistic rapprochement of environmentalism and animal liberation', *Social Theory and Practice*, 21(2), pp. 177–206.
McAdam, Doug (1982) *Political process and the development of black insurgency, 1930–1970,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
McAdam, Doug (1988) 'Micromobilization contexts and recruitment to activism', *International Social Movement Research,* I, 125–54, JAI Press, Greeenwich, CT.
McAdam, Doug (1999) 'The biographical impact of activism' in Mario Giugni, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly (eds.) *How social movements matter*, The University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London.
McAdam Doug, McCarthy John and Zald, Mayer (eds.) (1996) *Comparative perspectives on social movement: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures and cultural framings*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
McAdam, Doug and Paulsen, R. (1993) 'Specifying the relationships between social ties and activism', *American Journal of Sociology,* 99(3) November, pp. 640–67.
McCabe, Jane (1988) 'Is a lab rat's fate more poignant than a child's?', *Newsweek*, December, 26, pp. 50–57.
McCarthy, John and McPhail, Clark (1998) 'The institutionalisation of protest in the United States' in David Meyer and Sidney Tarrow (eds.) *The social movement society: Contentious politics for a new century,* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Lanham, Maryland.
McCarthy, John and Zald, Mayer (1977) 'Resource mobilisation and social movements: A partial theory', *American Journal of Sociolgy*, P2,6:1212–41.
McCarthy, John and Zald, Mayer (2001) 'The enduring vitality of the resource mobilization theory of social movements' in Jonathan Turner (ed.) *Handbook of sociological theory,* Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.
McCright, Aaron and Dunlap, Riley (2000) 'Challenging global warming as a social problem: An analysis of the conserveration movement's counter-claims,' *Social Problems,* Vol. 47, No. 4, November, pp. 499–522.
MacCulloch, Jennifer (1993) C*reatures of culture: The animal protection and preservation movements in Sydney, 1880–1930,* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney.
McDonald, Barbara (2000) 'Once you know something, you can't not know it: An empirical look at becoming vegan', *Society & Animals,* Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1–23.
McDonald, M. (1994) *Caught in the act: The Feldberg investigation,* Jon Carpenter Publishing, Oxford.
Magel, Charles (1989) *Keyguide to information sources in animal rights,* Mansell Publishing, London.

Magel, Charles (1992) (editor) J. Howard Moore's *The universal kinship*, The Centaur Press, Fontwell, Sussex.
Margalit, Avishai (1996) *The decent society*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Marsh, Ian (1994) 'Interest group analysis' in Andrew Parkin, John Summers, Dennis Woodward (eds.) *Government, politics and policy in Australia*, 5th edition, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.
Martell, Luke (1994) *Ecology and society*: *An introduction*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
Marvin, Garry (2000) "The problem of foxes: Legitimate and illegitimate killing in the English countryside, in John Knight (ed.) *Natural enemies: People-wildlife conflicts in anthropological perspective,* Routledge, London and New York.
Maurer, Donna (1995) 'Meat as a social problem: Rhetorical strategies in the contemporary vegetarian literature', in Donna Maurer and Jeffrey Sobal (eds.) *Eating agendas: Food and nutrition as social problems,* Aldine de Gruyter, New York.
Mauss, Armaud (1989) 'Beyond the illusion of social problems theory' in James Holstein and Gale Miller (editors) *Perspectives on social problems: A research annual*, Vol. 1, JAI Press Inc. Greenwich, London.
Mazur, Allan and Lee, Jinling (1993) 'Sounding the global alarm. Environmental issues in the US national news', *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 23, No. 4, November, pp. 681–720.
Melia, K.M. (1987) *Learning and working: The occupational socialization of nurses,* Tavistock, London.
Melucci, Alberto (1984) 'An end to social movements', *Social Science Information,* 23, pp. 819–35.
Melucci, Alberto (1989) *Nomads of the present: Social movements and individual needs in contemporary society*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
Melucci, Alberto (1996) *Challenging codes: Collective action in the information age*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Mennell, Stephen (1991) 'On the civilising of appetite' in M. Featherstone, M. Hepworth and B.S. Turner (eds.) *The body: Social processes and cultural theory,* Sage Publications, London.
Merton, Robert (1968) *Social theory and social structure,* The Free Press, New York.
Merz-Perez, Linda and Heide, Kathleen (2004) *Animal cruelty: Pathway to violence against people,* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.
Meyer, David and Tarrow, Sidney (1998) (eds.) *The social movement society: Contentious politics for a new century,* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. Lanham, Maryland.
Michael, Mike (1996) *Constructing identities,* Sage Publications, London.
Midgley, Mary (1983) *Animals and why they matter,* Penguin, Harmondsworth.
Miller, Gale and Holstein, James (1989) 'On the sociology of social problems' in James Holstein and Gale Miller (eds.) *Perspectives on social problems,* Vol. 1, pp. 1–18, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
Miller, Gale and Holstein, James (1997) *Social problems in everyday life: Studies of social problems,* JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
Miller, James (1990) 'Carnivals of atrocity: Foucault, Nietzsche, cruelty', *Political Theory,* Vol. 18, No. 3, August, pp. 470–91.
Miller, Leslie (1993) 'Claims-making from the underside: Marginalisation and social problems analysis' in James Holstein and Gale Miller (eds.) *Reconsidering social constructionism: Debates in social problems theory,* Aldine de Gruyter, New York.
Milliken, Robert (1992) *On the edge: The changing world of Australia's farmers,* Simon & Schuster, East Roseville, NSW.
Mills, C. Wright (1951) *White collar: The American middle classes*, Oxford University Press, New York.
Mondros, Jacqueline and Wilson, Scott (1994) *Organizing for power and empowerment,* Columbia University Press, New York.
Moore, Barrington (1978) *Injustice: The social bases of obedience and revolt*, Sharpe, White Plains, New York.

Munro, Lyle (1993) 'Hands up those who have pets!' *Proceedings of the Animal Welfare Conference*, Animal Ethics Unit, May, 1993, Monash University, Clayton, Melbourne.
Munro, Lyle (1993/94) 'A decade of animal liberation', *Current Affairs Bulletin,* 70(7) 12–19, WEA of NSW in association with the University of Sydney, Sydney.
Munro, Lyle (1995a) Animals and social issues survey (ASIS): A questionnaire to assess attitudes concerning our treatment of nonhuman animals.
Munro, Lyle (1995b) Various news and entertainment segments of the 1993 and 1994 duck shooting seasons, Rehame Australia, video footage, Melbourne.
Munro, Lyle (1996) *'Mapping the animal movement: A survey of animal rights and welfare advocates in Australia'*, Paper presented to the International Society of Anthrozoology conference, July, 24–26, Downing College, Cambridge.
Munro, Lyle (1997a) 'Narratives of protest: Television's representation of an animal liberation campaign', *Media International Australia,* 83, 103–12.
Munro, Lyle (1997b) 'Framing cruelty: The construction of duck shooting as a social problem' in *Society & Animals*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 137–54.
Munro, Lyle (1999a) 'From vilification to accommodation: Making a common cause movement' in *Cambridge Quarterly of Health and Ethics*, 8, 46–57.
Munro, Lyle (1999b) 'Contesting moral capital in campaigns against animal liberation' in *Society & Animals*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 35–53.
Munro, Lyle (2001a) 'Caring about blood, flesh and pain: Women's standing in the animal protection movement', *Society & Animals*, Brill, No. 1, pp. 43–61.
Munro, Lyle (2001b) 'Future animal: Environmental and animal welfare perspectives on the genetic engineering of animals', *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, Vol. 10, 314–24.
Munro, Lyle (2001c) *Compassionate beasts: The quest for animal rights*, Praeger, Westport CT.
Munro, Lyle (2002) 'The animal activism of Henry Spira (1927–1998)', *Society & Animals,* Vol. 10, No. 2.
Newell, Peter (2000) 'Environmental NGOs and gobalization: The governance of TNCs', in Robin Cohen and Shirin Rai (eds.) *Global social movements,* The Athlone Press, London and New Brunswick, NJ.
O'Brien, Tim (2001) 'Factory farming and human health', *The Ecologist,* Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 30–46.
Oliver, Pamela and Marwell, G. (1992) 'Mobilising technologies for collective action', in A.D. Morris and C. McClurg-Mueller (eds.) *Frontiers of social movement theory,* Yale University Press, New Haven.
Oogjes, Glenys (1997) 'Codes: A painful mistake?', *Animals Today,* 5(2) May-July, 23–25.
Orlans, F.B. (1993) *In the name of science: Issues in responsible animal experimentation,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Ortega y Gasset, J. (1972) *Meditations on hunting* (H.B. Wescot, Trans.), Scribner's New York.
Pakulski, J. (1991) *Social movements: The politics of moral protest,* Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.
Parkinson, Brian (1996) 'Emotions are social', *British Journal of Psychology*, 87, 663–83.
Passmore, John (1980) Man's responsibility for nature: Ecological problems and Western traditions, Duckworth, London.
Paterson, D. and Ryder, R. (1979) *Animal rights – a symposium,* Centaur Press Ltd. London.
Phillips, Susan (1994) 'New social movements and routes to representation: Science versus politics', in Stephen Brooks and Alain G. Gagnon (eds.) *The political influence of ideas: Policy communities and the social sciences,* Praeger, Westport, CT.
Philo, Chris (1998) 'Animals, geography and the city: Notes on inclusions and exclusions' in Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel *Animal geographies: Place, politics and identity in the nature-culture borderlands*, Verso, London.
Philo, Chris and Wilbert, Chris (2000) 'Animal spaces, beastly places: An introduction', in Chris Philo and Chris Wilbert (eds.) *Animal spaces, beastly places: New geographies of human-animal relations,* Routledge, London and New York.

Pichardo, N.A. (1997) New social movements: A critical review, *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol. 23, pp. 411–30.
Piven, Frances F. and Cloward, Richard A. (1977) *Poor people's movements: Why they succeed, how they fail*, Pantheon Books, New York.
Polletta, Francesca and Jasper, James (2001) 'Collective identity and social movements', *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol. 27, pp. 283–305.
Primatt, H. (1776/1992) *The duty of mercy and the sin of cruelty to brute animals,* A Kinship Classic, Sussex, Centaur Press, Fontwell.
Regan, Tom (1984) *The case for animal rights,* Routledge, London.
Regan, Tom (1985) 'The case for animal rights' in Peter Singer (ed.) *In defence of animals,* Harper & Row, Publishers, New York.
Regan, Tom (1987) *The struggle for animal rights,* International Society for Animal Rights Inc., Clarks Summit: PA.
Reiss, M.J. and Straughan, R. (1996) *Improving nature: The science and ethics of genetic engineering,* Cambridge University Press, London and New York.
Richards, Rebecca (1990) *Consensus mobilization through ideology, networks, and grievances: A study of the contemporary animal rights movement*, PhD Dissertation, Printed by University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor.
Rifkin, Jeremy (1992) *Beyond beef: The rise and fall of the cattle culture*, Dutton Books, New York.
Rifkin, Jeremy (1995) *The end of work: The decline of the global labor force and the dawn of the post-market era,* G.P. Putram's Sons, New York.
Rissel, Christopher and Douglas, William (1993), 'Environmental issues as prime time television', *Media Information Australia*, 68, May, pp. 86–92.
Ritvo, Harriet (1987) *The animal estate: The English and other creatures in the Victorian age,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Ritvo, Harriet (1992) A review of Keith Tester's 'Society and animals: The humanity of animal rights' in *The American Historical Review,* October, p. 1180.
Rochon, Thomas (1990) 'The West European peace movement and the theory of new social movements' in R. Dalton and M. Kuechler (eds.) *Challenging the political order: New social and political movements in Western democracies*, Polity, Cambridge, pp. 105–21.
Rochon, Thomas (1998) *Culture moves: Ideas, activism and changing values*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
Rodd, R. (1990) *Biology, ethics and animals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Rollin, Bernard (1998) *The unheeded cry: Animal consciousness, animal pain and science,* Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
Rootes, Chris (1984) 'Protest, social movements, revolution', *Social Alternatives,* 4(1) 4–8.
Rucht, Dieter (1990) 'The strategies and action repertoires of new movements', Russell Dalton and Manfred Kuechler (eds.) *Challenging the political order: New Social and political movements in western democracies,* Polity Press, Cambridge.
Rudacille, Deborah (2001) *The scalpel and the butterfly: The conflict between animal research and animal protection,* University of California Press, Berkeley.
Ruddick, Sara (1980) 'Maternal thinking', *Feminist Studies,* 6: 350.
Ryan, Charlotte (1991) *Prime time activism: Media strategies for grassroots organising,* South End Press, Boston.
Ryder, Richard (1979) 'The struggle against speciesism' in David Paterson and Richard Ryder (eds.) Animals' rights – a symposium, Centaur Press Ltd. Fontwell, Sussex.
Ryder, Richard (1983) *Victims of science: The use of animals in research*, National Anti-vivisection Society Limited, London.
Ryder, Richard (1989) *Animal revolution: Changing attitudes towards speciesism*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
Ryder, Richard (1992) (editor) Humphrey Primatt's *The duty of mercy and the sin of cruelty to brute animals*, A Kinship Classic, Centaur Press, Fontwell, Sussex.
Ryder, Richard (1996) 'Putting animals into politics' in Robert Garner (ed.) *Animal Rights: The changing debate,* Macmillan Press Ltd, London.
Ryder, Richard (1998) 'Speciesism' p. 320 in M. Bekoff and C. Meaney (1998) *Encyclopedia of animal rights and animal welfare*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.

Sabloff, Annabelle (2001) *Reordering the natural world: Humans and animals in the city*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
Sapontzis, Steve (1993) 'Aping persons – pro and con' in Paola Cavalieri and Peter Singer (editors), *The great ape project: Equality before humanity*, Fourth Estate, London.
Scarce, Rik (1990) *Eco-warriors: Understanding the radical environmental movement*, Noble Press, Chicago.
Scarce, Rik (1995) *The social construction of salmon: Nature in the making (mythology)*, Unpublished PhD thesis in sociology, Washington State University.
Scarce, Rik (1997) 'Socially constructing Pacific salmon', *Society & Animals*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 117–35.
Schlosberg, D. (1995) 'Communicative action in practice: Intersubjectivity and new social movements', *Political Studies*, XLIII(2) 291–311.
Schneider, F.W. (1985) Social problems theory: The constructionist view, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 11, pp. 209–29.
Scott, Alan (1990) *Ideology and new social movements*, Unwin Hyman, Boston and London.
Scruton, Roger (1996) *Animal rights and wrongs*, Demos, London.
Scully, Matthew (2002) *Dominion: The power of man, the suffering of animals, and the call to mercy*, St Martin's Press, New York.
Senate Select Committee Report on Animal Welfare (1985) *Export of live sheep from Australia*, Commonwealth of Australia, AGPS, Canberra.
Senate Select Committee Report on Animal Welfare (1989) *Animal experimentation*, Commonwealth of Australia, AGPS, Canberra.
Senate Select Committee Report on Animal Welfare (1990) *Intensive livestock production*, Commonwealth of Australia, AGPS, Canberra.
Serpell, James (1986) *In the company of animals: A study of human-animal relationships*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
Shapiro, Ken (1994) 'The caring sleuth: Portrait of an animal rights activist', *Society & Animals*, 2(2) 145–65.
Sharp, Gene (1973) *The politics of non-violent action*, P. Sargent Publisher, Boston, Mass.
Sinclair, Upton (1905) *The jungle*, Vanguard Press, New York.
Singer, Peter (1975) *Animal liberation: A new ethics for our treatment of animals*, New York: New York Review and Random House.
Singer, Peter (1978) 'Preface' in David Patterson and Richard Ryder (eds.) *Animal rights' – a symposium*, Centaur Press Ltd. Fontwell, Sussex.
Singer, Peter (1985) 'Ten years of animal liberation', *New York Review of Books*, pp. 46–52.
Singer, Peter (1990) *Animal liberation (2nd ed.)* Jonathon Cape, London:.
Singer, Peter (1992a) 'Bandit and friends', *New York Review of Books*, April 9, pp. 9–13.
Singer, Peter (1992b) 'Becoming a vegetarian', in D.W. Curtin and L.M. Heldke (eds.) *Cooking, eating, thinking: Transformative philosophies of food*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
Singer, Peter (1992c) 'Animal liberation: An exchange', *New York Review of Books*, Nov 5, 59.
Singer, Peter (1995a) 'Guns and animals: An animal liberation perspective', in J. Crook (eds.) *Hunting: A critical perspective*, pp. 68–72, Gun Control Australia, Inc., Melbourne.
Singer, Peter (1995b) 'Animal liberation: The book that changed perceptions about animals' in an interview with the editor in *Animals Today*, Vol. 3, No. 4, February-April, pp. 8–12.
Singer, Peter (1998) *Ethics into action: Henry Spira and the animal rights movement*, Rowan and Littlefield Publishers Ltd, Maryland.
Singer, Peter (2003) 'Animal liberation at 30', *New York Review of Books*, Vol. 50. No. 8, May 15.
Smelser, Neil (1996) 'Social sciences and social problems: The next century', *International Sociology*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 275–90.
Smith, J. McCarthy, J. McPhail, C. and Augustyn, B. (2001) 'From protest to agenda building: Description bias in media coverage in Washington DC', *Social Forces*, Vol. 79, No. 4, June, pp. 1397–1423.

Snow, D.A. and Benford, R.D. (1988) 'Ideology, frame resonance and participant moblilization', in B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi and S. Tarrow (eds.) *From structure to action: Comparing social movement research across cultures,* International Social Movement Research, a Research Annual, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 197–217.
Snow, D.A. and Benford, Robert (1992) 'Master frames and cycles of protest' in Aldon Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller (eds.) *Frontiers in social movement theory*, Yale University Press, New haven and London.
Snow, D.A. Burke Rochford, E. Jr., Worden, S.K. and Benford, R.D. (1986) 'Frame alignment processes, micromobilization and movement participation', *American Sociological Review,* 51, 464–81.
Somerville, Jennifer (1997) 'Social movement theory, women and the question of interests', *Sociology,* Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 673–95.
Spector, Malcolm and Kitsuse, John (1973) 'Social problems: A reformulation', *Social Problems*, Vol. 21, pp. 145–59.
Spector, Malcolm and Kitsuse, John (1977) *Constructing social problems*, Cummings, Menlo Park, Berkley, CA.
Sperling, Susan (1988) *Animal liberators: Research and morality*, University of California Press, Berkeley CA.
Stevenson, William and Greenberg, Diana (2000) 'Agency and social networks: Strategies of action in a social structure of position, opposition, and opportunity', *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Vol. 45, No. 4, December, pp. 651–78.
Stoett, Peter (1997) *The international politics of whaling*, UBC Press, Vancouver.
Stull, Donald, Broadway, M. and Griffith, D. (eds.) (1995) *Any way you cut it: Meat processing in small-town America,* University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.
Sullivan, Robert (2000) *A whale hunt*, Headline Books Publishing, London.
Sunstein, Cass (2000) 'Standing for animals', No. 47, *UCLA Law Review,* 1333, 1368.
Sutherland, Anne and Nash, Jeffrey (1994) 'Animal rights as a new environmental cosmology', *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Summer, pp. 171–86.
Swan, James A. (1995) *In defense of hunting*, Harper, SanFrancisco.
Szasz, Andrew (1994) *Eco populism: Toxic waste and the movement for environmental justice*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
Sztompka, Piotr (1993) *The sociology of social change,* Blackwell, Oxford, UK.
Sztybel, David (1998) 'Animal rights', in Bekoff, Marc and Meaney, Carron *Encyclopedia of animal rights and animal welfare*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.
Talbot, Jenny (1981) *Whales*, Greenhouse Publications Pty Ltd, Melbourne.
Tarrow, Sidney (1994) *Power in movement: Social movements, collective action and politics,* Cambridge University, Cambridge.
Tarrow, Sidney (1998) *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (2nd edition) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Tesh, Sylvia (2000) *Uncertain hazards: Environmental activists and scientific proof,* Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London.
Teske, Nathan (1997) *Political activists in America: The identity construction model of political participation*, Cambridge University Press, UK.
Tester, Keith (1989) *The relationship between the idea and the practice of animal rights*, Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Leeds, Leeds.
Tester, Keith (1991) *Animals and society: The humanity of animal rights,* Routledge, London.
Tester, Keith and Walls, G. (1996) 'The ideology and current activities of the Animal Liberation Front', *Contemporary Politics,* Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 79–91.
Thomas, Keith (1983) *Man and the natural world: Changing attitudes in England 1500–1800,* Penguin Books, Middlesex, England.
Thomas, Keith (ed.) (1999) 'Introduction', *The Oxford book of work*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Tilly, Charles (1978) *From mobilization to revolution,* Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.
Tilly, Charles (1985) 'Models and realities of popular collective action', *Social Research,* 52, Winter.
Tilly, Charles (1993/94) 'Social movements as historically specific clusters of political performances", *Berkeley Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 38, pp. 1–29.

Tilly, Charles (1999) 'Conclusion: From interactions to outcomes in social movements', Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, Charles Tilly (eds.) *How social movements matter*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
Townend, C. (1981) *A voice for the animals: How Animal Liberation grew,* Kangaroo Press, Kenthurst, NSW.
Townend, C. and Mowbray, M. (1986) 'Beyond single issues: The politics of animal liberation' in *Social Alternatives*, Volume 5, Number 2, pp. 17–20.
Tronto, Joan (1993) *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*, Routledge, New York.
Troyer, Ronald (1989) 'Are social problems and social movements the same thing?' in James Holstein and Gale Miller (editors) *Perspectives on social problems: A research annual*, Vol. 1, JAI Press, Greenwich, London.
Turner, Bryan (ed.) (1993) *Citizenship and social theory*, Sage Publications, London.
Turner, E.S. (1992) *All heaven in a rage*, Centaur Press, Fontwell, Sussex.
Turner, J. (1980) *Reckoning with the beast: Animals, pain and humanity in the Victorian mind,* The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
Turner, Ralph and Killian, Lewis (1987) *Collective behavior*, 3rd edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
Vance, Linda (1993) 'Remapping the terrain: Books on ecofeminism' (Bibliographic essay), *Choice,* June, pp. 1585–93.
Vanderford, M. (1989) 'Vilification in social movements: A case study of pro-life and pro-choice rhetoric', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 75, pp. 166–82.
Van Krieken, Robert (2001) 'Elias and process sociology' in George Ritzer and Barry Smart (eds.) *Handbook of social theory,* Sage Publications, London.
Van Zoonen, Liesbet (1996) 'A dance of death: New social movements and the mass media' in David Paletz (ed.) *Political communication in action: States, institutions, movement, audiences*, Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ.
Vogel, Steven (1996) *Against nature: The concept of nature in critical theory,* State University of New York Press, New York.
Wadel, Cato (1979) 'The hidden work of everyday life', in Sandra Wallman (ed.) *Social anthropology of work,* Academic Press Inc., London.
Walls, John (2000) *The campaign against live exports in the national and local press, 1990–1996,* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Portsmouth, UK.
Watson, William (1996) 'Bad samaritan: Very cognitively disabled people and the sociological sensibility', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology,* 37, 3–4 December 231–51.
Weaver, R. Kent and McGann, James G. (2000) 'Think tanks and civil societies in a time of change' in James G. McGann and R. Kent Weaver (eds.) *Think tanks and civil societies: Catalysts for ideas and action,* Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick (USA) and London (UK).
Webster, John (1994) *Animal welfare: A cool eye towards Eden,* Blackwell Science Ltd., Oxford.
Weick, Karl (1984) 'Small wins: redefining the scale of social problems', *American Psychologist*, January, pp. 40–49.
Weinbren, D. (1994) 'Against all cruelty: The Humanitarian League, 1891–1919', *History Workshop Journal,* 38, 86–105.
Wells, D.L. and Hepper P.G. (1997) 'Pet ownership and adults' views on the use of animals', *Society & Animals*, 5, pp. 45–63.
Wenzel, George (1991) *Animal rights human rights: Ecology, economy and ideology in the Canadian Artic,* University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
Weston, Anthony (1992) *Toward better problems: New perspectives on abortion, animal rights, the environment and justice*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
Wiersma, W. (1991) *Research methods in education: An introduction* (5th edition), Allyn & Bacon, Boston.
Wilson, John (1973) *Introduction to social movements*, New York, Basic Books Inc.
Withington, A.F. (1991) *Toward a more perfect union: Virtue and the formation of American republics,* Oxford University Press, New York.
Wolfe, Alan (1993) *The human difference: Animals, computers and the necessity of social science*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Woolf, M. (1999) 'Revealed: Secret slaughter of 9 million "useless" lab animals', *Independent on Sunday,* 15 August, 6. Cited in Philo, Chris and Wilbert, Chris 'Animal spaces, beastly places: An introduction', in Chris Philo and Chris Wilbert (eds.) *Animal spaces, beastly places: New geographies of human-animal relations,* Routledge, London and New York.

Worster, Donald (1977) *Nature's economy: The roots of ecology*, Sierra Club Books, San Francisco.

Wynne-Tyson, Jon (1990) *The extended circle: An anthology of humane thought*, Cardinal, London.

Yearley, Steven (1992) *The green case: A sociology of environmental issues, arguments and politics*, Routledge, London.

Young, Iris (1990) *Justice and the politics of difference*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Index