

APPEALS FOR COMPASSION: THE USES OF ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND
SENTIMENTALITY IN ANIMAL ADVOCACY CAMPAIGNS

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Division of Religion
Drew University in partial fulfillment of
The requirements of the degree,
Doctor of Philosophy

Kelly M. Robbins

Drew University

Madison, New Jersey

December 2016

Committee Chair: Dr. Laurel Kearns

ABSTRACT

Appeals for Compassion: The Uses of Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in Animal

Advocacy Campaigns

Ph.D. Dissertation by

Kelly M. Robbins

The Graduate Division of Religion
Drew University

December 2016

This dissertation is concerned with the uses of anthropomorphism and sentimentality by animal organization websites in the United States. These include secular groups: (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) and religious groups such as, (All-Creatures.org and Jewish Veg), and religious departments of secular organizations (Faith Outreach of the Humane Society of the United States and Jesus People For Animals). Religion plays a role in the history of the development of the welfare movement, and particularly strong in the 19th century. As the movement faded and redeveloped in the 1970s, Christianity and Judaism were particularly derided. Yet, religion has had a renewal of importance in animal studies, especially in the last 20 years, demonstrated in part by the presence of religious animal groups.

Disparaged by some in the scientific community, anthropomorphism portrays animals in human terms. Animal philosophers have viewed sentimentality, which evokes emotions such as compassion, empathy, sympathy, and care as inappropriate for activism and philosophical discourse. Public stereotypes of animal advocates as overly emotional or only care about animals have been used against the movement. There is a link between

the two concepts in the way that animal organizations use anthropomorphism and sentimentality simultaneously to build support.

The purpose of this dissertation is descriptive, showing how animal organizations use anthropomorphism and sentimentality at a rhetorical level for persuasion. The dissertation argues that a developed moral theory of sentimentality, based on ecofeminism and contemporary sentimentalist philosophy grounded in the work of philosophers such as Josephine Donovan, David Hume and Adam Smith would further the movement. Such an expanded moral theory provides organizations with a moral grounding that moves beyond and avoids the criticisms of rights and utilitarian philosophy that have plagued the movement.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ACRONYMS

CHAPTER ONE: ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND SENTIMENTALITY:

INTRODUCING THE CONCEPTS AND BACKGROUND	1
Ecofeminism and Animals	6
Definitions of Anthropomorphism	11
Background of Anthropomorphism.....	13
Definitions of Sentimentality	20
Background of Sentimentality	22
Connections Between Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality	29
Methodology.....	33
Research Design	37
Theoretical Underpinnings	40
Position of the Researcher	46
Chapter Outline	47
Conclusion	48

CHAPTER TWO: A MOVEMENT FOR COMPASSION: A BRIEF

HISTORY OF THE ANIMAL MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED

STATES	50
--------------	----

The Early Movement: Before 1970.....	50
--------------------------------------	----

Contemporary Movement: 1970s to Present	59
The Animal and Environmental Movements	62
Philosophical Influences on the Movement	69
Feminism and Animals.....	79
Religion and the Animal Movement	81
Definition of Religion and Religiously Oriented Organizations.....	92
Overview of Organizations' Use of Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality	99
Conclusion.....	111
 CHAPTER THREE: "ANIMALS ARE COUNTING ON	
COMPASSIONATE PEOPLE": PETA AND THE ASPCA.....	113
PETA: People For The Ethical Treatment Of Animals.....	114
PETA's Range of Concerns.....	118
Animals as Food	123
Companion Animals.....	124
Frame Analysis.....	126
Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality on PETA's Website	130
ASPCA: American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	138
ASPCA's Range of Concerns.....	140
Farm Animals	141
Companion Animals.....	144
Frame Analysis.....	145
Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality on the ASPCA Website.....	147
Conclusion.....	151

CHAPTER FOUR: “UNCONDITIONAL LOVE AND COMPASSION”:

CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH COMPASSION FOR ANIMALS.

ALL-CREATURES AND JEWISH VEG.....	160
Hebrew Scriptures	161
Christianity	168
All-Creatures	176
Frame Analysis.....	178
Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in All-Creatures.org	184
Judaism.....	191
Jewish Veg.....	196
Frame Analysis.....	203
Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in Jewish Veg.....	207
Conclusion.....	210

CHAPTER FIVE: “KINDNESS AND MERCY”: RELIGIOUS

COMPASSION IN MAJOR ORGANIZATIONS. FAITH

OUTREACH (HSUS) AND JESUS PEOPLE FOR ANIMALS (PETA).....	213
HSUS: Faith Outreach.....	223
Frame Analysis.....	227
Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in HSUS Faith Outreach	233
PETA: Jesus People For Animals.....	236
Frame Analysis.....	245
Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in JPFA	246
Conclusion.....	249

CHAPTER SIX: BUILDING A CRITICAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC
AND SENTIMENTALITY: TOWARD AN ECOFEMINIST

MORAL SENTIMENTANISM	254
Framing and Blame	257
The Use of Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality	260
Risks and Pitfalls of Using Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality	267
The Importance of Religion in the Animal Movement	275
The Animal Movement in General	284
“Critical” Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality	291
Suggestions for an Expanded Movement	293
Bibliography	304

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank my dissertation committee, Laurel Kearns, Elias Ortega-Aponte, and Laura Hobgood-Oster. I am grateful for your insightful comments, precise reading, and constant encouragement, without which this dissertation would not have come together in its present form.

I want to thank my colleagues in the Dissertation Support Group at Drew University for many evenings of helpful conversation and cheerful morale boosting. To my friend and colleague Theresa Ellis, who always made herself available for helpful conversation and inspiration. To my sister Kristen, who constantly offered enthusiastic support and motivation.

Finally, I want to thank my husband Eric for his unwavering support and indefatigable patience throughout this process. This dissertation could not have happened without you.

ACRONYMS

AAVS	American Anti-Vivisection Society
ALF	Animal Liberation Front
ASPCA	American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
AHA	American Humane Association
AWI	The Animal Welfare Institute
CAFOs	Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations
CVA	Christian Vegetarian Association
DVA	Dharma Voices for Animals
IDA	In Defense of Animals
FARM	Farm Animal Rights Movement
FoA	Friends of Animals
JIFA	Jewish Initiative for Animals
JPFA	Jesus People for Animals
JVNA	Jewish Vegetarians of North America
PETA	People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
PCFRM	Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine
RSPCA	Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
SPCA	Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

CHAPTER 1
ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND SENTIMENTALITY:
INTRODUCING THE CONCEPTS AND BACKGROUND

“State of Emergency... DONATE,”¹ says the main page of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) website, as the viewer looks into the eyes of a small, scruffy dog adorned with a flea collar that is much too large for its tiny size. Pictures of dogs take up the entire space of the computer screen as soon as a person logs onto the site, demanding the viewer’s full attention. Flashing across the screen, the next image comes into view from off the page: a large, brown, mixed-breed dog peers out through the metal wire of its cage at the viewer.² Again, written prominently on the screen, is a button labeled “DONATE,” and “60 cents a Day Saves Lives, give a little to make a big difference.”³ These images represent catchy emotional hooks with which animal groups use sentimentality to motivate viewer partnerships and prompt immediate action to help change the lives of animals of all kinds.

Because of the power of such presentations, this dissertation looks at the discourse framing and arguments made by animal organizations in the United States and their use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality through an in-depth analysis of six organization websites: People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), The

1. American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. <https://www.asPCA.org>. Accessed 10/08/16.

2. I will use the terms *reader* and *viewer* interchangeably.

3. ASPCA. <https://www.asPCA.org>. Accessed 10/08/16.

American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty of Animals (ASPCA), All-Creatures.org, Jewish Veg, Faith Outreach (the religious department of The Humane Society of the United States [HSUS]), and Jesus People for Animals ([JPFA] the religious department of PETA). What I propose is that animal organizations use these concepts to elicit attendant emotions for rhetorical purposes and for a gut-level response about the content conveyed. In subsequent chapters, I will describe the ways in which a rhetorical use of *anthropomorphism* (referring to animals in human terms) and *sentimentality* (which elicits feeling concern for others, in this case, emotion for animals) are borne out on organizational websites that present information and campaigns about animals. These definitions will be discussed in detail below. I argue that whereas these rhetorical uses have been effective, given the frequency of their utilization, they are insufficient. Thus four of the organizations examined also draw upon religious concepts, rhetoric, and motivations, and this dissertation examines what difference is made by the addition of religious framing. Finally, I suggest that the incorporation of concrete moral theories of sentimentality and care ethics can advance the movement and bring an understanding of animals that further breaks down the species barrier.

The discourse in the animal movement has primarily revolved around animal *rights* versus animal *welfare*, and the debate and tensions between the two approaches can seem intense, although an examination of their presentation through websites reveals a great deal of similarity. It also reveals a common approach that may be more geared toward thinking *about* animals, rather than thinking *with* them; developing a nuanced approach to animal issues that goes beyond strictly rights or moderate welfare offers one way to think *with* animals.

Through efforts such as protests, boycotts, and undercover videotaping of animal cruelty, animal advocacy groups gain positive attention as well as scrutiny. These activities elicit moral emotions such as anger, disgust, outrage, and offense as well as compassion and sympathy. These highly visible actions are a large part of the success for animal advocacy groups, but capitalizing on that success and attention requires more than just free media exposure. Groups approach garnering support in other ways, as the ASPCA home page portrays through the use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality. “Contentious performances” are standard ways that movement claims are made, and such performances include demonstrations or presenting a petition (Tilly and Tarrow 2015:15). However, not all contention is always as expressive or direct as demonstrations, and much of it falls outside the realm of politics; the type of contention involved with the animal organizations in my dissertation are political because many of the groups are making claims on government to give animals better treatment (8). The reason for focusing on less publicized performances, such as the use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality and the associated emotions, is because the concepts have until recently been largely neglected or dismissed by scholars of animal studies and ethics (Donovan 1996; Filonowicz 2008). Anthropomorphism and sentimentality are not necessarily subtle aspects of animal movement campaigning and recruitment, as anyone can attest who has viewed the seemingly inescapable commercials from the ASPCA, which feature videos of animal cruelty such as dogs being kept outside on chains and left exposed to the elements or sad-looking puppies in shelters.

Because this approach is often derided for its emotional appeal, many movement intellectuals have had misgivings about using anthropomorphism and sentimentality. The

major philosophers of the movement, Peter Singer and Tom Regan, do not like the stereotype that animal advocates are overly emotional. When scholars address animal rights theory, they continually refer to Regan and Singer. Numerous other philosophical theories on animals exist, but in terms of the movement itself, Singer is an important figure. Regan explains that his book, *A Philosophy of Animal Rights*, is in part a response to the “tired charges of being ‘irrational,’ ‘sentimental,’ ‘emotional,’ or worse” (1983:xii). Singer has argued that “reason is more universal and more compelling in its appeal” because “even where other human beings are concerned, people are surprisingly adept at limiting their sympathies to those of their own nation or race. Almost everyone, however, is at least nominally prepared to listen to reason” (2009:243). Emotion and sentimentality have been downplayed in the animal movement in order to counter claims that animal activists “only care about animals” or that they are “too emotional.” Julian Groves’ study of animal activists found that carefully managing emotions, often by not appearing too sentimental or emotional, was important for activists both in public settings and in movement meetings and gatherings (1997:127).

Through the process of examining the connection between anthropomorphism and sentimentality in the arguments of animal activist organizations, this dissertation attempts to build on the growing conversation about anthropomorphism and sentimentality (Jasper 1999; Greenebaum 2004; Rudy 2011; Daston and Mitman 2005; Bekoff 2006, 2010). Whereas sentimentality and emotion have been debated for appropriateness, anthropomorphism has more often been viewed negatively in scientific studies on animals (Regan 1983; Groves 1997; Singer 2009; Mitchell et al. 1997; De Waal 2006). Anthropomorphism is frequently understood in science to be sloppy and not intellectually

rigorous; yet it is through finding similarities between humans and animals that the animal movement has made anthropomorphism a priority (Regan 1983; Singer 2009). Comparisons between humans and other animals have increasingly become the currency of the movement, in part because of work in cognitive ethology (the study of animal behavior) and every day individual interactions with companion animals. For instance, statistics show that in the United States, companion animals living with people number around 79.7 million households and 163.6 million animals.⁴ Recognizing this fact, organizations concentrate on the vast amount of companion animals in our society and apply anthropomorphism, sentimentality, and emotion liberally.

Animal activists, especially on the “rights” side of the spectrum, do not want to be thought of as only “animal lovers,” even though many people came into the movement because they have an affection and affinity for individual animals (Groves 1997). In her study of women in the animal movement, Emily Gaarder found that animal activists repeatedly mentioned being looked down upon for their emotion. Women occasionally “downplayed their empathetic connections to animals in attempts to legitimize the cause” (2011:152). Women in her study also noticed that men in the movement were inclined to “demean ‘welfare concerns’ such as companion animals issues,” whereas men held more extreme actions such as “liberating animals” as the peak of activism (152).

In addition to exposing conflicts between reason and emotion, essentialism, and interconnection, another reason to focus on anthropomorphism and sentimentality is because the concepts are connected to a dichotomy—real or imagined—between scholarship and activism. Philosophers like Regan and Singer disparage sentimentality,

4. Humane Society of the United States.
http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/pet_overpopulation/facts/pet_ownership_statistics.html. Accessed 03/02/16.

emotion, and care and rely on rational discourse. Additionally, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), for example, declares their allegiance to Singer's work; yet as my dissertation will show, anthropomorphism and sentimentality are common features of PETA's and other organizations' websites.⁵ The basic philosophy of animal rights and rationalism is not often challenged in the mainstream activist organizations as they were in academic scholarship, presented first by ecofeminists.

Ecofeminism and Animals

Ecofeminists such as Carol Adams, Josephine Donovan, and Lori Gruen have critiqued the philosophical baseline that Regan and Singer represent. They argue that rationality alone does not fairly consider affect and an ethic of care in the fight to give animals rights and other forms of justice (Donovan and Adams 2007:5).⁶ Utilitarian and rights theories also presuppose a "society of equal autonomous agents," but Donovan and Adams argue that animals are not equal to humans; domestic animals, for example, are dependent on humans (6). They argue that "rights theory disregards the fact that most humans and animal operate within interdependent support systems and provides no

5. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/why-peta/why-animal-rights/>. Accessed 03/09/16.

6. Ecofeminism focuses on the intersection of oppressions. "Drawing on the insights of ecology, feminism, and socialism, ecofeminism's basic premise is that the ideology which authorizes oppressions such as those based on race, class, gender, sexuality, physical abilities, and species is the same ideology which sanctions the oppression of nature" (Gaard 1993:1). Ecofeminism that has concentrated on animals has rejected the rationalist base, arguing that it discounts emotion and sympathy, as has been discussed in this chapter. Ecofeminism has had a difficult time in scholarly literature. After its initial development in the late 1980s and early 1990s, many feminists rejected it because ecofeminism was perceived as essentialism because of how it highlights the connection between women and nature (Gaard 2011:36). The connection between women, nature, and animals has been used to degrade not only women but also people of color in an attempt to make them seem "less than human." I think ecofeminism is a valuable tool and lens through which to see the connections between humans and other animals because of its attention to care. Adams, Donovan, and Gheaus among others use ecofeminism to place emphasis on the animals themselves rather than their utility for humans.

obligation to care for those who are unable to live autonomously” (6). Lori Gruen echoes the critique that Regan and Singer’s philosophy rests too much on the idea of independence, where “individual interests and experiences are put into categories of similarity, generalized over, and become interchangeable” (2015:25). In other words, this kind of animal philosophy ignores particularities and relationship. Further, Regan and Singer have been criticized for needing to find in animals some shared aspect of humanity. This results in humans forming the baseline that then still represents animals as somehow less than human: “In effect, animals are being represented as beings with the *kind of capacity* that human beings more fully possess and deem valuable for a living a full *human life*” (Slicer 1991:111). In her critique of the reason/emotion split of Regan and Singer, Donovan asserts:

Regan’s and Singer’s rejection of emotion and their concern about being branded sentimentalist are not accidental; rather, they expose the inherent bias in contemporary animal rights theory toward rationalism, which, paradoxically, in the form of Cartesian objectivism, established a major theoretical justification for animal abuse (1996:35).

Thus the rejection of emotion by Regan and Singer and some activists is based on not wanting to perpetuate a negative stereotype in the public eye. My exploration of animal organizations’ successful and widespread application of anthropomorphism and sentimentality continues the challenge of the dominance of rationalism as a justification for animal rights/welfare. Using ecofeminism as a foundation helps in this critique.

Ecofeminists have long argued for developing contributions to care ethics and sentimentality that connect feminism with animals and the environment. Referring more specifically to animals, Deane Curtin argues for compassion as a basis for the moral inclusion of animals. Curtin argues that compassion is more developed than empathy,

because both humans and other animals have empathy (2014:40). She views compassion as “a cultivated aspiration to benefit other beings” (2014:40). Compassion, for Curtin is developed from empathy, is not merely an emotional response but combines reason. Curtin argues that because compassion mixes reason and feeling, it is more durable than empathy (41). She defines *empathy* as a “basic capacity,” important because it is “a/the defining characteristic of being human,” and *compassion* as a “moral commitment” that people must develop (44). She understands compassion to be a mature, reflective, emotional capability. Being able to empathize is what allows us to even understand that others exist in the world (43). What is more, empathetic identification is shared by other animals, which highlights our “interconnections to other beings,” and because of this, “being is a matter of degree rather than kind” (43). Curtin argues that empathy is more basic than rationality, although rationality is often deemed as what separates humans from other animals (41). Ruth Groenhout, a philosopher at Calvin College, argues that feminist care ethics concentrate on the idea that “human flourishing depends on social structures of care that both protect the vulnerable and reflect an accurate understanding of the worth of care” (2004:2). When examining rationality and the propensity to understand it as something abstract, Groenhout remarks that “rationality cannot be understood apart from social context and apart from the social structures that make it possible” (10). In both Groenhout’s and Curtin’s care ethics, relationality and being social—rather than relying solely on rationality and individualism—are central to moral development.

Ecofeminism has also been viewed as reinforcing essentialist notions of women because it seems to “conjure up images of a merging of the categories ‘woman’ and ‘nature’ and seems to imply an ‘essential’ or ‘universal’ bond uniting them together”

(Kheel 2008:9). Greta Gaard, one of the earliest ecofeminist theorists, detailed the history of rejection of ecofeminism in her article “Ecofeminism Revisited: Rejecting Essentialism and Re-Placing Species in a Materialist Feminist Environmentalism” (2011). Gaard contends that feminists largely dismissed ecofeminism after its initial scholarship in the 1980s because many saw it as essentialist in its foregrounding the woman/nature connection. However, Gaard argues that some aspects of cultural ecofeminism did have that problem, but she suggests that labeling all of ecofeminism as “essentialist,” is incorrect (27, 31). Adams and Gruen maintain that such an idea about ecofeminism is a misinterpretation and has resulted in the “appropriation of ecofeminist ideas in which embodied authorship disappears” in the emerging field of animal studies (2014:30). Ecofeminist scholars who emphasize the intersectionality of oppressions have also highlighted the connections between animals and racism, the historical and current practice of designating people of color as animals in negative and demeaning ways (for example, Adams 1994; Kappeler 1995; Kim 2014; Twine 2014).

Ecofeminism’s contributions to animal studies have sometimes been ignored, and its insights have been shifted to other scholarship without recognition. In her article “Pussy Panic versus Liking Animals: Tracking Gender in Animal Studies,” Susan Fraiman argues that the larger field of animal studies has taken ecofeminism’s critique of rationalism and ignored its protracted history, thus erasing ecofeminism’s contribution (2012:100). Fraiman’s observation is that the major players in animal studies in the humanities, such as Cary Wolfe and Michael Calarco among others, declare Jacques Derrida to be the “forefather” of animal studies despite his relatively small and very recent contribution, and they turn to him for the critique of reason (75). Fraiman argues

that acknowledging ecofeminism's contribution would no longer look past scholarship that is deemed feminine in order to privilege masculine readings that these authors ignore (93). She asserts that a reason for this could be that "men working in the area of contemporary animal studies—men siding with animals—may indeed feel threatened by 'castration.' Proximity to this feminized realm may even induce a degree of gender/species anxiety" (100). This is in part because of such entrenched "humanist" notions about gender and animality, as discussed earlier with the dismissal of ecofeminism because of charges of essentialism (Fraiman 2012:99). Rather Fraiman maintains that ecofeminists such as Carol Adams, who was first publishing on the connection between women and animals in 1975, should roundly be considered at the heart of "the animal turn" (103).⁷ The avoidance in science notwithstanding, animals have been discussed more frequently in academic scholarship in recent years in this so-called animal turn. "Animal studies" is a relatively new field that has coincided with the animal turn, encompassing a variety of disciplines. Harriet Ritvo comments that "during the last several decades, animals have emerged as a more frequent focus of scholarship from the humanities and social sciences" (2007:119). The field is growing rapidly, which can mean that it is difficult to navigate (Wolfe 2009:565). Ritvo goes on to explain: "As it has expanded the range of possible research topics in a number of disciplines, the animal turn has also suggested new relationships between scholars and their subjects and new understandings of the role of animals in the past and present" (119). With the animal turn has come a heightened examination of anthropomorphism and sentimentality.

7. The term *animal turn* refers to the recent growth of "animal studies," and/or "human-animal studies," that has become a major part of academics. Paul Shapiro and Margret DeMello write that there are now 23 college programs throughout the world that deal with animal studies, and several journals are dedicated to the subject (2010:308).

Definitions of Anthropomorphism

Loraine Daston and Gregg Mitman, editors of *Thinking with Animals: New Perspectives on Anthropomorphism*, define *anthropomorphism* as “the word used to describe the belief that animals are essentially like humans” (2005:2). Their volume focuses on anthropomorphism and how it is used in a variety of settings and scholarly work, from historical practices to evolutionary biology to daily life, which includes companion-human relationships and images of animals. The volume also looks at anthropomorphism in film (Daston and Mitman 2005). Marc Bekoff, discussed below, in addition to Daston and Mitman presume the presence of anthropomorphism in everyday living and scholarly work. Their definitions reinforce the research of this dissertation on the use anthropomorphism by animal organizations because animal organizations are using the concept not scientifically but in the language of the popular vernacular. Especially for animal rights groups, the emphasis on the similarities and sameness between humans and other animals is a common approach to their arguments and educating the public. Describing human-like characteristics in animals is equally a part of their technique.

Mary Midgley, a philosopher widely cited in animal studies for her book *Animals and Why They Matter* (1983), elucidates the concept of anthropomorphism as originating as a theological caution in Christianity against certain descriptions and representations of God as having a human physical form. Accordingly, the majority of Christian interpretations believed that God was not supposed to have a physical form at all (1983:125). Midgley explains that *anthropomorphism* has meant giving “human

personality to anything impersonal or irrational” (125). Eventually, the word was used to refer not just to representations of God but to other-than-human animals as well (125). *The Oxford American Dictionary* defines *anthropomorphism* as “the attribution of human characteristics or behavior to a god, animal, or object” (2011).

In the world of science, anthropomorphism is perceived to lack the kind of objectivity in which scientific study is grounded and thus has been seen as a grave error: “Positions against the use of anthropomorphism and anecdotes have seemed an institutionalized scientific doctrine...” (Mitchell et al. 1997:3). Marc Bekoff’s work in cognitive ethology, an interdisciplinary science that studies the “evolution of cognitive processes,” is well known (Bekoff and Allen 1997:313), and Bekoff uses a definition similar to that of Daston and Mitman: he maintains that anthropomorphism is “attributing human characteristics to animals and inanimate objects” (2010:54). Cognitive ethology focuses on the field study of animals, as opposed to observing animals in a laboratory, because the latter is indicative of cognitive psychology (Bekoff and Allen 1997:313). Bekoff argues that anthropomorphism is valuable and necessary for cognitive ethology and science in general because discussing animal behavior only in terms of brain and muscle function does not account for context, which is crucial for discovering why animals act in particular ways (2006:26).

In contrast to much criticism in scientific studies, where it is often argued that it is “imprecise,” Bekoff contends that anthropomorphism helps allow “other animals’ behavior to be accessible to us” (2006:25, 27). This is not to say that animal and human behavior are supposed to be viewed as being the same, an aspect of the major critique against anthropomorphism. It seems clear that behaviors, thoughts, and feelings of

animals and humans are different. Bekoff is arguing that when scientists and lay people anthropomorphize, it should not be a direct correlation. On the other hand, denying anthropomorphism does not mean that certain animal feelings, thoughts, and behavior do not exist at all (2010:76).

Background of Anthropomorphism

The acceptance of the utility of anthropomorphism by Bekoff and others contrasts with many in science, and anthropomorphism has been frequently, and sometimes curtly, dismissed by scholarship in science studies on animals. One example is found in the literature on the study of animal cognition: Hank Davis, a psychologist from the University of Guelph, maintains that “Anthropomorphism is commonplace for a number of reasons. Most basically, it represents a form of intellectual laziness. In its most extreme case, anthropomorphism results from the failure to make species differentiations” (1997:336). Davis’s argument against anthropomorphism represents the general wariness of the concept among scientists (see also Guthrie 1997; Sober 2005; Daston 2005). As shown above, activists advocating for animals have also contested anthropomorphism and sentimentality.

Gordon Burghardt, an ethologist, and Harold Herzog, who studies animal-human relations, observe that anthropomorphism is one factor that helps determine what kinds of animals are valued for human use and what kinds are valued for their own sake. They argue that people’s sensitivities frequently direct how animals are used, stating that such sensitivities bring out what is “important in our essentially gut-level evaluations of whether a given use of an animal is right, proper, or necessary” (1980:765). For example,

Burghardt and Herzog ask how many people would be able to eat live oysters if they screamed or cried when someone bit into them (765). Additionally, studies have shown that a phylogenetic similarity between certain animals and humans brings out anthropomorphism and empathy in participants (Herzog and Galvin 1997; Harrison and Hall 2010). An understanding of animal mind⁸ is also affected by a perception of physical and phylogenetic likeness between animals and humans. The emphasis that people place on certain characteristics and kinds of animals helps individuals deal with the conflict between caring for companion animals, such as a dog or cat, and using animals in experimentation or as food (Knight et al. 2003; Bastian et al. 2012). People who ate meat frequently denied the animal mind in order to reduce the negative emotions caused by dissonance between the suffering caused to animals in order for them to become food and caring for them on the other hand (Bastian et al. 2012:253). Such studies support the argument that emotion plays a substantial role in how people understand animals and make judgments about them. The attempt to engender such “gut-level” reactions and evaluations when it comes to anthropomorphism and sentimentality is a large part of what this study examines, and almost a visceral reaction is the kind of emotional response that animal organizations seek when they use these methods.

Frans de Waal, a world-famous ethologist, is an important thinker in the field of animal studies—and in some senses, the animal movement in general—which challenges any boundary between humans and animals and seeks to challenge the systematic forgetfulness of the reality that humans are also animals (Waldau 2011:6). De Waal has

8. The term *animal mind* refers to the study and the attribution of cognition and/or mental states in animals. This question of animal cognition is a highly debated subject in science, much like the use of anthropomorphism is debated in the literature (Silverman 1997:170). Animal mind is different than *sentience*, a term that refers to physical capabilities such as the ability to feel pain.

done extensive work with primates, and he explains that the problem many scientists have with anthropomorphism is evident in the definition of it as the “misattribution of human qualities to animals” (2006:63). De Waal refines the definition as the “(mis)attribution of humanlike characteristics and experiences to other species” (2016:319). For de Waal, the rejection of anthropomorphism is fundamentally a dismissal of the similarities between animals and humans along with the fact that humans are animals (de Waal 2006:65). He writes, “I can’t count the number of times I have been called naïve, romantic, soft, unscientific, anthropomorphic, anecdotal, or just a sloppy thinker” for using anthropomorphism when describing animals (2016:265).

The main problem with anthropomorphism in science stems from differences in two schools of thought, behaviorism and ethology. Behaviorism primarily has to do with psychology, whereas ethology has to do with zoology (de Waal 2016:39). Behaviorists focus on learning and argue that “since associative learning was thought to explain behavior across all species, one of the field’s founders, B.F. Skinner, felt that it hardly mattered what kind of animal one worked on” (27). Behaviorists and biologists tend to describe animal behavior in terms of learning and actions, and ethologists found that species behavior had a structure and was stereotypical and that it could be recognized in the same way as a physical attribute (39). De Waal notes, however, that both behaviorism and ethology were “reactions against the overinterpretation of animal intelligence” (41). Overestimating intelligence is one way to anthropomorphize, so ethologists often attempted to resort to entirely functional terms when speaking about animal emotion or intelligence (44). De Waal argues that anthropomorphism is only dangerous when it is used to refer to animals that are too distant from humans phylogenetically, as with fish

(24). He states that times have changed, and there has been a departure from denying the presence of animal cognition. Applying the term *cognition* to animals is seen as typical in science and in popular culture, but scientists do not see cognition as automatically occurring in animals because scientists always need proof (265).

In *Images of Animals: Anthropomorphism and Animal Mind* (2000), Eileen Crist explains that to avoid anthropomorphism, scientific fields such as cognitive ethology, biology, and behaviorism have used technical language that has made animals into objects, and these terms “derive their meanings from the observer’s framework” (2000:5). She argues that using technical language such as “stimulus-response” or “innate releasing mechanism” has serious repercussions for how animal lives are understood. Technical terminology makes animals into “natural objects” (6). In contrast, the language of “everyday reasoning about human action” gives animals subjectivity. This everyday language expresses that the “experiential perspectives of animals” is critical for perceiving animal lives (2). Crist argues that anthropomorphism is used as a pejorative label to discredit any language that “allows a flow of common meanings between animal and human life” (209). But this label assumes that some neutral language exists that can be used to describe and explain animal behavior. Crist contends that when it comes to animals, no language is neutral, and this is especially true when discussing animal mind (210). In opposition to an objective language, she maintains that anthropomorphism actually “advances the powerful view of animal life as experientially meaningful, authored, and temporarily cohesive” and that it “articulates a compelling argument for human-animal evolutionary continuity” (203). The language of anthropomorphism and

“everyday reasoning” give assent to a connection between humans and other animals that is valuable for animal organizations in their framing.

Some fears about anthropomorphism that have plagued the concept and practice are worth noting. One fear is that by engaging in anthropomorphism, people are projecting their own feelings, thoughts, and emotions on animals where these do not exist for the animal and/or attributing these features incorrectly to animals, such as identifying a dog as being sad because the person observing the animal is sad. Secondly, the trepidation is that scientists researching animals or even lay people observing animals will see in animals only what they want to see, as Daston and Mitman put it, “because they egotistically believe themselves to be the center of the universe” (2005:4). Bekoff pinpoints these cautions when discussing “inappropriate anthropomorphism.” He notes that people should not “presume that the way we see and experience the world must be the only way. It is also easy to become self-serving and hope that because we want or need animals to be happy or unfeeling, they are” (2007:128).

Tension concerning the similarities and differences between humans and animals haunt concerns about anthropomorphism, and this tension also permeates much of human-animal studies. In his book *The Animals' Manifesto* (2010), Bekoff contends that if animals were to write a manifesto, they would ask humans to keep in mind that “all species are similar, rather than focus on differences” and he suggests that “...further, animals would argue that different doesn't mean better or worse” (2010:79). He contends that we are now able to understand so much more about animals, and through the science of cognitive ethology, we know that animals “not only think, but feel—deeply”; he also says that “animals live and move through the world with likes and dislikes and

preferences just like we do” (2010:76). In their book *Wild Justice* (2009), Bekoff and Pierce argue that what they have learned from animals through cognitive ethology also means that many animals are also moral. They define *morality* broadly, maintaining that an expansive definition gives the term more meaning, such as “a suite of other-regarding behaviors falling into the rough clusters of cooperation, empathy, and justice” (2009:138).

According to Bekoff, The fact that animals do not experience or show their pain, happiness, sadness, or fear in the exact same way that humans do does not mean that animals do not experience emotions at all (2010:76). For Bekoff, attributing emotions to animals in human terms and language does not constitute the improper use of anthropomorphism (2007:128). However, an overemphasis on either sameness or difference between humans and other animals can elicit the charge of inappropriate anthropomorphism. Stressing sameness can come off as “arrogant and unimaginative,” and putting too great a weight on difference can reveal a false superiority that makes it seem that humans are “qualitatively different from animals” (Daston and Mitman 2005:4). There needs to be a balance within this tension and in the use of anthropomorphism.

Many would argue that rather than something to be entirely avoided, anthropomorphism is an inevitable and productive way of describing the feelings, emotions, and actions of other animals. As Bekoff notes, “We can only describe and explain the behavior using words with which we’re familiar from a human-centered point of view” (2007:123). Additionally, Midgley argues that whenever humans confront something new that needs to be comprehended, they relate it to something already

encountered, “finding a way to bring it within reach of our existing range of concepts” (1983:127). To not be anthropomorphic, she says, would mean that human language can be at most used to describe exclusively human behavior (124). Midgley elaborates that “all human communities have involved animals” and that we live in a “mixed community” so that our language has evolved to include descriptions of other animals (112; 124). Sandra Mitchell makes an important point regarding anthropomorphism, cognitive ethology, and animal advocacy. She contends that knowing more about animal minds might change the way animal organizations make their case; that is, it would evolve from an argument about the rights of animals approximating human rights to an evaluation of what kinds of capacities make anyone, humans or other animals, the subject of moral consideration (2005:115).

When animal organizations describe a pig being “intelligent like a young child,” for example, or when they show a picture of an animal with sad-looking eyes staring back at the reader/viewer, they are being anthropomorphic; they are making portrayals of the animal that are comparative to humans in order to emphasize the similarities between the two. These comparisons are an attempt to draw people into a connection between themselves and the animal. As evidenced by the field of cognitive ethology, as Bekoff describes, the characterizations ultimately reveal facts about an animal’s cognitive ability. Additionally, the use of anthropomorphism helps a person make an emotional identification with an animal. As Bekoff, is both a scholar and an activist, the animal movement is aware of his work in cognitive ethology and anthropomorphism. Ingrid Newkirk, president of PETA, and Wayne Pacelle, president of HSUS have positive reviews of his books, for example in the front matter of Bekoff’s *The Animal Manifesto*

(2010) and Newkirk's review is listed in the front matter of Bekoff's *The Emotional Lives of Animals* (2007). In light of the knowledge of evolutionary theory concerning the continuity between humans and other animals, it is almost impossible to maintain the idea that humans and animals are vastly different in order to invalidate anthropomorphism (Daston and Mitman 2005:8; Bekoff 2007:33; Midgley 1983:128).

Definitions of Sentimentality

A major distinction that I wish to make in this dissertation is between a rhetorical use of sentimentality, which concentrates on eliciting gut reactions, and a developed moral theory of sentimentality. An example of rhetorical sentimentality is when the ASPCA posts numerous pictures of cute-looking animals, or animals with big eyes that look sad, they are intending to evoke emotions of empathy, sadness, or guilt about the animal and its plight. In "Attention to Suffering: Sympathy as a Basis for Ethical Treatment of Animals" (1996), Josephine Donovan delves into the history of the moral theory of the sentimentalist school with David Hume and Arthur Schopenhauer, and she also looks at more recent scholars, such as Philip Mercer and Max Scheler.⁹ Through her exploration of scholars on sympathy, Donovan determines that sympathy comes before justice and is a prerequisite for it (153). Because of such a prerequisite, sympathy is necessary in order to establish a care ethics for animals. It is important to focus on sympathy, because she argues that it involves "not projecting oneself into another's situation but rather figuring out how the other is feeling" (150). Donovan was concerned

9. Donovan refers to Hume's *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (1777); Schopenhauer's *On the Basis of Morality* (1841); Philip Mercer's *Sympathy and Ethics* (1972); and Max Scheler's *The Nature of Sympathy* (1913). The sentimentalist tradition, which enjoyed its heyday in the eighteenth century, continues to have support in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. See also the discussion of Filonowicz.

about using sympathy instead of empathy because she interprets empathy as losing oneself into the other. Here, Donovan is careful to maintain that a sympathetic care ethics for animals includes reason and a purposeful distance from the other, a move that helps to stave off critiques of care ethics as being overly emotional and separate from reasoned proposals for animal ethics (149).

Later in Donovan's work, she includes the idea of a "dialogical mode of ethical reasoning." The concept connects well with her earlier work on sympathy and animal ethics. The dialogical component means that in contrast to a rights/utilitarian ethic based solely on rationality, "humans pay attention to—listen to—animal communications and construct a human ethic in conversation with the animals rather than imposing on them a rationalistic, calculative grid of humans' own monological construction" (2006:306). In addition, she argues that sympathy is not an irrational or even a purely emotional concept but that it includes a rational component. It is an emotional response, but it is also "a matter of trying to fairly see another's world, to understand what another's experience is" (1996:152). Donovan also discusses the idea of "moral imagination," which means broadening the morality of one known situation to another, from one being to another. An example she uses considers cows in a slaughterhouse: "One can likewise generalize from the treatment of one cow in the slaughterhouse to contend that no cows should be treated that way. Thus, through the use of moral imagination one can easily extend one's care for immediate creatures to others who are not present" (2006:308).

In her article "The Role of Love in Animal Ethics" (2012), Anca Gheaus develops a theory of animal ethics based on ideas of love and need that is grounded, like Donovan's, in ecofeminism. Gheaus argues that the love that humans have for certain

animals and the way in which these animals reciprocate that love is compatible with the idea that ethical consideration should be accorded to all animals (585). Gheaus states that consideration can be extended to animals with which we have no relationship: “If humans and animals did not share many needs, animals would make unlikely attachment objects and hence would be unlikely to fulfill affection and companionship needs” (584). Gheaus warrants that a need-based approach does not encompass the totality of animal issues but that the “full ethical significance of animals derives from people’s and animals’ need for love” (586). Throughout history, she contends, animals have been “valuable companions and friends whose emotional attachment warrants certain ethical standards” (585). She sees these ideas as frequently occurring in “everyday moral reasoning,” and like Donovan, she uses the concept of moral imagination to aid in the expansion from loving particular animals to a larger scope of universal moral concerns for animals (585). It is with the use of moral imagination that stems from the relationships humans have with some animals that Gheaus sees the ability to extend moral consideration to all animals (593; see also Rudy 2011). The moral imagination appeals to the basic similarities between humans and other animals to argue for moral consideration: “We can take our commonality with all animals as a basis for sympathy and solidarity” (595). Emotions such as love and the concept of caring that Gheaus and Donovan develop in their ethical frameworks connect significantly to sentimentality.

Background of Sentimentality

Joseph Filonowicz’s *Fellow-Feeling and the Moral Life* (2008) explores the eighteenth-century sentimentalist tradition’s consensus that ethical living must include

“human desires and emotions that are already other-regarding and benevolent in some sense on their own, prior to any abstract considerations concerning how one ought to live and act (2008:4). He describes these “other-regarding” emotions as “fellow feeling” (4). Sentimentality has to do with the “everyday” and “ordinary” aspects of life. Filonowicz defines *sentimentality* as an account of ethics that is based on experience and observation that is motivated by affections and desires rather than rationality only. Sentimentalism is also based on a benevolence toward others so that the welfare of others is taken into consideration (59). Filonowicz makes a connection between everyday actions and sentimentality by maintaining that the majority of people do things for “self-convenience,” which is not motivated by a concern for others. Yet when people do participate in “helping behavior,” such as helping someone across the street, these actions are morally valuable, whereas acting out of self-concern is morally indifferent (16, 17). Thus when this “helping behavior” does occur, emotions are certainly involved and the emotions are “morally valuable” (16).

Jesse Prinz also argues that “ordinary moral concepts,” which he defines as “the ones we deploy in token thoughts most frequently,” are imbued with emotions (2006:30). He explains that ordinary moral judgments are “constituted by sentiments, and they represent the response-dependent property of causing sentimental responses in us” (39). Prinz defines *sentiment* as a disposition to have emotions. Moral judgments have to do with the determination of something as “wrong,” and “emotion serves as the vehicle of the concept of “wrong” (34). He argues that moral judgment cannot occur without sentiments or emotions. Maintaining that David Hume defined sentimentalist theory as “to believe something is morally wrong (right) is to have a sentiment of disapprobation

(approbation) towards it,” (33) Prinz contends that rationalists bring forth concepts designed to regulate behavior but that these are not really “ordinary moral concepts.” Prinz holds that there is no independent set of standards and concepts that create the sense of “wrong,” rather this disapprobation only comes from sentiments and emotion (41). The quintessential case for his point is the fact that there are infinite varieties of moral judgments, and something that is considered “wrong” in one society or culture is not so in another. Moral judgments are always response dependent (41). The background of the sentimentalist tradition provides the basis for the direction my dissertation is headed, especially the common sense nature of sentimentalism present in the history of the tradition and contemporary authors. As Elisa Aaltola, a lecturer in philosophy at the University of Eastern Finland, explains, “Sentimentalism has a clear explanatory power in the context of moral judgments concerning nonhuman animals. Everyday animal ethics are often based on emotive responses, which are again guided by socially constructed meanings, and which remain wholly unreflected” (2015:204). Similar to Aaltola’s assertion that animal ethics are based on emotive reactions, my research shows that viewers of animal organization websites are encouraged to view animal causes with the type of sympathy that Donovan develops.

Donovan, however, pushes the concept of caring further, saying, “Caring must therefore be extended to mean not just ‘caring about their welfare’ but ‘caring about what they are telling us’” (2006:310). Here, Donovan echoes a Jain proverb¹⁰ that discusses the similarities in the way humans and other animals experience pleasure and pain (310) in

10. The proverb is as quoted in Donovan’s “Feminism and the Treatment of Animals: From Care to Dialogue” (2006:310): “All beings are fond of life; they like pleasure and hate pain, shun destruction and like to live, they long to live. To all life is dear” (*Jaina Suṭras* [1884] 1973, I.2.3).

terms of what animals are conveying to us of their needs and desires. Filonowicz's idea of "everyday" morality and the helping behavior that gets at the "distinctly emotional concern for others—sympathy, compassion, kindness—once again, fellow feeling" pairs well with Donovan's perception of sympathy and care ethics (2008:5). For Filonowicz, Donovan, and the sentimentalist tradition, the aforementioned emotions serve as a basic, foundational starting point for grounding ethics. Filonowicz, Prinz, Donovan, and Gheaus all contend that sympathy and sentimentality are cornerstones of everyday life and part of the way people should consider the moral status of animals. The everyday aspects of sentimentalism are a critical factor for why it works for animal ethics.

Sentimentality stems from the eighteenth-century philosophical sentimentalist tradition and scholars such as David Hume, Adam Smith, and others who maintained that in contrast to "selfish theories," people exhibit altruism for others in their daily lives, and this altruism comes from a "certain affective sensitivity" (Filonowicz 2008:4).

Sentimentality was a reaction to theorists such as Thomas Hobbes and the "intellectual or rational camp," who argued that reason and metaphysics were the ground of morality.

The sentimentalists claimed that humans' "innate sociability and fellow-sympathy" was the best support for morality (Filonowicz 2008:3).¹¹ Coventry and Hiller argue that

11. Many interpretations have been made of David Hume's sentimental philosophy, which is frequently used as a guide for a sentimentalist animal ethic as to whether he applied justice to animals (Coventry and Hiller 2015:170). The scholars explored more fully in this dissertation have used Hume and other sentimentalists definitively for a defense of the moral significance of animals. On the other hand, some scholars say that Hume merely leaves the possibility open. For instance, Anthony Pitson argues that Hume recognized many similarities between humans and other animals, including that animal mind was only different from human reason by degree, as opposed to animals not having feelings and reasoning at all, but Hume maintains that human reasoning is superior, therefore making human beings superior to animals (1993:301; 302). According to Pitson, Hume did not see animals as moral agents and is undetermined on whether animals are able to be objects of human moral consideration (308-9). Denis Arnold maintains that Hume did not view or conceive of animals as having the same moral capabilities as humans. However, Hume stresses the similarity between humans and animals for the ability to communicate sympathy, a key component of Hume's idea of moral judgment (309). Arnold argues that whereas Hume locates moral

Hume's conception of sympathy has great potential for animal and environmental ethics. The authors describe Hume's sympathy as "a natural mechanism in human nature." It is natural to sympathize with those that are closest to you (2015:172). The difficulty of being able to sympathize better or exclusively with those creatures that most closely resemble humans is resolved, for Coventry and Hiller, by employing Hume's concept of a "general point of view," which helps people see beyond their own feelings and positions and makes communication easier. It is through communication that humans receive sympathetic understanding (172). The ease with which people are able to sympathize with those who are both close in proximity and those with whom one identifies relates to the discussion of anthropomorphism above because comparing animals to humans can help people make connections to animals. Hiller and Coventry argue that extending Hume's sympathy and general point of view can make Hume's sentimentalism a viable way forward for animal ethics (174).

There has been a contemporary reemergence of sentimentalism in moral philosophy, arguing that emotion must be involved in moral agency (Aaltola 2015:201). Aaltola, notes that although a resurgence has occurred in the field of moral philosophy that counters the rationalist dominance, animal ethics has been slow to take sentimentalist philosophy—and the empirical evidence of its validity from social psychology and neuro studies—seriously (2015:203). She writes, "Although sentimentalism has reserved a place in some of the second-generation approaches to animals, the majority of contemporary animal ethics has remained staunchly oriented towards rationalism" (2015:203). Emotion in moral philosophy is being considered as a foundation for

differences between humans and animals, Hume does see animals as having the possibility of a type of moral sentiment similar to that of humans (314).

morality and in social processes, as seen in Jasper (discussed in detail below), who argues that emotions produce significant motivation for social movements (1995; 1997; 1998; 2011). Martha Nussbaum was one of the first to reclaim the idea that emotions are “forms of judgment” (2001:22) in her book, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions* (2001). Furthermore, Nussbaum later wrote *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership* (2006), where she subsequently argues, speaking of animals and what they deserve, that “compassion overlaps with the sense of justice, and a full allegiance to justice requires compassion for beings who suffer wrongly, just as it requires anger at the offenders who inflict wrongful suffering” (337). Additionally, Aaltola notes that sentimentality does not only refer to the emotions of sympathy and care—positive emotions, in other words. Sentimentalism can also speak to emotions such as anger, disgust, and rage that are present in the opposition to animal rights. “Animal ethics and philosophy should consider more carefully just how relevant a role disgust, hate, anger, contempt, pride, and other similar emotions play in determining anthropocentric attitudes towards animals” (2015:205).

Sentimentality comes with its own set of problems in terms of discussing compassion, care, empathy, and sympathy, terms often used interchangeably. In light of concern about the use of sentimentality, one of the first issues that must be established is how to use empathy and sympathy. Because the two concepts are used similarly, it is important to show the differences and, in the process, to show how I am using sympathy and empathy in this dissertation. The authors that discuss sentimentality and ethics are not settled on which concepts constitute sentimentality. Sympathy and empathy are included in the realm of sentimentality for different reasons. For instance, in *The Ethics*

of *Care and Empathy* (2007), Michael Slote defines *empathy* as “having the feelings of another (involuntarily) aroused in ourselves, as when we see another person in pain” (13). Sympathy, on the other hand, is feeling “sorry for, bad for, the person who is in pain and positively wish them well...it can happen even if we aren’t feeling their pain” (13). Slote is not sure that an ethics based on empathy can be applied to animals because he does not think they can be objects of empathetic moral concern; however, he sees “caring *about*” not just animals but also objects and ideas as a plausible possibility (19). Still, his distinction between empathy and sympathy is a helpful one. To give some examples of the ways in which empathy and sympathy are used analogously, Donovan, Filonowicz, and Slote discuss corresponding ideas but use one term or the other. Slote argues that eighteenth-century sentimentalists such as David Hume and Adam Smith were actually discussing empathy using the word *sympathy*, even though the term *empathy* was not used formally until the twentieth century (127). Josephine Donovan, on the other hand, discusses some of the same scholars in the early sentimentalist tradition, including Hume, when arguing for sympathy in an ethics of care for animals (Donovan 1996:154). Additionally, when considering anthropomorphism and his research, Bekoff describes feeling empathy for the animals he studies: “As I watch an animal, I’m not reaching for the closest word to describe the behavior I see; I’m feeling the emotion directly, without words or even a full conscious understanding of the animal’s actions” (2007:128). Most scholars discussing care ethics and sentimentalism focus on empathy. Congruently, those discussing care and animals also use empathy (Gruen 2015). However, as discussed above, Donovan (1996) has strategic reasons for choosing sympathy over empathy, although sympathy and empathy are both connected to caring. Jesse Prinz, a

contemporary sentimentalist philosopher, explains that “caring is a disposition to pay attention to something in a way that motivates both interaction with that thing and behaviors that promote the flourishing of that thing” (2007:83). It is motivation for caring that sentimentalism and care ethics demonstrate, and this is what animal organizations are trying to develop in those they seek to motivate to action. For the purposes of my dissertation, I will use both empathy and sympathy, because they are both linked to caring. The type of caring discussed in the Prinz quote above is the kind animal groups seek; they want motivated and interactive adherents and, ultimately, a motivated and active public. Animal organizations want people to both feel sorry for and to identify with their cause.

Connections Between Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality

I argue that there is a connection between anthropomorphism and sentimentality because they are repeatedly used simultaneously by animal organizations to evoke particular emotions and to make emotional appeals on behalf of animals. Connections can be found between the way scholars discuss anthropomorphism and the scholars discussed who treat sentimentality. To begin with, Daston and Mitman’s edited volume is entitled *Thinking With Animals* (2005). Their title is indicative of how the volume contributors and editors view anthropomorphism—rather than thinking *about* animals, it can be used to think *with* them, which necessarily involves issues of agency. They ask, “In what sense is the animal a participant and actor in our analyses?” (5). They also argue that thinking with animals changes the way humans come to understand and feel about animals and themselves. There is a “transformative process” that occurs as one thinks *with* as opposed

to *about* (5, 6). The way Daston and Mitman view anthropomorphism can be connected to one of Donovan's core ideas about a dialogical notion of care. She writes that care theory should be about "listening to animals, paying emotional attention, taking seriously—caring about—what they are telling us" and that "we shift the epistemological source of theorizing about animals to the animals themselves" (Donovan 2006:305).

"Moral imagination" is a concept used extensively by both Donovan and Gheaus to explore how to look at the moral consideration of animals. Donovan argues that sympathy for another animal requires a moral imagination that involves "strong powers of observation and concentration, as well as faculties of evaluation and judgment" (1996:152). Gheaus uses the concept of imagination to underscore the fact that even though many differences are apparent between some animals and humans, similarities of need also exist—such as food, shelter, and avoidance of danger—on which to base the moral consideration of animals. Further, with moral imagination, it is possible to extend the love that people have for certain animals to others with whom they are not close. It is possible to use these likenesses to imagine the "moral relevance of all animals' needs" (2012:593).

While discussing animal emotions and behavior, Bekoff makes many arguments for the moral consideration of all animals and for issues that are in line with animal rights and welfare concerns (see for example *The Animal Manifesto*, 2010). He describes how animals' emotions, self-awareness, and consciousness come through in patterns in behavior and that "flexibility in behavior is one of the litmus tests for consciousness, for a mind at work" (2007:31). The behavior patterns in animals and the presence of consciousness are a prime example of similarities in humans and animals. The key to

seeing such behavior patterns is to be able to conduct assiduous observation and study to perceive the emotions and behaviors of animals that are required in the field of cognitive ethology. Bekoff mentions that even people untrained in science are able to reliably identify animal emotions through their own observations (2007:46). He argues throughout his work that being able to discuss these aspects of animals' minds requires anthropomorphism, and he is very careful about attentive observation. Bekoff's understanding of anthropomorphism and the observation expected in the field of cognitive ethology link well with Donovan's and Gheaus's conceptions of the moral imagination.

Finally, the way in which Bekoff, Daston and Mitman, and Midgley discuss anthropomorphism as something that is inevitable and recurrent in everyday life is also how sentimentality, sympathy, and love are considered among Donovan, Filonowicz, Prinz, and Gheaus. Anthropomorphism and sentimentality are ways of thinking that are frequently used by lay people and scholars. The common use of these concepts is crucial for understanding both their use by animal organizations and what they are trying to achieve in their reliance on these ideas. For example, when PETA describes geese as being "family oriented," they are asking readers to expand their moral imagination and take the analogy of human families as applicable to animals so that they can identify with that particular species, and they are banking on the fact that these analogies and anthropomorphisms are easily made and readily available.

Because companion animals are often more anthropomorphized, many groups try to make a connection between the love and care of companion animals and other animals that are in need of consideration. One way of doing this is by comparing companion

animals with other animals: “Although we do not have emotional bonds with most individual animals, we can nevertheless easily recognize some of the animals to whom we do not directly relate as being similar to those we actually love and who love us” (Gheaus 2012:593). Gheaus confirms that love of animals can help people determine that animals require moral consideration.

For the animal movement, the “gut-level” reactions to animals are the kinds of emotions that can draw people to the cause. Jasper and Nelkin (1992) argue that “sentimental anthropomorphism” is a strong feature of the movement. As they define the term, they say that “it portrays animals as partners to humans in intimate emotional relationships, valued for their own sake and not merely regarded as useful tools, metaphors, or totems which we might use in pursuit of our own ends” (11). Similar to the way in which Jasper and Nelkin link sentimentality and anthropomorphism, I have argued for a connection between the two terms. The reason I have treated the terms separately is because I am arguing for a moral theory of sentimentalism that attempts to push the movement beyond rights.

At the same time, the animal movement—especially those more oriented toward animal rights—has tended to disparage sentimentalism in favor of the rational argumentation (Regan 1983; Groves 1997; Herzog and Galvin 1997; Singer 2009). This stereotype of being too emotional is one reason why Singer and Regan’s philosophical works are popular: because they sought to bring rational arguments to the movement’s ideas, a move that has been critiqued by ecofeminists (Slicer 1991; Donovan 1996; Adams and Gruen 2014). Despite its strong component in the movement as a motivating factor, taking emotion seriously has been difficult for both scholars and people within the

movement (Groves 1997). Gaarder notes that women have been especially susceptible to this stereotype and that even some feminists have been wary of the animal movement because of the above characterization of it as too emotionally based (2011:153).

With my dissertation, I hope to add to the second-generation approaches, including ecofeminism that has taken moral sentimentalism seriously. Animal organizations, with their use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality—even though not as developed as the discussions above—have the seeds to enhance protectionist ideas with a fuller moral theory that can avoid some of the critiques of rights philosophy from both within and outside the movement.

Methodology

One way to go about understanding the use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality is by analyzing the discourse and framing of arguments on the websites of major organizations. When looking at social movements, Anthony Ladd observes that frame analysis

“still constitutes the most widely used body of literature in the field to explain the emergence of social movement organizations (SMOs), the mechanisms through which individuals are recruited and mobilized for collective action, and the cognitive processes that activists employ to organize and interpret how their own beliefs are championed by a given movement” (2011:349).

Snow, Rochford, Worden, and Benford’s (1986) theory of framing in “Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation” provides one of the major methods in the analysis of organization websites. This theory refers to the “interpretive orientations” that combine the beliefs, values, convictions, and ideals of an organization with the activities, objectives, and intentions of the group. By using frame alignment, the

authors attempt to combine “social psychological and structural/organizational factors” (464). In general, frame alignment and the idea of framing are useful for this dissertation because of the blending of psychological and organizational elements. In order to get a better picture of the movement overall, the emotions and the psychological factors—as well as the structure of the organizations (their websites primarily)¹²—need to be interpreted and described. Frame analysis and alignment processes have been used in a number of studies on social movements and, more recently, on the animal rights and environmental movements (Mika 2006; Ladd 2011; Brulle and Benford 2012).

Snow et al. use four alignment processes to discuss how social movement organizations frame their arguments and issues. The authors borrow from Erving Goffman, who defines frames and frameworks as a “schema of interpretation” for people to organize events in their worlds (1974:21). The first alignment is “frame bridging,” which links together the framing of issues or ideas that were previously unconnected (467). An example of bridging is the way many groups connect their ideas about animal rights with environmentalism. Next, “frame amplification” is about the clarification of an issue (469). Snow et al. see this as done in two primary ways: by “value amplification” and “belief amplification.” *Value amplification* connects the “presumed basic values” of potential supporters with the ideas or problems with which the group is concerned (469), whereas *belief amplification* concerns beliefs about the causality or location of blame, antagonists or “targets of influence,” the likelihood of change and the effectiveness of collective action, and the necessity of “standing up” for a cause. The authors found each of these amplifications common in social movement literature (470). These recurrent

12. Websites do not represent the structure of an organization and only provide a limited view of a group’s message. Websites do, however, give a partial sense of how an organization presents itself to the public.

belief amplifications supply a template to discover how the groups argue their case and perceive their opposition. Third, “frame extension” has to do with expanding a group’s ideas about a problem to include a not previously accounted for idea; for example, extension is needed when an organization’s issues or causes do not have resonance with a particular “sentiment or adherent pool” (472). When this happens, the group must broaden its frames to incorporate concerns that might be very important to potential adherents (472). Lastly, “frame transformation” includes two types: “domain specific” and “global.” The term *domain specific* refers to changes in a specific, sometimes singular area of life that was previously taken for granted or normalized (474). In the case of animal rights groups, and sometimes welfare groups, a good example of this would be the call to a change in diet, namely from an omnivorous to plant-based diet. A global frame transformation is a larger transformation in which a new “master frame” becomes the central way in which an adherent understands being in the world (475). An example of this could be the vegan lifestyle that some animal rights groups advocate. Beyond a change in eating habits, it would encompass almost every area of a person’s life, so that the master frame leads to constantly considering how everyday choices impact animal suffering.

To further the use of framing and analysis, I have followed Benford and Snow’s “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment” (2000). They have identified three “core framing tasks” that social movements often use (215). “Diagnostic framing” is the presentation of the problem and the “source(s) of causality, blame, or culpable agents” (216). An example of this in the animal protection movement is the blame placed on Concentrated Animal Feed Operations (CAFOs) or factory farms

for the deplorable conditions in which many animals raised for food are forced to live. “Prognostic framing” is the presentation of solutions for the problem and a strategy to combat the aforementioned issue (2000:216). A solution to the conditions on factory farms would be to clean up the living conditions through better enrichment, space, room to move, and time outside for the animals or to avoid eating animals raised in such conditions, hoping that consumer pressure will have an impact. “Motivational framing” consists of the reasoning for wanting to solve the attendant issue, which includes “the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive” (217).

In addition to framing analysis, my exploration of the text and images from the websites under study is guided by a basic set of questions designed by James Paul Gee in *Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (1999). Four types of questions are considered in this research: the first has to do with the *systems and language* being used in a piece of discourse, and it asks about the images, writing, and knowledge set down in the document (1999:84). These questions are good for web page analysis because both images and writing are a critical part of how the message is disseminated. The next set of questions deals with patterns in words that discuss *places, bodies, objects, and institutions* that are important to the document (84). For example, one question asks about physical bodies and what importance they have in a piece of writing or speech. Bodies are particularly important for animal rights and welfare organizations, and featured heavily in the organizations’ web pages are pictures, descriptions, and discussions of real animals and the pain and injury incurred upon their bodies.

Sociocultural identities and relationships are also important for sociological analysis. The third set of Gee’s questions asks about the *social goods, roles, and*

positions presented in a particular piece (84). The organizations are typically in a role of teacher or knowledge provider for the person visiting the page. Social goods, especially as related to power and status, are relevant to these websites because the power dynamic as represented by animal organizations always tilts toward humans, and the animals being discussed are typically powerless. The last set of Gee's questions concerns looking for "*connection building*" (84). Connections are made among various sections within an organization and between organizations—whether these take the form of language, images, and ideas and whether these are from past, future written, or verbal interactions—and with other related movements, such as environmental or food-related movements. Gee's set of questions informs my analysis and assessment of the web pages and the discourse used to get messages across to the reader/viewer.

Research Design

To better understand the use of sentimentality and anthropomorphism, this study analyzes discourse and frame alignment of websites from four animal organizations and two departments within these groups. My research focuses on the United States portions of the organizations and their websites, although some of the groups have international presences. I chose to concentrate on the U.S. context to limit the scope and also because many major animal organizations are headquartered in the United States. Websites were chosen as the primary focus because they are one of the central means through which potential adherents and supporters educate themselves on the issues and priorities of animal advocacy, and they are a principal way that organizations communicate who they are and what they do. Organization websites and their Internet presences have replaced

organizing tools such as direct mailing and cold calls both as a primary form of gaining support at the initial stages of awareness and education and for mobilizing around a particular issue. Additionally, websites are used by organizations to organize protests, both physical and online; boycotts; petitions; and mail campaigns, such as emailing legislative offices (Earl and Kimport 2011), that further convey what is important to the organization.

My research design includes a broad survey of a variety of types of organizations, including People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), In Defense of Animals (IDA), Friends of Animals (FoA), the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI), and the American Humane Association (AHA). I also briefly looked at two organizations that are more radical, the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and Earth First!. Religious groups I considered included Jewish Veg, All-Creatures.org, Dharma Voices for Animals, and the Christian Vegetarian Association (CVA). Religious organizations are included because of the perception in segments of the animal rights movement that religion is not “pro-animal.” Additionally, animal welfare has a historical religious background and I wanted to see how groups with a religiously oriented focus use religion to advocate for animals. By looking at religious organizations, I wanted to see what difference religion makes to the movement. There has been a growing interest in and study of religions and their implications for animals in scholarly literature and in activist work. This is evidenced by the strength of scholarship in the field of animals and religion as well as the fact that two of the major animal organizations, HSUS and PETA, now have departments dedicated to religious traditions. This “turn to religion” within the

animal turn shaped several research questions: How does religious framing change how animals are viewed and discussed? How do religious animal groups interpret their respective religions and beliefs? Does religious discourse on animals make a difference in the way anthropomorphism and sentimentality are used?

The organizations in this study were chosen because they have a developed Internet presence, which makes their websites favorable for analysis. Additionally, I mainly chose fairly large and well-known organizations that have multi platform campaigns and issues that they address. Many animal advocacy groups, such as the Farm Animal Rights Movement and Physicians for Responsible Medicine, concentrate on one or another cause; for example, focusing exclusively on factory farming or experimentation. For the sake of analysis and comparison, and in an attempt to cover the large breadth of considerations in the animal movement, I rejected those organizations that focused on singular issues. I chose popular and established groups because I wanted to gain an understanding of the current direction of the movement in the way it is presented to the public; size is usually an indication of popularity, although an exception to this may be All-Creatures, whose support and popularity were hard to determine. Although the animal movement has a vast grassroots contingent, and countless animals are helped by the tireless efforts of small-scale organizations and individuals, the larger groups often represent—for better or worse—the public face of the movement. Out of all the organizations, PETA, the ASPCA, All-Creatures, and Jewish Veg the Faith Outreach department of HSUS and Jesus People for Animals (JPFA), which are directed at people of faith will be analyzed more closely. I chose to look at All-Creatures and Jewish Veg even though they are different from the other four groups: All-Creatures represents an

abolitionist standpoint from within Christianity, and because of this—regardless of their popularity—their rhetoric and arguments are valuable for analysis. Jewish Veg is well-known within the religious sector of environmentalism and animal rights, and although they focus exclusively on veganism, as I will show, there are religious reasons why this focus in Judaism is an important launching point for other animal issues. I chose to concentrate on these six because they were major organizations and religious departments within secular groups. Without broadening the scope as to become unwieldy, this breadth will give a good picture of both the secular and religious work in the movement. I examined the websites over a period of one year, from June 2014 through July 2015, and I frequently checked back throughout the writing process to track changes in website materials.

Theoretical Underpinnings

James Jasper's theoretical work on emotion and the use of emotions in social movements grounds my analysis of movement websites. Jasper argues that the importance of sociological understandings of emotion in social movements has been largely ignored in the past or perceived as irrational (1998:398). He has used the animal rights movement specifically to demonstrate his theories on the use of emotion in protest (see Jasper 1993; 1997), but he has gone on to write extensively about social movements in general. Jasper's emphasis on emotions in social movements has helped me to tease out the particular emotions present in anthropomorphism and sentimentality.

For example, Jasper introduces the concept of "moral batteries," where a combination of positive and negative emotion often spurs action. "An emotion can be

strengthened when we explicitly or implicitly tie it to its opposite” (Jasper 2011:14.22). The back and forth of positive and negative emotions occurs regularly in the animal movement websites and pages I studied. The emotions frequently associated with sentimentality—love, compassion, care, empathy, sympathy, and so on—are often linked together in the same sentence, paragraph, or page with the potential for emotions such as anger and disgust. The same can be said for the way in which groups anthropomorphize certain animals. Sometimes, animals that are likely to produce the most moral outrage in the reader/viewer—for instance, baby seals and the seal hunts around the world—are also those animals that are anthropomorphized more strongly. It is a case of moral batteries because anthropomorphizing animals frequently elicits positive emotions of sympathy and compassion.

In “The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and Around Social Movements,” Jasper (1998) categorizes emotional states and feelings into three types that are helpful for sorting out how anthropomorphism and sentimentality are used by animal rights and welfare groups. He sees these categories of emotions on a continuum (402). First are “reactive emotions,” those elicited in reaction to particular events or situations. Examples of such emotions are anger, grief, loss, and outrage (406). Jasper’s discussion of reactive emotions designates them as primarily negative, whereas affective emotions are frequently more positive. “Affective emotions” are those emotions that are, according to Jasper, longer lasting, such as loathing, hatred, love, loyalty, trust, and respect (402; 406). In the middle of the spectrum are what Jasper terms “moods.” These are emotions such as compassion, sympathy, pity, fear, and dread (406). Moods are “chronic or reoccurring feelings that do not always have a direct object” (402). Jasper’s

moral batteries can be combinations of reactive and affective emotions and moods (2011:14.22). For instance, he notes that moral batteries include pity and joy, a mood and an affective emotion (14.22). The basic aspects of anthropomorphism and sentimentality fall generally under Jasper's category of "moods" (406). Emotions such as sympathy and pity typically understood as moods, however, can be prompted more reactively. One unique feature of moods is that they can initially begin as a reaction, but they can "linger" (1998:402). In cases such as these, Jasper's idea of moral batteries and Snow et al.'s theory of frame alignment are particularly important. For instance, a picture of a hurt animal—such as a clubbed seal during a seal hunt—or a graphic description of the processes of milk or veal production can produce both lasting "moods" and reactive emotions. Examples like these have the possibility to change the way people behave (transformation) and cause an initial sense of anger.

Looking at the kinds of stories told about animals and the narratives that organizations tell about themselves and the movement is an important part of investigating websites. Narrative analysis provides nuance to frame analysis and emotions theory and helps to create connections between them. Davis suggests that framing "suffer[s] from an overemphasis on logical persuasion and consensus of belief;" he explains, along with Jasper, that framing has largely ignored emotion as an element of analysis or inquiry (Davis 2002:9). He argues that "stories, even self-stories, are inherently social" (21). Studying social movements through the lens of narrative can get at cultural dimensions that might be neglected by other methods (Davis 2002:10). Narratives comprise three basic components: events, sequence, and plot. Stories always include the reader and are "transactional." Stories have the ability to generate

“experiences for and request certain responses from their audience” (12). The stories told by the animal rights movement ask for clear responses from the reader/viewer, such as action in the form of donations, signing a petition, boycotts, or even a lifestyle change to avoid animal products.

Secondly, the concept of collective narratives is significant for looking at social movements. Collective narratives told by movements are not only about the causes but also about the organizations’ origins and work. In “Plotting Protest: Mobilizing Stories in the 1960 Student Sit-Ins,” Polletta explains that story plots are “derived from a cultural stock of plots. Their canonical quality makes narratives recognizable...this explains our tendency to turn to stories when we encounter phenomena that are unfamiliar or threatening” (2002:34). When examining animal rights and welfare websites, the reader/viewer often comes upon material and information that is unfamiliar or threatening. Stories have the ability to link the unfamiliar idea with an already present or presumed value (value amplification) for the reader/viewer in order to draw attention to the problem being discussed. For example, a story of an animal that was abused through the “sport” of dog fighting or a story about a raid on a “puppy mill” are those that make the reader/viewer reevaluate common norms. The stories, especially those that provide a new way of thinking (frame transformation), can make an issue take on greater urgency and make new information more palatable.

The final aspect of narrative pertinent to the study is what Gary Alan Fine describes as “metanarratives,” or “events and occasions that have been encountered by the group or previously recounted, and as a result, can be broadly referred to as narrative, even if on any particular occasion the plot is implicit and obliquely referred to” (Fine

2002:237). Fine refers to stories and plots that underlie groups but are not always explicitly expressed. For example, some metanarratives in particular are repeatedly told by organizations in the animal advocacy movement, such as the metanarrative that society does not realize how terribly animals are treated by various industries. The hope is that once people have this knowledge, they will change. The fact that animal abuse exists or that certain industries are to blame for the conditions of factory farm animals is not always explicitly stated but is ever present for these organizations. Stories such as these are “the kind of talk that is common in groups in which members know each other and talk in ‘storied shorthand’” (2002:238).

Along with anthropomorphism, anecdotalism is frequently labeled as a careless way to conduct scientific practice. Anecdotalism is essentially telling stories about particular research subjects in order to make a more generalized interpretation (Mitchell 1997:151). Bekoff discusses the prevalence of anecdotalism in cognitive ethology and uses anecdotal evidence for his work with canines, showing that it is not always a bad way to convey information (2006:24; 2009:37). Similarly, telling stories is a common strategy of animal advocacy groups; one anecdote is used to suggest something is widely prevalent or indicative.

Frame analysis illuminates the way in which organizations attempt to maneuver the reader/viewer into a certain point of view, and frame alignment has much to do with cognitive processes such as beliefs, opinions, and values. But as was seen with the above discussion of sentimentality, emotion is necessary for judgment making. Emotion is used for accepting, formulating, and bringing forward beliefs and opinions. This is because “emotions involve beliefs and assumptions that are open to cognitive persuasion. We

often can be talked out of our anger on the grounds that it is too extreme a response, or that we are misinformed” (Jasper 1998:401). Using frame analysis achieves a better understanding of the motivation and consequences of appealing to and creating particular beliefs and emotions about animal issues. Similarly, stories and narrative have the potential to better connect the reader/viewer to the material presented because stories can make difficult subjects more palatable. By studying the stories of various movements, another facet of how organizations attempt to connect their causes with the reader/viewer can be seen. Discourse analysis is fruitful because it looks at what is behind particular words, speech, and dialogue in order to consider more fully the message brought by animal organizations. The particular combination of methods paints a clearer picture of how organizations and the movement as a whole spread their messages and concerns. By combining framing analysis, emotions theory, and narrative analysis in examining the use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality, I have been able to fill in gaps left by any one of these methods because no single method is entirely adequate in and of itself (Fine 2002:230).

This dissertation deals with a limited set of information. By focusing primarily on websites, my research design does not present the fullness of the organizations’ structure or their messages. Additionally, such an emphasis left out participant observation and interviewing, which could have been used to more completely gauge the opinions of people in the movement and reactions and thoughts about organization websites. Further, observing and interviewing actual organization involvement from leadership or members could have granted a better picture of each groups’ message and impact.

Position of the Researcher

I became interested in this topic because of my own ethical and political commitments to animals. I first learned about the animal rights movement through my own research outside of academic study and through reflection about the animals in my own life. When I was first learning about the animal movement, I came across many of the websites that I have now studied for this project. Starting out, I assumed that the theories about animal rights that existed and the argumentation on behalf of animals were confined to philosophical viewpoints such as Peter Singer's and Tom Regan's. During the period of my increasing interest in animals, I was also studying disability theory and the disability rights movement. One of the most important things for me in studying disability was the responsibility toward interdependence. A major theme in disability studies, and especially feminist disability studies, is the idea that no matter their abilities, humans are interdependent upon one another for support. When a person is disabled and must rely on another to help, interdependence comes into stark contrast with the constant standard of individual independence in Western society and the seemingly negative understandings of dependence (Hillyer 1993; Wendell 2010). When thinking about animals, interdependence is a similarly important idea. Humans are animals, and we are all interdependent on one another and other animals to create a sustainable world. Humans have been terrible at sustaining the earth we live in and recognizing our interdependence with other animals, whether as part of ecosystems or in shared lives with companion animals or animals as food. Recognizing interdependence is essential to future planetary sustainability and to the work in this dissertation. When studying animals, anthropomorphism and sentimentality, it helped me to realize that paying

particular attention to care, emotion, and sympathy increases understandings of interdependence in a way that arguing for legal rights does not. After reading ecofeminists and feminist care ethics for animals, I noticed that anthropomorphism, emotion, and sentimentality were discussed often in the field of animal studies and animal advocacy philosophies in ways that were different than most animal rights ethics. Influenced by the idea of subtle anthropocentrism in animal rights/protection philosophy, I was looking for something beyond the notion of “rights” for animals.

Throughout this dissertation, I have used the word *animals* to refer to those beings that, culturally and taxonomically, we think of as different from humans. Thus for the sake of ease in writing, and because of the concepts I have chosen to take on, I have kept the terms *humans* and *animals* mostly separate. Following Paul Waldau’s discussion that there is “no neutral choice for terminology about animals, I sometimes use the phrase “humans and other animals” (2011:6) because I think it is an appropriate reminder that we humans are also animals; I also do this to continually diminish the cultural and epistemological boundaries between animals and humans.

Chapter Outline

Chapter 2 takes a closer look at the history of the animal rights/welfare movement, from the early welfare-oriented development to the more recent growth of the rights movement. It is necessary to understand the background of the movement in order to grasp its present form and how it operates. The chapter also explores background information on the field of animal studies and on religious scholarship on animals. Additionally, it takes a broad sample of organizations and gives examples of their use of

anthropomorphism and sentimentality. Chapters 3 through 5 provide a detailed exploration and analysis of organization websites, concentrating on their general discourse, messages, and tactics; these chapters analyze organizations' use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality. Chapter 3 deals with the secular organizations, the ASPCA and PETA, and Chapter 4 looks at two religious organizations, All-Creatures and Jewish Veg. Chapter 5 examines the two religious departments of two secular organizations, HSUS' Faith Outreach and PETA's Jesus People for Animals. That two of the largest animal groups have religious programs is an indication of both the value of a religious approach and the increased favorable opinion of religion within the movement. Finally, Chapter 6 my findings and patterns in the organizations' are summarized messages and campaigns in addition to their use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality and the emotions associated with the concepts. I conclude by examining some potential risks with sentimentality and anthropomorphism and suggesting ways forward in their use by organizations and future research.

Conclusion

This dissertation explores how animal organizations use anthropomorphism and sentimentality to frame the issues and information on their websites. I chose these organizations in particular because they illustrate how the movement is represented to a wide audience, including religious populations, within the United States. Anthropomorphism and sentimentality explore the connection that people can have with other animals. Drawing upon framing and discourse analysis, emotions theory, and narrative, I aim to give a fuller picture of these aspects of the movement and their use by

specific organizations. I utilize Jasper's arguments about emotion because feelings are directly connected with the emotions involved in sentimentality and the emotional and moral identifications that are solicited with anthropomorphism. Finally, narrative is important because stories are often involved in getting the reader/viewer to connect or sympathize with other animals.

This research is intended to enhance the growth of the broader field of animal studies, including studies on anthropomorphism and sentimentality, and ecofeminism. With the large numbers of animal companions, a growing concern about where food comes from, and deeper involvement with environmental issues, the time is ripe for the growth of the animal movement. Revealing how animal movement organizations use these concepts and arguing for them to broaden their rhetorical use to substantiate a concrete moral theory will contribute to the interdependence not only of activism and scholarship but also of animals and humans.

CHAPTER 2

A MOVEMENT FOR COMPASSION: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ANIMAL MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The Early Movement: Before 1970

Since colonial times, animal welfare has been an issue of concern for many people in the United States. As early as 1641, laws were passed in the United States that dealt with cruelty to animals (Davis 2015:1).¹³ The earliest humane society, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals—the SPCA, later called the *Royal SPCA* with the patronage of Queen Victoria—began in Britain in 1824. The founder was an Anglican priest who developed the organization as distinctly Christian (Linzey 2009:26). As a result, religion has been a part of the movement from the beginning. After he attended a meeting in London with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), Henry Bergh used this organization as a model when he founded the American SPCA (ASPCA; Jasper and Nelkin 1992:58). Similarly, in the nineteenth century, the anti-vivisection movement in the United States and Britain were guided by Christian values (Gorman 2007:381). Brian Lowe observes that the early American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS) was formed in 1883¹⁴ based on an idea of Christian duty to animals and that much of the movement was developed to produce a better “Christian nation” (2001:45). This is consistent with the early welfare/humane movement’s consideration that attending to the suffering of animals would help to bring about moral reform. During the same period in the nineteenth century, the vegetarianism movement

13. Janet M. Davis. <http://tah.oah.org/november-2015/the-history-of-animal-protection-in-the-united-states>. Accessed 07/26/16.

14. American Anti-Vivisection Society. <http://aavs.org/about/history>. Accessed 09/06/16.

was largely a Christian enterprise. Around this time, the Bible-Christian Church in Pennsylvania created and maintained a nascent Vegetarian Society in 1850 (Preece 2008:310). Preece notes the frequent vegetarian argument found in the “dominion” passages of Genesis, which provide humans with the injunction to *care* for other animals rather than to own them (318). In the early years of the movement, women were instrumental in both the anti-vivisection and vegetarian movements, and they made up much of their membership (Beers 2006:9; Preece 2008:318).

The animal movement in the United States began in earnest in the late 1860s with the ASPCA (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:57). In 1866, Bergh landed his first successful prosecution of an animal cruelty case in New York City, and this started an increased awareness and concern for animal cruelty (Beers 2006:61). Diane Beers, professor of history at Holyoke College, writes in her recent history of the movement that it was not until the late 1870s that the tide of public opinion began to turn: by then, more people were concerned about animal welfare, and judges and courts were more willing to prosecute and convict people for animal cruelty (2006:62). The history of the animal protection movement is long and accompanied by many successes, failures, along with a waning and surging of public interest that is characteristic of every social movement. James Jasper, who has written numerous books and articles on social theory and the animal movement, along with Dorothy Nelkin write in their early history and analysis of the movement that the increase of animal protection societies during this time was part of a wider humanitarian trend (1992:5). Although their writing on the animal movement is dated, it is still cited by current scholars not only for its history but also for the way in which they break down the movement, described in greater detail below (see for example

Pellow 2014). From these very early stages, the focus of the animal movement would become more and more about taking on institutions, industries, and consumer habits (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:6). These early successes led to combatting what was viewed as a larger societal impulse toward animal cruelty (Beers 2006:63).

Some of the early campaigns and concerns of the burgeoning animal movement included raising animals for fur and the conditions of cattle in slaughterhouses and in transportation. Animal protection groups also stoked concerns about human health to raise awareness about the conditions of livestock in stockyards across the United States (Beers 2006:68). It was an effective strategy: “By manipulating the public’s fears about disease and linking it to animal cruelty, the campaign successfully demonstrated the need for transport and slaughter reform” (2006:69). The early campaigns for better conditions in slaughterhouses and transport subsequently helped advocate for a law that required railroad transporters to stop every twenty-eight hours so cattle could rest and ingest food and water; however, the victory was hollow because alterations made to the law by opposition lobbyists made it virtually invalid. Inspections of transports became infrequent, and the law was unsuccessful in defining rest-stop provisions (69). In the wake of this action, the movement created a national assembly of the animal protection groups from ten states, so that the movement would have more influence with lawmakers with combined goals and missions. It was out of this assembly in 1877 that the American Humane Association (AHA) was formed. The AHA dealt with cruelty to animals and children, and this dual purpose still makes it unique among animal organizations today.¹⁵

15. American Humane Association. <http://www.americanhumane.org/about-us/history/>. Accessed 11/27/16.

The early humane societies believed that “kindness to animals” was crucial for social maturity, and thus their activities “reflected the charitable impulses of the privileged elite” (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:56). One consequence of this was a gradual turn toward more conservative causes. For example, as the AHA grew in political power, it began to make compromises with the meat industry that made more radical factions upset. They also increasingly blocked progressive groups from participation in the organization (Beers 2006:71). “Association leaders contended that radical sermonizing about fanciful abolitionist goals such as vegetarianism and unreasonable regulations alienated the public and harmed the cause by making it susceptible to charges of fanaticism” (71). This allowed the AHA and other influential humane groups to keep their wealthy donors, who did not look favorably on radical change, especially when contributors were a part of the industries being targeted. They still believed they could make moderate change for the plight of animals even while taking money from the industry. Jasper and Nelkin also observe that the humane impulse toward the protection of animals in the nineteenth century also involved a class element: “Controlling the abuse of animals was also a way to impose a bourgeois moral sensibility on the lower classes, which were perceived as lacking in moral sensibility and social order” (1992:58).

The conservative trend of the animal movement and organizations continued between the two world wars of the first half of the twentieth century (Beers 2006:93). A focus on humane education became central to the societies of the period, where the message of compassion for animals was a part of childhood education in schools. “For the first time in U.S. history, an entire generation of school children listened to the message of animal advocacy” (Beers 2006:98). Beginning in 1915, on the back of the

success of humane education in elementary schools, the AHA and other organizations created a national “Be Kind to Animals Week.” It was an expression of the growing sentiment at the time for animal protection (98). Animal advocacy continued to be a part of a larger desire for the moral reform of human society. Because animals, particularly “pets,” were a growing part of middle class society, the “humane” movement saw it as educating both children and lower classes of society as a part of a civilizing process (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:58). It was during this time, as reflected in the development of the AHA, that an increasing separation in the movement began between conservative welfare societies and more stringent advocates who thought that “piecemeal results confirmed their allegations that pursuing a moderate approach was like putting a band aid on a gaping wound” (Beers 2006:103). The struggle between working for moderate reforms and an expanding abolitionist mindset of activists has continued throughout the movement’s existence into the present.

After WWII, during the 1950s, the animal movement continued to grow; many new organizations were launched, and the movement began to take its current shape (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:5). The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) was formed in 1954, and Friends of Animals followed three years later (1957). Three former employees from the AHA who believed that organization was not sufficiently progressive in its efforts founded the HSUS; in fact, the three were asked to leave after criticizing the AHA (Beers 2006:156). Friends of Animals (FoA) was founded as one of the first “animal rights” organizations that sought to see animals as ends in themselves, and they took a more abolitionist approach (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:61).

The increase of “pets” in human households, in part because of increased suburban/urbanization is another aspect behind the blossoming of animal welfare and rights groups during this period. Companion animals and strays became a large focus for many groups. Jasper and Nelkin argue that with the proliferation of the middle class family came an elevation of “emotional bonds” and sentimentalization that extended to the animals with whom more and more families shared their lives (1992:15; see also Groves 1997:37). Beers explains: “Activists correctly realized that even though many people could emotionally distance themselves from food animals, few could ignore the connections between the animals sharing their homes and those fending for themselves in cold alleys” (2006:74). The importance of companion animals is still a major source of activism and is a catalyst for other concerns in the animal movement today. A reason for this is because companion animals are some of the only animals with whom most people in the present day have meaningful interactions. This is due in part to urbanization and a decrease in small-scale farming, both of which have caused people to have less and less contact with wildlife and domestic farm animals. Hirschman (1994) notes that in our “cultural hierarchy,” animals who were thought to be closer to humans and subsequently most anthropomorphized, such as cats and dogs, were less likely to be “objectified and commoditized,” as opposed to animals lower on the hierarchy who are objectified, such as rats and pigs (624, 625). Thus if an organization can convince a person that certain animals are like humans or comparable to a companion species, there is a greater chance that someone will be drawn to or understand the cause of animal advocacy better.

Today, caring for animals is no longer viewed as part of the “civilizing process” mentioned above, but compassion for animals does indeed impact a human moral society.

Kelly Oliver argues that animal ethics is not only about animals but about humans as well. The violence, racism, sexism, and oppression that humans have perpetrated against one another throughout history can never be changed if we do not understand the history of disparaging animals because they are directly connected in Western thought (2010:271). On a less philosophical level, studies have shown how violence toward animals often precedes violence toward women in intimate partner violence (Adams 1994). Fitzgerald, Kalof, and Deitz, studying the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) for U.S. counties that had high numbers of slaughterhouses and “right to work” laws, found that large industrial slaughterhouses had an effect on reported crime statistics, particularly in the realm of arrest and reported crime rates as opposed to similar industries (2009:172; 174). Similarly, research indicates that the value of human life coincides with the value placed on animal life. (Kemmerer 2006:127; Arluke et al. 1999:968). Thus sympathy and compassion for other humans is connected to how one is able to care for other animals.

The animal movement and concern for other animals also advances the human moral society. As was seen with the AHA above, the “humane” tradition encompasses both humans and other animals. Studying animals in whatever discipline can encompass humans and other animals. As Cary Wolfe notes, the disciplines of animal studies and posthumanism connect, “returning us precisely to the thickness of human embodiment and to human evolution as itself a specific form of animality, one that is unique and different from other forms but no more different, perhaps, than an orangutan is from a starfish” (2009:572). Scholars in the field of animal studies have revealed that understanding animals helps us to know ourselves as humans better

Animal rights groups have sometimes had an ambivalent relationship to companion species. The goals and philosophies of rights groups are generally geared toward the complete elimination of the use of animals for human ends (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:52; Rudy 2011). Thus some would argue that because companion animals are kept entirely dependent on humans for their livelihood, the situation of such domestication still reflects using the animals for human ends. Yet all of the animal rights groups in my study have significant concerns for, and pages on, companion species. Similarly, a central focus of many welfare groups includes abandoned or homeless animals and thus do not directly propose the end of domestication. There are multitudinous shelters and unaffiliated “humane societies” that house and adopt animals throughout the United States. A prime example of this is the ASPCA, a large welfare organization whose work today gives substantial attention to concern with adopting animals and proper care for companion species.

The subject of companion species brings up important issues about the differences between welfare and rights, a crisis of overpopulation, and the argument for animals to be considered as persons instead of property. Rights and welfare groups are deeply concerned about cruelty surrounding companion species. This mistreatment is a significant problem, and the animal movement has garnered a great amount of attention for the subject. Cruelty to companion animals was one of the original concerns of the animal protection movement from the very beginning. The number of companion animals in the world has increased exponentially, and we now have more of these animals than can be adequately cared for by humans. Welfare and rights organizations address this in similar ways but with some differences. In an attempt to reduce new births, particularly

of cats and dogs, the vast majority of groups strongly promote spay and neuter programs. Where the difference comes in is that welfare organizations frequently recognize the legitimacy of “responsible” breeders to bring new animals into the world. Many rights groups do not think breeding more companion species is responsible at all because we have so many homeless and abandoned animals already. The overpopulation problem connects to the legal status and protections for companion species. Legally, people are considered “owners” of their “pets,” which essentially gives companions the status of property, like an appliance, rather than a member of the family. An argument of animal rights is that companion species should not be considered property, and the vast majority of people consider their companion animals part of their families. The legal status of companion animals makes it easier for people to get away with abuse and allows substantial problems to continue, such as puppy mills. Animal groups are gaining in status, and more and more laws are being passed to stop such abuses, but rights groups maintain that real change will not happen until animals are no longer considered property.

Another significant aspect of the animal movement’s history and current state is the impact women have had on the movement. From very early on, women have been an integral part of its development and advancement. Women founded many of the new groups that started in the 1950s, and Beers notes that animal activism fit into both eighteenth- and twentieth-century ideas of gender norms for women (2006:156). Women were, and typically still are, believed to be more caring and nurturing than men. “The burgeoning humane movement provided possibilities in a field devoted to caring and compassion and, therefore, socially accepted as appropriate to female skills” (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:58). Even early vegetarian societies comprised predominantly women

(Preece 2008:318). Groves argues that the animal movement, especially during the 1950s, could almost be called exclusively a women's movement (Groves 1997:934).

Women still make up the majority population in the animal protection movement today, and gendered explanations and understandings still create tension about the movement (Gaarder 2011). Along the lines of what I have argued in this paper, outsiders have seen the movement as overly emotional. One reason this is an easy assumption is because of the cultural understandings about women, emotion, and caring that coincide with the large numbers of women in the movement. In a male-dominated society, it is difficult for a movement made up predominantly of women to be considered legitimate (Groves 1997; Einwohner 1999; Gaarder 2011). Emily Gaarder notes that “women in the animal rights movement alternatively use, reject, and reformulate cultural ideas about sex and gender to both explain their pull toward activism and the prevalence of women in the movement” (Gaarder 2011:60). Gaarder also observed that within the animal movement, men were more often seen as leaders, whereas women frequently did the day-to-day work that was required to make the movement, organizations, and shelters run (88; 97).

Contemporary Movement: 1970s to the Present

Beginning in the late 1970s and 1980s, the modern animal movement began in earnest, and another cluster of new organizations was born. Accompanying this was a new wave of demonstrations and direct action that got the attention of the media. Increasingly, groups seek out media—whether for scrutiny or affirmation—as a way to enhance awareness for the plight of animals (Wrenn 2013:387). For example, in 1975, Henry Spira took the Natural Museum of History to task for experiments it was

conducting. The result of Spira's efforts caused the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to take away funding from the project (Groves 1997:39). In 1984, the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), perhaps the most radical of the new groups, vandalized the University of Pennsylvania's research laboratory that was conducting experiments on baboons. The vandalism did about \$20,000 worth of damage, and the FBI subsequently put the ALF on the terrorist list (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:2). These instances are now more or less classic stories for the modern animal movement. Many of the videos of this type of direct action were given to PETA.

PETA, another animal rights organization, got its start in 1980 with leaders Alex Pacheco and Ingrid Newkirk. Now, PETA is one of the largest animal rights groups in the world. At this time, these "new animal 'rights' organizations rejuvenated the older and larger animal welfare movement, and together they are reshaping public awareness of animals" (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:3). Likewise, the notoriety that the new animal rights organizations have gained through controversial protests and demonstrations has inspired more traditional groups to adopt the theories and tactics of these organizations (Beers 2006:201). A telling example of this, as will be seen, is the fact that large welfare groups like HSUS and ASPCA now have campaigns about factory farming. Many times, the information coming from these organizations is very similar to the communications of PETA.

The current iteration of the animal protection movement has seen a vast expansion so that the movement is almost ubiquitous to the public, especially in the United States. Jasper and Nelkin divide the movement into three categories: welfarist, pragmatist, and fundamentalist. The welfarist believes that the use of animals by humans is acceptable

but wishes that conditions might be improved. The pragmatist “would allow humans to use animals when the benefits from their use outweigh their suffering” (1992:9). The fundamentalist groups, which Jasper and Nelkin believe have been allowed to orient the nature of the rights portion of the movement, believe in completely abolishing the use of animals by humans altogether (9). The stake in each of these approaches is that the welfarist and pragmatist positions are more common today and have had the result of reducing the number of animals being harmed by humans and have created somewhat better regulations on their use. The abolitionist approach consequences are harder to determine because it has never been fully enacted. Domestic animals used for food would have to be taken care of in some manner and managed so that they would not become overpopulated. Industrial animal agriculture has done a great deal of damage, and animal abolitionists may not have thought through the environmental damage and the repercussions of ending animal use fully and at once. Yet strategy-wise, they might not need to think that far ahead. The chance of abolishing animal use in anything other than an incremental way is unlikely. These categories are helpful in seeing what might be a fissure in the aims of the movement and the differences between welfare and rights groups.

The fracture in the movement between the animal rights and welfare hinges on a difference in how they see the solution to animal cruelty and use. These differences are what Benford calls “frame disputes” (1993:678). For the most part, rights and welfare groups are in agreement on what the diagnosis of the problem is except for the fact that welfare groups believe that animals are intended for human use, as long as they are not treated cruelly (1993:679; Benford and Snow 2000). Thus it is the “alternative reality”

and the movement's prognosis that welfare and rights groups dispute. Reform versus abolition is the contrast that the movement deals with in its frame disputes (Benford 1993:679). Benford found that frame disputes could both help and hurt social movements; this is the case with the animal movement as well. Frame disputes are sometimes beneficial because they can cause the formation of new groups; for instance, the way in which HSUS was formed after disagreements within AHA. Additionally, many animal *rights* groups formed from a perceived compromise and lack of rigor of animal *welfare* groups. The formation of new groups can strengthen the ones that remain with the development of a "division of interpretive labor within a movement" (1993:697). Among groups in the nuclear disarmament movement, Benford found that moderate groups refined problem identification, whereas radical groups refined the ability for adherents to take action (697). Animal rights and welfare share similar goals and ultimately want to end cruelty to animals, but they can play off one another to make immediate reformist goals, which all groups seek (Francione 1996).

The Animal and Environmental Movements

A discussion of the animal protection movement cannot be further developed without looking at its relationship with the environmental movement. At first glance, the two movements have many similarities. For example, the interrelatedness of humans, animals, and nature is central for both movements. Protecting animals and the environment is, on different levels, the major goal for animal advocacy and environmentalists. Moreover, the environmental movement's tactics, strategies, and organizational culture have influenced the animal protection movement greatly (Jasper

and Nelkin 1992:89). Some divisions between the two are based on fundamental differences in beliefs and philosophies. Anna Peterson points out that the debates between environmentalists and animal rights advocates stem from the dualities of culture/nature, domestic/wild, and individual/whole. Each of these plays on one another to create deep divisions between the two movements (2013:118). Human culture often takes precedence over individual animals, especially when it comes to domestic animals where environmentalists are concerned. Holistic environmentalism can fail to hold once it comes to human culture in practical application (Peterson 2013:125).

J. Baird Callicott, in his famous essay “Animal Liberation: A Triangular Affair” (1980), exemplifies some of the dualisms that lie at the heart of the difficulty between environmentalism and animal rights/welfare. He identifies that a major division between environmental ethics and animal liberation is the attention to domestic animals. “Environmental ethics sets a very low priority on domestic animals as they very frequently contribute to the erosion of the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic communities into which they have been insinuated” (1992:60). Animal liberation, on the other hand, pays very close attention and spends its energy on domestic animals (40). Animal liberation works to reduce and end the use of farm animals for consumption and to stop cruelty to companion species. Animal advocacy groups argue that cruelty to animals in any form is wrong and that given their dependence on humans, domestic animals should be a measure of priority because they have been forced to bear the brunt of human cruelty.

The two movements have on occasion cooperated on campaigns. One crusade, ongoing since a film on the subject was first introduced in the late 1960s, is the fight to

stop young harp seals from being hunted in countries like Canada, Russia, and Norway (Beers 2006:191). The campaigns involve a number of organizations that speak out against the practice. A few include PETA, HSUS, and Greenpeace. “In their most ambitious dreams, the activists of both movements could not have manufactured a more powerful symbol for their respective causes and joint concerns than the embattled harp seal” (Beers 2006:192). For environmentalists, what is at stake is the destruction of habitats and the dwindling numbers of seals that were caused by the hunts. For animal groups, it is the killing, brutality, and abuse against animals that is the grievance. Nevertheless, in the case of the harp seals, the diminishment of the species caused by the hunt for their fur and the environmental impacts on their domain from global warming and human encroachment is a concern for both movements, making it a cause for which they can come together.

One topic that organizations and individuals in the two the movements truly diverge on is that of hunting. Hunting is where the central division between the whole versus the individual is apparent. Environmentalists view the hunting of animals, particularly deer, as a method of wildlife management. The same can be said for hunting other native species that have become overpopulated for a variety of often anthropogenic reasons. Animal populations need to be kept at a certain level so that other species may also thrive. The animal protection movement, especially the rights portion of the movement, sees hunting as simply killing individual animals who are trying to survive. The crux of the concern for environmentalists is the diversity of the entire biotic community and keeping habitats intact and species as a whole flourishing. For the animal

movement, the essence of the concern is that individual animals should not be harmed, and culling them for population control seems wrong (Regan 1983:361).

After writing his famously critical article, mentioned above, J. Baird Callicott concluded that animal liberation and environmental ethics have incompatible philosophies and value systems, arguing further that animal liberation is “utterly unpracticable” (1992:60). Callicott later changed his mind and argued an approach that incorporated sympathy as a bridge to join the two movements. Callicott combines three perspectives to come up with a solution that he argues will combine animal and environmental movements. First, he uses Mary Midgley’s concept of the “mixed community;” Callicott explains that humans have always lived in a mixed community with other animals, and that in that community are “coevolved social beings participating in a single society, we and they share certain feelings that attend upon and enable sociability—sympathy, compassion, trust, love, and so on” (1992:252). Second, he relies on David Hume’s moral philosophy of sentiments, which argues that feelings are the ground of morality, rather than reason and altruism, and that this is central to human moral society and is not “reducible either to enlightened self-interest or to duty (1992:253). Third, he incorporates Aldo Leopold’s “land ethic,” which focuses on the biotic community, rather than the individual, and is at the least “indifferent” to domestic animals (farm and companion) for whom the animal movement has taken as a significant cause for concern. Callicott relies heavily on Leopold in his first essay to argue against animal liberation; however, he later highlights the community aspect of both Leopold and Midgley, and having in common Hume’s ideas about “altruistic feelings,” he argues for a joining of the two movements (254).

Further, in the volume *The Animal Rights/Environmental Ethics Debate* (1992), where Callicott's articles appear together, editor Eugene Hargrove contends that if the two movements are to find common ground, embracing rather than ignoring the sympathy and emotion that is at the core of their concerns could be a solution to moving forward together (1992:xxiv). The reason for close attention to Callicott is because he is such a large figure in environmental ethics and was one of the first to open the divide between environmentalists and animal activists more widely. Additionally, in his arguments about environmental ethics and animal rights, he focuses on some of the theorists and ideas that have been central to my dissertation.

Since Callicott's essays, some scholars have argued for the joining of forces between animal rights and environmentalists. In his book *In Nature's Interests? Interests, Animal Rights, and Environmental Ethics* (1998), Gary Varner argues from an environmentalist perspective that animal rights and environmental ethics can come together on one of their most contentious conflicts: hunting. He argues that by looking at Peter Singer and Tom Regan, we find support for what he calls "therapeutic hunting of obligatory management species" (100). He points out that a species may have, as some do, a "fairly regular tendency to overshoot the carrying capacity of its range to the detriment of its own future generations and those of other species" (101). In regard to Singer's popular book *Animal Liberation*, which has become a guide for the movement, Varner contends that Singer employs a hedonistic utilitarianism that focuses on the maximization of pleasure and the nonexistence of pain (1998:104). Although Singer does not treat the killing of animals in detail in *Animal Liberation* (2009:21), a hedonistic utilitarianism could support therapeutic hunting because it would ultimately maximize the

good of both individuals and the future of the species. More pain would be caused by “letting nature take its course” (106). Varner argues that Singer thus could agree with environmentalists on the point of therapeutic hunting in principle, but may not be in line with the application (107). Singer does, in fact, raise the issue of nonlethal population control. Varner maintains that Regan could agree with therapeutic hunting on the basis of his use of the miniride principle, which states that when looking at comparable harms, one must choose to override the rights of a few in order to protect the rights of the many when the potential harms are the same (Regan 1983:305). These principles say that “death harms normal individuals of the same species equally” (Varner 1998:113), and theoretically, killing the fewest number of individuals would be appropriate for Regan’s theory of individual rights (113).

In a recent anthology, *Animals and the Environment: Advocacy, Activism, and the Quest for Common Ground* (2015), Lisa Kemmerer and Daniel Kirjner argue that the discord between animal rights proponents and environmentalists stems from anthropocentrism on both sides, even while each movement has the goal of ending anthropocentrism. They argue that anthropocentrism causes some animal advocates to consume in ways that do not reflect an environmentally sound perspective, such as not regarding energy, not recycling, or packaging too many products (16). Kemmerer and Kirjner contend that similarly, environmentalists feel they have the right to decide which species lives or dies and that they do not see the benefits of a vegan lifestyle as readily (16). The authors list many scholars I have discussed in this dissertation—such as Marc Bekoff, Mary Midgley, and Greta Gaard—who work in animal studies and

environmentalism, just as Peter Singer and Tom Regan have both worked on environmental issues (17).

Nonviolent direct action is a part of both movements, thus animal rights proponents and environmentalists have commonalities on a practical, activist level. Corporate interests, and now the United States government, target both movements as “terrorists.” The actions by both groups are feared by the corporate entities that sustain the exploitation each movement is trying to change (Kemmerer and Kirjner 2015:25). Calling it the “Green Scare,” John Sorenson describes the targeting of environmental and animal activists as “a corporate-driven propaganda campaign to counteract the work of animal advocates, demonize them, make their ideas seem dangerous, extreme and unthinkable and to develop legal tools to criminalize their activities” (2015:18). Sorenson argues that there is an entire cottage industry of “entrepreneurs” built around “selling” the movements as terrorists (45, 47). This Green Scare has even extended to more mainstream groups such as the HSUS (7). Formal legislation, such as the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (AETA), has discouraged alliances between the movements (Kemmerer and Kirjner 2015:26).

Carrie P. Freeman persuasively maintains that human rights, environmentalism, and animal advocacy all share similar goals of “an inherent respect for life that precludes objectification and exploitation. Each seeks to promote fair play and responsible and respectful interactions with the diversity of life” (2015:53). Freeman argues that a collective call to action would include a “respect for all sentient individuals (members of the animal kingdom, including human beings), allowing them to live free from suffering caused by exploitation and oppression and respect life-supporting ecological systems,

sustaining the natural world, and all living beings (including human beings)” (53). In this statement, Freeman provides all three movements with the valuable reminder that we are all animals. Similarly, Carol Glasser suggests that the animal and environmental movements see the intersectionality of the issues they deal with through a logic of domination that “justifies human supremacy, benefitting a few of the most privileged people while devaluing and oppressing everyone else” (2015:44). She calls for solidarity, not focusing exclusively on one area, because without solidarity, it is possible to adopt oppression of others while advancing one’s own cause (45). She also calls for coalition building “to combat the institutionalized economic and political structures that are destroying both animals and the Earth” (46). Coalition building is especially important for environmentalism and animal advocacy because of the “mutual dependence between animals and their ecosystems” (46). What Callicott helped introduce—and others such as Varner, Kemmerer, and Freeman have sought to further—the idea that animal and environmental movements have much in common. Both movements would greatly benefit from coalition building and joining together without the need to agree on everything seamlessly.

Philosophical Influences on the Movement

During the more recent period in the larger animal movement, philosophical works began to augment ideas about animal protection. In 1975, ethicist Peter Singer wrote *Animal Liberation*, a book that would become a cornerstone of the rights movement. Mentioned several times already in my dissertation, Singer’s work is extremely important for the animal movement. Singer is a utilitarian who follows

eighteenth-century philosopher Jeremy Bentham's ethical formula that "each counts for one and none for more than one," which he calls the "principle of equality" (Singer 2009:5). In general, utilitarianism as a moral theory centers on the idea that a moral act is one that maximizes utility for the greatest number of people. Utility can mean a number of things from happiness to fulfilling preferences (Wolff 2006:49). In *Animal Liberation*, Singer also mirrors Bentham's statement: "The question is not, Can they reason? nor Can they talk, but, Can they suffer?" (Bentham 1789/2004:136). The framing of Bentham's question is a glimpse at some of the ways in which humans have sought to distinguish themselves from other animals: through capacities such as reasoning, language, feelings, or consciousness. Eisenman notes that Bentham's question remains one of the most influential arguments for giving animals greater consideration (2013:103). Singer's basic argument says that because animals are sentient, they have the ability to experience pleasure and pain, thus they have interests that should be considered. Sentience, for Singer, is a "necessary and sufficient" criterion for consideration. Or, at the very least, animals have interests in avoiding suffering (2009:8). The principle of equality that Singer established posits that the suffering of both human and other animals must be considered equally. What Singer's theory proposes is equal consideration, not equal treatment. He does not necessarily believe that all lives are of equal worth (2, 20). The subject of worth for Singer relies heavily on certain capacities. In line with his anti-speciesist argument discussed below, he does not think it is always a matter of species membership when it comes to saving or taking life, but of certain capacities that a creature may have. A human life may be valued less than that of an animal if that person is seen as lacking the capacities of a "normal human," for example, when a person is

severely disabled. Singer uses this argument in reference to euthanasia and the abortion of a disabled fetus (2011:46).

Singer also popularized the term “speciesism,” which was first coined by Richard Ryder in 1970 (Waldau 2011:178). Speciesism, according to Singer, is likened to racism or sexism in that one species is favored over another: namely, humans are valued in our society above other animals. Speciesism is the cause of the blatant disregard for animal interests because it makes humans devalue other animals and use them only as means to an end. “Speciesists allow the interests of their own species to override the greater interests of members of other species” (Singer 2009:9). Singer’s book has been one of the most authoritative texts for activists, particularly the “rights” portion of the movement, even though he does not directly argue a rights position (Jasper and Nelkin 1992:90).

Tom Regan is the other major philosopher of the modern animal movement. He has developed an actual philosophy of rights for animals. Regan has four major avenues that lead to his theory of animal rights: He begins by looking at the Kantian concept of autonomy, the ability of an individual to reflect on the consequences of an action and make a decision based on those reflections (Regan 1983:84). Kant’s understanding of autonomy would exclude animals other than humans. Regan proposes a kind of autonomy he calls “preference autonomy,” which argues that individuals are autonomous if they “have preferences and have the ability to initiate action with a view to satisfying them” (85). Animals other than humans would fall under the category of preference autonomy. Preference autonomy can be connected to the way in which organizations anthropomorphize animals. When using anthropomorphism, as will be shown later,

groups frequently describe animals as having preferences and initiating action just as humans do.

Along with establishing the idea that animals have autonomy, Regan discusses the idea of moral agents and moral patients; however, the paradigmatic cases for each are human animals. Moral agents have the kind of autonomy discussed by Kant, in that they are able to bring “impartial moral principles” into a decision-making process. They are able to determine with these moral principles what ought to be done (151). According to Regan, “normal” adult humans are those who should be considered moral agents. Moral patients, on the other hand, lack what would make them morally responsible for their actions: the formation and use of impartial moral principles. For Regan, animals exist in this “moral patient” category, and he describes moral patients as those who “lack the prerequisites that would enable them to control their own behavior in ways that would make them morally accountable for what they do” (1983:152). Regan identifies two types of moral patients: those who are “conscious and sentient” and those who additionally possess “cognitive and volitional abilities” (153), and he was particularly concerned with the second kind in developing his theory of rights for animals. This second category includes “those individuals who are conscious, sentient, and possess other cognitive and volitional abilities” (153) such as belief and memory.

The autonomy and moral status of both humans and other animals make each a “subject-of-a-life”—those who have preferences, can act on those preferences, have beliefs and desires, feel pleasure and pain, and have perception and memory as well as a sense of a future and identity over time (Regan 1983:243). For Regan, it is a principle of justice that those who are subjects -of a -life deserve treatment “that is respectful of the

kind of value they have,” and he maintains that they and “are owed this treatment equally” (277). As a moral principle, Regan believes that moral patients in this case, animals have a claim to a right (something is owed or due) to respectful treatment, including the right not to be harmed (277).

Gary Francione, another scholar who has written extensively on a philosophy of animal rights, is more controversial in the movement than Regan and Singer because he asserts an absolutely abolitionist point of view, and he thinks other positions do not go far enough. On the face of it, Francione’s position is very similar to the aforementioned theorists. He advocates for the “principle of equal consideration” and argues that humans and other animals have interests in not suffering, despite whatever other differences there may be between the two species (2000:99). For Francione, humans and animals have “experiential welfare,” meaning that when their interests in not suffering are honored, things will go better for them (99). Like Singer, Francione bases his rights theory on sentience, yet Francione contends that the principle of equal consideration means that animals are to be considered “persons.” This does not mean that animals are to be treated in the exact same way as humans, but for equal consideration to be taken seriously, animals cannot be regarded as property (101). Going further, Francione argues that for these things to happen, “We must extend to animals the basic right not to be treated as our resources” (101). He contends that this means humans cannot warrant using animals in the ways we currently do today.

Steven Wise is another scholar who has had an influence on the movement with his philosophy of animal rights. He works as a legal scholar and lawyer, bringing cases about chimpanzees and bonobos to courts. He argues in *Rattling the Cage: Toward Legal*

Rights for Animals (2000) that chimpanzees and bonobos have the same type of autonomy that the courts afford human children and the severely disabled (256). They may not have the full autonomy that philosophers such as Kant describe. Wise describes Kant's autonomy:

“I have autonomy if, in determining what I ought to do in any situation, I have the ability to understand what others can and ought to do, I can rationally analyze whether it would be right for me to act in some way or another, keeping in mind that I should act only as I could want others to act and as they can act, and then I can do what I have decided is right” (246).

Wise contends that the majority of humans cannot reason at this level, and he argues for the concept of “potential autonomy,” in that the autonomy of humans and animals can change and advance or not (251). Using English Common Law, Wise contends that any level of autonomy can determine “dignity and legal personhood” (250). If animals have autonomy, they should be given dignity rights, which all humans are given regardless of their mental capacity. Intelligent people mostly agree that it is morally unacceptable to experiment on and enslave humans, and when this has happened in the past, legal steps have been taken (eventually) to have such atrocities condemned; yet this same treatment is widely accepted when perpetrated against chimpanzees and bonobos (258). By arguing for the legal personhood rights of chimpanzees and bonobos, Wise does not exclude other animals from the picture. Many animals, such as bottle-nosed dolphins and Caledonian crows, possess the type of autonomy that warrants their personhood (269). He argues that the “wall” that has long separated humans and other animals is slowly being dismantled, and granting chimpanzees and bonobos personhood rights is another step in that direction (5).

The philosophical and scholarly conversation has moved past Singer and Regan but is frequently in dialogue with their works. This growth in the conversation around animals is bound to influence the animal movement, and many scholars are also activists in some sense. However, it is difficult to determine from examining websites the depth of how the conversation has affected the movement on the ground. Jacques Derrida represents a significant turn toward animals in philosophy. In his most concentrated work on animals, *The Animal That Therefore I Am* (2008), Derrida's insights about animals come from his recognition that his cat has a point of view regarding him. Derrida encounters his cat while he is naked in his bathroom and is startled by the encounter and surprised by his feelings of shame because of his own nakedness (11). Derrida stresses that what he is talking about is an actual cat, not a figure or representation of a cat or many cats (9); he is dealing with real animals. In his moment of shame, he considers and recognizes the otherness and the reality of the differences among animals. The fact that his cat is seeing him, responding to him, makes Derrida question who he is and what the human is in relation to other animals. "As with every bottomless gaze, as with the eyes of the other, the gaze called 'animal' offers to my sight the abyssal limit of the human" (12). Derrida's real life encounter with his cat leads him to pay careful attention to animal suffering and violence, and he takes seriously Jeremy Bentham's question, "Can they suffer?" Derrida includes in his challenging of the anthropocentrism of the human/animal divide the situation of the instrumental use of animals (25-26).

In *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, Derrida reflects on the long-held human/animal binary and the criteria with which philosophers, societies, and religion have used to show that other animals were inferior to humans. He explains that Descartes,

Kant, Heidegger, and Levinas each deny that animals are capable of language (Derrida 2008:32). What is critical for Derrida is that included in language is the ability to respond. Other animals were said to only be able to react, but not to respond, because the animal was nothing other than a machine (124). The question of response is what prompts Derrida's discussion of philosophy. He argues that in the encounter with his cat, the cat has a "point of view regarding me" (11).

The importance of language comes into Derrida's theory of "the animal." He asserts that when discussing animals, it is incorrect to refer to "the animal" in the singular, rather the plural should be used in order to recognize the differences among animals. He criticizes philosophers for attempting to group all animals into one singular category (34). The problem Derrida has with the language of "the animal" connects to the way philosophers have denied animals language, rationality, and response. What seems to be a poignant feature of Derrida's discussion is a careful balance, and often a fine line, between sameness and difference, but difference is still essential.

What Derrida is attempting to do is blur the line between human and other animals, yet it is important for Derrida that the line is not erased altogether. He does not want to get rid of the distinction between human and animal, but by "complicating, thickening, delinearizing, folding, and dividing the line precisely by making it increase and multiply" (29). Just as the language of "the animal" is too singular, so is denying animals' response and basing a responsibility toward them upon on a single criterion. Blurring the line between humans and other animals engages in what Derrida calls "border crossing," where the limits of what is human and animal are expanded (3). This border crossing and blurring hints at sameness that is linked in discussion of difference

that is so crucial for Derrida to maintain. He wants to recognize the “heterogeneous multiplicity of the living” that is “beyond the edge of the so-called human” and the relationships between all beings (2008:31).

Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka assert in their book *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights* (2011) that welfare arguments have been more palatable for the public, and those arguing often contend that animal rights theory has been a “political nonstarter” and that rights campaigns have “largely failed in the fight against systematic animal exploitation” (5). They argue that animal rights have been narrowly conceived to concentrate on negative rights, that is, to *not* be killed, tortured, and owned (6).

Donaldson and Kymlicka argue for a theory of citizenship to augment animal rights that is based on the human-animal relationships and interactions that exist in our world, where they see animal rights theory as generalizing too much (49). They hold that some animals, like some humans, should be viewed as co-citizens, and that their interests must be valued in establishing the common good (54). Further, some animals, those seen as “temporary visitors,” and their interests set “side constraints” to a consideration of the common good, because they are “belong amongst us, but are not one of us” (214). Therefore, temporary visitors must be treated somewhat differently than sovereigns or co-citizens. Lastly, other animals are to be considered “residents of their own political communities” with sovereignty and territory (54).

Domestic animals, both companion species and animals that we use as food, are to be co-citizens. Domestic animals must be a part of human social and political arrangements in ways that are equitable to them. They are members because they have the capacities of citizenship, “to have and express a subjective good, to participate, and to

cooperate” (122). Involving domestic animals as members and co-citizens is an ongoing process as humans learn how domestic animals express their subjective good (122). Next are what Donaldson and Kymlicka call “liminal animals.” These are animals such as rats, squirrels, and raccoons that are both in and outside of human society. They frequently rely on humans for food sources and shelter and have adapted to human structures (210). Donaldson and Kymlicka grant liminal animals “denizenship.” Many different types of liminal animals exist, so a theory of denizenship would vary depending on which creatures are involved. But all animals have a right to residency in that they cannot be treated as “aliens or foreigners” because they require the right to stay when they have arrived (241). “Terms of reciprocity” must be afforded them also because denizens require the right to have a diminished relationship; in other words, they must be able to “opt out” of aspects of citizenship (241).

Finally, rather than merely leaving them alone, humans actually have a significant amount of contact with wild animals, and the repercussions of human habitation and encroachment have important consequences for wildlife (205). In the citizenship model, wild animals should have sovereignty, and these authors argue that sovereignty cannot be tied to merely territory or boundaries such as a national park (191). It must consist of “ecological viability” for everyone involved, a multidimensional understanding of territory, and elements involved in both animal and human mobility must be considered (191). An idea of sovereignty must also take into account the perimeters and potential for “cooperative parallel co-habitations” (191). Donaldson and Kymlicka’s theory of citizenship provides avenues to supplement animal rights philosophy that pays attention to relationships, and it nuances animal particularities in ways that animal philosophy does

not always accomplish. Like what Donaldson and Kymlicka argue, while the typical animal rights theory, like those described above, has taken hold with academics and a small group of activists, it has no traction with the general public.

Feminism and Animals

The next important philosophical and theoretical development in the history of the movement was the feminist critique that developed in the late 1980s and 1990s, when feminists began to look at the connection between women and animals. In this section, because it is in a chapter on movement history, I deal with primarily older ecofeminist sources. In Chapter 1, I discussed current iterations of ecofeminism in depth because such an analysis is very important for the movements introduced in that chapter, given the large numbers of women who are activists and members of these groups. Emily Gaarder argues that studies regularly place the percentage of female activists at 68 to 80 percent of animal activists as a whole (2011:11). Ecofeminists see connections between several types of oppression: sexism, racism, animal abuse, and domestic violence among others. Ecofeminism argues that an attempt to end the above types of oppression requires an exposure of the dualisms that privilege humans in general—and males in particular—over the earth, women, and animals. Further, combining feminism and ecology, Greta Gaard maintains that it is impossible to change the situation of women without liberating women (Gaard 1993:1, 5). These oppressions are connected in the way that “the Western intellectual tradition has resulted in devaluing whatever is associated with women, emotion, animals, nature, and the body, while simultaneously elevating in value those

things associated with men, reason, humans, culture, and the mind” (5). Ecofeminism attempts to bring to light interrelated oppressions.

Carol J. Adams wrote one of the pioneering works connecting feminism and animals, *The Sexual Politics of Meat*, first published in 1990. In it, Adams connects the oppression of animals with the oppression of women, noting that meat eating is a “symbol of patriarchy” and that men are usually associated with meat (2010:61). She argues that meat is a symbol of power and that there is a sexist, classist, and racist dimension to meat eating. The book explores the messages and “texts” that are generated around meat and animals and notes that meat is often only available to wealthier people and societies. Similarly, “the emphasis on the nutritional strengths of animal protein distorts the dietary history of most cultures in which complete protein dishes were made of vegetables and grains” (55). She asserts that culturally, women are often linked to eating vegetables whereas eating meat is reserved for men (60).

Another crucial insight to come out of Adams’s book was the idea of the “absent referent.” When speaking of animals, the actual bodies of the animals humans eat are absent from the discussion in that live animals become “meat” when they die (40). For example, in English, chicken becomes “poultry,” baby male calves become “veal,” and cows become “beef.” “The absent referent functions to cloak the violence inherent in meat eating to protect the conscience of the meat eater and render the idea of the individual as immaterial to anyone’s selfish desires” (Adams 2010:304). Speaking of women, Adams uses the idea of violence to explain how women are the absent referent as well. She explains that the word “rape” is used often to refer to other things, such as in the phrase, “the rape of the earth,” wherein it is used to describe environmental

degradation. The violence done to actual women in the act of rape becomes absent through the metaphor (43). Many other excellent feminist works on animals have been written by various authors—for example Gaard (1993), Donovan and Adams (1996), Kheel (2008), and Adams and Gruen (2014)—and as I have shown in the introduction, ecofeminism provides a foundation for the definitional and theoretical premise that underlies this dissertation.

Religion and the Animal Movement

Religion has long played a role in the animal movement in the United States and Britain. For instance, Janet Davis traces the concern for animal cruelty in the United States to religious concerns of the Puritans, who believed that kind treatment toward animals was a reform of the consequences of the Fall and that the harsh dominion of humans ruling over other animals was a result of Adam and Eve’s sin. Animal cruelty also played a role for concerned ministers during the Second Great Awakening (2015:1).¹⁶ Even into the nineteenth century, the founders of the United States saw animal cruelty as a way to impart the republican ideal of the newly formed Union to the people. In 1786, Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was one of the earliest to be troubled by the consequences of animal cruelty and human moral sentiments (Smith 2012:127). Bill Leon Smith writes that those concerned about animals in the “founding generation” made several connections in thought: “They drew out animal cruelty’s implications and linked them to God’s divine will and the millennial republican destiny of the United States” (127). Ideas about human morals and animals

¹⁶ Janet M. Davis. <http://tah.oah.org/november-2015/the-history-of-animal-protection-in-the-united-states/>. Accessed 07/26/16.

were also connected to notions of apocalypticism and the Second Coming of Christ (127). Early Quakers in the Philadelphia area such as Benjamin Lay, John Woolman, and Joshua Evans campaigned against slavery and animal cruelty. Lay and Evans were vegetarians (130). John Woolman sought to extend kindness to animals to all children, writing a primer that “conveyed lessons of human responsibility for animals and children’s role in God’s moral order, which was to provide proper care for animals” (131). These are just some examples of early impulses in the United States toward animals. In the history of the movement, religion has been ever present—albeit latent—in the development of its current importance. The founding of many organizations was predicated by religion or headed by someone who was a minister at the time. After a period during the modern era of the movement, in which religion was pushed into the background, largely secular organizations today such as HSUS (even though they have had religious people in leadership for a good portion of their history) and PETA have religious divisions that seek to channel religious support for their causes. Conversely, it is also true that the dominant Western religious traditions that have influenced U.S. society, ethics, and philosophy, particularly Judaism and Christianity, have generally been hostile to other animals.

A major aspect of this reframing of religious discourse and ethics includes questions about what distinguishes humans from animals. Such a dualism can be seen in nearly every religious tradition including Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, and Islam (see McDaniel 2006; Cohn-Sherbok 2006; Waldau 2002; Foltz 2006). In response, there has been considerable reinterpretation of religious traditions has come from academic circles. For example, Paul Waldau and Kimberly Patton argue that the Abrahamic

religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—are not necessarily as strictly anthropocentric as they are made out to be by animal activists; rather, these three religions are theocentric, placing God at the center of theological and cosmological concerns (2006:17). Carol Bakhos argues similarly that when it comes to Abrahamic religions, they are not entirely anthropocentric, although these religions do each argue for human superiority to one degree or another. But neither are the Abrahamic religions entirely animal-friendly. Within traditions of the religions claiming human ascendancy, the message is still that humans should behave compassionately toward other animals (2009:180). My fourth chapter will echo what Patton, Waldau, and Bakhos contend: Christianity and Judaism have both an animal friendly and anthropocentric message paralleled in their scriptures, histories, and scholarship. Within the field of animals and religion, scholars have gone back to scriptures, stories, and theological messages to rediscover where animals might have been ignored. Some examples of a reexamination of religious traditions include a large edited volume, *A Communion of Subjects* (2006). The volume looks into several religions' myths, texts, and belief systems to rediscover animals within the traditions. It covers scientific considerations of animals and the attention to animals from leading people in the movement such as Peter Singer and Carol Adams. The anthology is a good model of how religion is being reconsidered in regard to animals, not only in rediscovering animals in religious traditions but also exploring how religions might handle weighty ethical concerns such as factory farming and experimentation. Katherine Willis Perlo (2009) also examines several world religions such as Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism and their attitudes and references toward animals. She argues that divergent understandings and emotions about animals

have created in these traditions “strategies of resolution” that have then turned into theological positions (3). David Clough (2012), who will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, has developed his own systematic theology of animals in which he looks at the received tradition about what Christianity believes about humans and other animals and explores the “unrecognized implications of previously unconnected doctrinal insights” (xv). Religious discourse and interest in animals by religious denominations and individuals are becoming an increasingly important factor in the animal movement.

Two scholars and theologians in Christianity and Judaism have made convincing arguments that these religious traditions have many resources and ethical frameworks for belief systems that can see animals in other ways than merely being useful to humans. One of the first theologians to do this was Andrew Linzey who, along with his collaborator Dan Cohn-Sherbok, looked for ways that Christianity and Judaism could be mined for positive theologies for animals in their book *After Noah: Animals and the Liberation of Theology* (1997).

Another important work, Laura Hobgood-Oster’s *Holy Dogs and Asses: Animals in the Christian Tradition* (2008), is an example of delving into Christianity to discover its attitudes toward animals. In this work, she moves from the earliest influences of Judaism and the Roman Empire on Christianity to current practices, such as the “blessing of the animals” performed on the feast day for St. Francis of Assisi (22). Hobgood-Oster observes that Christianity is human centered, yet animals are found in texts for a variety of purposes (61). She maintains that official forms of Christianity, from the earliest incorporation in the fourth century up to today, do not give much consideration for animals (129). Yet in less official versions of Christianity, in apocryphal texts and stories

of saints, is at least an increased presence of animals (61; 65). In *The Specter of Speciesism*, Paul Waldau examines the Buddhist and Christian traditions with similar conclusions, stating that these traditions have a protracted history of an awareness and concern for animals yet retain speciesist understandings of them (2002:14). Waldau argues that in Buddhism, the tradition maintains a separation between humans and animals, not seeing “animals in terms of their own realities” (154). Christianity comparably has also maintained a division between humans and other animals in that an “exclusivism favoring humans on the basis of species membership considerations was held to be wisdom and the highest form of morality” (216). Waldau argues that this exclusivism is changing because of animal and ecological concerns within the religions (217). Throughout these examinations of religion, a strong critique is made of the anthropocentrism at the center of this human/animal dualism, which places humans as radically different and superior to other animals.

Both major animal philosophers, Peter Singer and Tom Regan, have addressed religion in the context of animal protection. Regan does not find animal rights to be inconsistent with the idea that humans are created in God’s likeness or that humans are perceived as more valuable to God (1991:147). He argues instead that humanity has been made God’s representatives, and therefore humans are morally responsible for treating animals as creatures with inherent value (148). However, in the animal activist community, people are often less likely to be religious at all (Jasper and Poulsen 1995; Lowe 2001). Growing academic interest in the topic of religion and animals reflects a cultural turn, or perhaps a return, to connecting religious belief systems with the need for moral actions.

The interpretation of the “dominion” passage in both the Hebrew and Christian Bibles has created an environment in which many religionists and animal advocates are at odds. Genesis 1:26-28 states,

Then God said, ‘Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.’ (27) “So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them. (28) God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth (New Revised Standard Version 2007:4).

Traditionally, this passage is treated as a mandate from God that humans were given dominion, interpreted to mean that humans were given control over the rest of the earth with directives to “subdue” (Genesis 1:28). Not only does the verse mention the earth itself, it also mentions fish, birds, and other animals that move on earth. That humans were regarded as being made in God’s image resulted in anthropocentric explanations in which interpreters of these passages believed humans were the height of God’s creation and that human animals were the only beings believed as possessing souls. In general, the larger Christian and Jewish traditions have interpreted this passage to mean that humans were given control and sanction over the unlimited use of animals. There have been different explanations of the idea of dominion, including calls for stewardship and care of creation that interpret dominion differently. Some examples include Sallie McFague, who argues that a typical Christian interpretation of creation is one of God’s power and transcendence. Humans in this story are “God’s darlings” (2008:59). As an alternative, she suggests that Christians think about themselves as partners, that God is involved in the world, and that the world is God’s “body” (63). This means that humans are together

with God in having a responsibility to care for the Earth (63). Similarly, Nekeisha Alexis-Baker suggests that the dominion passage in Genesis implies that humans are not above the rest of creation, including animals, but that we are all in community together and that the “goodness” of humanity is closely related to the goodness of everything else in creation (2012:40, 41). A third example of an interpretation of dominion as stewardship comes from Steven Bouma-Prediger, discussing an evangelical interpretation of “creation care.” He argues that in Genesis, God does not have complete agency, and he suggests that all of creation is “empowered for its own benefit” and has the “genuine ability to respond” to God (2010:88). Further, he argues that the dominion text means the “flourishing of all creation” and that the notion should be understood in terms of service (64). Bouma-Prediger is developing an ecological theology and finds animal rights and welfare to be too individualistic, although he believes some animals should be ethically considered (122). Bouma-Prediger’s understanding of Genesis and his views on animal rights represents an interpretation that holds anthropocentrism and a responsibility for animals and the environment in tension.

Peter Singer argues that the entrenched Western attitudes toward animals as expendable and for human use stem from the influence of such an interpretation of Christian perspectives. He contends that he specifically focused on certain Christian historical figures—including Augustine, Aquinas, and (with exception) Francis of Assisi—to call attention to the dominant attitudes toward animals and their historical background in Christianity. He acknowledges the more nuanced approaches of other Christian figures, but he argues that they have had less of an overall influence on Western thought than the figures mentioned above (Singer 2006:616). Sociologist Brian Lowe

maintains that the modern movement has developed away from the explicitly religious anchor and has generated new ethical justifications (2001:54). Part of the shift is to focus less on the human moral reform and more on the animals themselves. I will look more closely at the differences in Jewish and Christian interpretation of the Genesis texts and beliefs about animals in Chapter 4.

Peek, Konty, and Fraizer (1997) describe how Christian religious beliefs may actually be a catalyst, instead of a deterrent, to animal rights/welfare beliefs among the public. These authors did a regression analysis from the 1993 and 1994 General Social Surveys. They based their analysis on 1376 respondents (640 men, 736 women) for the animal rights questions and 2220 respondents (977 men, 1243 women) for animal testing questions (431; 432). Although this research is dated, it nonetheless provides some unique conclusions about religious beliefs and animal rights. The authors initially thought that religion had been an obstacle to animal rights support, and they expected to find three points of contention within religious circles. First, at the time of their study, Peek et al. found that the majority of animal rights supporters claimed not to be a part of mainstream religious groups (430). With religious participation within animal support groups being low, it draws speculation that there is an opposition to, or at least a lack of appetite for, the animal movement (430). Next, the fact that animal rights advocates disagreed with the dominion passage would cause less support among religious people (430). Secondly, because there was a dominant belief that the Bible was the literal word of God, Peek et al. expected that a belief about a literal interpretation of the Bible would be a point of disagreement between Christians and animal activists (430). The authors found that in some segments of Christianity, a creationist mindset can connect the belief

in a literalist interpretation of the Bible with distrust in science (1997:430). Science is not without critique and suspicion among animal advocates, especially when it comes to animal experimentation and the instrumentalist nature of factory farming (Jasper and Nelkin 1992). Peek et al. found through their analysis that belief about creation and anti-science views often correlated positively to support for animal rights ideology (Peel et al. 1997:437). Yet in general, people with a high level of religious involvement, as measured by church attendance and type of religious affiliation, showed less support for animal rights (433). Additionally, these researchers discovered that people with a belief that “God was found in nature” coordinated with more a favorable opinion of animal rights (434). Breaking down the findings by gender, a small portion of men—but not women—who believed that the Bible was the literal word of God were less supportive of animal rights (431). Women who viewed God as ungracious, believing the divine to be judge or master as opposed to mother or friend, were also less supportive (434). Women, but not men, showed a difference based on religious affiliation: fundamentalist Protestant women were more opposed to animal rights were than Catholic women (433). Peek et al. explain that their predictions based on existing research on religious affiliation and animal rights coincided. They anticipated that a literal view of the Bible would have negative effects on support for animal rights, but it showed almost nothing, except in men. They surmise that because the Bible portrays both a dominion and “covenant” picture about animals that these may cancel out each other out; also, people may have conflicts about these divergent understandings in the Bible (Peek et al. 1997:437).

Religious communities have shown an increasing interest in the plight of animals and a greater appreciation for the work of animal welfare and rights groups. For instance,

a growing population of Evangelical Christians are concerned with animal cruelty and factory farms (Gutleben 2016¹⁷; Pulliam Bailey 2015).¹⁸ Hobgood-Oster comments on the burgeoning trend of “blessing of animals,” in which churches on a given Sunday—most often on St. Francis Day, because St. Francis of Assisi is considered the patron saint of animals in many Christian traditions—allow animals into the sanctuary or just outside in order to pray for/with them and give them blessings (2008:113-118).

Overall, the preponderance of people within the movement consider themselves agnostic or atheist (Jasper and Poulsen 1995; Jamison et al. 2000; Mika 2006). Others see the animal movement itself as a kind of religion for many advocates. Jamison et al. (2000) argue that many elements that exist within the movement could be classified as religious. This is especially true with some of the ascetic aspects of vegan advocacy. Particularly, these researchers looked at elements common to religion: conversion, community, creed, code, and cult (305). Among activists, there is often a moral “conversion” in some sense, when the person realizes that they have contributed to animal suffering and death and then resolve to change their own behavior and support the cause. This can come from both being influenced by movement rhetoric and by images, videos, and pictures of animals (311). Because of this conversion, there is a need for a new community, one that sustains and reinforces the convert in the cause for animal rights. Part of the need for a new community comes from the fact that such a dramatic

17. Christine Gutleben. “The Development of Evangelical Perspectives on Animals.” *Presentation at the 64th Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society*, Milwaukee, WI, November 14, 2016. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/evangelical_theological_society_speech.html. Accessed 11/27/16.

18. Sarah Pulliam Bailey. “Inside the Evangelical Push to Rally Around Animal Ethics,” *The Washington Post.com*, last modified April 10, 2015, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2015/04/10/inside-the-evangelical-push-to-rally-around-animal-ethics/>. Accessed 04/10/15.

conversion to supporting animal rights often alienates a person's family and friends (312). Preece, in discussing vegetarianism—a common feature of conversion to the animal movement—also notes the importance of community, arguing that vegetarians can have some difficulty in social situations with omnivores because of the primacy of meat on restaurant menus, and they can sometimes experience a strain with family, especially during holidays such as Thanksgiving. The vegetarian can become an outsider to the rest of the group (2008:7). Moreover, those involved in the animal movement also are obliged to adhere to a certain “creed” and code of conduct that help to shape their beliefs and actions, much like a religion. This can sometimes mean living a vegan lifestyle, espousing the belief that humans are responsible for ending animal suffering and embracing the idea that animals are not for human use (Jamison et al. 2000:316; 317).

Despite a nonreligious majority of the movement membership, the desire for religious cooperation is growing. This is partly because knowledge of the situation for animals is increasing among the public, and as mentioned above, religious groups are beginning to respond (Pulliam Bailey 2015). Along with philosophical and theological treatises on religion and animals, a growing number of organizations are religiously oriented (a few will be explored in more detail in the course of this dissertation), but suffice it to say that the animal protection movement is not entirely secular. Groups such as the Christian Vegetarian Association, Dharma Voices for Animals, All-Creatures.org, and Jewish Veg are drawing upon and appealing to religious traditions for how to change the way society treats animals.

A final example is Bruce Friedrich, a former campaign coordinator for PETA, who writes about how to speak to religious individuals about animal rights in *Animal's Agenda*, a prominent movement magazine (2002:36). In it, he states straightforwardly that people with religious backgrounds are important to the movement. He tells readers not to ignore people's faith when doing outreach and to take it seriously, but he cautions against engaging in theological debates (36). He says, "I've seen so many animal people who are simply disdainful of religion. This may offer a sense of moral superiority, but it doesn't help animals. Again, with 90% of Americans subscribing to some Western faith, it is crucial that animal advocates not come across as disdainful of religion" (36). The inclination is growing toward incorporating religion into the U.S. animal movement, and the necessity for religious support is acknowledged more widely. Religious institutions and people of faith have been important players and are potentially a strong ally of the animal protection movement.

Definition of Religion And Religiously Oriented Organizations

The religious organizations studied draw upon somewhat different motivations than strictly secular groups with anthropomorphism and sentimentality to reach people. Each of the groups—All-Creatures.org, Jewish Veg, HSUS Faith Outreach, the Christian Vegetarian Association (CVA), and Dharma Voices for Animals (DVA)—try to connect the reader/viewer's presumed faith with the cause for animals.

As was noted earlier, the animal movement has had a precarious relationship with religion because some philosophers and activists view religion, especially Christianity and Judaism, as justifying the exploitation of animals. Some evidence bears this out, and

many religions—especially Christianity and Judaism—have been anthropocentric. The positive stance that an organization like HSUS takes on religion by having a department dedicated to religious outreach is a promising step forward.

When examining religiously oriented animal groups, Clifford Geertz's functional definition of religion is particularly useful: "(1) a system of symbols which acts to (2) establish powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations in men by (3) formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and (4) clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that (5) the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic" (1973:90). The reason a definition like Geertz's is instructive here is because the main groups under examination are not necessarily affiliated with specific denominations of Christianity or Judaism (such as Episcopalian, Evangelical, Conservative, or Reformed). Thus a functional definition is broader and can encompass a number of expressions of religion, which can include aspects that are not specifically religious by other definitions (McGuire 2008b:12). Religion functions for these groups in the ways that Geertz identifies in that it creates an "order" to a world that is chaotic and marked with suffering (the exploitation and killing of other animals). The third segment of Geertz's definition refers to religions' role in creating meaning and a perceived order for adherents.

Many things may cause a person to experience chaos and meaninglessness. Geertz explains that an experience of meaninglessness is not always caused by major events. He writes, "Nor is this to argue that it is only, or even mainly, sudden eruptions of extraordinary events which engender in man the disquieting sense that his cognitive resources may prove unavailing," but rather that "more commonly it is a persistent,

constantly, re-experienced difficulty in grasping certain aspects of nature, self, and society” (1973:102). Geertz’s discussion of the ways religion provides moral order and the common reasons for experiencing chaos corresponds to the experience of animal advocates. Activists and others sympathetic to the movement discover that something is categorically wrong about how animals are perceived of as food, as companions, and in the wild. The realization can happen suddenly, as with the “moral shocks” that Jasper and Poulsen describe, which can occur from “suddenly imposed grievances” (1995:498). However, many people come to the realization gradually after reading, viewing, and considering animal issues (Lowe and Ginsburg 2002:207). Whether, as Geertz says, questioning the instrumental use of animals comes from “extraordinary events” or a “re-experienced difficulty of grasping certain aspects,” the claims of the animal movement can be unsettling for religious worldviews. J.M. Coetzee’s character Elizabeth Costello in *The Lives of Animals* (1999) exemplifies the often, unsettling nature of the realization:

I seem to move around perfectly easily among people, to have perfectly normal relations with them. Is it possible, I ask myself, that all of them are participating in a crime of stupefying proportions? Am I fanaticizing it all? I must mad! Yet everyday I see the evidences. The very people I suspect produce the evidence, exhibit it, offer it to me. Corpses. Fragments of corpses that they have bought for money (69).

Religiously oriented organizations taken the for granted and normalized use of animals and interpret it through their religious traditions, practices, and beliefs to make sense of it; to animal advocates, this is both chaotic and unsettling and can lead to an anti-religion stance.

Following Geertz however, religions can help to deal with the meaninglessness of animal suffering and exploitation. Central to the exploration of religions in my dissertation is that they produce powerful moods and motivations (Geertz 1973). Geertz’s

motivations are similar to Jasper's moods in that they are long lasting and persistent. Motivations are a "chronic inclination to perform certain sorts of acts and experience certain sorts of feeling" (1973:96). By giving people a place to deal with the meaninglessness of animal exploitation, religious organizations provide individuals with motivation to create change and to feel differently about animals; these are primary aspects of what religiously oriented groups attempt to do. The mission statement of the HSUS Faith Outreach is a good example of religion functioning in this way: it imbues an attitude from religious people of "kind and merciful" actions. Consequently, the relationship of religion to social change is extremely important.

For Geertz, moods are temporary and can encompass a variety of emotions and reactions (97). So the task is how to create moods that are longer lasting, and that is a central task of all animal organizations, to move beyond momentary responses to sustained action. Religions can create powerful moods related to a sense of justice that motivate working toward animal protection. As will be shown, religious animal organizations attempt to illuminate a justice legacy in Christianity and Judaism in order to bring people to the cause of animals. Religions provide a sense that a person is doing something right. Combining justice with motivations that tend toward change for animals allows people to know that championing the cause of animals is the right thing to do. Moreover, religion is also about creating reconciliation among people who feel they have sinned, for example, or among different groups of people. Christian and Jewish animal groups provide worldviews and ethics aimed to reconcile and create right relations with what are sometimes ambiguous relationships with animals.

Geertz contends that it is through ritual that moods, motivations, and conceptions a general order of existence comes together. He writes that “in a ritual, the world as lived and the world as imagined, fused under the agency of a single set of symbolic forms, turn out to be the same world” (1973:112). After a religious ritual is performed, a person is changed, and the “common-sense world” is changed as well (122). Geertz has in mind rituals as “consecrated behavior” and in a “ceremonial form” (112). Religious animal groups attempt to ritualize certain aspects of animal protection, as will be seen in subsequent chapters. The groups are enacting what Meredith McGuire calls “lived religion,” which distinguishes the “actual experience of religious persons from the prescribed religion of institutionally defined beliefs and practices” (2008a:12). Lived religion has as its focus practices and ways people build and piece together their “religious worlds” that are not just a cognitive endeavor but are socially determined (12).

McGuire’s lived religion is a conglomeration of practices and beliefs, not all of which may seem traditionally religious (15). Formal religious institutions do not govern the religiosity that is developed by animal groups. None of the organizations in my dissertation are formed or run by official religious institutions. Thus what they are seeking to enact, by including animals in various presentations of Christianity and Judaism, are practices that may not be seen as traditionally religious. The devotion and practice—for example, becoming vegan or practicing the mindfulness of including animals as a part of moral consideration—can be added to a more formal religious understanding or as a person’s primary sense of spirituality.

New materialism is another way to theorize religion that can connect to McGuire’s sense of lived religion. New materialism focuses on “the significance, but also

the *agency*, of the material world” (Jones 2016:5). The agency of the material world means that humans are not the only agents (6). Everything that exists is interconnected, and every action has a consequence (6). Clayton Crockett and John Reader, religious studies scholars in the field of new materialism, use the case of factory farming and the pollution and consequences for human and other animals to argue that new materialism offers a “conceptual challenge to humanism” (2016:98). New materialism, they contend, confronts most people—whether in religion, philosophy, or in general—who do not see the interdependence of all beings (2016:98). New materialism approaches seriously a critique of the many forms of dualism and highlights embodiment and actual bodies (Crockett and Reader 2016:87).

New materialism privileges the immanence over transcendence in religion. Manuel Vasquez argues that despite the focus on immanence, religious individuals inevitably search for the transcendent, thus immanence must be open, “meaning that transcendence must be intrinsic to it” (2011:324). Matter is not an inert substance that acts against transcendence or divine spirits; it is a “fully potent reality that is our flesh, the flesh that enables and emplaces our discursive and nondiscursive practices (324).

Although I can only briefly discuss it here, the emphases of new materialism have significant points of contact with animals and religion. Like McGuire’s lived religion, new materialism’s concentration on immanence opens up the category of religion to a much wider scope of practices, and practices are a key feature of a new materialist conception of religion. It also posits religion as a significant force for change (Vasquez 2011:323; Crockett and Robbins 2012:25). Central to the concerns of the animal movement are the material animal bodies that are suffering cruelly because of

exploitation at the hands of humans. Connecting materialism to sentimentality, as I have argued along with ecofeminism, the primacy of rationality is misplaced; tapping into feeling and emotion is crucial for compassion for animals.

Finally, as new materialism argues, religion is not just about belief and immanence but about emotion. Donovan Schaefer argues that there are “many modes in which religion, like other forms of power, feels before it thinks, believes, or speaks. The phenomenological is political” (2015:8). Frans De Waal notes that empathy is primarily a bodily emotion; humans and other animals react with empathy and other emotions from perceiving bodily movements and features (2009:75; 82). Emotion is a powerful tool in religion, and it is also a powerful tool in animal advocacy.

The difference for religiously oriented organizations is that they take what the rest of society takes for granted and has normalized, but which, in the view of animal advocates is chaotic and unsettling and interpret it through their religious traditions, practices, and beliefs to make sense of it. These religions understandings can ground the perspective and work of animal groups in an “aura of factuality“ that allows the organizations and members to come to an understanding that their religion supports the cause of animal protection.

Religions have often represented and reinforced the existing state of affairs when it comes to animals and many other issues, as many animal rights activists and philosophers have noted. Religions also have the ability to foster change, which is exactly what the organizations under discussion are trying to do particularly in the name of Judaism and Christianity (McGuire 2008b). “Religious ideas therefore effect social action in two ways: They may form the content of what a group of people tries to do; and they

may shape people's perception of what their interests are" (247). The religious animal groups I explore have taken ideas common to the animal movement and reworked them through their particular faith traditions in order to advance a perspective for why animal exploitation is wrong; in doing so, they have sought to expand and promote these insights to their wider religious communities. The interest is present in the desire to live up to what the groups and members see as their religion's ideals and possibly an interest in penance and forgiveness for past and subsequent complicity (Jamison et al. 2000:318).

Additionally, the idea of religious imagery is important for religious change and the religious animal organizations in this analysis. "Religious symbols frequently present an image of future change. They create a vision of what could be and suggest to believers their role in bringing about change" (McGuire 2008b:249). The religiously oriented organizations each have a vibrant strain of images for future change that are grounded in specific traditions. The power that religion has to create order and meaning, as well as to present a visualization about what an alternative future could look like, is why it has the capacity to be a potent force in animal advocacy.

Overview of Organizations' Use of Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality

In order to shift to a more in-depth examination of specific organizations and their use of sentimentality and anthropomorphism in subsequent chapters, it is worthwhile to more generally survey how several groups not examined in more detail in the following chapters use anthropomorphism and sentimentality. There are several examples of what organizations do in general: how they talk about animals and what issues they focus on outside of the anthropomorphism and sentimentality. These examples will assist in an

understanding of a broader range of the movement and how groups are framing animals and the problems associated with them. A considerable factor for organization websites is education. Most groups provide detailed accounts of the conditions animals live in, whether in factory farms, companion abuse cases, or in the wild. Organizations utilize eye-catching pictures that supplement the descriptions of animals; these range from cute, cuddly puppies to gruesome images and slaughter videos. Images and videos can elicit a range of emotions, from sentimentality to anger. As discussed in detail in the introduction, I define *anthropomorphism* as describing animals using characteristics usually thought of as exclusively human or comparing animals to humans. Anthropomorphism helps to create a connection to animals that are typically hard for people to relate to. *Sentimentality* is defined as focusing on feeling and emotion as a ground for morality and ethical living. Moral emotions, such as empathy and sympathy for animals, entail trying to understand another's experience. Sentimentality and anthropomorphism can work simultaneously together to draw people to the cause of animal advocacy.

In my overview of organizations, I examine primarily the American Humane Association (AHA), Animal Welfare Institute (AWI), In Defense of Animals (IDA), and Friends of Animals (FoA). The welfare organizations I examined spent more time on companion species and less time on wildlife. Education and proper "pet" care were significant features of several groups. For example, the AHA has a "compassionate mission" and focuses on both animals and child welfare. A large part of what they do is to promote "humane education," and the web page that discusses humane education emphasizes getting children and infants used to animals and teaching children how to get

along with other animals.¹⁹ By designation, the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) is on the welfare side of the organizational spectrum. Many welfare organizations routinely describe cats, dogs, birds, and other species that live with humans, as “pets.” Consequently, it is interesting that AWI chooses to call the creatures that live in human homes “companion animals.” Their page on companion species puts emphasis on the human-animal bond and the idea that animals are a source of comfort to humans. The page notes that children often remark that their animal companions are some of the most important members of their families.²⁰ This instance is illustrative of anthropomorphism, seeing animals as a part of a human family, and sentimentality, because it discusses how animals are a source of comfort.

Another strong use of sentimentality is through the utilization of pictures. All of the groups studied have numerous pictures to accompany the issues they raise. On the page that lists “Animal Programs” on AWI’s website, each of the sections is accompanied by a picture of a baby animal.²¹ The AHA website has many pictures of animals and children together, and on the main “Animals” page, the header shows a dog with the wind blowing through its fur.²² All of the pictures described are of what could be considered “cute” animals, and as mentioned in the case of the AWI, pictures often show baby animals. It would seem that the purpose of these pictures is to draw out emotions of connection, even sympathy, and the desire to protect the animals in question, or possibly

19. The American Humane Association. <http://www.americanhumane.org/interaction/programs/humane-education>. Accessed 04/30/15.

20. American Welfare Institute <https://awionline.org/content/companion-animals-0>. Accessed 04/29/15.

21. AWI. <https://awionline.org/content/animal-programs>. Accessed 04/29/15.

22. AHA. <http://www.americanhumane.org/animals/programs>. Accessed 04/30/15.

even to remind visitors of the site of the relationship they might have with their own companion animal(s).

Additionally, the pet food industry seems to be expanding their advertising of “healthy” lines of dog and cat food. Typically, *healthy* means the inclusion of meat as the first ingredient and sometimes no grain. Animal “by-product meal” is something that is also often eliminated.²³ Perhaps the trend in dog and cat food signals a growing awareness of what goes into food as well as an increasing concern for companion animal health and well-being among consumers.

Although companion species were frequently sentimentalized by welfare groups, farm animals, on the other hand, were not consistently anthropomorphized or directly sentimentalized. In reviewing websites and organizations, the genesis of my more broad-ranging inquiry into anthropomorphism came from discerning how animals are compared to humans and how animals are seen to be like or unlike humans. One reason for less anthropomorphizing is that it is evident from the welfare side of the movement that animals are definitively separate from humans. For instance, the AHA recognizes the connection between humans and animals in one sense, saying on the header for “Human-Animal Interaction” that the organization is “Promoting Compassion: Advancing the inextricably connected well-being of people, animals, and the world we share.”²⁴ There is a shift when the AHA examines farm animals, however; the group describes the guidelines for how to humanely slaughter animals for food. The promotion of “compassion” for animals and concern for their “well-being” in their header apparently

23. Blue Buffalo. <http://bluebuffalo.com/why-choose-blue/nutrition-philosophy>; Rachel Ray Nutrish. <http://nutrish.rachaelray.com/faq/Nutrition-and-Ingredient-Quality-Questions>. Accessed 09/07/16.

24. AHA. <http://www.americanhumane.org/interaction>. Accessed 04/30/15.

does not exclude killing them. Their page on farm animal welfare deals exclusively with information about their own welfare standards for farmed animals.²⁵ The AWI is similar, in that like other welfare groups, it still agrees to animals being used for human means. The organization also goes so far as to call farm animals “sentient creatures,”²⁶ which goes against the norm, because using the word “sentient” is usually reserved for animal rights groups. Little anthropomorphizing of farm animals was found in either of the aforementioned group’s websites. The AWI spends most of the pages on farm animals describing what conditions are like for factory-farmed animals and presenting alternatives.

It is more the case that sympathy for farm animals is drawn out in an indirect way by the previously discussed welfare organizations. The details of animal lives on factory farms, which the AWI and AHA present, is meant not only to illuminate the issues to readers but also to make them feel compassion and concern for the animals—enough so that they make changes in their own lives. Each of the organizations discussed above is actively involved in developing alternatives to factory-farmed meat.

Wildlife seems to be even less of a concern for some welfare groups. For instance, the AHA does not have a section on wildlife. The AWI, however, has an extensive amount of information about wildlife, including endangered species, the difference between lethal and nonlethal management, and the trade of animals and animal parts.²⁷ The AWI describes dolphins and whales as “complex social creatures,” and their section

25. AHA. <http://www.americanhumane.org/animals/programs/farm-animal-welfare.html>. Accessed 04/30/15.

26. American Welfare Institute. <https://awionline.org/content/inhumane-practices-factory-farms>. Accessed 04/29/15.

27. American Welfare Institute. <https://awionline.org/content/wildlife>. Accessed 01/22/16.

on wildlife is so large that they break it down between “wildlife” and “marine life.” The website pays close attention to oceans and pollution as a part of this discussion, which could be suggestive of a greater focus on wider environmental concerns than the other two groups.²⁸ Still, the AWI does not use much anthropomorphism of wild animals on their website. Much of the pages’ particulars give facts about the state of wildlife throughout the United States and other parts of the world.

With welfare organizations, the careful consideration of farm animals is telling, especially for a group like the AHA; as was pointed out in the history section of this chapter, they are one of the most conservative of the groups. Some criticism could be found among other welfare groups that the AHA welfare standards for farm animals do not go far enough. Nevertheless, the AHA is among several animal welfare groups now calling for reform in factory-farming practices. Further, the AHA cites surveys that highlight the public’s concern for humanely raised meat for human consumption.²⁹

The wide use of pictures, especially of baby animals and children, may indicate a sentimentalizing and anthropomorphism that helps the reader/viewer identify with the animals in question. In general, the use of these concepts—and, for the most part, the subtle emotions prompted by welfare groups—are couched in a large amount of information for the reader/viewer to learn and sort through.

Pictures are also used by animal rights groups to help illustrate their issues and promote compassion for animals and anger at industries and cruelty. Images of baby animals—whether these are farm, wild, or companion animals—play a role in the sentimentalizing of animals. In *Defense of Animals (IDA)* and *Friends of Animals (FoA)*

28. AWI. <https://awionline.org/content/confinement-marine-life>. Accessed 04/29/15.

29. AHA. <http://www.humaneheartland.org>. Accessed 04/30/15.

portray baby fawns sleeping in grass or leaves on pages concerning hunting. FoA depicts a young bear cub climbing a tree when discussing the organization's opposition to bear hunting.³⁰ Companion animal overpopulation is a major concern for rights groups. FoA has an extensive spay and neuter program mentioned on the front page of the website³¹ and also references the overpopulation issue to urge the reader/viewer to spay and neuter their dogs and cats.³² They use the overpopulation problem to point to other matters surrounding companion animals, such as breeding and buying animals from pet stores that they argue often come from puppy mills. The description of pet stores and puppy mills draws on emotions that viewers may have for their own companion animals, with the hope that the reader will become an advocate against such practices and not patronize pet stores. Additionally, both IDA and FoA encourage the reader to adopt from shelters to decrease the overpopulation. In each of these cases of domestic and feral animals, the backdrop for animal rights organizations is human culpability.

In terms of the concerns described above, IDA does less with companion animals but has a campaign that seeks to change the conception of animals as “pets” to one that views the humans who live and take care of companion animals as their “animal guardians.” The “guardian” program wants to change the concept of ownership and make companion animals more greatly recognized as family members and friends. They explain that a majority of the public already feels this way about the animals with whom

30. Friends of Animals. <http://friendsofanimals.org/programs/free-living-animals-their-environment/hunting-wildlife-management/deer>. <http://friendsofanimals.org/programs/free-living-animals-their-environment/hunting-wildlife-management/bears>. Accessed 04/28/15. In Defense of Animals. <http://www.idausa.org/campaigns/wild-free2/habitats-campaign>. Accessed 05/06/15.

31. FoA. http://www.friendsofanimals.org/spay_neuter_certificate_information. Accessed 01/25/16.

32. FoA. <http://friendsofanimals.org>. Accessed 04/28/15.

they share their lives.³³ IDA demonstrates frequently the similarities between humans and other animals, a key component of anthropomorphism, by arguing that animals are “feeling beings,” just as humans are: “As feeling beings we are united by our desires to seek pleasure and enjoyment and avoid pain and suffering.”³⁴ IDA’s statement about other animals is reminiscent of Singer’s animal philosophy because it echoes the philosopher’s utilitarian argument for animal liberation the avoidance of pain and striving for pleasure for the most amount of people is central to utilitarian philosophy. The organization also ties human well-being closely to the welfare of other animals. As a part of their mission statement, they argue that the way in which people treat other animals reflects how humans are as a species. They argue that “our own good is interwoven with the good of others,”³⁵ meaning *animal* others.

With animal rights groups, farm animals and wildlife are anthropomorphized to a greater degree than is done by welfare organizations. FoA describes wolves as “intelligent and family-oriented,” and pigs are likened to dogs by saying that they are intelligent in similar ways.³⁶ IDA discusses the similarities between elephants, dolphins, and whales by describing their psychological complexities. They also relate the psychological damage elephants can suffer from being in captivity.³⁷ Whereas the previous examples do not directly compare animals and humans, characterizing these

33. IDA. <http://www.idausa.org/campaigns/the-guardian-campaign>. Accessed 05/06/15.

34. IDA. <http://www.idausa.org/about-ida>. Accessed 05/06/15.

35. IDA. <http://www.idausa.org/about-ida/>. Accessed 05/06/15.

36. FoA. <http://friendsofanimals.org/programs/free-living-animals-their-environment/hunting-wildlife-management/wolves-danger>; <http://friendsofanimals.org/programs/veganism/vegetarianism-animals>. Accessed 05/14/15.

37. IDA. <http://www.idausa.org/campaigns/dolphin-whale-protection>; <http://www.idausa.org/campaigns/wild-free2/elephant-protection>. Accessed 09/09/16.

animals with psychological and social complexity helps to build a connection between animals and humans.

One of the major concerns of FoA, as with PETA (described in subsequent chapters), is vegan advocacy. One way that both groups do this is by going into graphic detail about animals raised on factory farms. The “gut” reaction to this for the reader/viewer is one of sadness but also potential sympathy for the animals. The main hope is that these details will not only lead to reforms of concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) practices, as advocated on animal welfare sites, but also that the reader will stop using animal products altogether. With such an emphasis on promoting a vegan lifestyle, it seems that for these organizations, it is the ultimate expression of compassion. FoA calls veganism the “direct application of the principles of animal rights.”³⁸

In summary, animal rights groups contrast with welfare groups in how they anthropomorphize and sentimentalize farm animals and wildlife more than they do companion animals. Companion animals have been traditionally more of a concern for welfare organizations, whereas farm and wild animals are more of a cause for animal rights and environmental groups. Obviously, these priorities do not hold in all cases, yet they hold true as a general observation. Rights groups may feel that farm animals need greater attention because their lives and the processes by which they become food for humans are almost exclusively hidden from public view. Using anthropomorphism and sentimentality is a means to draw attention to their plight in a different way. Like welfare groups, pictures of “cute” and often baby animals are a strong way to use sentimentality throughout the websites. Drawing comparisons between humans and animals, as seen above, is also a common occurrence, pointing out the similarities while respecting the

38. FoA. <http://friendsofanimals.org/programs>. Accessed 05/14/15.

differences between humans and animals. Rights groups also compare farm animals and wildlife to companion animals, presumably to help create connections for the reader/viewers between animals they might already live with to the plight of other animals. Similarly, IDA is trying to change how companion animals are perceived, using language to promote a different thought process and trying to move away from the idea of these animals as property. Finally, rights groups' endorsement of a vegan lifestyle is possibly one of the key ways these organizations encourage an individual to live compassionately toward other animals.

Just as in the academic study of religion and animals, religiously oriented animal groups have sourced their traditions and texts to find justification for animal protection. Some examples include how the Christian Vegetarian Association (CVA) and All-Creatures.org quote numerous Bible verses to show how Christianity should align with animal issues, and the CVA argues that the Bible has as its ideal a “plant-based” diet.³⁹ Scriptural support for religious groups, especially Christian and Jewish ones, is crucial for interpreting animals differently. The audiences of the aforementioned groups likely look to scripture for guidance on life and how to live as a believer, and the passage in Genesis 1 is central to both religions; reinterpreting it and expounding on other biblical passages, imagery, and stories that can be viewed as supporting animal welfare, it is easier for the reader/viewer to invest in the causes of the organizations.

Like the secular groups, the religious groups compare and suggest similarities and anthropomorphize animals. The CVA has several examples of anthropomorphism and sentimentality on their website; for instance, they suggest that animals have a “full range

39. Christian Vegetarian Association. <http://christianveg.org/mission.htm>; All-Creatures <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/chicken.html>. Accessed 01/25/16.

of feelings” like humans. They bring up the idea that mother cows “grieve” for their young. The group also makes a parallel between animal abuse and human abuse, asking whether humans’ willingness to “abuse weak and vulnerable animals” puts “weak and vulnerable humans at risk.” The organization argues that “chickens have distinct personalities and can learn their names.”⁴⁰ One poignant example of comparing other animals to companion animals appears on their website: “In many ways, the animals people eat are just like the animals we love as pets.”⁴¹

Dharma Voices for Animals (DVA) also has some strong examples of anthropomorphism and citing religious texts for justification. For instance, “According to the teachings, at some point you have been related to virtually every single being in existence.”⁴² Quoting the Brahmajala Sutra, the group cites, “All male beings have been my father and all female beings have been my mother... Therefore when a person kills and eats any of these beings, he thereby kills my parents.”⁴³ The citation also is a strong example of how some religions, like many animal studies and a large majority of animal organizations, attempt to break down the species barrier that has existed socially and culturally between humans and other animals. Moreover, DVA has pictures in several places, most of which are not of slaughtered animals or factory farms but of cute animals. Their logo is a circle around a piglet, a cow, and two baby chicks.⁴⁴ On the DVA site,

40. CVA. <http://www.all-creatures.org/cva/honoring.htm> . Accessed, 05/05/15.

41. CVA. <http://christianveg.org/honoring.htm>. Accessed 01/25/16.

42. Dharma Voices for Animals. <http://dharmavoicesforanimals.org/eating>. Accessed 01/25/16.

43. DVA. <http://dharmavoicesforanimals.org/eating>. Accessed 01/25/16.

44. DVA. <http://dharmavoicesforanimals.org>. Accessed 01/25/16.

accompanying a section about a “cruelty-free lifestyle,” is a picture of a person holding a piglet with its snout pointed up; it looks almost to be smiling.⁴⁵

Like the secular animal rights groups studied, three religious groups advocated for a vegan lifestyle. Rod Preece argues that beginning in the 1980s, when the animal rights movement began to blossom, veganism began to be synonymous with the movement (1998:327). Given the titles of the organizations, the Christian Vegetarian Association and Jewish Veg, it is not a complete surprise that their main focus is vegan advocacy. Even though vegetarianism is their primary work, fundamentally, this work is for the protection of animals rather than exclusively for some other issue such as health concerns.

Another group, Jewish Initiative for Animals (JIFA), takes a different approach. They focus on the reduction of animal consumption by promoting the raising and kosher slaughter of heritage breeds of chickens; because the animals are not mass-produced, heritage chickens are less widely available.⁴⁶ They explain that there has been a long history of Jewish involvement in animal welfare but that many people involved have come from a secular position. JIFA’s position is to “reconnect Jewish communities to the long Jewish tradition of being a voice for the voiceless.”⁴⁷ Like other groups, JIFA considers companion animals to be members of the family for many people.⁴⁸ For these groups, convictions about their faith drive the fact that they advocate for animals.

45. DVA. <http://dharmavoicesforanimals.org/about-dva>. Accessed 01/25/16.

46. Jewish Initiative for Animals. <http://jewishinitiativeforanimals.org/get-involved/heritage>. Accessed 09/08/16.

47. JIFA. <http://jewishinitiativeforanimals.org/about-us>. Accessed 09/08/16.

48. JIFA. <http://jewishinitiativeforanimals.org>. Accessed 09/08/16.

Conclusion

The history of the animal movement has included both conservative and progressive factions. Welfare organizations have played a major role in creating better conditions for animals on farms and in laboratories, and they seek to address the way humans treat their animal companions. Only in the last 30 to 40 years has the more radical “rights” side garnered more attention. The animal movement has increased its visibility, and likely because of this, the public is more aware of animal issues and is more willing to work toward reforms (Rollin 2011). Not only organizations but also the scholarly scrutiny of animal issues has helped to usher in what Weil (2012) calls “the animal turn” in the academy. Singer, Adams, Regan, and the numerous religious scholars who have put other animals into a new perspective have certainly increased the movement’s flourishing. While opinions are changing, public attention is not usually on the scholarly discourse, but on attention grabbing activities of animal organizations.

Public opinions of the animal movement are regularly focused on outrageous stunts, demonstrations, and direct action of more fundamentalist groups. For example, the public would likely be able to identify the demonstrations by PETA, where activists throw fake blood on passersby wearing fur. These kinds of activities make news headlines, giving free advertisement to the organization. This type of attention has been both positive and negative for the movement, yet attention and media coverage is by and large negative when it comes to animal rights (Wrenn 2013:388). PETA has become the organization most easily recognizable in discussions on animal rights, but because of some of their tactics, they have garnered criticism and dislike even from those who

support the animal movement (see Adams 1990/2010; Luke 2007; Adams and Gruen 2014). At the same time, existing moderate successes and calls for further reforms are increasingly supported by public opinion, especially when it concerns food animals.

The influential role of religion helped the movement early on to develop a particular moral background. The movement has since moved on from its religious footing and has created new moral rationales. It is clear that religion is beginning to once again share a prominent position in the movement. Religions have many resources for reinterpreting attitudes about animals. The groups that use their religious traditions are furthering the animal movement to grow and accomplish its goals. Finally, I have begun to show how anthropomorphism and sentimentality are used generally throughout organization websites. Arguably, the concepts have been present throughout the history of the movement. Anthropomorphism and sentimentality may be used subtly, or at least not as sharply, because often the graphic images and “contentious performances” (Tilly and Tarrow 2015) get the most attention; however, they are frequent tools for getting messages to the reader/viewers via websites.

The next chapter begins the close analysis of specific organizations. The ASPCA and PETA, two of the largest welfare and rights groups working for animals, will be explored in detail. Much of the groups’ information is similar, but their tactics are different.

CHAPTER 3
“ANIMALS ARE COUNTING ON
COMPASSIONATE PEOPLE”⁴⁹: PETA AND ASPCA

The American Society for the Protection of Animals (ASPCA) and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) are among the most fervid, committed, and recognized organizations for animal advocacy that exist today. The two groups have a major presence both within the movement and in the public eye. They diverge from one another philosophically, but given their popularity, they have both been effective in promoting their vision of animal causes. The ASPCA is the oldest animal advocacy organization in the United States, founded in 1866. Conversely, PETA, founded in 1980, represents part of the recent wave of groups that have shaped the “rights” era. PETA reports having more than 5 million members to date.⁵⁰ I chose these organizations for comparison because they are two of the largest secular animal organizations in the United States, but they are also at opposite ends of the spectrum. The ASPCA is more conservative and is arguably more respected by the public, whereas PETA is controversial inside and outside the movement. As such, each group reaches wide audiences, although not necessarily the same ones; thus it is useful to study them in regards to movement framing, anthropomorphism, and sentimentality in order to get a broad assessment.

49. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues>. Accessed 10/09/16.

50. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/>. Accessed 11/17/16.

This chapter explores the website content of the ASPCA and PETA, with special attention to the information and campaigns pertaining to companion animals, wildlife, and farmed animals. The framing of discourse, rhetoric, and images will be analyzed in consideration of the group's uses of anthropomorphism, sentimentality, and emotion.

PETA: People For The Ethical Treatment Of Animals

PETA began in 1980, founded by Ingrid Newkirk—who still heads the organization today—and Alex Pacheco. The group epitomized the grassroots nature of the animal rights movement from the beginning, holding offices in a warehouse with only 90 employees. They grew rapidly in membership—to 300,000 in less than a decade after its inception and more than three million today (Finsen and Finsen 1994:77).⁵¹ Their website describes the reason they launched the group and states their intent:

PETA's founders sought to give caring people something more that they could do and to provide them ways to actively change society. They wanted to promote a healthy vegan diet and show how easy it is to shop cruelty-free. They wanted to protest, loudly and publicly, against cruelty to animals in all its forms, and they wanted to expose what really went on behind the very thick, soundproof walls of animal laboratories.⁵²

PETA maintains that there was a need for a new kind of organization that engaged its audience in the kinds of activities that were bolder and perhaps more tendentious, such as boycotts and protests. PETA also claims that before their arrival on the scene, humane organizations did not question the ethical and moral implications of killing animals.⁵³

Thus the way PETA tells its story communicates to outsiders and members that the group

51. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/why-peta/peta-tactics>. Accessed 12/18/15.

52. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/learn-about-peta/history>. Accessed 12/18/15.

53. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/learn-about-peta/history>. Accessed 12/18/15.

was providing a service to meet a need that was previously unfilled. PETA positions themselves as the people who help animals and potentially the people who “care” in ways that other groups had not. Even though it is one of the larger organizations addressed in this dissertation, PETA has the least amount of revenue, expenses, and assets of the major organizations. Their revenue totaled just under than \$45 million, with expenses at \$45 million and assets of \$16 million in 2015.⁵⁴

Some examples of recent victories described on the PETA website include many local, county, and federal successes.⁵⁵ For instance, PETA professes to have discovered and stopped a military training course in San Diego that shot at pigs as a part of their training exercises.⁵⁶ A significant federal victory included a battle waged by PETA and other groups for years to stop the National Institutes of Health (NIH) from testing on chimpanzees. The federal government will give the chimpanzees over to sanctuaries.⁵⁷ Stated victories in 2015 included helping to defeat “ag-gag”⁵⁸ bills in several states, including Colorado, Montana, and New Mexico. PETA campaigned to stop brain experiments on cats at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and they report in their 2015 annual review that the laboratory shut down and the director retired. The

54. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/learn-about-peta/financial-report>. Accessed 10/08/16.

55. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/victories>. Accessed 01/07/16.

56. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/victories/san-diego-county-blocks-cruel-military-medical-drills-on-pigs>. Accessed 01/07/16.

57. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/victories/nih-to-retire-all-chimpanzees-from-laboratories>. Accessed 01/07/16.

58. Ag-gag laws refer to state legislation aimed at criminalizing the exposure of animal cruelty and the conditions on CAFOs. Sorenson argues that the corporate interests that have backed much of the bills, and the conflict of interest of legislators who are members of the groups lobbying for ag-gag laws, is particularly troubling. Undercover investigations into laboratories, circuses, zoos, and factory farms and their subsequent evidence have long been a hallmark of the animal movement. These investigations have also revealed abuses of human workers in CAFO facilities. (Sorenson 2016:162; 172).

organization had lobbied for “open-records” from the school, created protests and email campaigns, and filed federal complaints that penalized the lab.⁵⁹

According to Similar Web, a site that compares the traffic of websites, PETA’s website gets the most visitors per month of all the websites in my study, around 4 million. The average amount of time spent on the website per visit is one minute 47 seconds, and the average number of pages viewed is just under 2 at 1.84.⁶⁰ What these numbers suggest is that a person may go to PETA’s website to view the home page, which is full of information, or perhaps to get the latest news on PETA’s concerns, and many people may visit a second page. In addition to the highest number of views, the average amount of time spent on the website was the longest of all the websites that I examined.

When visiting the PETA website, the viewer may note their motto in the header of their home page that stays visible through every link: “Animals are not ours to eat, wear, experiment on, use for entertainment, or abuse in any way.”⁶¹ A picture of a cute looking rabbit, a signature part of their logo, adorns the header. The image of the rabbit, while functioning as a sentimental appeal to the audience, also refers to their campaigns against the testing on animals of beauty products intended for human use.

The image of the rabbit contrasts with what others often see as outlandish and sometimes offensive tactics that PETA uses to gain attention for their campaigns. The group is infamous for producing brazen campaigns and being unconcerned with whether it upsets some people. They have found that this brash behavior has been a successful

59. PETA. Annual Review 2015, p. 7,11 pdf. <http://features.peta.org/annual-review-2015>. Accessed 09/22/16.

60. Similar Web. <https://www.similarweb.com/website/peta.org>. Accessed 11/12/16.

61. PETA. <http://www.peta.org>. Accessed 06/02/15.

style to get their causes noticed, even if it is unfavorable to many inside and outside of the animal advocacy movement. One example of this unabashed attitude is the use of nudity and sexual suggestiveness⁶² in their campaigns and ads that often receive negative attention. For instance, PETA is famous for their “I’d Rather Go Naked than Wear Fur” campaign. They have had celebrities pose almost naked for advertisements and now have a sign-up for anyone to become a part of the campaign.⁶³ Additionally, PETA has several public service announcements (PSAs) that are offensive to some for their fat shaming, linking a vegan diet with weight loss. These advertisements were a part of their “outdoor” PSAs, presumably as billboards or other posters and flyers pointing to their scope outside of their website.⁶⁴ The group also has examples of their print, television, and radio spots.⁶⁵ PETA justifies these actions under the FAQ on their website, which states, “PETA knows that provocative, attention-grabbing actions are sometimes necessary to get people talking about issues that they would otherwise prefer not to think about.”⁶⁶ Those within and outside the animal movement have criticized PETA for some of their methods, arguing that perhaps the way PETA advocates does more harm than good for both animals and women. Adams argues in her book, *The Pornography of Meat*, that

62. In some of PETA’s print ads, women and men appear partially naked, most often protesting fur or encouraging veganism. But in parts of their entire range of campaigns, from promoting cruelty-free products to companion animal issues, PETA uses this method. The most common, protesting animal “skins,” can be seen here: http://www.peta.org/media/psa/type/print/?category_name=skins. Accessed 12/18/15.

63. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/action/would-rather-go-naked>. Accessed 09/22/16.

64. PETA. http://www.peta.org/media/psa/type/outdoor/?category_name=vegan. Accessed 09/22/16.

65. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/media/psa/type/print>; <http://www.peta.org/media/psa/type/print>; <http://www.peta.org/media/psa/type/radio>. Accessed 09/23/16.

66. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/faq/why-does-peta-sometimes-use-nudity-in-its-campaigns>. Accessed 06/29/15.

PETA reinforces male privilege using women in their ads in sexualized ways, such as the above example on their well-known anti-fur campaign. Adams contends that it is difficult to maintain an aura of compassion while at the same time using women in such a way (2004:168). Bryan Luke maintains that animal activists are often feminized: “Vegetarians because of the gendered connotations of diet, activists in general because the institutions challenged by the movement—vivisection, hunting, and meat production—are major centers for the construction of patriarchal masculinity” (2007:205). He contends additionally that because women have been the cornerstones of the movement, “the use of techniques that disempower women can only undermine the long-term visibility of the movement” (216). Luke argues that PETA’s campaigns are no different than magazines and publications that “animalize women as objects of men’s sexual pursuit” (216).⁶⁷ The extensive publicity some of their campaigns receive is one of the reasons that I have chosen to investigate more subtle aspects of not only PETA’s apparent website strategies but also of the other organizations in this study as well. Many of the campaigns described above rely on shock and outrage to be noticed, while I am concerned with the quieter aspects of their work, much of which concentrates on sympathy and compassion.

PETA’s Range of Concerns

In order to understand PETA, it is helpful to understand their “performances.”

Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow describe the work of a social movement as “a sustained

⁶⁷ As mentioned in previous footnotes and in the body of the text, PETA addresses some of its critics in the form of a FAQ section that answers questions about their questionable tactics. They do not address feminist scholars specifically, but in one example, Newkirk addressed the subject of feminism and animal rights in a video and summary in a PETA blog post. Newkirk simultaneously argues for ideas similar to ecofeminists, stating “discrimination is discrimination, and it’s wrong, whether you’re a woman or a chicken.” She also suggests that women “use their gender stereotypes to their advantage,” such as expressing emotion about animals. <http://www.peta.org/blog/do-women-make-better-animal-rights-activists-ingrid-e-newkirk-animal-rights-feminism>. Accessed 08/05/16

campaign of claim making, using repeated performances that advertise the claim, based on organizations, networks, traditions, and solidarities that sustain these activities” (2015:145). PETA and the other organizations in this dissertation are a part of the “social movement base” (148), and their claims and arguments will be analyzed in more detail. Common ways of communicating are the “performances” that Tilly and Tarrow identify, especially demonstrations, petitioning, strikes, marches, and so on (2015:11). What many of these performances have in common is that they are public, collective, and attention grabbing. These performances in particular are designed to coordinate action, and PETA has a reputation for their demonstrations and protests because they sometimes use questionable tactics to raise awareness about the use of animals. Performances are staged in physical public spaces where people can act, and the online world has become a public arena where individuals can gather for both information and an array of activities (Tilly and Tarrow 2015:17). The Internet and social media have been effective tools for the advertising of claims in a “cost effective” and “efficient” manner (Obar et al. 2012:16). My focus with PETA and the other organizations is how the groups communicate their claims through stories and rhetoric on their websites, using anthropomorphism and sentimentality as a frame.

In order to investigate the presentation of three different categories of animals—wildlife, farm, and companion—and to provide consistency in my analysis across sites, I chose the “Issues” section on the PETA website as a large part of my concentration. PETA links multiple pages that discuss their concerns for each of these animal categories. Here, the issues are laid out in bold letters for the reader:

Every day in countries around the world, animals are fighting for their lives. They are enslaved, beaten, and kept in chains to make them perform

for humans’ “entertainment”; they are mutilated and confined to tiny cages so that we can kill them and eat them; they are burned, blinded, poisoned, and cut up alive in the name of “science”; they are electrocuted, strangled, and skinned alive so that people can parade around in their coats; and worse.⁶⁸

The “we” language from the very beginning of the Issues pages strongly suggests that it is the everyday practices of human beings that cause wildlife, farm, and companion animals to suffer. PETA balances the blame on the reader/viewer by telling them that animals are counting on the reader as a “compassionate person.”⁶⁹ For PETA, compassion comprises not treating animals as means to human ends, and they believe that any use of an animal by humans is wrong. Too often, when humans use animals, they are exploited and made to suffer.

The page explains the culpability of the reader/viewer: “It’s even more so when we realize that the everyday choices we make—such as what we eat for lunch and the kind of shampoo we buy—may be directly supporting some of this abuse.”⁷⁰ As a part of their multifaceted outlook, PETA argues that when we consume animals, whether as food or as test subjects for cosmetics, animals are dying. Animals, like humans, should not be considered commodities. For example, “Each of us has the power to save animals from nightmarish suffering-and best of all, it’s easier than you might think.”⁷¹ Again invoking a “we” language, they state: “Together, we can make a difference.”⁷² By using such an approach, PETA provokes the reader/viewer to be personally responsible for their actions

68. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues>. Accessed 07/22/14.

69. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues>. Accessed 07/22/14.

70. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues>. Accessed 12/21/15.

71. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues>. Accessed 12/21/15.

72. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues>. Accessed 07/24/14.

and be involved in the process of helping animals. A person comes to the PETA website, likely out of curiosity or an interest in animal issues in the first place, so it is easy for PETA to assume the “we” and “us” language. Additionally, given their controversial nature, someone might also go to the PETA website to check out what they are all about or to view more controversial campaigns. Even the disinterested or distanced viewer is included in this “we,” and PETA wants to reach this audience as much as they do an already sympathetic audience. In this initial introduction to the issues, the group is establishing the argument for destabilizing the industries (CAFOs, laboratories, puppy mills, etc.). In other words, PETA is attempting to make what is often considered normative to be no longer typical, regular, or even customary (Gee 1999:85).

The “Wildlife Issues” page continues the destabilization of normalcy and the personal responsibility of the reader/viewer. PETA recognizes that some wildlife are deemed to be menacing or pests, and this designation is used to justify their killing. The group gives a range of wild animals that are in this category:

Each year, millions of animals are killed because they are considered pests. Beavers, bats, geese, deer, pigeons, mice, raccoons, snakes, chipmunks, and squirrels, are among those animals who most often suffer horrific death because some consider them a nuisance, but the list also includes bears, coyotes, ducks, foxes, mountain lions, prairie dogs, rabbits, and even wolves.⁷³

PETA has pages that give information about the habits and behaviors of several individual species of animals, including rabbits, mice, geese, raccoons, and chipmunks.⁷⁴ Many of these animals are those routinely viewed as problematic animals for urban/suburban dwellers as well as animals that are difficult for farmers. PETA provides

73. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife>. Accessed 12/28/15.

74. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife>. Accessed 12/28/15.

“factsheets” wherein they discuss animals such as deer, fish, pigeons, seals, and hunting.⁷⁵ The wildlife sections are concerned with how to control wildlife in “humane” ways in contrast to inhumane ways such as trapping, drowning, and poisoning to control animal populations.⁷⁶

PETA has a subsequent category of pages entitled “Living in Harmony with Wildlife,” and each subsection is filled with helpful tips to avoid having to use painful traps and killing. PETA argues that humans are causing the wildlife problems, and the reader/viewer should deal with animals in the least cruel way possible.⁷⁷ Some of the ways the viewer can help the cause of wildlife include proper handling of disposable items, and PETA places great value on the disposal of household items such as cans, cardboard boxes, and garbage that when treated improperly can be harmful to animals; in this, they join with environmental groups concerned about the degradation of ecosystems and the ingestion of plastic. Here again, the reader/viewers are put in the position of being responsible for changing the way they confront animals, particularly the ones encountered inside human dwellings. Dealing “responsibly” with animals is the alternative to killing the mouse or spider found in a family kitchen, for instance. Because humans are making life more difficult for animals by changing their habitats, causing them to move in on the domains of other animals, it is the least we can do to help them stay in the wild and out of human residences.

75. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/wildlife-factsheets>. Accessed 12/28/15.

76. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/cruel-wildlife-control>. Accessed 12/28/15.

77. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/living-harmony-wildlife>. Accessed 07/24/14.

Animals as Food

Chickens, pigs, and cows make up the majority of PETA's consideration of farmed animals.⁷⁸ The graphic pictures on the pages offer a vivid illustration of the extreme situations faced by these creatures. In one illustration, PETA draws attention to the confinement of chickens, which does not allow chickens to even spread their wings and move around freely. "Natural" and "unnatural" are two words that come up several times, referring to how chickens would behave in appropriate environments, such as taking dust baths and moving around at will, versus the harsh limitations they experience in factory farm confinement.⁷⁹ Confinement for pigs is a major focus for PETA, which discusses the gestation crates and crowded pens. Descriptive images are used: "Piglets are torn from their distraught mothers after just a few weeks. Their tails are chopped off, the ends of their teeth are snipped off with pliers, and the males are castrated."⁸⁰

Another discussion point details painful procedures performed on cows, such as branding and dehorning; it describes how cows horns are "gouged out or cut or burned off" without the use of painkillers. Similarly, the plight of cows in slaughterhouses is graphically detailed, noting that, "some cows remain fully conscious throughout the

78. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) are large-scale industrialized animal farms, often called "factory farms" by animal organizations. The problems that animal groups have with factory farming are numerous. Chickens in factory farms are bred to grow faster than normal, and male chicks are discarded as trash soon after hatching. Dairy cows are made perpetually pregnant in order to produce milk, their offspring are taken away immediately, and male calves are kept in cages to prevent growth so their muscle will stay tender for veal meat. Sows are often kept in small cages in order to breed, factory farms are overcrowded, and animals frequently spend no time outside and receive none of the enrichment that is normal for their species.

79. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/chickens>. Accessed 06/05/15.

80. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/pigs>. Accessed 06/05/15.

entire process.”⁸¹ By describing what happens in the lives of the animals portrayed, PETA’s tactics are not only informational: they seek to elicit outrage at the industries for their maltreatment of the animals and to elicit empathy and sympathy for what the animals go through in the course of their existence. This pattern seems to be a prevalent strategy with all of the pages PETA uses to inform its audience about animals used for food.

Companion Animals

In the sections on companion animals, some of their strategies include a discussion of “Cruel Practices.”⁸² PETA argues that what are usually considered cosmetic procedures—such as tail docking, declawing, and ear cropping—are cruel to these animals. In this context, cruelty means doing things that are only for the benefit of the human guardians or even for aesthetics. Tom Regan’s arguments about animals’ “preference autonomy” highlight the problem with these practices. The term *preference autonomy* means that animals have the “ability to initiate action with a view of satisfying them” (1983:85). For example, mammalian animals can make “preferential choices,” such as a dog deciding whether to eat or to go outside or choosing between one type of food and another. Mammals can do this, Regan argues, because they have the cognitive ability to have desires and goals (85).

81. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/cows>. Accessed 06/08/15.

82. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues/cruel-practices>. Accessed 06/09/15.

The “overpopulation” of companion species, especially dogs and cats, is a very real issue that needs a solution.⁸³ The goal, PETA argues, is for a “no-birth nation,” where every possible dog and cat is spayed or neutered so that the “crisis” is diminished. Because there are so many homeless animals in the world, breeding more animals is not a sensible activity. Further, they do not agree with “warehousing” animals in no-kill shelters where, they argue, that animals languish without proper care and are extremely lonely.⁸⁴ To handle the overpopulation issue, PETA is strongly in favor of euthanasia as the most responsible way to help deal with the vast amounts of homeless and abandoned animals.

PETA is not without opponents who challenge their views and other groups’ views of euthanasia and their idea of a no-birth nation. Kathy Rudy argues that the logical conclusion of animal rights theorists’ aspiration, to entirely stop the use of animals, will eventually rid the world of all animals. The only human interaction with animals would be wildlife observation (2011:5, 6). Getting rid of animals is not a solution that is realistic or desirable for most humans. She argues that some relationships that humans have with animals, especially the companion animal–human relationship, are efficacious and that animals provide humans with too much joy to get rid of them entirely (6). Although Rudy does not place PETA in the category of the “strong sense” of animal rights, PETA’s position on companion overpopulation supports this stronger understanding of animal

83. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues/overpopulation>. Accessed 06/09/15.

84. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues/overpopulation>. Accessed 08/05/16

rights. Yet PETA's stance on euthanasia and the ideal of a no-birth nation is as stringent as it is because the overpopulation crisis is so great.⁸⁵

Frame Analysis

Part of my analysis of animal groups includes how they frame their arguments. The following are excellent examples of frame extension, in which a group extends “the boundaries of the primary framework so as to encompass interests or points of view that are incidental to its primary objective but of considerable salience to potential adherents” (Snow et al. 1986:472). Erving Goffman, in his work *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience* (1974), explains that people tend to interpret events in “primary frameworks” (21). These frameworks are “schemata of interpretation” that allows people to make meaning out of something unintelligible, and to “locate, perceive, identify, and label” occurrences in their lives within their life space and the world at large” (1974:21). People often do not recognize the organization of frameworks, even though they are used without difficulty (21).

When thinking about how the organization frames its arguments, a few particularly interesting elements stand out as pertaining to frame extension. “Meat and the Environment”⁸⁶ argues that raising animals for food is the cause of several climate change issues, and 51% of greenhouse gases are directly related to the industry's use of vast amounts of water. For instance, PETA suggests that a person who commits to a vegan diet will save 219,000 gallons of water per year. Furthermore, manure and waste

85. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues/overpopulation/euthanasia>. Accessed 09/22/16.

86. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/meat-environment>. Accessed 06/09/15.

from factory farming produce pollution that ends up in water runoff and streams and as particulates in the air.⁸⁷ Finally, the page argues that commercial fishing and fish farms hurt the oceans by ruining coral reefs and putting nonnative species and pollution into sensitive aquatic ecosystems.⁸⁸

Next, PETA connects animals raised for food with frames of human health, hunger, and labor justice, and they demonstrate that it is not just concerned about animals, as some might want to dismiss it as being. The page touts the health benefits of a vegan diet, citing the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics to support these claims.⁸⁹ PETA describes poor working conditions in factory farms; people work for low wages, and injury is common. The page argues that the industry's incessant desire for profit over safety and health is the cause of terrible working conditions in slaughterhouses and factory farms, and a connection is made to stopping world hunger through a vegan diet.

87. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/meat-environment>. Accessed 06/09/15.

88. Public and scholarly discourse have debated the impact of a vegetarian/vegan diet on the environment. It has been found that all things being equal, eating a diet sustained by animals *not* raised in a factory-farm setting and organic vegetables grown from local sources and in season would constitute a way of eating that would be significantly environmentally sustainable. In today's world of mass-produced, quick, and cheap food, many popular sources of nourishment that vegetarians and vegans frequently rely on do not come from environmentally sustainable sources. For popular-media sources see: Kiera Butler. Mother Jones. <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2010/07/is-vegetarian-diet-green>; Tom Philpott. Mother Jones. <http://www.motherjones.com/tom-philpott/2014/07/lay-off-almond-milk-ignorant-hipsters>. Accessed 07/27/16. I include popular sources because they are the public debates and articles the average reader/viewer of animal organization websites would most likely be familiar with. On the other hand, all things are not equal, and the industrial agriculture industry supporting factory farms remains the dominant and most cost-effective way for the vast majority of people to consume animals. Additionally, given the prevalence of food deserts in the United States and around the world, access to local, fresh, whole vegetables is not always a possibility for many consumers. It has often been argued that a vegetarian/vegan diet is one for the middle class and rich, given the aforementioned circumstances. Yet it is argued that the scale to which factory farms house, feed, and kill animals for human consumption outweighs the consequences to the environment from producing vegetables, even on a mass scale, for human consumption. Further, the workers involved in industrial farming are often mistreated, and they have more in common with those in food deserts due to racially restricted housing choices and low income. See for example: Katie Cantrell. Tikkun. <http://www.tikkun.org/nextgen/the-true-cost-of-a-cheap-meal>, Accessed 07/27/16.; see also Boggs, Carl. 2011. "Corporate Power, Ecological Crisis, and Animal Rights" in *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation*, Ed. John Sanbonmatsu. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

89. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/eating-health>. Accessed 06/09/15.

PETA contends that decreasing meat consumption and not raising animals for food will allow more land area for crop growth, which should increase food production.⁹⁰

Frame extension and boundary work is also related to stories. Essentially, PETA is telling a story about animals and humans that attempts to engage the reader in their claims. Tilly argues that stories are everywhere in social life and that they are a significant part of communication among individuals and political organizers (2002:9). Moreover, “political entrepreneurs draw together credible stories from available cultural materials, similarly create we-they boundaries, activate both stories and boundaries as a function of current political circumstances, and maneuver to suppress competing models...” (2002:209). Thus, they have extended the frames of the environment and human health to apply them to the situation with animals in factory farming in such a way as to enable the audience to be willing to accept the information that connects the extended categories, which are prominent “available cultural materials.”

PETA’s fundamental objective is not the environment, health, or world hunger. Thus it has extended its concerns to other areas that might be pertinent to the reader/viewer. To get the reader/viewer to more fully resonate with their argument, the group has tried hard to explain that animals raised for food and factory farming have consequences far beyond those that impact the animals; their stories and graphics assume an epistemological level of engagement that will at least open the door to concerns about animals, and it places the moral of the story on something other than solely “using animals is wrong” to other areas of life that should matter to the reader/viewer.

90. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/reasons-go-vegan>. Accessed 06/09/15.

As an animal rights organization, PETA's primary framework is about the animals and the goal of ending their use by humans. But the group takes the gamble that the reader/viewer coming to their website may be concerned about issues of the environment, worker conditions, and health in addition to the plight of animals (Benford and Snow, 2000:625). In the context that PETA uses them, the above-mentioned movements are about food; thus the extension is extremely important for PETA because their primary goal and solution for animal problems is veganism. PETA assumes that prior knowledge about these subjects already exists for the reader/viewer, and engaging in frame extension is a good way for PETA to connect to people who may be more interested or knowledgeable about environmental issues or worker conditions and only marginally concerned about animals as food, or to amplify their concern for animals by making the bridge to other issues, especially human issues. Because PETA is somewhat controversial, using these other subjects as extensions could serve to temper their reputation for people who feel they go too far in their campaigning and advertisements.

PETA's goals are ultimately about mass social change, and specifically in the way society understands, uses, and treats animals. Frame alignment comes into perspective when considering this desire for broader social change. According to Snow et al. (1986), "Frame transformation" is the most comprehensive frame alignment because it asks the advocate or potential adherent for a considerable amount of change. The authors describe two types of frame transformation, and arguably, both can be seen on PETA's website and in the range of concerns it seeks to address.

The first type of frame transformation, *domain specific*, has to do primarily with one area (domain) of life, such as dietary habits. Snow et al. describe the change as when

“a domain previously taken for granted is framed as problematic and in need of repair, or a domain seen as normative or acceptable is reframed as an injustice that needs to be changed” (474). Domain-specific frame transformation is clearly seen in PETA’s discourses on animals used for food. As noted above, PETA attempts to destabilize two prevalent ideas: the first is the opinion that humans should eat animal flesh, the second is that animals raised for food live in bucolic settings where they are treated with care and concern.

Similarly, the “global interpretive transformation” is where the new framework opened by the organization becomes a more extensive “master frame” that affects virtually all aspects of a person’s life. It calls for a “thoroughgoing conversion” (475). As emphasized on their site in the “Issues” pages, unacceptable use of animals covers practically all areas of the reader/viewer’s life from food to toothpaste. Consequently, PETA seeks throughout its website to encourage the reader/viewer to make a lifestyle change by discontinuing the use of animals whatsoever. To put an end to instrumental animal use, people must choose to opt out of industries and behaviors that would contribute to the use or abuse of animals. To help facilitate this conversion, the website provides numerous suggestions and has an entire section labeled “Living.” It even lists “cruelty-free” businesses in areas from cosmetics to food.⁹¹

Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality on PETA’s Website

PETA’s sections on wildlife are one area where the use of anthropomorphism is most abundant. On these pages about wild animals, PETA uses descriptions of animal emotions to help anthropomorphize them. Below are some examples of how wildlife is

91. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/living>. Accessed 01/08/16.

anthropomorphized. By explaining how similar they are to humans, PETA portrays many of the animals that are often considered urban/suburban nuisances in particularly anthropomorphic terms. Geese, for instance, are said to “possess many of the traits humans value and strive to obtain.” In order to show that geese are compassionate and communicate with their young, they continue: “Devoted to each other, goose couples mate for life, raise and protect their babies together and take care of one another.”⁹² Additionally, geese are described as very emotional animals that mourn the death of their fellows and demonstrate expressions of happiness.

Also equated in human terms, house mice and rats are described as “students” and are said to be extremely social creatures. PETA asserts, “Like us, mice and rats are very social creatures. They become attached to one another, love their families, and enjoy playing, wrestling, and sleeping curled up together.”⁹³ Mice and rats are also discussed as being as intelligent as canines, thus linking them to companion animals familiar to the reader. The “Did You Know” section explains that rats and mice “make chirping noises that *sound like laughter*” (emphasis mine), and are even able to recognize names given to them by humans. Pigeons are depicted as being family oriented animals that mate for life and alternate taking care of their young and their watching nests “like humans.”⁹⁴ Raccoons are portrayed as “independent, gregarious, and clever,” skunks as “peace-loving and non-aggressive,” and wild rabbits as “benevolent and cuddly.”⁹⁵ Fish are

92. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/living-harmony-wildlife/canada-geese>. Accessed 06/04/15.

93. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/living-harmony-wildlife/house-mice>. Accessed 06/04/15.

94. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/living-harmony-wildlife/pigeons>. Accessed 06/04/15.

described as being individuals with their own personalities. Comparing fish to humans, PETA cites biologists who chronicle fish as having social traditions and exhibiting cooperation when looking for food. A factsheet about the animals explains that some fish such as sharks are known to be playful and highly intelligent with inquisitiveness and social ability. Further, the factsheet notes that humans may not recognize that fish experience pain and suffering, but they do indeed feel pain.⁹⁶ The sheet references scientific studies and news reports to support their claims.

When the use of anthropomorphism is applied to wildlife, especially animals considered pests, it allows the reader/viewer to identify such animals with a new association. Rather than problems, wild animals are shown with positive humanlike qualities. By disclosing the sameness between humans and other animals and thereby creating identification, PETA opens the door for the reader/viewer to then begin to feel empathy for the animals. In PETA's vision, the person who feels empathy will hopefully go the next step and want to act on behalf of animals. PETA's examples illustrate how anthropomorphizing leads to sentimentality, and the concepts of anthropomorphism and sentimentality work hand in hand to educate and compel emotion.

Farmed animals are the second most anthropomorphized creature group in PETA's advocacy. Sows are described as being "distraught" when their young are taken away. Similarly, "mother cows can be heard frantically crying out for calves for several days after they have been separated."⁹⁷ A picture of a "cute" baby piglet makes a

95. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/living-harmony-wildlife/raccoons>; <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/living-harmony-wildlife/skunks>; <http://www.peta.org/issues/wildlife/rabbits>. Accessed 06/04/15.

96. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/animals-used-food-factsheets/fishing-aquatic-agony-3>. Accessed 06/03/15.

rhetorical sentimental appeal on the header of the “Animals Used as Food” page. The photo was taken in such a way that its piglet snout appears to jut out from the picture plane. The “adorable” creature stands in juxtaposition to the gestation crates that mother pigs are held in to generate progeny. Normal behaviors and feelings of ducks and geese are contrasted with how they are treated when being raised to make *foie gras*. In this process, ducks are force-fed to produce a “diseased ‘fatty liver’” as a delicacy.⁹⁸ It is mentioned that many people might not think of the plight of ducks and geese when considering “farm animals” because they are also wildlife. As such, ducks and geese are described as beloved and admired by people. PETA argues that in reality, the animals are “deprived of everything natural and important to them.”⁹⁹

On each of the pages involving “animals used for food,” the animals are clearly victims of industries and systems. PETA attempts to diminish the power of these industries by making the reader/viewer aware of the state of CAFOs. PETA’s focus on corporations is apparent in language targeted more at the industries that raise, transport, and slaughter the animals than it is geared toward individuals who are employed by the businesses. Moreover, viewers are also given a certain amount of empowerment because at the end of each page, they are asked to consider a vegan lifestyle in order to help the animals by refraining from participating, as much as possible, in the industries that “abuse” and practice “cruelty” toward these animals. Hence, part of their theory of

97. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/cows>. Accessed 06/08/15.

98. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/ducks-geese>. Accessed 09/11/16.

99. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/ducks-geese>. Accessed 09/11/16.

change is to change consumer behavior and thus influence corporations via their pocketbook.

Another intriguing feature of how PETA and other organizations describe animals is by comparing certain species with companion animals. Although this is not anthropomorphism, it suggests a certain level of sentimentality that seeks to connect viewers of the site to animals with whom they might be less familiar. For example, chickens are described as intelligent and social, and they are compared to companion species and even primates.¹⁰⁰ Pigs are also compared to companions—namely, dogs—where they are described as intelligent, friendly, and loyal. They are said to be smarter than a human 3-year old and that they enjoy playing. Pigs are characterized as being very clever animals who love to explore and very clean animals.¹⁰¹ Cows are similarly compared to dogs in that they are social and form packs. Like chickens and pigs, cows are depicted as clever and curious. To help show that these farm animals demonstrate intelligence and disapproval of their treatment and environment, PETA notes that it has been documented that some cows have tried extremely hard to escape slaughterhouses.¹⁰² Turkeys are also discussed as intelligent and as animals that enjoy listening to music and being petted like companion animals.¹⁰³

100. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/chickens>. Accessed 06/08/15.

101. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/pigs>. Accessed 06/08/15.

102. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/cows>. Accessed 06/08/15.

103. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/turkeys>. Accessed 06/08/15.

Companion animals, particularly cats and dogs, are not as anthropomorphized in PETA's web pages as are wildlife and farm animals. Frequently, as was shown, members of the latter categories are compared to dogs and cats to describe various animals' behavior and emotions. Perhaps the reason that companion animals are not the considerable subjects of anthropomorphism is because companion animals are so well known and already anthropomorphized and sentimentalized heavily by the wider public (Jasper and Nelkin 1992; Serpell 2002). Companion animals are supposedly understood by humans and most likely by a reader/viewer who would be looking at an animal rights website, so it is possible that it is seen as not as necessary for PETA to make this characterization. Also, PETA is not as focused on the treatment of companion animals.

In terms of images of companion animals, some examples of a sentimental leaning can be found. Each of the pages has a picture of an animal that could be considered cute or even sad. In the case of the "Cruel Practices" page, it has a picture of sad, tired-looking dogs sitting on cinder blocks against a white background. The main "Companion Animals" page, in contrast, has a picture of a big, wet, white dog sitting inside a tub filled with white suds, presumably getting a bath.¹⁰⁴ The "Overpopulation Crisis" page has both a small kitten for a link and a picture of a cute-looking dog at the top.

PETA focuses their anthropomorphizing on lesser-known companion species. Ferrets are described as "inquisitive, smart, and playful." Rabbits as pets are said to need human and other animal attention and love because they are social, complex animals with

104. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues>. Accessed 01/08/16.

individual personalities.¹⁰⁵ It is also noted that rabbits do not typically belong in the “pet industry,” yet humans often on a whim purchase them every year. Additionally, there are numerous “factsheets,”¹⁰⁶ as with wildlife, which explore companion animals that are not quite as common such as gerbils, guinea pigs, rats, and mice. These factsheets devote a large amount of text to telling the reader/viewer how to care for the animals and advocating adoption from shelters, such as telling the reader/viewer that hamsters need a large amount of items to chew on because their teeth do not stop growing.¹⁰⁷ The factsheet explains that rabbits “need just as much attention as a dog or cat.” These pages are some examples of how PETA deals with individual companion animals and the way the reader/viewer is informed of what they believe is proper care. The main concern for PETA in terms of companion animals seems to be informing the reader/viewer about practices and industries that are dangerous to the animals’ well-being, health, or safety.

PETA does the most anthropomorphizing with wildlife and the least with companion animals. Farm animals receive the most sentimentality, as the reader/viewer potentially feels sympathy for the plight of these animals and anger toward factory farming—ideally, so much so that people will abstain from the use and consumption of animal products entirely. Here is another instance where anthropomorphism can lead to identification and sympathy. Farm animals are discussed as having humanlike qualities, and in addition, long descriptions of the negative aspects of factory farming and the extremely dire conditions of animals are included. Ultimately, the animals in each of

105. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues/companion-animals-factsheets/facts-rabbits>. Accessed 08/11/15.

106. See, for example, PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues/companion-animals-factsheets/facts-ferrets>. Accessed 08/11/15.

107. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/companion-animal-issues/companion-animals-factsheets/facts-gerbils-hamsters>. Accessed 09/11/16.

these areas are portrayed as powerless and in need of humans to step up to help them. The reader/viewer is encouraged to take this potential power and use it for change; PETA is an advocacy group in addition to being a direct action group.

The detailed descriptions about the situation of animals in factory farms, by PETA and almost every other organization in this study, could be a shocking to the reader/viewer. James Jasper's concept of moral shock argues that in the absence of previously built networks for recruitment, moral shocks are often used by social movement organizations (SMOs) to gain support. The shock of pictures and discussion can cause the reader/viewer to want to change their moral perspective on an issue (Jasper and Poulsen 1995; Jasper 1997; 2011). The emotions that result from moral shock are varied, but such shock is often accompanied by anger. With its depictions of farm animals, PETA and other groups attempt to elicit outrage and blame against the industry. But at the same time, the group creates a connection between the reader/viewer and the animal that could draw sympathy for the plight of the animal; for example, by describing pigs as intelligent, friendly, and "smarter than dogs."¹⁰⁸ The combination of emotions is an example of what Jasper terms "moral batteries," where two seemingly opposite emotions are paired together to develop a particular response (2011:14.22).

In a study of marketing and message framing, Maheswaran and Meyers-Levy found that when a person is well informed about a product or issue, negative framing is particularly persuasive. When an individual is not as involved with an issue, a favorable portrayal was convincing, because the positive portrayal influenced their opinion, which was often based on inference and personal attitudes (1990:366). PETA and other

108. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/factory-farming/pigs>. Accessed 06/08/16.

organizations rely on both moral shocks and sympathetic and anthropomorphic depictions of animals. Each of the strategies is crucial given that their audience is likely to comprise people who are at least somewhat supportive of animal rights, as well as people who are just curious about what PETA is all about, considering their some of their contentious campaigns that get easy media attention.

ASPCA: American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

The ASPCA was the first major animal welfare organization in the United States, founded in 1866. Their mission, developed by Henry Bergh from its inception, states that it is “to provide effective means for the prevention of cruelty to animals throughout the United States.”¹⁰⁹ Of the three major secular organizations that are a focus of this dissertation, the ASPCA has the second largest total assets, totaling over \$247 million (behind HSUS), and just over \$130 million in expenses and almost \$188 million in revenue in 2015.¹¹⁰ Another measure of success is legislative victories, and at the end of each year, the ASPCA advertises and promotes their top ten victories.¹¹¹ In 2015, several of these victories were at the state level, showing that the organization works closely at all levels of government. For example, the page states that because of the ASPCA’s efforts, New York and New Jersey took measures to crack down on puppy mills and their access to selling to pet stores. Voters in Massachusetts chose to ban “cruel confinement of pigs, hens, and veal calves and ensure products sold in the state meet the same

109. ASPCA. <https://www.asPCA.org/about-us>. Accessed 01/06/16.

110. ASPCA. http://www.asPCA.org/sites/default/files/financial_statement_2015.pdf. Accessed 01/06/16.

111. ASPCA. <https://www.asPCA.org/news/big-wins-animals-2015-check-out-asPCAs-top-10-legislative-victories>. Accessed 01/06/16.

standards.”¹¹² Some examples from 2014 were that four states made stronger laws concerning wildlife. Michigan voted to repeal wolf hunting, and Illinois created greater protection for wolves, cougars, and bears. New York and New Jersey banned the sale of ivory from rhinos and elephants.¹¹³ Several states attempted to enact “ag-gag” laws, but these laws were eventually defeated.¹¹⁴ Many groups have rallied to derail the formation of ag-gag laws. The same victory over such laws was championed by PETA as well, demonstrating both common cause and cooperation among groups. Whereas the ASPCA is known for their care and adoption of companion animals, like many animal organizations, legal action and lobbying is an important part of their efforts. The website has much more than just information about adoption and “pet” care. According to Similar Web, the ASPCA’s website gets the third highest number of views at 1.9 million, with the average duration of stay being one minute 30 seconds. The average number of pages viewed is slightly higher than for PETA, at 2.06.¹¹⁵ Because the ASPCA’s home page is filled with bright pictures of companion animals, and one of the first things on the page is the Adoption Center, people may go to the site to look for adoptable animals, which could account for the second page viewed. Or people may choose to look at the information listed under “Our Response,” which goes into more detail on how the ASPCA handles animal concerns.

112. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/news/big-wins-animals-2015-check-out-aspcas-top-10-legislative-victories>. Accessed 01/06/16.

113. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/news/top-10-legislative-victories-animals-2014>. Accessed 01/06/16.

114. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/news/top-10-legislative-victories-animals-2014>. Accessed 01/06/16.

115. Similar Web. <https://www.similarweb.com/website/aspc.org>. Accessed 11/12/16.

ASPCA's Range of Concerns

Wildlife are referred to only in policy or position papers because the organization does not have any campaign or other informational pages dedicated to wild animals.¹¹⁶ Because these are seemingly more official documents, the language is rather formal, so sentimentality and anthropomorphism are not very prevalent. The ASPCA's policy and position papers on wildlife range from issues of hunting to zoos and animal sacrifice. Some examples of their policies include the fact that they view wildlife and its management as a domain of government agencies and agree with current policies regarding the animals.¹¹⁷ The ASPCA is opposed to "sport" hunting and would prefer nonlethal methods of control, but it does agree with lethal wildlife management when "animal and human interests collide," although there is no specific detail about what exactly constitutes such conflicts.¹¹⁸ The ASPCA's policy on zoos and aquariums is that zoos and aquariums are appropriate under strict conditions. These facilities and attractions should be accredited by the Zoos and Aquariums Association and should maintain proper social groupings for the animals and provide "mental stimulation" for all animals in captivity.¹¹⁹

116. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-policy-and-position-statements>. Accessed 01/17/16.

117. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-policy-and-position-statements/wild-animals-general-considerations>. Accessed 09/29/14.

118. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-policy-and-position-statements/hunting>. Accessed 06/16/15.

119. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-policy-and-position-statements/position-statement-on-zoos-and-aquariums>. Accessed 06/16/15.

Farm Animals

“Farm animal cruelty” is a major emphasis for the ASPCA. They introduce the issue by asking the reader/viewer, “What is a Factory Farm?”¹²⁰ The organization elaborates, saying that the majority (99%) of animals consumed as food are sourced from industrial farms. Several pictures in the sections on farm animal cruelty show poor conditions and maltreatment of animals in factory farms, such as chickens crowded together, a cow that looks “sad” and is dirty, and lines of cattle in pens.¹²¹ These pictures attempt to encapsulate the gravity of the situation for animals within industrial farming. A significant value for the context of farm animals is “human health.” The organization repeats many times that industrial factory farms are not only terrible for the animals’ welfare but that it also has an adverse effect on humans who consume the animals. For example, the large doses of antibiotics fed to animals, ostensibly to keep them healthy and combat dangerous bacteria such as *E. Coli*, contribute to antibiotic-resistant bacteria that have harmful consequences for humans and animals alike.¹²²

Some pages deal with individual animal species: pigs, cows, and chickens. “Pigs on Factory Farms”¹²³ shows the reader/viewer a virtual look at what sows experience in gestation crates. The page attempts to destabilize the inhumane treatment of pigs by describing in vivid detail how pigs on factory farms live their lives. The “Cows on

120. ASPCA. <https://www.aspca.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty/what-factory-farm>. Accessed 06/17/15.

121. ASPCA. <http://www.aspca.org/animal-cruelty/farm-animal-welfare/animals-factory-farms#Pigs>. Accessed 09/23/16.

122. ASPCA. <http://www.aspca.org/animal-cruelty/farm-animal-welfare>. Accessed 09/23/16.

123. ASPCA. <https://www.aspca.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty/pigs-factory-farms>. Accessed 06/17/15.

Factory Farms”¹²⁴ page shows hundreds of cows on a large feedlot and details the conditions of cows raised for both meat and dairy. One way to illustrate the treatment of cows is to compare the lifespan of a cow on a factory farm with that of a “normal” cow.

Chickens are the main farm animal concern for the ASPCA. Currently, the organization is running a major campaign, “The Truth About Chicken.”¹²⁵ Because the group has a large public presence, their championing of chicken welfare reaches an audience that might not visit the website of an animal rights group. The ASPCA argues that the reason they are concentrating so much effort on chickens is because “All birds—egg-laying hens, meat chickens, turkeys, ducks, geese and others—are excluded from all federal animal protection laws. By the numbers, these are the animals most urgently in need of protection.”¹²⁶ The main problem the ASPCA is tackling with chickens is the rate at which they are bred to grow on today’s factory farms, as opposed to less industrial farms in the past, which they call “selective breeding.”¹²⁷ The ASPCA advocates for slower-growth chickens that are healthier for humans and for the animals so that their bodies are less taxed. The Truth About Chicken campaign is more visually arresting than their other informational pages about chickens and other farm animals. A large, breast-heavy, dirty chicken stoops—seemingly unable to stand upright—contrasting with a classic picture of a smaller and brighter white chicken standing upright. These images

124. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty/cows-factory-farms>. Accessed 06/17/15.

125. ASPCA. <http://truthaboutchicken.org>. Accessed 06/19/15.

126. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/animal-cruelty/farm-animal-welfare/animals-factory-farms#Pigs>. Accessed 09/23/16.

127. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty/growing-problem-selective-breeding-chicken-industry>. Accessed 06/19/15.

effectively illustrate the demonstrable difference between traditionally raised and industrially raised chickens.¹²⁸

The group cites the desire for consumers to have a better product with greater welfare for both human and animal, and not just for the reasons of human health but also for the animals' well-being. One part of the campaign page asks the reader/viewer to fill out a form letter to petition grocery stores to carry higher-welfare chickens and explains in a couple of sentences the gist of the information about chickens on factory farms. The reader/viewer can then send the letter to the store of his or her choice. In their annual report for 2014, the ASPCA extolled their Truth About Chicken campaign and noted that "100,000 new advocates added their names on the campaign's website, truthaboutchicken.org."¹²⁹ A major success of the campaign, according to the group, was to press for the defeat of a directive from the USDA to increase the speed of the chicken slaughter lines. They did this in conjunction with worker's rights groups to ensure the safety of the operators.¹³⁰

Diane Beers, in her history of the animal protection movement, mentions that rights groups have influenced welfare groups so that many of the tactics and issues are now used by welfare organizations (2006:201). As part of the campaign, the ASPCA gave a grant to fund an undercover investigation of a chicken producer by the animal rights group, Compassion Over Killing (COK).¹³¹ Cooperation between such a well-known animal welfare organization and an animal rights group presents a formidable

128. ASPCA. <http://truthaboutchicken.org>. Accessed 06/06/16.

129. ASPCA. ASPCA Annual Report 2014 pdf. Accessed 01/06/16.

130. ASPCA. ASPCA Annual Report 2014 pdf. Accessed 01/06/16.

131. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/blog/new-investigation-shows-live-chickens-factory-farm-buried-dead-others-barely-able-stand-living>. Accessed 06/19/15.

challenge for the factory farm industry to maintain their level of secrecy, and it is a direct example of the close work between animal welfare and rights organizations.

Additionally, it shows that these groups have quite a bit in common and that the differences among groups are not always so great. Because of such efforts by animal welfare groups, knowledge about factory farming and the problems therein have begun to reach a much wider audience. The ASPCA's championing of the issues is an excellent way to legitimize the subject of compassion for farmed animals.

Companion Animals

Companion animals and pet adoption are the areas for which the ASPCA is best known. Animal adoption makes up a large part of their website, which offers tips on how a person might choose the right adopted animal(s) and provides information about the processes for adoption through the ASPCA.¹³² The group also provides guidance on how to care for various animals once they are in a person's home.¹³³ Puppy mills are a concern for the ASPCA, and in several states, they have often done rescue work to collect and regulate puppy mills.¹³⁴

The ASPCA addresses the overpopulation crisis, advocating animal adoption from a shelter. Because the organization dedicates much of its efforts to adoption and sheltering, the overpopulation crisis is of particular importance for them. The ASPCA describes the enormous estimates of animals taken into shelters and the comparatively

132. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/adopt/meet-your-match>. Accessed 06/29/15.

133. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/pet-care>. Accessed 06/29/15.

134. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/animal-cruelty/puppy-mills>. Accessed 09/23/16.

small number that are actually adopted out.¹³⁵ Another aspect of the overpopulation crisis they discuss is stray and “community” cats, misunderstandings about the animals and ways to help them. The ASPCA strongly advocates management through trap, neuter, and release (TNR) programs.¹³⁶ The ASPCA’s position on euthanasia¹³⁷ is similar to PETA’s in that they recognize that euthanasia is necessary in some situations, and they advocate for a painless method. They also recognize the “long-term housing of individual dogs and cats in cages without access to exercise or social activities is not an acceptable alternative.”¹³⁸

Frame Analysis

Several illustrations of frame alignment can be found on the ASPCA website. Frame extension is present often in the way the organization combines the problems with farm animals and human health. Like PETA, the ASPCA highlights the harms to human health from factory-farmed meat. Connecting the two issues helps the organization to further tap into people’s concerns about food sourcing and foodborne illnesses.

An important interpretive frame for the animal organizations, including the ASPCA, is cruelty. It is the lens through which the group wants the reader/viewer to regard animals and is the archetypical action that the group seeks to end. In this way,

135. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/animal-homelessness/shelter-intake-and-surrender>. Accessed 09/23/16.

136. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/animal-homelessness/shelter-intake-and-surrender/closer-look-community-cats>. Accessed 09/23/16.

137. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-policy-and-position-statements/position-statement-on-euthanasia>. Accessed 06/24/15.

138. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-policy-and-position-statements/position-statement-euthanasia>. Accessed 09/23/16.

cruelty could be considered value amplification, where a value “presumed basic to prospective constituents but which have not inspired collective action for any number of reasons” (Snow et al. 1986:469). The idea of cruelty to animals in a general sense is something that would be familiar to most people visiting the ASPCA website. By establishing it as their main concern, the ASPCA is further delineating cruelty as a broad category. Cruelty extends to hurtful and dangerous practices visited upon animals, from companion animal abuse and hoarding to the greatly increased growth rates for chickens in industrialized farming. For the ASPCA, the term *cruelty* does not refer to using animals as a mean for human ends, as it does for PETA. It is defined as deliberate and gratuitous callousness and harm to other animals.

Another leading frame is the inverse of cruelty: protection. The term clearly conveys that no matter what species, type, or category, if animals are being treated cruelly, the organization, members, the reader/viewer, and society in general should protect them. Protection is not only the way the ASPCA frames what it does; it is also the response it hopes to elicit from the viewer. Protection, in the sense of ending cruelty to animals (by the ASPCA’s standards), is seen the primary task of the organization.

The ASPCA uses belief amplification, in that it applies blame repeatedly to the industries and individuals (in the case of abuse) that treat animals cruelly. With the ASPCA, however, the reader/viewer is not taxed with a high degree of individual responsibility. In the cases of adoption, the reader/viewer is encouraged to only adopt homeless animals or to purchase from reputable breeders.¹³⁹ Encouragement for change is also evident in the ASPCA’s stance on reforming the poultry industry from the way in which they ask reader/viewers to petition grocery stores to carry humanely raised

139. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/animal-cruelty/puppy-mills>. Accessed 09/23/16.

chicken. Rather than the reader/viewer being complicit in the cruelty, overpopulation crisis of companion animals, and the factory farm industry, individuals are urged to change their ways after being made aware of the problem but without blame. Thus the frame transformation for the ASPCA is muted; they advocate a gradual, minimal change, particularly in terms of eating habits, and the ASPCA does not officially promote veganism or vegetarianism.

Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality on the ASPCA Website

Most pages in the farm animal sections on the ASPCA's site use sentimentality. They describe chickens as "intelligent, with complex cognitive and social capabilities." They mention that pigs are one of the only animals in the United States that is both kept as a companion species and also raised for food. One significant example of both sentimentality and anthropomorphism is on the organization's Truth About Chicken site: a video features a cartoon chicken who is a professor, dressed with a monocle, suit, and bowtie. The title of the video is "Words from the Professor."¹⁴⁰ The chicken professor explains the fast growth of chickens. Commenting about factory farms, he says, "Tens of thousands of us are housed here." Sad cartoon chickens are shown at a table eating with forks and plates; the professor says that they are "conditioned to eat around the clock."¹⁴¹ Throughout the video, cartoon chickens have hair on their heads and wear baseball caps. They high five one another when discussing being raised in more humane conditions, and it turns out that the professor is teaching younger chicks about the problems with factory-farmed chickens. The anthropomorphism could not be stronger; the animals in the video

140. ASPCA. <http://truthaboutchicken.org>. Accessed 11/25/16.

141. ASPCA. <http://truthaboutchicken.org>. Accessed 11/25/16.

resemble and behave like humans. Sentimentality is clearly present, and the intent is for the viewer to be drawn to identify with the plight of the chickens through the anthropomorphism presented.

Another sentimental appeal, for example, is to provide the mortality and life spans of pigs, cows, and chickens; these are discussed on each of the respective pages. Pigs can live up to 15 years, but industrial farms slaughter them as young as 6 months.¹⁴² Cows can live nearly 25 years but are killed for their flesh at around the age of 3 years.¹⁴³ Mentioning the death and the shortened lengths of the animals' lives could potentially make the reader/viewer pause and think introspectively about what it might be like if humans were killed after a few years or even weeks or months.

Lori Gruen argues that the death of animals, whose life spans are much shorter than they would be because of practices like those being tackled by animal organizations, makes their lives unimportant and unintelligible (2014:136). She contends that in our society, it is extremely difficult to attend to such aspects of animals' lives and deaths. Gruen suggests that countering the practices that make animals' lives worthless by developing ways to mourn their losses is a way to face their deaths and create more meaningful relationships with animals (137). Culturally, it is considered a tragedy in the United States when humans die young. Making the reader/viewer aware of how young the farm animals are when they are slaughtered is a way to connect humans to other animals.

142. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty/pigs-factory-farms>. Accessed 06/25/15

143. ASPCA. <https://www.aspc.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty/cows-factory-farms>. Accessed 06/25/15

When looking at the wildlife issues addressed, the ASPCA does not use anthropomorphism and sentimentality as strongly as they do with companion species. The organization sees a distinct line separating humans and animals; none of the wildlife position papers and policy statements tries to compare animals and humans. The organization believes that the death of animals is tolerable in many circumstances, although every attempt should be made to avoid it. They do place the value of humans over that of animals, especially in the statement “animal and human interests collide.”¹⁴⁴ It is interesting that they do not provide any further explanation for what “interests colliding” might mean, nor do they offer how to act on such a statement. It is unmistakable that the ASPCA cares for the well-being of all animals and that it seeks to do what is best for them; but ultimately, for the organization, caring for animals should not come at the expense of human interests. When not done capriciously, the ASPCA approves of the use of animals for human benefit. At the same time, it maintains that humans should protect animals; and particularly, in the case of wild animals, it suggests humans should leave them alone as much as possible.

The use of sentimentality is particularly apparent in soliciting donations. This is true of many social organizations, but it is noteworthy in how heavy sentimentality is utilized by the ASPCA. Each of the sections has various advertisements for donating to the organization. Wherever there is a donation solicitation, animals staring out at the reader compete for the reader’s attention. The site uses sidebars to showcase the corresponding animals: cute pigs are pictured to represent farm animals, and puppies depict the companion species set. The pictures may cause a viewer to feel sympathy and

144. ASPCA. <https://www.asPCA.org/about-us/asPCA-policy-and-position-statements/hunting>. Accessed 06/16/15.

even pity for the animal depicted because, combined with the captions provided, it appears as if the specific animal pictured has been experiencing distress.

In most of the pictures, the animal's eyes are a focal point and are portrayed in a way that suggests the animal is sad. For instance, there seem to be similar tactics used by organizations that deal with child hunger, homelessness, and other human welfare issues. At the very least, pictures and captions are designed to encourage some sort of emotional connection between the viewer and the animal depicted, and by extension the ASPCA, because they are the vehicle through which a particular animal is being helped.

A major part of the ASPCA's success has been through avenues other than their website. One of the primary reasons people visit their site is because of the organization's long and often heart-wrenching commercials of sad dogs and cats abused and left to languish, presumably until the ASPCA brings the animals to their shelters or rescues them from disasters and hoarding situations. The group has gathered celebrities to appear and endorse them in commercials, adding to the appeal.¹⁴⁵ The first thing that many people think of when hearing the name of the organization is their television spot. Their advertisements have been a boon to their fundraising, and they specifically reference their commercials when soliciting donations.¹⁴⁶

The ASPCA's television commercials are a prime example of how recognizable the group is outside of their website and of their rhetorical use of sentimentality. Many people come to the website specifically because they saw a commercial on TV that was

145. Stephanie Strom. December 26, 2008, New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/26/us/26charity.html?_r=2. Accessed 09/22/16.

146. ASPCA. https://secure.aspc.org/donate/joinaspc?ms=wb_lpf_homepage-featuredhighlight&initialms=wb_lpf_homepage-featuredhighlight&pcode=N15URLWEB2&lpcode=N15URLWEB1. Accessed 09/23/16.

designed to elicit an immediate “gut reaction,” so the person instantly feels bad for the animals and is prompted to help. The moral emotions involved are anger at the people abusing, hoarding, or neglecting an animal and compassion enough to want to help them; this is another excellent illustration of moral batteries combining positive and negative emotions (Jasper 2011). Interestingly, their commercials deal almost exclusively with companion animals, never with farmed animals or wildlife. Schmitt and Clark argue that sympathy as an emotional gift has its limits. Asking for too much sympathy and for too long a period can affect sympathizers’ “sympathy margins” (2007:478). The emotional intensity of the commercials points to the idea that our society is presented with increasing numbers of people with plights, with stories of disasters, crime, abuse, and so on. The media fights “sympathy fatigue” by making accounts more and more dramatic (487). The ASPCA commercials dramatically pull at the viewer’s sympathy, enjoining them to make a donation and/or to visit the website, and this tactic has been very effective for the organization.

Since I began my research and writing, the ASPCA website layout and information have changed. Particularly, the information on farm animal cruelty has been truncated and is presented slightly differently. Therefore I have used both the URLs and information from my original research along with some from their newer web design.

Conclusion

Surprisingly, PETA and the ASPCA, who at first glance seem to be at very different poles in terms of their tactics and message, actually have much in common. A consequence of this is that I have spent time and analysis detailing portions of each

website and to offer a more general survey and observations of the website as a whole. I have concentrated on PETA's "Issues" section, where it is broken down into the various causes about animals that the organization discusses. On the ASPCA's website, I looked at similar areas that were more spread out, such as the policies and positions of the "About Us" section and issues within the "Fight Cruelty" section. I have done this in order to be able to compare and contrast equivalent messages as much as possible.

As I have shown, a large amount of the information presented by each group is very much the same. Both groups oppose sport hunting and have similar positions on "canned" hunting. The depiction of the realities concerning factory farms is the same, but their solutions are different. Each of the organizations has similar positions about euthanasia and feral cats; however, their beliefs about no-kill shelters and breeders differ a bit, and not surprisingly given their philosophical positions: PETA is adamantly opposed to both, whereas the ASPCA believes that "communities" of no-kill groups are a positive feature as opposed to single shelters.¹⁴⁷ The ASPCA strongly supports spay/neuter programs and the adoption of homeless animals, as does PETA. Thus their positions and promoted solutions for the companion animal overpopulation are analogous.

The way in which these organizations use framing is also comparable. As mentioned earlier, the connections PETA makes between meat eating, human health, and the environment is a successful use of frame extension. The ASPCA also makes the connection between industrial farms, human health, and the environment. The human health direction is more prominent in the ASPCA's treatment, whereas the environmental

147. ASPCA. <https://www.asPCA.org/about-us/asPCA-policy-and-position-statements/no-kill-community-coalitions>. Accessed 06/25/15.

angle is more direct with PETA. The current iteration of the ASPCA's discussion of these three interconnections is a short paragraph about each; the environment section is only two sentences long. PETA's information about all three is more visually striking and takes up separate pages. Arguments about human health and the environment are popular justifications for veganism, even without an animal rights stance; therefore the fact that the ASPCA makes the connection might be more effective than PETA's presentation, given the ASPCA's audience may be less likely to recognize the link.

Belief amplification is a part of the frame alignment that attempts to reiterate an organization's stances, goals, and values; it corresponds in each of the groups. One of the common belief amplifications identified by Snow et al. is belief about causality or blame (1986:470). Both PETA and the ASPCA utilize this amplification extensively. With regard to factory farming and companion animal overpopulation, significant blame is placed upon the industries that perpetuate these activities. The industries are blamed for their monetary greed as a reason the cruelties toward farm animals are continued. The blame for animal cruelty and overpopulation seems to be placed on individuals who are careless or abusive, as well as—in PETA's words—the “pet trade” industry. Another frequent belief amplification common to both groups comprises “beliefs about the necessity or propriety of ‘standing up’” and “beliefs about the probability of change or the efficacy of action” (470). Indeed, change and “standing up” (action) are goals of both groups and of social movements in general.

A further tactical similarity between the two groups, which is interesting from a sociological standpoint, is how much the individual is called on to adjust. As was just mentioned, much of the blame is placed on larger social entities, such as industries,

businesses, governments, and stores. Yet subtle and not so subtle hints suggest liability of the individual reader/viewer. As was discussed with PETA, they use “we” language frequently to reference how humans’ daily habits might cause animals harm. The “we” language helps to build solidarity among adherents, and both PETA and the ASPCA hope to build a committed base—affirmations of what Tilly calls “WUNC: worthy, unified, numerous, and committed” (2002:12). But, ultimately, although it seems that larger entities are to blame, the reader/viewer is charged with the responsibility to make changes in daily habits and practices in order to save animals from suffering. For the ASPCA, this may mean signing a pledge to only acquire companion animals by adoption or committing to purchase only “humanely raised” chicken. For PETA, the reader/viewer is encouraged toward a more drastic transformation: becoming vegan and removing animals from not only the diet but from other aspects of life.

When it comes to the ultimate goals for change, differences between the two groups are quite evident. The ASPCA urges changing individual consumer habits and promotes citizen advocacy for reform as a way to achieve the eventual diminishment of suffering of animals in factory farming, but it does not go so far as to advocate ceasing to use animal products. For PETA, the individual reader/viewer is responsible for making sure that they are “living in harmony with wildlife.” The organization provides a multitude of advice on how to deal with urban/suburban wildlife that might enter a residence.

The similarities that the organizations share concerning anthropomorphism is mostly concentrated on farm animals. The groups present similar information, and a

strong vein of anthropomorphism is present in their treatment of the animals. Both groups compare farm animals to dogs and discuss the intelligence of pigs and chickens.

It is possible that farm animals require the most anthropomorphizing because humans experience the greatest cognitive dissonance or create the “absent referent” for these animals (Adams 2010:13). In *The Sexual Politics of Meat*, Carol Adams explains that the animals that people eat are never referred to as the individual or species that they actually are: cows become “beef,” and pigs become “pork” and “bacon.” Referring to the animals by something other than what they are makes them “absent referents;” their actual bodies and individuality are removed from the language. A consequence of the absent referent is a disavowal of the lives, pain, and death that occurred to make the animals into consumable goods. Animals are absent referents in three ways: in the literal sense, they are absent in that they are dead; the second way they are made absent is “definitional,” as with the name changing discussed above, “so we do not conjure dead, butchered animals but cuisine” (2010:66). Lastly, metaphorically, “the original meaning of animals’ fates is absorbed into a human-centered hierarchy” (67). Whereas wildlife, for most people, are the most separated physically from everyday life, the animals that we eat are transformed in a myriad of ways so that they become something else entirely in the minds of many. The idea of the absent referent could also be another reason why both groups compare several kinds of animals to dogs and cats. Companion species are the closest animals with which the majority of people in the United States come into contact. Eileen Crist notes that language has consequences for a person’s “perceptual and affective experience” (2000:208). She describes reading about the experience of a wasp hunting, wherein the wasp is compared to a dog that is digging at a rabbit hole; “The

effect of superimposing the familiar image of a dog digging for a rabbit is to deliver the wasp's activity as irreducibly intentional" (208). Comparing animals that are more distant with those in proximity to the individual is a reminder that the animals that might share one's home profoundly resemble those that we ingest or kill for sport and those whose habitats we destroy.

When examining the sentimentality of the websites, both organizations use moral emotions and the combination of a negative and positive emotion, Jasper's "moral batteries" (2011:147). Very often, it seems that the reader/viewer is asked to feel sympathy and sadness, and at the same time, the reader/viewer is to feel anger or outrage toward the industry or individual perpetuating suffering. Elsewhere, Jasper explains that emotions such as anger and outrage are more fleeting "reactive" emotions, whereas emotions of love, compassion, and empathy are more lasting "moods" that may or may not have a specific object (1998:402). The "reactive" emotions that might bring someone into agreeing with a movement, such as the outrage toward factory farms, can also be what make a person stay with a social movement (Jasper 1998:407). As mentioned above, PETA tells the reader/viewer from the outset of the Issues section that her or she is a compassionate person. The hope is that the combination of sentimentality, an emotion that Jasper argues is lasting, and the anger a person might feel toward those that the organizations say are to blame will cause the reader/viewer to take on some of the individual responsibility for the type of change the organizations are seeking.

Although some similarities exist in the information and strategies that each organization presents, obvious differences between the two groups are apparent. A most striking variation is noticeable as soon as the website opens. PETA's homepage is busy

with an abundance pictures, videos, celebrities, and multiple features that can be clicked on and viewed further. Most pages have related pages where a person can click on similar topics. Several navigation options are available for finding the information contained within the site. Further, there are separate sites for teens (peta2) and older individuals (peta prime). A lot happening on PETA's homepage and on the website as a whole. The ASPCA's website is more streamlined, containing less color, fewer images (albeit images are generally larger) and videos, and fewer options for initial navigation. The pictures presented on the homepage are mostly of companion animals and animals for adoption, with cute faces that fairly plead with the reader/viewer.

Another main difference is in the anthropomorphism of wildlife. PETA makes wildlife much more of a priority than the ASPCA does. Additionally, because PETA puts its focus on changing views of animals regarded as pests, it makes significant use of anthropomorphism toward them. Because the ASPCA's treatment of wildlife is mainly in position and policy papers, not as much anthropomorphism is apparent in presentations of those animals. Differences are also evident in some of the long-term goals. For example, PETA strongly emphasizes veganism and a "no-birth nation" for companion species. The ASPCA, on the other hand, emphasizes gradual consumer changes where factory farming and individual eating habits are concerned. The organization also desires to keep companion species in the world, and it is a major facet of their work. PETA's idea of a "no-birth nation" could lead to the conclusion that ultimately, the group wants to eradicate those animals. Essentially, a large amount of the information and facts and many of the tactics are alike. Each group has used anthropomorphism and sentimentality to get its message across.

The information presented by PETA and the ASPCA comes in the form of “rhetorical stories,” as they set up a particular relationship between the reader/viewer, the organization, and the diagnostic and prognostic framing of their arguments (Tilly 2006:73). Tilly argues that “stories provide simplified cause-effect accounts of puzzling, unexpected, problematic, or exemplary events” (64). Narratives are especially helpful for “assignments of responsibility” than are other types of rhetoric (65). The moral of PETA’s and the ASPCA’s story is that animals are being treated inappropriately and cruelty is unacceptable, and the prognostic result is that the reader/viewer should change. According to Jones and Song, stories are helpful to the reader, particularly in developing heroes and villains, and this indirectly impacts how convincing a story becomes (2014:662). They further argue that the purpose of narrative control by “governments and other powerful political actors”—in this case, animal organizations—is to influence public policy (660). PETA and the ASPCA need stories because they are extremely invested in changing society’s relationships with animals. These and other organizations create heroes and villains by placing blame for the plight of animals on both a distant outsider (i.e., industries and businesses) and the individual reader/viewer. Having heroes to admire and villains to blame helps to influence the person to take up the cause. It would be a mistake to take the stories at face value because it is easy to “slip into interpreting new social situations as if standard stories adequately represented their causal structures” (Tilly 2002:28). Stories streamline the issues, actors, and situation into understandable bits of information, when often the scenario is more nuanced than any particular telling (Tilly 2006:65). This is especially true in the way that the groups utilize anthropomorphism and sentimentality to enhance their stories and information.

The ASPCA and PETA use anthropomorphism and sentimentality as a rhetorical device to garner particular emotions at the “gut level.” The groups obviously understand the concepts rhetorical force; perhaps it is time for them to develop a different ethical outlook that focuses on emotion, sympathy, and connection similar to the care ethics Donovan, Gruen, and Gaard have advanced. Doing so will develop a fuller understanding of compassion, care, and welfare that all groups purport to advance. Sentimentalism as a moral theory places the weight of morality on feelings of sympathy and empathy. I argue that Donovan’s and Gheaus’s idea of “moral imagination,” which asks the individual to listen and imagine what an animal might really want, provides ways in which the groups can expand their use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality. PETA and the ASPCA are successful in terms of membership and the wide audience that they reach, and they have lobbied for certain legal changes; however, the definitive, concrete realities of animals has changed little.

In the next chapter, I will look specifically at religious organizations that have used their traditions to advance the cause of animal rights. These groups will use many of the tactics, including anthropomorphism and sentimentality, in ways similar to how PETA has used them. For these religious organizations, the moral grounding and the weight of their convictions about animals are based on religious justifications, which perform a different function in the movement.

CHAPTER 4

“UNCONDITIONAL LOVE AND COMPASSION”¹⁴⁸: CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH COMPASSION FOR ANIMALS: ALL-CREATURES.ORG AND JEWISH VEG

I chose All-Creatures and Jewish Veg because they represent two prominent religions that have a generally a negative legacy regarding their views of animals. All-Creatures is different from the other organizations in my dissertation because they are a website hosted by a foundation, rather than a full-fledged organization with membership. Yet All-Creatures exhibits many key hallmarks of animal rights activists, and it proffers traditional Christian themes. Jewish Veg is a well-known group within the religious movement for animals. They are also one of the major Jewish organizations in the sphere. Because of their associations, they represent quintessential Jewish arguments for animals. In this chapter, I will look more closely at the Christian and Jewish traditions and their theology regarding animals. This will include how each tradition holds promise for animal advocacy. I will discuss each organization in turn, describing the history and tactics concerning animal protection. Finally, I will examine how each organization uses anthropomorphism and sentimentality when presenting animals in their websites.

Stephen Webb, in his book *On God and Dogs* (1998), defines two strategies available for theologians who desire to include animals into religious interpretation. One strategy is to revisit the scriptures with an eye toward animal advocacy. The other strategy is to adopt the theoretical position of animal protection and incorporate this into one's theology (17). The organizations in this chapter, All-Creatures and Jewish Veg,

148. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org>. Accessed 10/09/16.

utilize both approaches. Ideologically they lean toward animal rights using biblical scriptures, stories, and other theological arguments. All-Creatures uses examples from scripture to explore the terribleness of animal exploitation by showing how scripture is against whatever abuse they are discussing. For instance, on a page about cattle, the website remarks that the reason factory farming exists is because the farmers want money, and people who eat veal get it for cheap. The page states, “This is why the Bible tells us that the love of money is the root of all sorts of evil (1 Timothy 6:10).”¹⁴⁹ Jewish Veg cites Leviticus 11 as proof that “God wanted to make it difficult for us to eat meat in hopes that we wouldn’t eat much of it.”¹⁵⁰ Leviticus 11 is a chapter in the Hebrew Bible that gives details on clean and unclean foods. What makes these groups different than the religious departments of secular organizations like PETA and HSUS is that they seek an almost exclusively religious audience. Both groups establish justifications for why Jewish or Christian followers should be compassionate toward animals.

The Hebrew Scriptures

Christianity and Judaism share the scriptural foundation of the Hebrew Scriptures, which does not portray a completely consistent stance on animals or kindness toward animals. There is a strong sense in the Hebrew Scriptures that humans are superior to animals (Waldau 2002:170), and this idea is seen from the first book of the Bible, in Genesis 1:26 (discussed in more detail below). Paul Waldau argues that animals were viewed as categorically different from humans, despite the fact that they shared a

149. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/cattle.html>. Accessed 10/01/16.

150. Jewish Veg. <https://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg/genesis-93---permission-eat-meat>. Accessed 10/01/16.

“creaturely” quality in the sense of a *nephesh*, meaning soul (170). Additionally, Katherine Willis Perlo suggests that the agrarian culture at that time clearly favored domestic animals and showed a fear regarding wild animals. Wild animals were feared because domestic animals were valuable to the economy, and wild animals endangered the lives of domestic animals and therefore to the economy (2009:32).

Creation stories are a focal point when discussing Christianity, Judaism, and animals. Whitney Bauman argues that the idea of “creation ex nihilo,” creation out of nothing, at the beginning of the creation story in Genesis is a result of humans wanting order in what was otherwise a chaotic world (2009:16). Bauman maintains that monotheism was able to create a “metaphoric feedback loop between humans, God, and the world. What could better ensure that chaos would be ordered and life would prevail than a monotheistic God over all creation?” (16). The God in the creation story was all powerful and could save humans from the forces of nature. The idea that humans were created in the image of an all-powerful God placed humanity at the center of creation, unlike other creation narratives, such as the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* (19). Bauman argues that “this moves humans, made in the image of this God, at least one step away from association with the forces of the natural world and toward the transcendent and omnipotent (which depends on the transcendent) space above the rest of the natural world” (19). The move to elevate humans over the rest of creation begins what Bauman argues is a “logic of domination,” where humans see themselves as outside of a context and thus are able to act entirely anthropocentrically and without the interconnectedness to the rest of the world (4).

Rendsburg argues that the book of Genesis contains two separate creation accounts, one that is highly anthropocentric and a one that favors the earth and animals (2005:320). The tension begins with the dominion passage in Genesis 1:26-1:28, which can be seen as more anthropocentric. The story in Genesis 1 focuses on the things of “earth and heaven” such as seas, sun, moon, and land. The ordering of creation is significant, for example, all the waters, plants, and animals were created before humans. In some rabbinic interpretation, this means that all were more important than humans and that humans are insufficient without the rest of creation. In the second story, found in Genesis 2, the order has been reversed: the man is created before vegetation and animals, yet it is said that the man was created from the “dust of the ground” (Genesis 1:7 NRSV). In this account, woman is created last, after the animals. Again, however, a central message can be that humans are insufficient in and of themselves. Genesis 1:29-30 has been interpreted as an outline for a “vegetarian utopia;” God tells the humans that they are to eat whatever plants are in the garden of Eden. In Genesis 2:15-16, Adam is told to cultivate the Earth and eat from any tree in the garden. Rendsburg argues that a common element in both creation stories is that God creates a world that is vegetarian (2005:321). He maintains further that the discourse on vegetarianism is the “longest speech by God in the first creation story. It is as if a movie camera focuses for a moment on this aspect of the narrative” (322).

Claus Westermann, who taught at the University of Heidelberg, is a well-known Hebrew Bible scholar and was an expert on Genesis interpretation (Scullion1984:ix). In his commentary on Genesis 1-11, he remarks that Genesis 1:26, where humans are said to be made in God’s image, refers not to the essence of humanity as it has been

theologically interpreted. Rather, being created in God's image has specifically to do with the act of creation (Westermann 1984:156). This has significance in regard to the hierarchy of humans and animals as well as to considerations of animal worth and their "sameness" to humans. Westermann's interpretation indicates that the uniqueness of humanity does not have anything to do with the nature of human beings but with a particular relationship with the Divine (158). He argues that Genesis 1:26 and the story of human creation may have been part of an independent narrative. The character of an independent story of human creation in Genesis, with its idea of creation in the "image and likeness" of God, is in line with Sumerian and Babylonian creation stories (157). Further, Westermann interprets "dominion" in the next part of Genesis 1:26 as using language that is a remnant of "Ancient Near East royal ideology," but it departs from its similarity with Sumerian and Babylonian texts because it refers to humans' goal as "being in this world" rather than at the service of the gods. The idea of dominion denotes being in the world because it introduces the idea of a hierarchy of beings (159).

Westermann argues that a definite hierarchy exists between humans and animals but that in order to understand that dominion and hierarchy, Genesis 1:26 should be read in light of Genesis 1:29, in which plants are given as food provisions for both humans and animals (159). He contends that with this, the idea of dominion does not mean killing them for food. Neither does it mean that animals are to be exploited by humans; to do so would violate the royal background of the word. He suggests that the royal language connotes a relationship that does not include exploitation (158). Westermann maintains that "humans would forfeit their kingly role among the living (that is what *rdh* refers to) were the animals to be made the object of their whim" (159).

Norman Habel, author of the Earth Bible series, argues that the apparent royal language does not weaken the idea of hierarchical dominion (2011:39). The power over creatures that humans are given in Genesis 1:26 is taken further in verse 28, in which humans are told to “subdue” the Earth. Habel remarks that this is a “heavy-handed control” (40). Genesis 1:26-28 is a departure from the rest of the creation story, where the Earth is a partner in creation with God. In these verses, humans are given control, and the Earth is a victim of humans’ domination (40).

In another recent commentary on Genesis, biblical scholars Martin Kessler and Karel Deurloo place a greater emphasis on the “likeness” mentioned in Genesis 1:26, stating that the rest of creation is repeatedly described as “after his kind,” but that humans were “uniquely God’s creature.” (2004:29). In addition, the authors see the uniqueness of humans in Genesis 1:27 as well, remarking that “the human is the only living creature who is directly addressed” (33). Dominion in 1:26 is taken for granted by Kessler and Deurloo, and they are leery of the idea of it being royal language. They argue that a human being created in the image of God means that they “represent God by his dominion over the earth, as *dominus terrae* (lord of the Earth)” (30).

Zvi Adar, an Education professor at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, writes in his commentary on Genesis that verses 1:26-28 mean that humans are the pinnacles of creation. Adar is adamant that humans are the most important aspect of creation, which is marked by the fact that the word “image” is used three times in these verses. Further, the mandate to “replenish the earth and subdue it” (1990:18) shows that humans are central. Humans are set apart from the rest of creation because there is a “divine element into

man” (18). Adar does not make any mention of Genesis 1:29, where humans and animals are told to eat plants.

Finally, the famous Jewish scholar Rashi (1040-1105 CE) wrote several commentaries on the Pentateuch and parts of the Mishnah and the Talmud. In regard to Genesis, he writes that the idea of being created in the image means that the moral and spiritual attributes of the “Almighty” are replicated in humans (1928:41). Rashi remarks on Genesis 1:29, that “Man, originally equal to living creatures and animals, all were to eat the grass of the field” (42). He ties this directly to the flood narrative in Genesis 9, where God grants humans permission to eat animals, “but when Noah and his children came into the world, the Almighty allowed them the consumption of flesh” (43). The commentaries described above represent a range of interpretations of the creation story in Genesis that operate in biblical studies.

In the early chapters of Genesis, animals were used for other purposes than as food by humans. For instance, in Genesis 4, Cain and Abel present sacrifices to God, Cain’s is a sacrifice of vegetables, and Abel’s is of the “firstlings of his flock” (NRSV). According to the story, God did not accept Cain’s offering but did accept Abel’s animal sacrifice. However, it is in Chapter 9, after the flood, where humans are granted permission to eat animal flesh. Genesis 9:3 states, “Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you; and just as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything” (NRSV). The passages of Genesis 1:26-28 and Genesis 9 are the places that define the parameters of meat-eating in the Hebrew Scriptures. As will be shown later, both Jewish scholars and Jewish Veg use these scriptures as the starting point for discussing Jewish vegetarianism.

In many other places in the Hebrew Scriptures, animals are seen in a positive light and are used by humans.

One of the most striking places that animals appear is in the book of Job. David J.A. Clines, emeritus professor of biblical studies at the University of Sheffield, observes that “animals have a major significance in the poet’s view of Yhwh’s design for the universe” (2013:101). Most of the discussion of animals in Job comes directly from the Divine’s speech. The animals in the book are all wild animals, free from use by humans. Clines notes that the one animal that is domesticated, the war horse, is described repeatedly as being an “independent agent” (102). In fact, the author of Job focuses heavily on individual animals and makes them independent. They are free to do what they want, with freedom from responsibility and acting with agency (105; 106). Clines says that the animals in the divine speeches of Job “remain even in our modern world a notable challenge to our assumptions about humans and their place in the universal order” (113).

The “peaceable kingdom” passage in Isaiah 11:6-9 is another segment of the Hebrew Bible that has potentially positive connotations for humans and other animals. The text presents a future vision of a world where humans and other animals live in peace together. This vision implies a vegetarian future; it harkens back to the ideal mentioned in early Genesis, where it says that God gave the man and woman plants, vegetation, and seeds to eat. The passage states:

The wolf shall live with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall graze, their young shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. The nursing child shall play by the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put its hand on the adder’s den. They will not hurt or

destroy on all my holy mountain; for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. (Isaiah 11:6-9 NRSV)

The passage is used as one of the most common rationales for a religious vegetarianism and animal welfare/rights in Christianity and Judaism. Yet, well-known scholar of animals and religion, Paul Waldau, interprets the passage differently. Rather than signaling a peaceable vegetarian future, he asserts that although it seems that the passage sets up a peaceable kingdom, it actually reinforces human superiority in that “a little child shall lead them” (2002:207). The animals that are represented juxtapose domestic animals and wildlife. Domestic animals were believed to be property under the ownership of humans. Waldau argues, “The interests here are *all* human interests, and the perspective of the ideal world is an ideal human world...the thrust of the passage is *humans’* peace with the nonhuman world and *not necessarily* generalized peace among all living things” (207). The Hebrew Scriptures presents a complex attitude toward animals; it forms the foundation for an understanding of animals in both Christianity and Judaism. Attitudes toward animals in Jewish thought and tradition are detailed before the section on Jewish Veg.

Christianity

Christianity developed as a spinoff of Judaism and as such took many understandings about animals from it, but Christianity changed attitudes toward animals from their Jewish counterparts in many ways. For example, Jewish perspectives on animals were guided by kosher/*kashrut* dietary laws that regulated how and what types of animals were allowed to be eaten (Gilhus 2006:164). Ingvild Saelid Gilhus, professor of history of religions at the University of Bergen, observes that Christianity did away with

these laws as a way to separate Christianity from Judaism as a distinct religion. Christians further seceded by distinguishing themselves from pagans because Christians refused to eat sacrificed meat (166). In the New Testament, different genres in the text reflect different views on animals. The gospels generally have animals as a part of the environment, and they play a role in many parables. In Pauline literature, animals are generally viewed in a negative light when mentioned at all. The last book in the New Testament text, Revelation, presents animals as terrific beings that are usually harmful (161). Gilhus explains that animals, in whatever form, “are not present in the New Testament texts for their own sake but because in one way or another—directly or metaphorically—they are being used for human purposes” (181).

Stephen Webb confirms that Christianity has been regarded as irrelevant in many writings on animal rights (1998:28). With its focus on human supremacy, the dismissal of Christianity partly stems from the biblical messages, especially the interpretation of dominion. Yet, within Christian scriptures and history, animals have been viewed with a dual mentality: animals are controlled by humans and are used for humans’ benefit, yet they are also seen as in need of protection. The discussions of Christianity in the second chapter showed this as well (see also Regan 1991). Below, it will be shown that some Jewish arguments for animal welfare have a similar twofold view of animals. Webb argues that there is a “vision” in the Bible that exhibits how “humans can have authority over animals within the context of mutuality and interdependence” (28). Early theologians such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Origen contributed to an anthropocentric understanding of animals in the earliest years of Christian theological development

(Waldau 2002:179). A number of medieval saints, theologians, and mystics used animals in stories and saw them as a source of inspiration.

Animals were a more frequent presence in these stories than in the New Testament (Hobgood-Oster 2008:17). A telling shift happened with medieval saints who viewed animals in a number of favorable ways. Laura Hobgood-Oster observes that there are many less publicized stories that involve animals extensively in the lives of saints and narratives of Christian martyrs (64). She categorizes these animal stories into three modes: First, animals are presented as examples of piety; one illustration is found in accounts of St. Francis, who became the paragon saint for animals, where animals are able to recognize the saint's preaching and "are capable of responding to it." Animals are portrayed as possessing religious sensibilities and the ability to believe in God (68). In other saint stories, animals become sources of revelation and are rendered as saints and martyrs themselves. Finally, animals are represented as "messengers of the divine to human beings" (69). For instance, Hobgood-Oster recounts the story of a spider that follows instructions from God to build a web to protect a bishop from being chased by persecutors (73).

In his commentary on Aristotle's *De Anima*, Aquinas, a primary theologian for Roman Catholicism, considered animals and their relation to humans and rationality. He contends with Aristotle that every living thing has a soul, where the soul is the "principle of life" (Aquinas 1999:139). Plants and non-human animals are included in this, and the "four ways of being alive" are discussed (137). Aquinas distinguishes between complete and incomplete animals, in which all animals possess the sense of touch. The recurring example Aquinas gives of "incomplete animals" is an oyster, which does not have

intellect in the same way as humans. Only “complete” animals have a sense of “local motion,” which is a “phantasia” that necessarily gives way to pain, pleasure, joy, and sorrow (144). Animals act with phantasia because they do not all have intellect. Some animals do have intellect: “beasts” (340) and “a few” animals operate with “prudence” (323). However, in Aquinas’s final estimation, even though all beings—including animals—have souls, animals exist for humans’ use: “Thus it seems that all bodies without souls are the instruments of beings with souls and exist for them, whereas less complete beings with souls exist for more complete beings with souls” (169).

Later Protestant theologians, such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, interpreted animals in ways that were anthropocentric. David Clough, who has written extensively on Christian theology and animals, explains that Luther’s position on animals is at best uncertain (2009:60). Clough observes that Luther “thanks God for the use of them, defines what it means to be human in relation to them, illustrates theological arguments using them, funds allegorical messages in biblical texts concerning them, and very frequently insults his enemies with reference to them” (41). Luther, on the other hand, recognizes human and animal similarities, for instance insisting that God has a relationship with all of creation and citing the story of the flood in Genesis as evidence that God cares about animals (52).

The scientific revolution also followed an anthropocentric course, perhaps peaking with Descartes’ famous assertion that animals were machines who did not pass two tests, they cannot speak or reason thus these were the fundamental differences between humans and animals (Descartes 2004:15). Even though there have been nuanced understandings of animals since his time, “broadly recognized as irrational and

inconsistent,” Descartes’ extreme dualistic teaching continues to justify human domination and exploitation (Kemmerer 2006:226).

Hobgood-Oster also notes that the “ambiguous and precarious position of animals continues in the world of early Protestant theology and ethics” (2008:37). Perlo points out that later in the seventeenth century and after, Protestant ministers and adherents often articulated “pro-animal sentiments,” particularly in England (Perlo 2009:90). John Wesley found that animal welfare was an extension of his soteriology. In his discourses on the Sermon on the Mount, considered Wesley’s comprehensive Christian ethics, Wesley remarks on the unity of creation. He says, “God is in everything and that we are to see the Creator mirrored in everyone. We should use and regard nothing as existing independently of God” (Wesley 2002:87). That God is mirrored in everyone does not only include other humans: “We should view heaven and earth and everything in them as being in the hollow of God’s hand. By his personal presence, he sustains all things and he pervades and guides the entire created order” (87). Additionally, Wesley regarded Christianity as a “social religion,” explaining “the words of Jesus reveal that several of the fundamental aspects of true religion require our involvement with the world” (108). Wesley focused on service to God and neighbor as an expression of free will and a resultant faith.

The emphasis on service and compassion was translated into the antislavery movement in England but expanded to encompass ideas about the welfare and care of animals (Gorman 2007:380). In the United States, New England became a place where animal welfare and protection were a popular subject (Perlo 2009:90). Although there were colonial initiatives against animal cruelty, formal welfare organizations were

formed as early as 1866 in the United States, which followed the pattern of earlier welfare groups in England (Shevelow 2008:5).

Paul Waldau's exploration of more contemporary Catholic teaching, as found in the 1994 Catholic Catechism, reveals a blunt approach to animals, namely that animals are for human use and human interests without any exception. The term "stewardship" in this Catholic Catechism describes the appropriate ways in which humans may use animals: for food, clothing, and experimentation (2002:203). All-Creatures quotes this catechism in detail, showing the stark separation that the statement maintains between humans and other animals:

God entrusted animals to the stewardship of those whom he created in his own image. Hence it is legitimate to use animals for food and clothing. They may be domesticated to help man in his work and leisure. Medical and scientific experimentation on animals is a morally acceptable practice if it remains within reasonable limits and contributes to caring for or saving human lives. It is likewise unworthy to spend money on them that should as a priority go to the relief of human misery. One can love animals; one should not direct to them the affection due only to persons.¹⁵¹

A significant contrast to the 1994 Catechism is a new encyclical by the current Pope. In May of 2015, the Vatican released Pope Francis's groundbreaking encyclical that highlighted the critical nature of the environmental crisis and included a discussion of animals—a far cry from the Catechism of two decades earlier.¹⁵² He writes, "In our time, the Church does not simply state that other creatures are completely subordinated to the good of human beings, as if they have no worth in themselves and can be treated as we wish" (Paragraph 69). The Pope argues that the poor treatment of animals, "other

151. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/cspv/godshunters.html>. Accessed 03/29/16.

152. Pope Francis, *Laudato Si'* Encyclical. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html. Accessed 04/06/16.

creatures,” influences how other humans are treated: “The same wretchedness which leads us to mistreat an animal will not be long in showing itself in our relationships with other people” (Paragraph 92). He further states that cruelty toward any creature lacks human dignity and gives an example of how caring about animals enhances a moral human society and not doing so damages it. Crucial for the animal movement and religion, he argues that humans have a disordered understanding of dominion.

The harmony between the Creator, humanity, and creation as a whole was disrupted by our presuming to take the place of God and refusing to acknowledge our creaturely limitations. This in turn distorted our mandate to ‘have dominion’ over the earth (cf. Gen 1:28), to “till it and keep it” (Gen 2:15)” As a result, the originally harmonious relationship between human beings and nature became conflictual (cf. Gen 3:17-19) (Paragraph 66).

Throughout the encyclical, Pope Francis criticizes anthropocentrism and calls for a recognition and emphasis on the interdependence of everything on Earth.

As I have discussed in other chapters, an immense growth has occurred in the field and study of religion and animals. In further evidence of this growth, contemporary theologians are including animals in their theologies and commentaries. For instance, David Clough has incorporated animals into his systematic theology. He argues that to begin with, God’s purpose in creation is not entirely geared toward humans and that all creatures have a place in God’s purpose (2012:25). He is careful to highlight the similarities and differences between humans and other animals: “If...we are prepared to acknowledge what humans have in common with other animal creatures, we are freed to see other animals for what they are, in all their particularity and diversity” (44). Clough’s systematic theology attends to the diversity of animals and the differences between humans (76). It is important theologically, philosophically, and in activism to be deliberate about sameness and difference when speaking and advocating for animals as

well as remembering that “the animal” or “animals” cannot be lumped into a single category that erases their multiplicity. Clough’s is just one example of a recent theology concerning animals.

In her book, *Ask the Beasts* (2014), Theologian Elizabeth Johnson counters the traditional understanding of dominion by developing a “community of creation paradigm” (267). She argues that evolutionary science has firmly indicated that everything on earth is interdependent and argues that the community is grounded in the love of God (268). A theology that is based on interdependence does not dismantle the species barrier but focuses on the whole community so that differences and similarities are recognized (268). The 2009 volume *Creaturely Theology*, edited by Celia Deane-Drummond and David Clough brings together scholars from a variety of disciplines to explore biblical passages with an eye toward the relationship between humans and other animals and God. The collection also explores historical Christian theologians and scholars for their notions of what it means to be human and animal. It tackles the scientific advances in cognitive ethology and the capacities of other animals (267) and also looks at practical considerations into what political advancements and questions around animals are being addressed (268). The works described above, along with Clough’s systematic theology and the Pope’s encyclical, mark a shift in Christian theology. The similarity in these works is surprising, and each recognizes the need for interdependence with attentiveness to difference. Thus throughout the history of Christianity and in contemporary theology, positive and negative portrayals of animals exist for animal organizations to draw upon.

All-Creatures

All-Creatures.org is not so much an organization as it is a website run by the Mary T. and Frank L. Hoffman under the auspices of their Family Foundation. For this reason, I will refer to All-Creatures as the website and not as an organization. I chose them because they are a religious group that concentrates on a broad range of animal issues. It appears that All-Creatures makes up the bulk of the foundation's work. Although they do solicit donations as a nonprofit, indicating the foundation is not their sole support. The foundation has three stated purposes that include stopping animal cruelty, supporting other organizations with the same purpose, and running the All-Creatures website. The expressed mission and information about All-Creatures is "We are dedicated to cruelty-free living through a vegetarian–vegan lifestyle according to Judeo-Christian ethics. Unconditional love and compassion is the foundation of our peaceful means of accomplishing this goal for all of God's creatures, whether human or otherwise."¹⁵³ The All-Creatures website itself is billed as an "Internet Archival Library" for cruelty-free living.¹⁵⁴ The website boasts "90,000 text documents"¹⁵⁵ as well as countless numbers of pictures to support their cause. The All-Creatures vision pays special attention to the Genesis 1:29-30 passage that describes the vegetarian ideal. According to Similar Web, All-Creatures receives 216,000 views per month with an average length of stay 28 seconds. The number of pages viewed is similar to the other

153. All-Creatures.org. <http://www.all-creatures.org>. Accessed 09/29/15.

154. Mary T. and Frank L. Hoffman Family Foundation. <http://www.all-creatures.org/ff/mission.html>. Accessed 09/29/15.

155. All-Creatures.org. <http://www.all-creatures.org>. Accessed 09/29/15.

websites in my study, at 1.43.¹⁵⁶ The short length of stay on the website may mean that on average, people may look through almost two pages and decide to leave the website.

The website consists of an expansive amount of information that ranges from news stories about animals and their exploitation to information geared toward children about animal cruelty. All-Creatures deals with multiple platforms and issues and is similar to PETA in its scope. The group is rights oriented and provides a large amount of information on their interpretation of animal rights. Their motto, proclaimed consistently on the top of each page, states: “Working for a Peaceful World for Humans, Animals, and the Environment.”¹⁵⁷ The All-Creatures website strategically uses imagery to induce an emotional response from the reader/viewer. For example, between the name and the *.org* is a picture of a lamb. The home page displays several pictures of lambs that appear to be smiling and joyful. Sheep have powerful imagery in Christianity, and All-Creatures endeavors to use that as an advantage to draw in their audience.

Their “Animal Exploitation” page is organized as a list of animals in alphabetical order, ranging from bears to whales. Contrasting the cute images of the main page, the exploitation pages highlight a specific animal and portray the particular types of cruelty inflicted on them. The tactic is to present colorful, often shocking photo galleries of animal abuse and cruelty. All-Creatures works against all forms of animal use by humans, from hunting and fishing to the consumption of animal flesh. The website addresses practices that are common in the United States and worldwide, and each photo gallery is accompanied by descriptions and commentary; an example of this is a

156. Similar Web. <https://www.similarweb.com/website/all-creatures.org>. Accessed 11/12/16.

157. All-Creatures.org. <http://www.all-creatures.org>. Accessed 09/29/15.

discussion of the act of obtaining bile from bears, popular in China and thought to be medicinal. In sections that discuss animals that are hunted, such as bison and deer, the reader/viewer finds frame-by-frame video displaying animals being hunted and killed.¹⁵⁸ A page on dogs provides images of dogs raised for meat, stating that it is popular in some Asian countries.¹⁵⁹

On pages that deal with food animals is a feature titled “Wishful Thinking.” This section describes the myths about the condition of animals raised for food. For instance, on the page about chickens, the “Wishful Thinking” photos are of chickens roaming around outside a barn and building nests.¹⁶⁰ The “Reality” section follows, wherein All-Creatures shows animals in distressed and harsh conditions, thus dispelling the notion of wishful thinking. While the reader/viewer visits the site, All-Creatures provides a running counter that tallies the number of animals killed by various industries.”¹⁶¹

Frame Analysis

The identification of “culpable agents,” the root of the problem, and blame are essential for core framing tasks, in which social movement organizations seek to identify a problem and create “directed action” (Benford and Snow 2000:616). Belief amplification that focuses on blame is one of the primary ways that All-Creatures addresses issues, although blame is not an exclusively Christian notion. Calling people and industries “evil” is a common refrain they use to assign blame. Blame is a part of

158. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/bear.html>. Accessed 10/06/15.

159. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/dog.html>. Accessed 10/06/15.

160. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/chicken.html>. Accessed 09/30/15.

161. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/chicken.html>. Accessed 09/30/15.

diagnostic framing that pinpoints a problem that needs clarification (Benford and Snow 2000:616; Snow et al. 1986:470). All-Creatures faults the industries, as seen in the example of the kill counter. Additionally, the group blames the reader/viewer by association.¹⁶² For example, when discussing turkey production, All-Creatures states that “everyone who buys their products contributes to their suffering.”¹⁶³ Another instance, they state in their commentary on *foie gras*, “Every person who eats foie gras is just as “guilty” of the torture of these defenseless ducks and geese as if they personally rammed the food down their throats.”¹⁶⁴ When organizations produce blame and name responsibility or agency for wrongdoing, they are seeking justice (Tilly 2008:41).

Each of the organizations in this study places blame in a number of areas. All-Creatures’ language is more accusatory than other groups. For example, when discussing a picture of deer hunting, they question the truthfulness of hunters in general: “The men stand around watching the deer slowly die. Before the killing began, the men were reported to have said that the killing was quick. So much for the truth of of hunter/killers!”¹⁶⁵ A prominent feature of social life is assigning credit and blame, which looks differently depending on cultural factors. In the United States, credit and blame are frequently dealt with in courts between victims and perpetrators or those who are perceived at fault (2008:92). The legal aspect of determining blame and reparations is important for many animal organizations because using blame is how groups garner support, try to create change, and repair what has been done to animals.

162. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/cattle.html>. Accessed 04/14/16.

163. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/turkey.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

164. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/duck.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

165. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/deer.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

Perhaps the reason blame is such a feature of All-Creatures is because they do not have the massive lobbying capacity of other groups. Whereas the larger, more recognizable groups like PETA and the ASPCA spend a significant amount of effort and money on calling for and working toward changes in the legal status of animals, the creation and enforcement of cruelty laws, changes to factory farming practices, and other avenues, All-Creatures must resort to creating moral indignation as a strategy for change. Another reason for their focus on blame lies in the religious worldview of the organization, with frequent references to sin.

Every page offers the same solution to exploitation and cruelty: the reader/viewer should stop using animal products. Such a solution provides a forceful argument for frame transformation, and in the case of All-Creatures, it offers both domain-specific and global transformations (Snow et al. 1986:474-5). The immediacy with which the website urges the reader/viewer and the industries to change is uncompromising. Unlike the ASPCA and other welfare groups, and even PETA to some extent, gradual and incremental reform does not seem to be an option. In addressing how the reader/viewer might change, the website states:

You arrived to this page by no mistake. One way or the other, you have read, witnessed, and/ or heard about animal exploitation, abuse, and cruelty at the hands of humans. You're outraged, angry, depressed, and grieving. What can you do to make a positive difference? Perhaps you're wondering where you can even begin.¹⁶⁶

The emotions listed in the above quote are the specific feelings that the website primarily attempts to invoke. Given the content in animal exploitation, it seems that the website is designed for people without much knowledge of animal rights. Like many other

166 All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/articles/act.html>. Accessed 10/06/15.

organizations, the activism page provides the reader/viewer actionable steps for change individually and to continue outreach.

Humans are the evildoers who perpetrate the atrocities against animals and are not represented in a favorable light. According to All-Creatures, humans are greedy and only care about money and profit.¹⁶⁷ For illustration, in discussing egg production, the website charges: “One of the evils of this egg industry is that they don’t spend any money on veterinary care for sick and injured hens. Because money is their god, those in this industry consider it less expensive to let the hens suffer and die than to treat their problems.”¹⁶⁸ In the worldview of All-Creatures, humans are gluttonous and covet cheap entertainment, as is discussed in the sections about ducks, geese, and elephants.¹⁶⁹ When describing the processes and conditions of ducks to acquire *foie gras*, All-Creatures declares, “The diseased liver grows to this immense size in just four weeks, putting enormous pressure on the rest of the body’s organs. Only depraved humans would consider such a diseased organ ‘gourmet food’.”¹⁷⁰ The language of depravity is very Christian in nature. Similarly, their repeated use of the word *evil* is juxtaposed with God and the innocence of animals.

The religious arguments come in many forms. Within the pages of “Animal Exploitation,” Bible verses are used to give justifications for their arguments. For example, “The reason that we feel that the Church is so wrong about its silence to the

167. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/cattle.html>; <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/chicken.html>. Accessed 10/01/15.

168. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/chicken.html>. Accessed 03/28/16.

169. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/duck.html>; <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/elephant.html>. Accessed 10/01/15.

170. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/duck.html>. Accessed 03/28/16.

suffering of these fish and other animals is that the Apostle Paul calls upon all believers, as children of God, to free the whole of creation from the corruption to which it has been subjected (Romans 8:18-23).¹⁷¹ The audience is understood to have a base knowledge of biblical citations and presumably a sense of the Christian Bible's authority. Another example is a picture showing sheep in a feedlot, crowded together, and the message "To deliberately inflict pain and suffering upon another living being is ungodly. This is not what Jesus had in mind when He told Peter to 'tend my sheep' (John 21:15-17)."¹⁷² One page dedicated to biblical verses and sermons, mainly by Rev. Frank Hoffman. The website argues for the inclusion of animals into the realm of moral consideration based on a literal interpretation of the Bible aimed at those who may be most likely to accept a dominion understanding of Genesis. In general, the Bible is presented as the preeminent authority for the website's religious justifications and rationales against the use of animals, which indicates their audience. Due to the centrality of focus on the Bible, it could be reasoned that All-Creatures seeks to attract a more conservative audience. In addition to assigning blame to industry and consumers, the All-Creatures website also blames Christianity and churches for cruelty against animals.¹⁷³ Although the website holds that they are not trying to condemn churches, rather they are using these examples in the campaign as a wake-up call. One message in the "Animal Exploitation" "fish" section says: "The Church's silence is saying to all animal abusers that the Bible and Paul

171. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/fish.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

172. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/sheep.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

173. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/articles/act-c-scc.html>. Accessed 10/01/15.

are wrong, and that people should be further corrupting the world with more abuse and suffering. To us, this is blaspheme.”¹⁷⁴

One campaign, “Stop Cruelty in Churches,” lists articles that explain the myriad of ways that churches contribute to animal suffering. For example, All-Creatures has an article in which they describe the “reality” of cruelty to animals in “the Church.” The article explains: “For the most part, the Church has continued to be silent on these issues, particularly from the hierarchy, even though the founders of the Church and its various denominations have promoted compassion and kindness to animals. What is even worse is that the Church actually promotes much of this cruelty.”¹⁷⁵ All-Creatures goes on to say that some pastors have promoted hunting ministries and thought of fishing as a sacrament. They remark that every time a church has a community event that features animal products, they are supporting suffering.¹⁷⁶ It also lists “churches and pastors that promote cruelty,” although this section is limited to two examples: one is from 2009, in which a pastor thanks hunters for donations to the food pantry, another is a Catholic Franciscan Friar who has a website and books about “Hunting for God.” This section is not all about shaming: the page offers many examples of animal-friendly organizations, churches, and ministers. A list of “key issues” and suggestions for churches is also included, such as “The Church needs to recognize that animals, like humans, were created as living souls, and that they are in heaven, too.”¹⁷⁷ This recommendation is indicative of the website’s position on animals and the sensibility with which it sees

174. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/fish.html>. Accessed 09/24/15.

175. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/cspv/cruelty.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

176. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/cspv/cruelty.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

177. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/articles/act-c-sec.html>. Accessed 10/01/15.

animals. The idea that animals have souls comes up several times throughout the website and is counter to the dominant interpretation in Christianity.

Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in All-Creatures.org

Anthropomorphism is a steady motif across the website. Animals are repeatedly compared to humans, and the reader/viewer is frequently asked to imagine what it is like to be a particular animal in a given situation. In the “Elk” section of the “Animal Exploitation” pages, for example, are pictures of a group of elk on a canned hunting range. The page laments the fact that even though these animals are bred for hunting, the people that run the farm name the animals, which according to All-Creatures shows that the people who breed elk for hunting are “cynical.”¹⁷⁸ Another picture in this set explains that the elk with large antlers are “most assuredly reaching for heaven.”¹⁷⁹ In contrast, the page declares that the people who hunt these animals are “reaching for hell.” This sets up a stark contrast between humans and animals: humans are evil (the word is used three times on this page alone); the elk are innocent victims that have been tamed and cared for by humans only to be set up and hunted. In another sense, the commentary also suggests that the animals are acting in humanlike ways, as if the elk understands the concept of heaven or a deity.

On a page that discusses gestation and farrowing crates used with pigs, All-Creatures states that the piglets are “stolen” from the sows very soon after birth. The page further compares human and sow pregnancies to encourage the reader/viewer to identify with the animals. Pigs are described as intelligent and sensitive animals, similar to cats

178. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/elk.html>. Accessed 09/23/16.

179. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/elk.html>. Accessed 10/02/15.

and dogs. A picture of pigs looking out from behind cage bars challenges the reader to “Look into their faces and eyes and ‘see’ their souls. They’re no different from those of our companion cats and dogs. And, if we wouldn’t consider eating our companion cats and dogs, we shouldn’t eat them either.”¹⁸⁰ Another piece of commentary exclaims, “Look at the expression on these little pigs’ faces. They seek a little love and compassion from the photographer, even though other human beings have mistreated them.”¹⁸¹ The exposition asserts to know what the pigs are thinking (anthropomorphism), and that they are looking for sympathy with words such as love and compassion, primarily associated with sentimentality and used to evoke similar emotions in the reader.

In some instances, the separation between anthropomorphism and sentimentality is not so obvious with All-Creatures. Anthropomorphism and sentimentality are emphasized simultaneously, and this reiterates the argument that interconnections exist between the two concepts. For example, the statement comparing pigs to cats and dogs draws the reader into contemplating the loving care humans have for their companion animals and how pigs are similar to those animals. On the page about “pig exploitation,” the site asks “Imagine the utter frustration that the pig who is chewing is chewing on the bar must be feeling.”¹⁸² This exemplifies Donovan’s and Gheaus’s idea of moral imagination, where people are asked to listen to what the animal is saying. Another illustration of this is in a section on dogs, where the commentary on a picture again presumes to know what the animal is thinking: “We can see the pleading look on this

180. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/pig.html>. Accessed 10/02/15.

181. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/pig.html>. Accessed 10/02/15.

182. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/pig.html>. Accessed 09/16/16.

dog's face, 'Why are you doing this to me and my companions? Please help us!'"¹⁸³ Like most of the pictures on animal websites, a dog is looking directly out at the viewer.

The above example is a reminder of Bekoff's discussions of anthropomorphism in that I have tried to show that using anthropomorphism can be productive because it has the potential to advance a connection between the reader/viewer and the animal under discussion. The above instance could also serve as a caution about "inappropriate anthropomorphism," about which Bekoff remarks, "It is also easy to become self-serving and hope that because we want or need animals to be happy or unfeeling, they are" (2007:128). In the two examples shown, where All-Creatures is describing what the animal is thinking, it could be argued that they are doing it in a somewhat self-serving way. The purpose of such an assessment is to further the goal of the website and that of much of the animal movement: to stop humans from consuming/exploiting animals and using them only as a means to meet human desires. Their interpretation of these animals' feelings and thoughts is based on a human perspective of a photograph taken by someone else with the goal of supporting their campaign.

Pictures have a tremendous impact on the All-Creatures website. First, the reader/viewer is asked to imagine the animals in question in the scenarios that are depicted in the "Wishful Thinking" portion. They immediately draw the reader into an emotional mindset of compassion and sentimentality. For example, the page on dogs contains a picture of a small white puppy on a black background looking up expectantly into the camera when you click on the page.¹⁸⁴ Yet on all of the Animal Exploitation pages, the reader is bombarded with a series of images almost too gruesome to view, as

183. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/dog.html>. Accessed 10/02/15.

184. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/dog.html>. Accessed 10/02/15.

described later. One of the most important aspects of rhetorical stories is that the one telling the story must know the intended audience (Tilly 2006:74). With the juxtaposition of “wishful thinking” and “animal exploitation,” the group seems to be aiming at surprise and revulsion. Pictures throughout the “Animal Exploitation” sections serve to produce guilt. Guilt for one’s sins is a frequent refrain in some forms of Christianity. A central aspect of Christianity is that Jesus was God incarnate who died for humanity’s sins. Thus, if one feels guilty and repents of their sins, Jesus can save the person. Prinz notes that guilt arises from sadness because guilt is linked to “violations of moral rules concerning rights and justice” (2007:77). Sadness is a loss or harm to someone to which a person has an attachment (77). All-Creatures extensive use of pictures could definitely make someone feel guilty and sad for their complicity in animal exploitation. The website argues that using animals for humans benefit and in abusive ways is a matter of injustice. In many ways, the exploitation and mistreatment of animals are everyone’s sin, as was evidenced in the discussion on blame. The salvation that All-Creatures is presenting is one that comes through repenting of one’s sins against animals by ceasing to instrumentalize animals.

The group’s homepage changes often, with news articles, recipes, and new information the foundation decides to post. The commentary and pictures on the “Animal Exploitation” section do not change. They have a “What’s New” section that has new articles and sources posted almost daily.¹⁸⁵ All-Creatures also allows the reader/viewer to join in an “e-mail discussion group” as well as to sign up for text alerts about animal

185. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/whatsnew.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

issues.¹⁸⁶ Although the group is not an organization per se with official membership, these are ways to keep their audience engaged.

Thus in the aforementioned tactics used by All-Creatures, sentimentality is combined with a feeling of disgust and anger. These emotions are primarily reactive. Disgust and anger can also be a part of what Jasper calls “moral shocks.” Moral shock is a very common tool used by activists, where information is presented to trigger outrage, whether unexpected and immediate or gradual. The most common reaction to moral shock is often resignation to the situation or information (Jasper 1997:106). Moral shock can be “paralyzing” or “mobilizing” (106). Such reactions to All-Creatures Animal Exploitation pages is a prime exemplar of Jasper’s moral batteries, where negative and positive images and discourse are combined so that “the tension or contrast between them motivates action and demands attention. An emotion can be strengthened when we explicitly or implicitly compare it to its opposite” (2011:14.7). The intended emotions to be highlighted are anger, outrage, and disgust rather than compassion and sympathy. The ostensible depravity of humanity is accentuated throughout the discourse in places, even more so than the circumstances of the animals.

It has been well evidenced in studies and in movement practices that audacious actions, discourse, and protest garners a substantial amount of attention for social movements. Even though they are much more obscure, the All-Creatures website is similar to PETA in the way it uses graphic images to make their case. Clearly, the images are intended to induce moral outrage in the reader/viewer, but they might actually go too far. The target audience All-Creatures has in mind is a Christian person who presumably wants to learn more about the harsh treatment of animals. Because of the cognitive

186. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/index.html>. Accessed 09/24/16.

dissonance involved in animal cruelty, people who are not sympathetic to the movement often get defensive (Groves 1995:442). The horrifying pictures presented may serve to turn people away from the website and potentially from the movement entirely. Graphic images remain a powerful recruitment tool for animal organizations for the very same reasons that explicit elements can both immobilize and galvanize people toward action (Jasper 1997:107). Yet animal activists often remind themselves of what is at stake by reviewing pictures and videos of animal suffering (Groves 1997:95).

If the viewer is someone who sees nothing wrong with animal use for human ends, many of the pictures are so excessively abhorrent that someone might conclude that the pictures are merely the propaganda of a movement with which they disagree. If, on the other hand, the person viewing is already supportive of All-Creatures' cause, the sheer repetition of such repellant images can be emotionally taxing, bordering on unnecessary. One of the extreme examples is the "photo journal" on cats that shows images depicting detached skins and cats being burned alive.¹⁸⁷ Similarly, accompanying the discussion of *foie gras* is a picture of a pipe forced down a duck's throat.¹⁸⁸ A third example is a fox lying on the ground, ripped apart by hunting dogs.¹⁸⁹ These few samples illustrate not only the horrendous nature of the action depicted in images but also the potential difficulty in viewing the website pictures. In some Christian theologies, suffering is a reminder that God saves.

However, the argument can be made that exposing people to the actual situations of the animals may cause a realization that they, too, are complicit in animal suffering

187. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/cat.html>. Accessed 10/05/15.

188. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/duck.html>. Accessed 10/05/15.

189. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/fox.html>. Accessed 10/05/15.

and should therefore alter their actions in favor of animals. Stibbe reflects on the fact that “the coercive power to oppress depends completely on a consenting majority of the human population who, every time it buys animal products, explicitly or implicitly agrees to the way animals are treated” (2001:147). The perspective could be summed up in the question, What is a little emotional/mental discomfort when these animals are forced to live in such dire conditions and are treated in such sickening ways? Without such disclosure, it is all too possible for a person’s cognitive dissonance to continue unabated. Conversely, for visitors to the site who already agrees with the position, the images may reinforce their resolve. The graphic images shown on the website may be exactly what is needed, given the demographics that All-Creatures is potentially trying to reach. Herzog and Golden note that the emotion of disgust is positively correlated with conservatives because they are more concerned with “purity.” The authors also found that even though animal rights adherents tend to be liberal, disgust was also common in those with pro-animal sentiments and those favorable to the animal rights agenda (2009:493; see also Groves 1995). As was mentioned earlier, given the focus on the Bible, All-Creatures is likely targeting a more conservative Christian audience.

In summary, the All-Creatures website run by the Mary T. and Frank L. Hoffman Family Foundation is a Christian-oriented, self-described clearinghouse for information on animal rights. It is designed like many other animal movement websites, keeping readers up to date on animal issues as well as exploring the cruelties experienced by individual animals. The website places a strong onus on visitors to alter their own behavior, and it provides tips for outreach to others. The website also enlists a number of biblical references in order to reinforce their commentary on images of animal

exploitation. Going further, the site seems to hold Christian churches complicit for the continuance of animal oppression. It is apparent that a primary tactic of All-Creatures is to disseminate a brash assault of burdensome content to the reader/viewer. As described, this strategy can be a call to arms for those in support and a strong deterrent for those who either do not agree with the methods or cannot themselves accept the information.

Judaism

Several components of Jewish tradition make it potentially favorable to animals, particularly around food issues. One aspect concerns Jewish dietary laws and the practice of eating only foods considered kosher. Many debates and concerns about *kashrut/kosher* are beyond the scope of this paper, but as a “legal construction,” *kashrut* laws were meant to regulate everything consumed. *Kashrut* guidelines, theoretically, allow animals to remain at the center of Jewish religion (Abusch-Magder 2005:170, 172). Hazon, a Jewish environmental group that has been at the leading edge of a new “Jewish food movement,”¹⁹⁰ argues that being kosher in the twenty-first century is more than merely ensuring meat and other foods are kosher certified; sustainability and a decreasing carbon footprint are equally important. They note that many kosher slaughterhouses are actually the same as factory farms, and controversies have arisen surrounding their practices.¹⁹¹

190. Aaron Gross observes that in recent years, concern has been growing in American-Jewish communities around food, the environment, and animals. He argues that there is a new “Jewish food movement” that pays closer attention to the ethics of kosher meat. At the forefront of this shift is the organization Hazon, formed in 2006 and “the most visible organization dealing with Jewish food ethics” (2015:53).

191. Hazon. <http://hazon.org/jewish-food-movement/food-choices/kosher-shopping/>; <http://hazon.org/jewish-food-movement/food-choices/kosher-shopping/kosher-sustainable-meat>. Accessed 04/12/16.

Roberta Kalechofsky observes that the Talmud gives no prayers for eating meat, but it does give prayers for vegetables and bread. “The rabbis believed that the laws of *kashrut* were intended to teach us reverence for life and to refine our appetites” (2006:97). Kalechofsky notes further that in mystic literature, vegetarianism was a sign of hope, and it was thought that the Messianic Age would return humans to vegetarianism, as it was in Eden (97).

An additional foundational concept is that of the principle *tza'ar ba'alei chayim* or “cause no sorrow to living creatures” (Kalechofsky 2006:91). Author Elijah Judah Schochet, writing in *Animal Life in Jewish Traditions* in 1984, observes that the notion of *tza'ar ba'alei chayim*, despite not being specifically mentioned in scriptures, became likened to a biblical “ordinance,” particularly for those involved in Orthodox Judaism, of which Schochet is a part (151; Cohn-Sherbok 2006:89). Schochet’s text is cited in many places delineating an orthodox understanding of *kashrut* and animals (for example see Hazon.org; Cohn-Sherbok 2006; Clough 2012). Regarding *tza'ar ba'alei chayim*, Ronald Isaacs argues that “killing an animal when it is not for legitimate human need is strictly forbidden” (2000:77). Further, he maintains that rabbinic literature describes rest for animals on the Sabbath, because they stress “respecting the needs and feelings of animals” (78). He contends that Judaism has a long tradition of compassion that includes providing “permanent protection for animals under Jewish control,” (83) making an argument that Judaism has an obligation to see to the welfare of animals.

Tza'ar ba'alei chayim is applied to many areas of dealings with animals. For instance, rabbis used it to determine that a cow should not be slaughtered on the same day as its young and that mother cows should be able to stay with their offspring for awhile

after birth (Schochet 1984:151; see also Perlo 2009:37). Additionally, regulations regarding the working conditions of animals and humans were under *tza'ar ba'alei chayim* (154). Kalechofsky points out that “Judaism accepts a hierarchical scheme to creation, but hierarchy did not exclude feelings of loving kinship” (2006:92).

Richard Schwartz, a well-known scholar on Jewish vegetarianism, writes that the dominion passage in Genesis really means “responsible stewardship” and that people are summoned by God to “improve the world” according to the concept of *tikkun olam*, which includes opposing the overwhelming cruelty that exists in factory farms (2011:117). Further, in reference to the argument that vegetarians raise animals to the level of humans or make them even greater than humans, an infrequent argument, he maintains that because humans possess “imagination, rationality, empathy, compassion, and moral choice” (118), they certainly should not treat animals the way they are now. Schwartz also argues that veganism fulfills *mitzvot* (commandments) and contends that part of the Jewish commandments/laws insist that people prevent cruelty to animals, maintain their own health, conserve environmental resources and the Earth, and feed the hungry. Each of these commandments is fulfilled in veganism (107; 120).

In an exposition of animals in the Hebrew Bible, Schochet asserts that “ancients” ascribed “feelings and emotions, not only to animals, but to plants and even inanimate objects!” (1984:51). Furthermore, the scriptures provide evidence that “man has always detected, or believed that he detected, emotional reactions in animals not at all unlike his own” (52). Schochet argues a reason for the ascription is the close relationship between humans and animals in agrarian societies (52). Additionally, both animals and humans are destined to face death, and “biblical terminology reflects this unity of man and beast”

(53). Schochet's commentary illustrates anthropomorphism in Jewish literature, but he argues that the similarities described between humans and animals are there to teach lessons for humans (143). . Similar to Hobgood-Oster's description of stories about animals being viewed as messengers of God, examples of piety, and religiosity in the Christian saint's stories, the Jewish tradition has stories of animals who sing praises to God, pray, and observe the Sabbath (Schochet 1984:134-136).

In rabbinic literature, God gives animals rewards and punishments for good and bad deeds in comparable ways to humans (139). Even though Schochet recognizes animals in scriptures and in other literature, he rejects the anthropomorphic character of animals in these narratives (143). However, Schochet maintains the superiority of humans over animals, contending that "it is not the animal per se that really matters, but what the animal represents to man" (143). He argues that if animals are shown to have "religious responsibility" or are punished by God for wrongdoing, then humans will be more so. He contends that animals in rabbinic literature are "merely an object lesson used to make a point" (143). Nevertheless, these are intriguing examples of anthropomorphism that can potentially aid in cultivating a certain respect for animals in Jewish thought.

As Christian theologians have written theologies and compiled anthologies on animals and religion, Jewish scholars have done the same. In the book, *The Vision of Eden: Animal Welfare and Vegetarianism in Jewish Law and Mysticism* (2015), David Sears has compiled an anthology that is not "intended to be a to be a vegetarian or animal rights polemic, but a presentation of the relevant teachings on these subjects from diverse sources and points of view" (2015:xviii). Sears argues that the spiritual assignment of humans, and especially of Jewish people, is to "elevate all levels of creation by using the

things of this world to serve God, thereby neither completely renouncing the world nor exploiting it for the sake of ego and selfish desire,” (126) and this includes the welfare of animals. Sears’s argument is similar to that of Schwartz and recognizes the directive for humans to refine creation (126). Recognizing differing points of view in Judaism, Sears also notes that many Jewish philosophers maintain that it is a part of humans’ higher status that we are to eat animals. Kabbalists argue that by eating animals, humans advance the “holy sparks” or “divine life-force” that is in animals. Eating animals may free human souls that have been reincarnated as animals (127). Both Sears and Schwartz give affirmative arguments for veganism without elevating animals to the level of humans and maintaining human superiority (Sears:126; Schwartz 2011:118).

Finally, one of the most important Jewish voices for vegetarianism is that of Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook because “his writings provide the strongest support for vegetarianism as a positive ideal anywhere in Torah literature” (Kalechofsky 1998:28). Kook is one of the most cited authors for religious support of vegetarianism (Perlo 2009:140). Kook firmly believed that the permission to eat meat was temporary so that people would focus on justice for humanity. Additionally, if meat was prohibited and humans’ desire for flesh was strong enough, Kook reasoned that humans and animals might not be differentiated for consumption, causing “moral destructiveness” (Kook 2001:119). He argued that the regulations of *kashrut* were constructed so that people would retain a respect for life. A continued reverence for life, not only of human life, would eventually incline people to stop eating meat (Brumberg-Kraus 2005:126).

Yet just as in the discussion of the Hebrew Scriptures and Christianity above, the Jewish tradition has an anthropocentric orientation. Jonathan Brumberg-Kraus argues that

in the Jewish tradition, both meat eaters and vegetarians can find support for their positions in the idea that all animals have souls (127). Throughout the tradition, an assumption of human hierarchy over animals is evident. Brumberg-Kraus notes that “neither of these positions shares the belief of many contemporary ethical vegetarians and animal rights activists, that human beings and animals are of equal moral status” (2005:127). This is also one of the reasons given for the regulations of *kashrut*: to eat animals indiscriminately, without concern for the rules, makes a person no better than animals (120).

Consequently, the reason for choosing an organization that focuses on vegetarianism as opposed to a broader scope is because of the ideas and expressions in favor of vegetarianism drawn from the Jewish tradition. The possibility for a vegetarian precedent exists in the implications of *kashrut* and *tza'ar ba'alei chayim*, especially for scholars such as Kalechofsky and Kook. Unlike PETA, which focuses on a range of issues in order to encourage reader/viewers to become vegan, Jewish Veg uses vegetarianism/veganism as an entry point for other crucial animal issues.

Jewish Veg

Jewish Veg is a religiously oriented organization that began in 1975, not long after the modern animal movement began to pick up steam. Their motto is: “For Health. For Compassion. Jewish Values in Action.”¹⁹² The mission statement is to “encourage and help Jews to embrace plant-based diets as an expression of the Jewish values of compassion for animals, concern for health, and care for the environment.”¹⁹³ Recently,

192 Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org>. Accessed 09/18/15.

193 Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/about>. Accessed 09/18/15.

the organization changed its official name and is now *Jewish Veg* from Jewish Vegetarians of North America (JVNA). The explanation for the change was described on their homepage: “Using the word “Vegetarians” in our name created some confusion, as our mission is to encourage and help people to reduce their consumption of all types of animal products, with veganism as the ultimate objective.”¹⁹⁴

The organization mainly consists of three staff members but is supplemented with large rabbinic and advisory councils. Their website and organization may seem small, but they are well known in the circles of religiously oriented animal groups. They have a “sister organization,” the Jewish Vegetarian Society based in London, showing their international scope.¹⁹⁵ Their advisory council includes some influential people in the movement including Paul Shapiro, who works for HSUS and who founded Compassion over Killing, Alex Hershaft, founder of the Farm Animal Rights Movement (FARM), and several more who founded or are employed with movement organizations. Thus they are deeply connected to the animal and environmental movements. According to Similar Web, Jewish Veg’s website receives 20,000 views per month. The average length of stay is higher than All-Creatures, at 47 seconds. The number of pages viewed per visit is 1.3.¹⁹⁶ The small amount of views and short length of stay may indicate that the website is not very well known.

The main part of their website dealing with justifications for Jewish vegetarianism is entitled “What’s Jewish About Being Veg.”¹⁹⁷ This page includes sections concerning

194. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org>. Accessed 04/08/16.

195. Jewish Veg. <https://www.jewishveg.org/jewish-veg-links>. Accessed 12/01/16.

196. Similar Web. <https://www.similarweb.com/website/jewishveg.org>. Accessed 11/12/16.

197. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg>. Accessed 09/18/15.

human health, compassion for animals, the environment, and world hunger. There are also sections on biblical verses commonly discussed when thinking about Judaism and vegetarianism, including the Genesis 9 passage granting permission to eat meat. In addition, an FAQ section answers concerns about dominion, hunting, and kosher living as well as ancient practices such as sacrifice. Like the other organizations in this study, Jewish Veg uses issues such as health, the environment, and global food security to discuss vegetarianism and animals. These serve as an expedient frame for bridging techniques to expand the scope of how to think about animal concerns. Health is one of the primary concerns for the organization, and they provide articles on nutrition and recipes.¹⁹⁸ They cite a saying from Maimonides, where it is “mandated” that an unhealthy Jew cannot know God. They argue that being healthy is a Jewish value and cite several examples from studies, which tout the benefits of a vegetarian/vegan diet.¹⁹⁹

The “What’s Jewish About Being Veg” page declares “God’s first conversation with humankind: eat plants!”²⁰⁰ This initial argument includes their contention that the “dominion” passage does not mean humans were meant to kill and eat animals, because the command for humans to eat plant life was given in the verse directly after the dominion verse.²⁰¹ They cite various Jewish philosophers such as Nachmanides and Rabbi Joseph Albo to document that animals have souls and that cruelty against animals

198. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/nutrition-facts>; <http://www.jewishveg.org/recipe>. Accessed 04/08/16.

199. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/health>. Accessed 04/08/16.

200. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg>. Accessed 09/19/15.

201. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg>. Accessed 09/24/16.

is wrong.²⁰² Jewish Veg appeals just as much, if not more, to rabbinic and other extrabiblical authorities to reinforce their arguments.

Stories are a decisive aspect of the information presented. For instance, the page about compassion toward animals describes a story about Moses from the Mishnah, where he chases after a lamb that has run away. Upon discovering that it ran because it wanted water to drink, Moses carried it back on his shoulders. Jewish Veg maintains that the story illustrates that Moses was chosen to lead the Hebrew people because of his compassion for animals.²⁰³ The page concludes that the principles of *tza'ar ba'alei chayim* are not compatible with factory farming; Jews, especially, should be active in changing the situation.

In another effective narrative allusion, Jewish Veg contends that one of the reasons Jews should be particularly attuned to the suffering of animals is because they too have suffered so much:

Jews have known too well the bitter taste of cruelty and oppression, and Jews have remembered our tragic history when we have seen others suffering under the cold hand of persecution. Jews have taken leadership roles in the battles for worker's rights and for civil rights, and even today Jews have worked to help the plight of Haitians, Darfurians, and other beleaguered people. Let us not forget the suffering we have experienced as a people when it comes our turn to choose whether others will be brutalized at our hands.²⁰⁴

Because Jews have helped work against oppression and persecution in many areas, the argument is made that this “leadership role” should be extended to animals. The narrative in the paragraph is a subtle reminder of the atrocities that happened to Jews throughout

202. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg>. Accessed 09/19/15.

203. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/mercy-animals>. Accessed 09/19/15.

204. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/mercy-animals>. Accessed 09/19/15.

their history. It prompts what Francesca Polletta calls a “cultural stock plot” (2002:34) that is readily recognized by the reader who is examining the website. Jewish Veg has taken the “canonical quality” of Jewish oppression and asserted that animals should be included in the realm of the oppressed, that animal suffering should be considered alongside human suffering (34). This exemplifies what Fine calls the retrievability of a narrative. The reader/viewer is well aware of its meaning and implications (2002:240). The extension is important because it is putting animals on a similar plane to humans and arguing for like concern.

The pages within the “Compassion for Animals” section focus only on chickens and cows. The page about chickens informs the reader/viewer about the conditions that chickens raised for meat or for eggs endure.²⁰⁵ The information given on the page is typical for welfare and rights groups, but the description can be considered story-like as well. There is a plot, characters, and a conclusion with a moral (Polletta 2002:33). The plot is that chickens are being raised for food, and the conditions they live in are less than acceptable. The characters in the story are the animals themselves as well as the “farmers” who raise them. It mentions the difficulties faced by humans (“farmers”) after contact with the chicken waste: “As a result of the ammonia, dust, and disease in the air, farmers complain of sore eyes, coughing, and even chronic bronchitis and have been warned to avoid entering these areas.”²⁰⁶ Here, the reader is reminded what it is like to experience such symptoms, inferring the question, If humans are getting sick, how much worse must it be for the chickens that never get to leave?²⁰⁷ The story culminates with a

205. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/chickens>. Accessed 09/21/15.

206. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/chickens>. Accessed 09/21/15.

statistic: “20-25% of them die before they are killed at less than 2 years of age. By the time they’re killed, due to confinement and transport, 88% of the hens have broken bones.”²⁰⁸ The narrative about chickens in factory farms and asking the audience to identify with the people working to raise chickens prompts questions about justice, because both humans and animals are being affected by the conditions of factory farms.

The page dedicated to cows tells a similar story, one of pain and misery. A picture on the page shows a cow being pulled by a chain. The animal looks as if it had just fallen into a massive puddle of blood and remains. The caption notes that such abuses occurred at the largest U.S. kosher facility, AgriProcessors,²⁰⁹ thus implicating Jewish consumers in complicity.²¹⁰ On this page, instead of “farmers” being mentioned, the “industry” is to blame for their poor conditions.²¹¹ Unlike the commentary on chickens, no mention is made of the human hardships of raising and slaughtering cows for meat and dairy. The page is primarily informational, and no specifically religious argument is made against

207. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/chickens>. Accessed 09/21/15.

208. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/chickens>. Accessed 09/21/15.

209. In 2004, undercover video was released by PETA from AgriProcessors, a kosher slaughterhouse in Postville, Iowa. The video showed a series of horrendous abuses by workers to the cattle that were being slaughtered (Gross 2015:31). The video and news rocked the American Jewish community, which resulted in a number of differing responses to the situation. “The leadership of all of America’s halakhic forms of Judaism—Modern Orthodoxy, Haredi Orthodoxy, and the Conservative movement—have, since the AgriProcessors event, emphasized publicly that any degree of cruelty, no matter how egregious, has no impact on the kosher status of the meat” (Gross 2015:34). A range of responses resulted, from calling for boycotts and vegetarianism to pleas for more careful humane slaughter standards (178). Hazon.org, a Jewish environmental group, posted to its blog a variety of responses to the AgriProcessors situation. <http://jcarrot.org/category/agriprocessors>. Accessed 04/08/16. They also cite examples of orthodox and conservative condemnations of the activities of AgriProcessors, including a separate kosher certification developed by the conservative movement, Magen Tzedek. <http://hazon.org/jewish-food-movement/food-choices/kosher-shopping/kosher-sustainable-meat>. Accessed 04/08/16. For a comprehensive and insightful analysis of AgriProcessors and its implications, see Aaron Gross (2015) *The Question of the Animal and Religion: Theoretical Stakes, Practical Implications*.

210. JewishVeg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/cows>. Accessed 09/21/15.

211. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/cows>. Accessed 09/21/15.

the slaughter and consumption of cows. The picture on the page from AgriProcessers might serve as enough of a religious argument such that no other explanation is needed; further, it illustrates that the cows are not slaughtered according to kosher regulations.

Jewish Veg includes several appeals to both biblical and rabbinic sources to make their case, such as “Did you know...that God considered the Israelites unfit to receive the Torah at Mount Sinai until they stopped asking for meat?” It cites Numbers 11 as a reference. The group also chose to highlight two other biblical passages in the section, including the “vegetarian ideal” of Genesis 1.29. Jewish Veg notes that “the seven sacred foods associated (wheat, barley, vines, figs, pomegranates, olive oil, and honey) with the land of Israel are vegetarian,” citing Deuteronomy 8.7-9.²¹² Here select biblical passages affirm Jewish Veg’s main premise: that Judaism is compatible with vegetarianism. When discussing Genesis 9 in another section, Jewish Veg relies heavily on Kook for their assertion that the permission to eat meat was a provisional allowance, and they provide a picture of the rabbi on the page.²¹³ As the group’s argument goes, the concession was a compromise because humanity had become so deplorable that God had to start over, and then He promised never to destroy the world again by flood. In order to do this, “a disappointed God would have to lower His standards for mankind’s behavior, to make some concessions to humans’ baser instincts.”²¹⁴ Jewish Veg writes of Kook, “If people were denied the right to eat meat, they might eat the flesh of human beings due to their

212. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg;>
<http://www.jewishveg.org/ashir-bhalla-levine-dvar-torah>. Accessed 09/22/15.

213. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg/genesis-93---permission-eat-meat>. Accessed 09/22/15.

214. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg/genesis-93---permission-eat-meat>. Accessed 09/22/15.

inability to control their lust for flesh.” Jewish Veg explains that Kook “regards the permission to slaughter animals for food as a ‘transitional tax’ or temporary dispensation until a ‘brighter era’ is reached, when people would return to vegetarian diets.”²¹⁵

Jewish Veg attempts to turn the most commonly referenced verse for dismissing a biblically based vegetarian ideal on its head. Their argument focuses more on the state of humanity and less on the actual permission to eat animal flesh. The use of scriptural references and rabbinic sources is such that it might make the reader/viewer feel ashamed to eat meat because according to the argument, doing so is part of a grim biblical history, and a future of vegetarianism awaits.

Frame Analysis

The argument about humans’ “low level of spirituality,” at the time of Genesis 9, and recalling Jewish persecution, Jewish Veg engages in subtle blaming of the reader/viewer. Yet the calls for compassion for animals and for personal responsibility are numerous. Snow et al. note that within frame amplification, belief amplification emphasizes “beliefs about the locus of causality or blame” (1986:470). The authors observe that transformation often depends on whether blame is internalized or externalized, and they cite research on conversion to a Buddhist movement that “emphasizes personal transformation as the key to social change” (474). The personalizing of blame can contribute to frame transformation. Both religiously oriented organizations in my analysis rely heavily on placing blame and eliciting guilt from the individual, just as PETA also capitalizes on calling for individual responsibility for

²¹⁵ Jewish Veg .<http://www.jewishveg.org/whats-jewish-about-being-veg/genesis-93---permission-eat-meat>. Accessed 09/22/15.

change. In each case, blaming the individual reader/viewer is an interesting strategy. Most commonly, animal groups principally blame industries, corporations, and even the government. With the ASPCA, the individual consumer of chicken was charged with pressuring industries and businesses to reform through individuals' purchasing practices. After lobbying for legal changes from local and federal governments, the brunt of the responsibility and agency for changes falls to individuals rather than the industries. In legal manifestations of blame and reparations, one purpose of legal trials and the assignment of blame is to determine the value of a loss or damage done to a human person because of a crime, accident, or other things (Tilly 2008:94). It is likely that groups know that industries and corporations, while they bear the brunt of the blame, will not change due to the arguments of animal organizations. What is more likely, these industries will use animal groups arguments and blame to bolster their own positions (Tilly 2008; Swan and McCarthy 2003). Thus putting responsibility on the individual and asking them to help change business through their purchasing power is one way for organizations to enact change. Judaism and Christianity tend to concentrate more on the individual and their moral behavior. The focus on the individual for these religions makes them fit well with the larger disposition of the animal movement.

Much of the Jewish Veg website can be considered value amplification of frame alignment, identifying and illuminating certain values esteemed by the reader/viewer already in order to use it to advance the organization's cause (Snow et al. 1986:469). Jewish Veg is taking moral values—working against oppression, the principle of *tza'ar ba'alei chayim*, their interpretation of dominion²¹⁶—that are important in Judaism and

216. Jewish Veg. <https://www.jewishveg.org/faq-how-does-judaism-say-we-should-treat-animals>. Accessed 09/24/16.

applying it to animals. The goal of the website is to show how these central values and precedents in Judaism should also be used to help animals and to live a vegan life. Such discourse is a key part of the “core framing tasks” (Benford and Snow. 2000). For example, their header stating “Jewish Values in Action”²¹⁷ is a part of motivational framing, a “call to arms” (2000:617). Jewish Veg tries to align with the reader/viewers’ own belief system so that they might act in a way that is positive for animals.

Additionally, the declaration provides continued inspiration and encouragement for those who already believe in the cause to persist in their own transformation and work on spreading the ideal to others. Like PETA and All-Creatures, Jewish Veg has strong examples of frame transformation, where the potential adherents begin to create a new master frame (Snow et al. 1986:474). Advocating for veganism, in a call-to-action style that taps into religious convictions, is asking reader/viewers to change a large part of their daily life dramatically.

Additional motivational framing includes the “What Can You Do” section, and a couple of these suggestions are related to the individual and loved ones. There is a “Pledge to go Veg”²¹⁸ that asks to what degree the person is willing to eat fewer meals containing animals rather than inducing the reader/viewer to become vegan immediately. One section devoted to spreading the Jewish vegetarian message via media provides “talking points” for how someone can address issues like kosher slaughter and Judaism’s teaching on animals. Further talking points on dominion explain that although dominion was stated in the Bible, “There was to be a basic relatedness, and people were to consider the rights of animals. Animals are also God’s creatures, possessing sensitivity and the

217. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org>. Accessed 09/19/15.

218. Jewish Veg. <http://jewishveg.org/pledge>. Accessed 10/27/15.

capacity for feeling pain; hence they must be protected and treated with compassion and justice.”²¹⁹ The page notes that the Talmud talks about dominion as only including animals’ labor.²²⁰ Jewish Veg maintains that dominion did not mean “breeding animals and treating them as machines designed solely to meet our needs.”²²¹ The talking points on dominion further show the depth of Jewish Veg’s biblical justifications. Although not explicitly identifying with animal rights, they share their ideas.

Included also are outreach and volunteer suggestions that give tips on leafleting at events and sharing the Jewish Veg literature and message as well as suggesting that people volunteer their professional skills.²²² The “Professional Skills” section does not have any additional information provided. These activities focused on the individual and larger community allow reader/viewers to feel that they are able to transform their thinking about animals (frame transformation) and are able to join the cause to help change others. The other two “What You Can Do” aspects are interesting because they involve creating vegetarian versions of the Sabbath meal and meals for Jewish holidays. This focus reflects the importance of food in Judaism, including the importance of the weekly *Shabbat*, the food-centric aspects of Passover, and the large role *kashrut* plays in the daily lives of many Jews, or at minimum, prominent parts of Jewish history and guidelines for the practice of the faith.²²³ It makes sense that when attempting to make a

219. Jewish Veg. <http://jewishveg.org/media>. Accessed 09/24/15.

220. Jewish Veg. <https://www.jewishveg.org/faq-dominion>. Accessed 09/24/16.

221. Jewish Veg. <http://jewishveg.org/media>. Accessed 09/24/15.

222. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/what-you-can-do>. Accessed 10/27/15.

223. Jewish Veg. <http://jewishveg.org/holidays>. Accessed 10/27/15.

difference for animals within a religious group that Jewish Veg chose to concentrate its efforts on vegetarianism.

Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in Jewish Veg

No strong theme of anthropomorphism is present on the Jewish Veg website. Sentimentality, however, is demonstrated. One strong example of sentimentality is on the page concerning chickens that asks the reader/viewer to consider what it must be like for chickens in factory farms.²²⁴ Much like the sympathy discussed by Josephine Donovan and her concept of moral imagination the reader/viewer is asked to use imagination to consider what it must be like for the animals. Repeatedly, the reader/viewer is prompted to feel sympathy with the animals in question.

Jewish Veg's website goes against the trend of animal groups providing copious amounts of pictures. A few examples are of a woman sitting in a barn being nuzzled by some sheep and a picture of four cows standing behind a gate in what looks like a barn, staring out at the viewer.²²⁵ These are the only pictures on the website that could be considered as being of "cute" animals or a picture that elicited a positive type of sympathy. Two pictures, one of a bin of discarded male chicks and an abused cow at AgriProcessors on the "Compassion for Animals" page, provide just enough information to allow the reader/viewer to get the sense of the situation without causing them unnecessary anguish, unlike All-Creatures.

Jewish Veg constantly refers to the ideals of Judaism to support the content on their website. They explain that helping animals by becoming vegetarian is in accordance

224. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/chickens>. Accessed 09/25/15.

225. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org>. Accessed 09/25/15.

with the “highest ideals of our religion.”²²⁶ Like other religious organizations, this allows the reader/viewer to feel that becoming vegetarian, helping animals, and supporting Jewish Veg²²⁷ is a part of their religious duty. In fact, on the page about membership, the reader is encouraged to become a monthly “*mensch*,” which is Yiddish for a good person. One becomes a good person by supporting the organization and ceasing to use animal products. This is similar to the way PETA tells the reader/viewer that they are a “compassionate person.”²²⁸

James Jasper asserts that “moral emotions” is the feeling of “approval or disapproval (including of our own selves and actions) based on moral intuitions or principles” (2011:14.3). These principles include emotions such as guilt, shame, outrage, and compassion. Therefore, the feeling of approval that one might get from becoming a monthly *mensch* is the same when the reader is pulled toward compassion even by the subtle guilt that Jewish Veg evokes when it recalls particular religious arguments and reminders of Jews own religio-cultural persecution. Further, this engenders disapproval at one’s own actions, knowing, now from reading the website, of the factory farm abuse if one continues to consume animal flesh.

Concentrating on the “highest ideals of our religion” in reference to other animals only serves to increase this self-disapproval and guilt. With the inclusion of such guilt and shame, it seems that Jewish Veg is hoping that guilt will be turned into compassionate action by its reader/viewers. Jasper notes that reputation is “one of the most common human motives: concern for due honor, pride, and recognition of one’s

226. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/speakers-bureau>. Accessed 09/25/15.

227. Jewish Veg. <http://jewishveg.org/mensch>. Accessed 09/25/15.

228. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/>. Accessed 07/22/15.

basic humanity” (2011:14.5). Shame and pride are associated with a bad reputation and a loss of connection (14.5). Connection is an important aspect of both social movements and religions, and it builds a collective identity in an organization or religion (Jasper 2011:14.6). The tactics inducing guilt and a break of bonds provide the opportunity to rebuild the connection to the Jewish religion itself. When guilt is induced, there is a chance at reconciliation.

One attribute of religion is nurturing a sense of connection and community. Jewish Veg draws on the way food marks and shapes Jewish identity bonds and shifts the sense of connection from one that includes a bond tied to eating meat to one that is attached to vegetarianism. For the organization, a collective Jewish identity is manifested as the person recognizes that vegetarianism is one of its “highest ideals.”

Jewish Veg is more or less a single-issue group. The path they present to fulfill the ideals is through vegetarianism, which, according to the group, can end the most egregious of animal abuses: that of factory farming and meat eating. Through vegetarianism, they encourage others to adopt similar lifestyles and advocate for animals by spreading the message, bringing together Judaism’s strong ties to vegetarianism and latent reverence for all animals. They use vegetarianism to frame the problems for animals and as a bridge to other issues that are related and coincide with the use of animals for food, such as environmentalism and world hunger (Snow et al. 1986:467). For instance, they identify themselves as an environmental organization,²²⁹ and they argue animal agriculture has contributed greatly to environmental degradation and that Jewish texts delineate respect for the environment. Jewish Veg claims that “the waste

229. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/environment>. Accessed 09/29/15.

associated with meat production can be considered a blatant violation of “*bal tashchit*,” which means “do not destroy” and is a mandate from Deuteronomy 20:19-20.²³⁰ Jewish Veg sets the balance of blame and responsibility on the individual and does not call out industries or corporations as much. The blame of industries could be implied given the description of the animals’ circumstances in factory farms. Additionally, the call for vegetarianism tends to require an individual effort because large swaths of people will not become vegetarian at once, despite the hopes of some animal organizations.

Conclusion

The main differences between All-Creatures and Jewish Veg, as compared to PETA and the ASPCA, are where their moral grounding is placed. Three of the organizations—PETA, Jewish Veg, and All-Creatures—rely heavily on the responsibility of the individual for change. These three are also the organizations with the strongest push for veganism. Such a focus demands an appeal to the individual, rather than the collective, because veganism largely has to do with a domain-specific transformation rather than a global one (Snow et al. 1986). Yet the moral pull for the religious organizations/websites is obviously faith based, and in the case of Jewish Veg, the advocacy for vegetarianism is tied strongly to religious ideals. All-Creatures depends more on the outrage produced by animal cruelty and use, and it discusses how the Bible can be seen as a proof for the animal movement agenda. As was mentioned above, Judaism potentially has a stronger precedent for vegetarianism and kindness toward animals than Christianity because of *tza’ar ba’alei hayyim* and kosher dietary laws. All-Creatures’ use of anthropomorphism is more developed than that of Jewish Veg, and they

230. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org/environment>. Accessed 04/08/16.

reference the fact that animals have souls and compare them to humans, although not in a strictly religious way. All-Creatures comparison of animals to humans is more in line with other rights groups like PETA than with the religious organization in this study. Yet the religious groups do not use anthropomorphism and sentimentality very differently from the secular organizations. The emotional draw is similar as well. PETA and All-Creatures are equivalent in their soliciting of anger, disgust, and outrage, although All-Creatures may present an even stronger case for those emotions given the graphic nature of their images. The ASPCA and Jewish Veg are alike in their more pronounced use of sentimentality over anthropomorphism, just as their use of graphic images are more muted. Jewish Veg and ASPCA are also similar in their de-emphasis on wildlife and compelling campaigns against factory farming, especially in terms of chickens. Overall, attached to these religions is a sense of moral duty and obligation that is not present in the secular organizations.

The specifically religious organizations of All-Creatures and Jewish Veg are important because they tap into a population that has been underrepresented in the larger movement. The two groups are rights oriented, and although Jewish Veg does not specifically say so, advocating for veganism implies a strong leaning in that direction. As has been described in this chapter and in Chapter 1, Christianity and Judaism have been interpreted with a high degree of anthropocentrism. All-Creatures and Jewish Veg argue forcefully for a different way of interpreting their histories, stories, and scriptures. However, discussed in the next chapter, HSUS and PETA have religious departments. For the Jew or Christian who is looking for religious justifications and understandings of animal rights, All-Creatures and Jewish Veg fill that niche. The groups provide a wealth

of resources, information, and support for those already persuaded as to the cause of animal rights and welfare. All-Creatures, where membership is not an option, can serve the same purpose by giving someone a number of ways to reinforce pro-animal beliefs and action. Moreover, for a religious believer not convinced of the ideals of the movement, the websites of All-Creatures and Jewish Veg provide compelling arguments to gain support and cause change. Having Christian and Jewish involvement in general in the animal movement can only serve to help it. Because their legacy is one of negativity toward animals, the more that people of these faiths participate in the cause, the more it can change that perception. The strong convictions of morals and ethics to which many religious people adhere have the potential to motivate actions toward animal protection.

The next chapter will explore two religious departments embedded within HSUS and PETA. These wings within secular organizations, along with All-Creatures and Jewish Veg, highlight the strength of the religious presence in the animal movement.

CHAPTER 5

“KINDNESS AND MERCY”: RELIGIOUS COMPASSION IN MAJOR ORGANIZATIONS: FAITH OUTREACH (HSUS) AND JESUS PEOPLE FOR ANIMALS (PETA)

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) devote significant assets to branches dedicated to reaching religious communities. This chapter examines the units in each secular organization and how they deal with religious communities. Included is an assessment of how these departments incorporate anthropomorphism and sentimentality to further their causes. Part of the examination will consider any distinctions in religious departments’ treatment of the concepts versus that of the larger parent organizations. Whether as a foe or friend, as maintained throughout this study, religions have been an essential element to the animal movement. The presence of these departments is powerful evidence that religion has an essential part in pro-animal conversations and activism in the animal movement.

Before expounding on HSUS’s Faith Outreach, some background on the group is helpful. In 1954, four employees of the American Humane Association (AHA)²³¹ believed that the organization was headed in the wrong direction. Fred Meyers, a former journalist who wrote for the AHA’s newsletter, and three others—Helen Jones, Marcia Glaser, and Larry Andrews—were unhappy with the close relationship between the AHA

231. The American Humane Association (AHA) was formed in 1877. A group of 27 different humane societies decided to coalesce into a larger organization to combine their efforts. The AHA goals and mission include the welfare of animals and children. They are the only animal organization to treat these dual efforts. <http://www.americanhumane.org/about-us/history/>. Accessed 10/02/16.

and the National Society of Medical Research (NSMR). At the time, the NSMR pushed laws to avail shelter animals for experimentation. The AHA began to censor his work after Meyers ridiculed the NSMR in an AHA publication (Unti 2004:3). The four members left the AHA and created the National Humane Society. The organization's name changed two years later when the AHA sued them because their title was too similar. Finally, the organization was given the name The Humane Society of the United States (Unti 2004:4). Since then, the HSUS has grown to encompass a greater international scope, dealing with animal issues throughout the world. Their priorities include major animal concerns such as companion animals, wildlife, animals as food, and animal testing.

The HSUS has strong ties to Christianity, and several key members of the leadership staff have been Christian ministers. Bernard Unti, senior policy adviser for the HSUS, mentions in his history of the organization that Fred Meyers likened the welfare organization to a church because members often relied on the group for moral guidance (Unti 2004:13).²³² John Hoyt was selected as president in 1970.²³³ Before joining HSUS, Hoyt had been an active minister in a Presbyterian church and joked that he was leaving one church to join another.²³⁴ Hoyt, like Meyers, believed that HSUS workers, leadership, and members were dedicated to the cause of animals with religious-type

232. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/leadership/executive_staff/bernard_unti.html. Accessed 09/18/16.; http://www.humanesociety.org/news/interview/2012/berni_unti_021612.html.

233. Vitello, Paul. April 23, 2012. The New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/23/us/john-a-hoyt-dies-guided-humane-society-to-prominence.html?_r=0. Accessed 10/02/16.

234. Vitello, Paul. April 23, 2012. The New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/23/us/john-a-hoyt-dies-guided-humane-society-to-prominence.html?_r=0. Accessed 10/02/16.

fervor (14). Hoyt led the HSUS for 26 years, and his background as a minister made the impression of religion strong in the organization. It is not surprising that the HSUS would have a well-developed faith outreach branch, and they have always had good relationships with religious groups.

Identifying as “mainstream,” the HSUS titles its mission statement on their website “Celebrating Animals, Confronting Cruelty.”²³⁵ The statement goes on to pinpoint the wide scope of their work:

The HSUS is a mainstream voice for animals, with active programs in companion animals, wildlife and habitat protection, animals in research, and farm animals. We protect all animals through legislation, litigation, investigation, education, science, advocacy, and field work. And we rescue and care for tens of thousands of animals each year, but our primary mission is to prevent cruelty before it occurs.²³⁶

This is a succinct statement of the organization’s goals, work, and accomplishments. In its mission overview, the HSUS calls itself “the nation’s largest and most effective animal protection organization.”²³⁷

As a welfare organization, the HSUS positions itself as a “protection” agency, and this description is used multiple times throughout the “About Us” page. They also claim to seek “reform” from “multibillion dollar industries.” Similar to the ASPCA’s Cruelty Intervention Advocacy Program, HSUS prides itself on its “direct care,” assisting and protecting animals in immediately dangerous situations. The ASPCA and HSUS have been known to work together to intervene in cruelty cases. Beyond direct care, five

235. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/overview/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 08/04/15.

236. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/contact/frequently_asked_questions.html?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 08/04/15.

237. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/overview>. Accessed 02/12/16.

animal sanctuaries and medical centers working with numerous types of wildlife and horses are connected to the HSUS.²³⁸ Although the HSUS is engaged in the area of adoption, its primary focus related to companion animals is centered more on maintenance and enforcement of current laws, reform of poor practices, and cruelty cases. According to Similar Web, the HSUS website gets the second highest number of views, behind PETA, of the websites in my study, at 2.1 million. The average duration of stay on the site is one minute 26 seconds, just under that of the ASPCA. The average number of pages viewed was 1.75.²³⁹ Like PETA's website, the home page of the HSUS includes a news section that may attract people to get the latest information on animal concerns. People may go a little further to look at other headlines or to donate.

HSUS works to improve the lives of animals by stopping cruelty, abuse, and unnecessary use of all kinds of animals. In addition to providing information about companion animal care, they have done a vast amount of work concerning wildlife and farm animal cruelty. Some of the wildlife campaigns include working against Canadian seal hunting, a cause that almost all animal organizations champion. The HSUS entered the fight against seal hunting in the early 1970s, when along with the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) they organized a boycott of tuna, combining it with a larger campaign concerning marine mammals (Beers 2006:193). The society seeks to end the use of animal fur in consumer products, from both cats and dogs to wildlife such as seals,²⁴⁰ and

238. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/overview/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 08/05/15.

239. Similar Web. <https://www.similarweb.com/website/humanesociety.org>. Accessed 11/12/16.

240. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/campaigns/fur_free/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 02/15/16.

also attempts to stop individuals from keeping wildlife as “exotic pets.”²⁴¹ In addition, the HSUS has an entirely separate Wildlife Land Trust that aims to keep land free from overdevelopment and to provide permanent protection of land for wildlife.²⁴² Their work on farm animals includes issues of cruel confinement, cruel slaughter practices, humane eating, and force-fed animals, which deals with birds raised for *foie gras*.²⁴³ They additionally campaign against the environmental impact of factory farming. The HSUS consistently asks the reader/viewer to consider reducing the amount of animal products, including eggs from caged hens, which is one of the “cruellest factory farm products” and the subject of HSUS campaigns on college campuses. The page on environmental concerns addresses a large amount of animal waste from factory farms that pollute everything from soil to water surrounding the industrial operations.²⁴⁴

Humane society is a general term that applies to the title of many animal organizations. Not all humane societies are associated with the HSUS.²⁴⁵ Although they do not operate shelters, the HSUS provides training, education, and services to shelters and rescue groups that work with companion species.²⁴⁶ The HSUS says that it

241. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/exotic_pets/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 02/15/16.

242. HSUS. <http://www.wildlifelandtrust.org/about>. Accessed 02/15/16.

243. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/campaigns/factory_farming/?credit=web_id93480558; http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/force_fed_animals/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 02/15/16.

244. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/environment/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 02/15/16.

245. The HSUS explains that they do not run local shelters; animal shelters have always been independent of the organization. The HSUS was founded to work on animal issues on a large scale, outside the local shelter level, and it puts 80% of their expenses toward several animal causes, including companion species, laboratory animals, wildlife, and marine animals. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org/misdirection-shelters>. Accessed 02/15/16.

“complements the work of local groups by focusing on national-level issues like ending the puppy mill industry, strengthening cruelty laws, and eliminating large-scale animal abuses. We also run programs and spearhead campaigns designed to ease the burden on local sheltering groups.”²⁴⁷

Comparing the three secular organizations in this study, the HSUS is more like PETA than the ASPCA in a number of ways. For instance, the group has active campaigns concerning fur and advocates that people purchase “cruelty-free” cosmetics.²⁴⁸ Additionally, the section about animals lists 49 wild animal species for the reader/viewer to explore in depth.²⁴⁹ PETA likewise also deals with a wide variety of wildlife as a component of their main website, whereas the ASPCA only discusses wildlife through their policy and position papers. On HSUS’ main page is the statement: “You’re here to help animals. So are we. Join us.”²⁵⁰ It is an inclusive declaration, assuming that the reader/viewer is on the website because they care about animals. It is similar to the way in which PETA encourages readers by stating that they are, in fact, compassionate even while explaining how they need to change.

One of the most interesting aspects for framing the HSUS in the larger scheme of the animal movement is how the organizations deal with opposition. “Eye on the

246. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/animal_community/working_shelters.html. Accessed 02/15/16.

247. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/animal_community/resources/qa/common_questions_on_shelters.html. Accessed 02/15/16.

248. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/campaigns/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 08/05/15.

249. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/animals/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 08/05/15.

250. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org>. Accessed 08/05/15.

Opposition” is a linked to a separate site, Whoattackshsus.org, which looks closely at groups with an active stance against HSUS.²⁵¹ The page consists of catchy graphics that describe the main points of criticism and briefly answers the critiques. Supplementary information is linked to five “misdirection” pages for shelters, farms, lawsuits, investments, and salaries. By dedicating space to some of its detractors, HSUS is reinforcing their claim that they are the leading animal protection group at the forefront of animal advocacy. The presence of outside attacks can be a measure of success and influence. These groups, according to HSUS, are fronts for large agribusinesses with the guise of protecting consumers.²⁵² Many of the attacks have to do with financial issues.

251. HSUS. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org>. Accessed 08/05/15.

252. Some of the groups named by the HSUS, include “agribusiness fronts”: HumaneWatch, Protect the Harvest, the Center for Consumer Freedom, the Cavalry Group, and United Horsemen. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org>. Accessed 02/15/16. Protect the Harvest, for example, works to ensure the puppy mill industry and “attracts support from extremists like those who defend cockfighting, puppy mills, and other humane activities.” Founded in 2010 by oil magnate Forrest Lucas, it has also worked with “agriculture leaders” in Missouri to continue agribusiness and other practices. The organization has worked in other states, such as Indiana and North Dakota, to block stricter legislation and regulation against companion animal abuses. HSUS. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org/protect-the-harvest>. Accessed 02/15/16. Protect the Harvest argues that “your rights and ability to feed your family are under attack.” Their mission is to “defend and preserve the freedoms of American consumers, farmers, ranchers, outdoor enthusiasts, and animal owners.” <http://protecttheharvest.com/who-we-are/mission-statement>. Accessed 10/02/16. They believe that the HSUS is the “largest policy arm of America’s radical animal rights movement.” <http://protecttheharvest.com/who-we-are/faq>. Accessed 10/02/16. Protect the Harvest argues that the HSUS is trying to reduce the demand for animal products and trying to “obliterate a large portion of American life, culture, and heritage.” They argue that the HSUS does not operate animal shelters as they have led the public to believe and that they are too large and are not financially responsible. <http://protecttheharvest.com/hsus-exposed>. Accessed 10/02/16. The Center for Consumer Freedom (CCF) and its project HumaneWatch has launched campaigns against several groups: Mother’s Against Drunk Drivers (MADD), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the HSUS. The CCF was begun with money from the tobacco industry to thwart anti-smoking campaigns. When it comes to animals, the group works to derail animal welfare reforms, and the HSUS describes it as “defending lifelong confinement of animals, inhumane slaughter practices, and the reckless use of antibiotics on factory farms.” <http://www.whoattackshsus.org/center-for-consumer-freedom>. Accessed 02/15/16. The CCF and their HumaneWatch campaign argue that the HSUS is too large and has lost financial accountability. “The dog watchers at the Humane Society of the United States need their own watchdog too. HSUS now has an annual budget around the size of an NFL payroll. It has become too big and too unaccountable. Someone has to pay closer attention. This blog is an attempt to make sense of what’s going on inside that sprawling organization.” <http://www.humanewatch.org/why>. Accessed 10/02/16. In its “13 Things You Didn’t Know About HSUS,” HumaneWatch complains that “HSUS donors feel deceived, they receive poor charity evaluator marks,” and that their “manipulative and deceptive advertising” is pushing a vegan agenda. They also argue that HSUS is too radical, stating “HSUS’s senior management includes others who have voiced

Detractors contend that the HSUS does not significantly fund local animal shelters (which are not associated with it) or that they overpay staff members. Of the three secular organizations, HSUS had the largest amount of net assets in 2015, totaling \$232 million, with \$152 million annually going to all animal programs and close to \$5 million to “management and general.”²⁵³ It is clear that the organization spends considerably more on their programs than on management, and they dedicated \$33 million to fundraising efforts. Total contributions in 2015 were \$159 million.

The opposition groups’ main strategy attempts to invalidate HSUS in the minds of their supporters. Similarly, the whoattackshsus.org page seeks to discredit the allegations of the groups who try to damage the reputation of HSUS. The attempts at invalidation are an instance of counter framing (Benford and Snow 2000:617). The HSUS and the agribusinesses are engaged in “framing contests,” where an organization and opposing groups will try to frame and reframe each other’s and their own positions or work to invalidate a particular assault on a group’s practices or values (626). For example, because the HSUS relies heavily on member donations for funding, questions regarding the financial practices of the organization could foster mistrust and potentially lead to less support. The HSUS calls the reframing of their positions by opposing groups “misdirection,” and HSUS exposes what it deems the real intentions of the groups working against them.²⁵⁴ This separate site also reiterates HSUS values, a strong example of value amplification.

support for terrorist acts.” <http://www.humanewatch.org/13-things-you-didnt-know-about-hsus>, last modified March 28, 2014. Accessed 10/02/16.

253. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/2014-hsus-annual-report.pdf>. Pg.16. Accessed 08/06/15.

254. HSUS. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org/misdirection-shelters>. Accessed 07/19/16.

The values and information of whoattackshsus.org tell a story about the organization and its activities. As Adaval and Wyer argue, the manner of presentation of information is particularly important, and the first aspect of processing new information is to organize it into previously understood knowledge (1998:210). This conjecture about information processing also confirms one of the main purposes of looking at frame alignment: information, movements, and organizations are more readily accepted when they are framed in a way that resonates with potential adherents (Goodwin and Jasper 2003:52). The issues represented on the whoattackshsus.org site are familiar to a public curious about the HSUS and possible opposition. For instance, one section deals with a lawsuit involving Ringling Brothers, and elephant abuse is recognizable because the circus company and its use of elephants is a popular form of entertainment. Additionally, the information is told in a narrative style, with a chronological outline.²⁵⁵ The story about the lawsuit allows the reader to imagine the situation and what they might do in similar circumstances (Adawal and Wyer 1998:208). It creates a story wherein the HSUS and others named in the lawsuit are the heroes and Ringling Brothers is the villain. This type and/or style of story is used throughout the whoattackshsus.org site. No other groups have a website similar to whoattackshsus.org.

Most large nonprofit organizations issue annual reports that provide a financial overview of the previous year and highlights of significant key victories. These reports are important additions to the websites because they provide a succinct picture of a year's accomplishments and provide financial reviews. The HSUS report comprehensively

255. HSUS. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org/misdirection-lawsuits>. Accessed 07/18/16.

illustrates in about 20 pages of the organization's mission with many pictures and graphics to draw attention to its cause.²⁵⁶

Much of the information in the report is similar to what is on the HSUS website, such as how the organization has helped wildlife. For instance in 2014, in several states, the organization helped to stop wolf hunting and helped get federal laws against hunting gray wolves reenacted.²⁵⁷ The recapping of HSUS's efforts and accomplishments over the course of a given year is one way the organization uses frame amplification, and Snow et al. note that, "SMO mobilization is often hinged upon the clarification of an issue or problem" (1986:569). Within frame amplification, value amplification reiterates the group's goals and achievements, assuming the reader/viewer also shares those views and goals. The annual report expresses gratitude to contributors who have donated time, money, and resources to accomplish those results (469). The annual report could also be viewed as a recruiting tool because it is free to download from the website, and the HSUS encourages it to be shared.²⁵⁸ Sharing this information also helps refute some misconceptions about the organization's operations and funding.

A final aspect of HSUS frames has to do with the use of the phrase "transformational change." Several times, on the "About Us" page and in the annual report, the group talks about how their goals and activities are for "transformational change." Snow and colleagues explain that a frame alignment transformation is where

256. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/overview/financials/hsus-annual-report-2014.html?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 08/07/15.

257. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/2014-hsus-annual-report.pdf>. Accessed 02/15/16.

258. The other major organizations, the ASPCA and PETA, do not specifically tell people to share the annual report. But PETA's Annual Review and the ASPCA's Annual Report are available digitally and for download as a PDF.

new beliefs are formulated. There is “a change in the perceived seriousness of the condition such that what was previously seen as an unfortunate but tolerable situation is now defined as inexcusable, unjust, or immoral” (474). The HSUS sees itself as changing and reshaping how animals are treated and viewed in the United States and around the world. The transformational change this organization seeks pays close attention to legal battles by changing laws, and it pushes corporations to overhaul policies and procedures. The HSUS website speaks of transformational change on a larger scale in line with the “global interpretive transformation” that Snow et al. discuss, where an entirely new master frame is developed (475). As discussed above, religion has been a part of the HSUS from the beginning, and the organization’s role as the largest animal organization is cemented in the fact that they have been able to successfully reach religious audiences. The Faith Outreach department has been part of their success in this area.

HSUS: Faith Outreach

Whereas the HSUS and PETA share many similarities, their two religious “arms” have significant differences. Faith Outreach, one of 22 departments of the HSUS, is the program that works to connect religious individuals and organizations with a variety of animal protection issues. Their mission statement says that “The Faith Outreach program of the Humane Society of the United States seeks to engage people and institutions of faith with animal protection issues, on the premise that religious values call upon us all to act in a kind and merciful way toward all creatures.”²⁵⁹

The header and focal point of the Faith Outreach home page is a background with a blue sky and a strip of green grass, containing the name of the department and three

²⁵⁹ HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith>. Accessed 08/10/15.

lambs in the forefront looking out at the reader/viewer. Next to the picture of the sheep, a small icon says, “Did You Know?” The bubble that appears discusses the trend of people eating less meat and changing habits due to the realization of conditions on factory farms: “A growing number of Christians are changing their diet and consumer purchases because the way that animals are treated in factory farms is inconsistent with their beliefs.”²⁶⁰ The bubble links to Faith Outreach’s “Eating Mercifully” video that connects Christianity to how a person’s dietary choices impact animals. The religious discourse of the Faith Outreach department leans toward Christianity; for example, their resources are primarily based around that religion’s viewpoints. The Faith Outreach department has a new book entitled *Every Living Thing*, which focuses on Evangelical and Catholic teachings on animals.²⁶¹ Another video series, “Eating Mercifully,” profiles historical Christian figures and is concentrated on Christian perspectives, perhaps due to the fact that Christianity represents the largest religious group in the United States or perhaps because of the history of the HSUS.²⁶²

Despite having a preponderance of information for Christians, Faith Outreach is decisively inclusive of other faiths. The inclusivity is demonstrated by faith councils made up of religious scholars and ministers from a variety of denominations and religions.²⁶³ The Faith Advisory Council consists of religious leaders, activists, and scholars from the Abrahamic religions, such as Hobgood-Oster and Waldau, mentioned

260. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith>. Accessed 08/10/15.

261. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/every-living-thing-christian-teachings-on-caring-for-animals.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 02/15/16.

262. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/>. Accessed 02/15/16.

263. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/faith-advisory-council.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 08/10/15.

frequently in this dissertation. The “Dharmic Leadership Council” has members of traditionally Eastern religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism. The HSUS states that the Dharmic Leadership Council is instrumental in helping Humane Society International (HSI), an affiliate of the HSUS, and its work in India. The HSUS’s President, Wayne Pacelle, is quoted on the Faith Councils page: “Religious leaders have led the way in confronting cruelty to animals, and they’ve always had a prominent place in our organization.”²⁶⁴

The two traditions represented in the Faith Councils have historically treated animals very differently. The Dharmic traditions are inclined toward treating animals ethically because of a strong adherence to *ahimsa*, or no injury toward all living beings, including animals (Nelson 2006:181). In contrast, as explored in chapter one, Christianity and Judaism have been admonished by animal rights groups for ideologies stemming from the dominion passage and the hierarchy of creation in the Hebrew Bible.

As is evidenced by the Faith Councils, the HSUS Faith Outreach, like its parent organization, is multifaceted in their approach to animal protection. Faith Outreach’s resources concern not just food and farm animals but also address wildlife and companion animals. The resource on creating a “humane backyard” tells how to better construct a yard to accommodate urban and suburban wildlife near churches and people’s homes. The resource is geared toward church congregations’ land as an inviting space for wildlife. Making such areas more attractive to animals will provide “spiritual nourishment to the community.”²⁶⁵

264. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/faith-advisory-council.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 10/04/16.

Another example that shows the breadth of Faith Outreach's understanding of religion in relation to animals is the reflection that "Through the ages, a faith-based awareness of the need to care for creation—all that is and of the Earth—has been documented in the writings and beliefs of religions worldwide."²⁶⁶ The statement reiterates the assertion on the homepage that the values of all religions have the capacity to bring humans toward the understanding of the protection of animals. Furthermore, it claims a global moral imperative for their work that has deep historical roots and global range.

Faith Outreach's inclusiveness is further evidenced by a list of statements/positions on animals from religious groups and denominations: Christian, Jewish, Dharmic, and Unitarian Universalist. This resource is to help reader/viewers discover their own and other faith traditions' positions on animals.²⁶⁷ The function of Faith Outreach is to draw religiously minded people and communities to issues of animal welfare. A person viewing Faith Outreach's website might already be familiar with the HSUS, and they may want ways to incorporate their religiosity; they might even be drawn to the site because of dismissive statements and actions within their own faith community that have disturbed them. The statements on the HSUS website consist of a

265. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/humane-backyard-at-place-of-worship.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 02/23/16.

266. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/humane-backyard-at-place-of-worship.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 02/23/16.

267. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/facts/statements/?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 08/10/15.

religious body's own resolutions, statements of faith, sacred texts, and so on that mention animals.²⁶⁸

The resources on religious statements about animals could be used as a call for action for the person leading their own religious community's stance on animals. For example, if a religion's stance on animals were positive, reader/viewers might be further energized in their efforts and commitments toward welfare. A more limited perspective could be motivation for reader/viewers to encourage changes toward animals in their own religious community. Providing the reader/viewer with actual statements from religious groups places the onus on the individual to facilitate change and learn more, but it also empowers them. The variety of religious statements not only provides an opportunity to learn about other religions and views that may shed light on possible connections or new perspectives, it can motivate individuals who are alienated from their own religious community. In this way, the HSUS uses frame extension to combine religion with the cause of animals. Here, religion provides a prognostic and motivational frame for the issues, where they deliver "calls to arms" that involve religious ideals (Benford and Snow 2000:617).

Frame Analysis

The resources from the Faith Outreach department show the serious and comprehensive stance that the HSUS takes toward religion and education. Consulting with ministers and religious scholars and engaging the reader/viewer with booklets allows Faith Outreach to be an authority on animals and religion for the general public

268. For example
http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/facts/statements/hinduism.html?credit=web_id335185139. Accessed 07/15/16.

and religiously oriented people. The Faith Councils, booklets, and video series connect the reader/viewer to religious leaders and leading scholars. The work with the Councils also means that the HSUS has the respect of religious leaders and scholars working in this field, and for many years, the HSUS had a presence in the scholarly meetings of religion scholars. Such respect goes a long way toward incorporating people of faith to HSUS causes. Frame amplification is “particularly relevant to movements reliant on conscious constituents who are strikingly different from the movement’s beneficiaries” (Benford and Snow 2000:624), and the animal welfare/rights movement certainly falls under this category. Despite the argument that humans and other animals share numerous traits, feelings, and behaviors, it is likely that in general, reader/viewers perceive animals as very different from themselves. The amplification of religious beliefs and traditions allows religious reader/viewers to see animals in their own tradition and to see them valued in new ways that have strong, legitimizing possibilities. Understanding how animals can be positively incorporated into a person’s belief system helps to connect a person to animals, and perhaps more important for Faith Outreach, to the animal welfare movement. As mentioned in Chapter 4, religious organizations and leaders can fill a niche and meet a population that might not be reached by a secular organization. Faith Outreach’s Councils and video series like “Living Legacy” (discussed below), and “Eating Mercifully” are prime examples of this fact. Religious leaders and scholars present on the councils and in the videos provide legitimization for religious individuals to see animal welfare as a part of their faith practice. Additionally, bringing religious leaders to the movement helps to change the character of religions that can be anthropocentric in their worldview, which is especially true in the case of Christianity.

The frame of religion is used as value amplification to uplift particular religious ideals that can be used to elaborate on animal issues (Snow et al. 1986:469). Most succinctly, this is seen in the first assertion on the Faith Outreach's main page: they believe all religions summon adherents to the values of kindness and mercy toward animals.²⁶⁹ The use of value amplification is seen in the religious statements on animals. By putting them on the HSUS website, the organization is highlighting the point that religious values can be geared toward animals. Even the stances that cannot easily be interpreted as having animal-friendly values can be used to direct the reader/viewer toward behaving more kindly to animals, especially if they are already so inclined.

When framing animals and religious discourse, belief amplification is also one of the key aspects of mobilization (Snow et al. 1986:469). Belief amplification often involves designating blame, and with animal advocacy, blaming is typical and is focused on the industries that are perpetuating cruelty and harm to animals in the eyes of the animal organizations. Faith Outreach refrains from any blame or rehashing of dominion ideology, unlike All-Creatures, where Christian churches and religious individuals are also condemned for the plight of animals. This is not the approach of the HSUS: the Faith Outreach department sees religion as a solution to the problem and a partner in animal welfare.

A notable example of Faith Outreach embracing the positive in Christianity is in a set of videos posted to the website entitled "Living Legacy." The video series spotlights the lives and beliefs of historical Christian figures that shaped the movement and their

269. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith>. Accessed 07/15/16.

religious traditions.²⁷⁰ William Wilberforce was an evangelical minister in the British Parliament who was known for fighting to abolish the slave trade in England. In 1822, the first animal cruelty law was passed in Britain, and it was the first national cruelty law anywhere (Shevelow 2008:9). After the passing of this law, members of Parliament and ministers gathered to discuss how to continue the fight against animal cruelty. To ensure that the Act was enforced, the group decided to form the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Wilberforce was a part of this meeting, and this began his work championing the cause of animal protection (11). He continued throughout his career to fight for animals; however, his work for animals is not mentioned in observations about his life. Wilberforce saw campaigning against animal cruelty as a part of refining the morals of society. As mentioned in the introduction, anti-cruelty sentiments were commonly understood as a part of a civilizing project in the nineteenth century.

Hannah More fought along with Wilberforce against human slavery and for animal welfare, also with the purpose of improving the morals of society. More was the first woman to formally campaign against slavery in Britain, and she wrote tracts against it (Baer 2013:53). She was a popular writer who wrote for the upper classes (48), and she established a school for poor children and wrote many of the textbooks herself (51).

C.S. Lewis, a major figure among evangelical Christians, had a concern for animals throughout his life that shows in his written works.²⁷¹ He began writing stories as a child. *Animal Land* was a series of stories that featured an imaginary world of talking animals (McGrath 2013:140). His famous book series, *The Chronicles of Narnia*, is filled

270. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/video-series.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 08/11/15.

271. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/video-series.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 02/23/16.

with animals that act like humans. In these books, animals are “active, conscious agents in Narnia” (276). Lewis wrote an essay in 1947 on vivisection, which he opposed. McGrath notes that in the essay, Lewis was against vivisection on the grounds of “biological proximity of humans and animals, while asserting the ultimate authority of human beings to do what they please with animals” (275). These videos are meant to encourage Christians to take a more active role in animal welfare efforts, exemplified by the statement on the bottom of the web page: “Inspired to help animals? Become an HSUS Ally.” They also show that Christian concern for animals has deep roots in the Reformation and in the fledgling years of the movement, significantly an Evangelical enterprise. Thus these examples of Christian leaders add to the legitimatization that Christians have been carrying on this work for centuries.

Another principal approach by Faith Outreach is an appeal for volunteerism, something that people in faith communities are noted for promoting, backed up with resource materials and information on volunteering with Faith Outreach. “Fill the Bowl” is a community-based effort through which churches and other congregations can volunteer to help local shelters, rescues, and families with animals pay for food and supplies.²⁷² On the side of the Fill the Bowl page is a picture of a dog and a smiling woman, and it bears the words, “Live your faith. Volunteer with us.” That page links again to the volunteering page. While exploring the Faith Outreach department, the reader/viewer is inundated with opportunities and requests to volunteer. These requests are more frequent than solicitations for monetary donations.

272. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/fill_the_bowl/fill-the-bowl.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 08/11/15.

Framing the idea of helping animals to people of faith with volunteering is an astute tactic. The diagnostic framing of problems with an answer of volunteering that prioritizes local communities amplifies values and codes of behaviors that religious people may already have. For instance, the dedication, time, and effort of religion and religious activities place a significant focus on a person's surroundings, and religious groups are frequently involved locally (Benford and Snow 2000:616). Many religious communities and individuals want to spread their messages to outsiders, hoping to create converts. Volunteering with HSUS Faith Outreach is a combination of civic engagement (volunteering) and potential religious outreach. Faith Outreach harnesses these values to create an outreach base for the organization. Similarly, individuals want to feel that they are doing good things and serving a greater purpose. The phrase "Live your faith. Volunteer with us" appears on one of the sidebars and explicitly attempts to move people beyond religious beliefs and toward the incorporation of convictions in everyday life, again echoing frequent refrains within religious traditions. The expansion of faith commitment beyond the individual is an important value to religious groups, and volunteering on behalf of Faith Outreach, animals in need, and local communities fulfills these values. Placing a focus on local volunteering also extends the reach of the HSUS into areas that the larger organization might not be able to reach.

The Faith Outreach program does not try to convince the reader/viewer that religion and animal protection are linked concepts; it assumes it. The narrative that runs through the website is a story that religion and religious participation are, overall, a positive force. This story is first seen in the motto stated by Faith Outreach, that they operate with "the premise that religious values call upon us all to act in a kind and

merciful way toward all creatures,”²⁷³ and it continues throughout the website. The narrative prompts adherents to action that potentially promotes animal welfare, implying that being religious should compel a person to protect animals.

The narrative that religious values are linked to animal advocacy is stated on the “Volunteer With Us” page, where the department says that, “Almost all religious traditions have statements regarding animals.”²⁷⁴ For Faith Outreach, the ideal of a religious tradition should include all animals, not merely humans. Faith Outreach frames their central commitment that “kindness and mercy” are features of all religions that can be extended to animals by using discourse that religionists connect to and via volunteering and community engagement. Further, the telling of stories of animal advocacy by historical Evangelical leaders teaches people that some of the earliest impulses toward animal welfare were rooted in religious convictions. Moreover, Faith Outreach and the HSUS are artfully placing the organization within that history and legacy in the minds of the viewers.

Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in HSUS’s Faith Outreach

A common way that Faith Outreach uses sentimentality is in the display of pictures and images. Anthropomorphism is not a strong feature of their website. Each of the resources tabs has some picture of a “cute” animal: a sheep and a pig sitting together, a sad-looking dog holding a bowl, a sow and her piglet nuzzling, a child hugging a

273. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith>. Accessed 08/10/15.

274. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/community/volunteers/volunteer-faith-outreach.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 08/25/15.

chicken.²⁷⁵ In these instances, sentimentality becomes a rhetorical tool to draw upon emotions that invite someone to give to the HSUS and join the effort. With these pictures, Faith Outreach is attempting to make a person feel sorry for the animals and to be solicitous to them and to the HSUS. They hope to draw out the attachment to companion animals and apply it to helping animals that are more distant. All the pictures of cute, sad-looking animals with their large eyes and direct stares aimed at the viewer can serve to arouse guilt from those who visit the site.

Yet extracting the moral emotion of guilt is not necessarily a more sophisticated use of sentimentalism based in the theories of Hume, Smith, and others. Nor is it really using emotion in the ways of the feminist care ethics of Donovan and Gheaus, who suggest moral imagination, an “intense attentiveness to another’s reality that requires strong powers of observation and concentration and also faculties of evaluation and judgment (Donovan 1996:152). In order to do this, Faith Outreach would need to ask the reader/viewer to imagine what the animals might want, whether it is the cow going to slaughter or the companion animal being adopted. Moral imagining includes taking into consideration information that humans would know but that an animal would not. For example, it is good for a companion animal to be vaccinated even though the animal’s immediate pain might not be desirable to the animal (Donovan 2006:316; 317). Given the choice, an animal might not choose to experience immediate pain, but as an animal’s representative, the human can make that decision because it is ultimately in the best interest of the animal.

275. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/fill_the_bowl/fill-the-bowl.html?credit=web_id96887623. Accessed 09/19/16.

Additionally, the reader/viewer is constantly being asked to act “mercifully” toward animals. *Mercy* is a significant term because it corresponds to a petition for alleviating suffering and bestowing compassion, and it is an essential word when thinking about sentimentality. Commonly, when the term *mercy* is used, particularly in a religious context, it is to convey the idea of acting benevolently or forgivingly toward someone or something that one has power over. Drawing upon mercy works well in this context because god(s) are typically represented as more powerful than humans, especially in the religions on which the Faith Outreach concentrates.

Throughout the main HSUS website, with its focus on protection, the story about animals is that they are creatures who are hurt, killed, and harmed by humans; therefore the reader/viewer needs to help the HSUS and others who seek to make the world better for animals. The term *mercy* correlates well with these ideas about animals, and it is used in several places on their website; for example, in their motto and in their video titled “Eating Mercifully.” Rather than using “moral shocks,” which I discuss in more detail with All-Creatures in the previous chapter, Faith Outreach’s appeal to mercy could be seen as aiming at a tempered emotional appeal, and perhaps in a longer lasting sense, at an appeal for the “least of these” (Jasper 1998:409), one that fits in very well with a religious audience. Just as there was not a strong component of blame for industries, religion, businesses, or even individuals, the approach here is more about compassion, charity, and perhaps duty rather than anger. The HSUS being the largest welfare organization makes a huge difference in reaching out to religious communities. By having a religious department, the organization is filling a niche that the larger website is not. Religious individuals are able to see the HSUS commitments reflected in their faith

traditions. The appeal to religious people is important to the HSUS, given the focus on getting them to volunteer for the organization. Expanding the animal movement into religious communities only serves to grow the movement and to bring more people to the cause. Religions' attention to compassion and mercy, as argued by Faith Outreach, can broaden the moral umbrella under which the animal movement presents its case.

PETA: Jesus People for Animals

The new religious program of PETA, Jesus People for Animals (JPFA), was announced in 2014. The header contains their motto: "Jesus People for Animals: Because Animals Are Not Ours. (They're God's)."²⁷⁶ A picture of a blue sky with a strip of green grass at the bottom is displayed, and on the right-hand side are two sheep. Sheep are religiously significant animals for Christians because Jesus is often called "the Lamb of God." HSUS Faith Outreach and All-creatures both feature sheep on their headers as well. The overall look of the JPFA website is much more subdued than the main PETA website, where newsfeeds, pictures, graphics, and a bombardment of information compete for attention. The tone of the discourse is also more constrained in that the JPFA site does not seem as accusatory or harsh as the PETA site.

The Jesus People for Animals name alone connotes a different audience than that of the HSUS Faith Outreach. With its focus on religions other than Christianity, the HSUS presents it as reaching out to a wider group of people. The name "Jesus People" has is reminiscent of the Jesus People Movement, an evangelical countercultural movement from the early 1970s. The Jesus People Movement developed out of the secular hippie movement in the 1960s. The movement was both counter to and sought to

276. PETA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com>. Accessed 08/17/15.

uphold conservative Christianity (Smith 2011:46; Young 2015:2). It had begun with values of “communalism, rejection of social norms, radical apocalypticism, prophetic leadership styles, and anti-establishment leadership tendencies” (Smith 2011:56). The movement saw Jesus as countercultural, and they interpreted him as confronting injustice, materialism, and institutionalism (49). By the late 1970s, the movement was more widely accepted by conservative Evangelicals, and it “turned toward piety rather than political activism” (50). Like the Jesus People Movement, the JPFA focuses heavily on Christianity as countercultural and as fighting injustice. The Evangelical Christian audience of JPFA is evidenced throughout their website.

The language used throughout the website is generally Christian in nature, which is not surprising given the name. An entire section on the Scriptures has subsections such as “All Creatures Worship God” and “New Life in Christ,” although the majority of their scripture references are from the Hebrew Bible. The “New Life in Christ” section starts: “Christians are called to be radically inclusive in their love for the least and most marginalized of society, as demonstrated by the life and death of Christ.”²⁷⁷

Here the reference is to Christ, in other places it references Jesus, thus making sure to adopt a wide theological scope. This first line also reassures the reader that the understanding of Christianity is one that will appeal to evangelicals.²⁷⁸ Indeed, the front page in 2016 featured excerpts from a book called *Vegangelical*, strengthening the perceived identity of the audience.²⁷⁹ In its “core messages,” the program talks about “protection” and “stewardship.” JPFA argues that humans are protectors of other animals

277. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies/>. Accessed 10/02/16.

278. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies/>. Accessed 02/18/16.

279. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com>. Accessed 12/01/16.

and that God appointed people to be caretakers of animals and creation.²⁸⁰ Stewardship in this context is taking care of creation by not eating animals and thus not contributing to violence against them. The New Life in Christ section ends:

Everything about using animals for food, for clothing, for experiments, and as ‘entertainment’ flies in the face of what it means to be a good steward of God’s creation. All animals are individuals with feelings—they feel pleasure, loneliness, and fear, yet they are subjected to horrific abuse at human hands.²⁸¹

Compassion is another facet of JPFA’s “core messages.” In the context of the program, compassion describes the way humans should behave toward animals. Animals are portrayed as “the least of these,” and their suffering in today’s industries and agribusinesses is the “logical extension” of past concerns over human slavery and rights for women and children. The program maintains that the Christian church has been instrumental in bringing about justice in the latter two areas and that ending the suffering of animals should be a reasonable addition to the church’s “prophetic witness.” After calling Christians to be prophetic, the page asserts, “In the past, the church has struggled to bring about the abolition of slavery, suffrage and basic rights for women and children, and more. Acknowledging and working to relieve the plight of animals is a logical extension of that prophetic witness.”²⁸²

The section dealing with scripture contends that “in the beginning,” humans and animals were meant to have vegan diets, similar to other Jewish and Christian arguments for vegetarian or vegan diets. This page describes how humans are “made in God’s likeness.” For JPFA, this phrase has special meaning:

280. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/about-jesus-people-for-animals/>. Accessed 08/17/15.

281. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies/>. Accessed 02/12/16.

282. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/about-jesus-people-for-animals>. Accessed 08/17/15.

And what is God's likeness? Throughout the Scripture, God shows us mercy that we do not deserve, grace that we have not earned, and love that we cannot imagine. We are made in that likeness and are charged with reflecting those qualities to the whole of creation. Being made in the image of God is a call to caretaking, compassion, and mercy.²⁸³

The appeal to mercy is similar to that of the HSUS, but the context is different. The language in this section is very deferential to God, implying that humans owe God a great deal for the many things that God has provided to people without merit, repeating a frequent evangelical trope.²⁸⁴ The "likeness" means that humans should treat animals with compassion and mercy because God has treated humans similarly. Yet other animals are not discussed as having God's "likeness." Along with their parent organization, JPFA goes to great lengths to describe how animals and humans are similar, especially when it comes to feeling pain and suffering: "When we treat animals like unfeeling commodities, we undercut God's original design. God created animals with the ability to suffer in the same way and to the same degree that humans do."²⁸⁵ A counter argument to JPFA's statement is evidenced in the idea that God demanded the sacrifice of animals. Norman Wirzba argues that sacrifices were for the purpose of "communication that involves a double offering: a giving of the gift *and* giving of oneself" (2011:119). Sacrifice is a double gift because all animals, humans included, need food to live. Wirzba argues that no matter what makes up a person's diet, whether they be vegetarian or omnivore, the life of another is being consumed (120).

The discourse and theological arguments of JPFA are traditional at some points, such as the affirmation that Jesus was God incarnate and the use of royal language to

283. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies>. Accessed 08/17/15.

284. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies>. Accessed 02/12/16.

285. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how>. Accessed 02/18/16.

refer to God: “Jesus was God incarnate, enfleshed. Jesus brought the reign of God into human history and extended an invitation for the whole of creation to participate in a new Kingdom. The Kingdom of God is countercultural and offers liberation from sin, death, and oppression.”²⁸⁶ At the same time, this passage is also novel and encompasses some of the most progressive aspects of their arguments. JPFA pursues the social justice angle heavily as it argues that Christians should protect animals and become vegan as a part of a “compassionate” lifestyle. As in the above example, throughout the website, Christianity is portrayed as countercultural, fitting with the Jesus People association evoked by the organization name, because churches have been at the forefront of social justice issues.²⁸⁷ Stressing the connections between Christianity, human rights, social justice, compassion, and animals could be considered the paramount premise to JPFA’s argument about animals. Joseph Davis elucidates that “stories reconfigure the past, endowing it with meaning and continuity, and so also project a sense of what will or should happen in the future” (2002:12). JPFA endows Christianity’s past with a strong slant toward social justice, and their argument sets up the story so that the future of an already socially oriented Christianity will include justice for animals.

As mentioned above, the program compares animal suffering to other justice issues such as abolition and women’s rights. The grounds for veganism is divided into four rationales, the obvious being “for animals,” but the other three are tied into more customary social justice ideals: the environment, human rights, and to “fight

286. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies>. Accessed 02/18/16.

287. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies>. Accessed 08/17/15.

oppression.”²⁸⁸ In the Human Rights section, JPFA discusses worker injuries and situations that people employed on factory farms must endure. The page also considers the need to cease raising animals for food because of the environmental issues involved, such as resource use in the production of grain, use of water, and acquiring adequate arable land. The argument here is that with such problems, animals as food causes greater human hunger and is unsustainable in the long run. They contend that growing crops and vegetables for human consumption would help solve world hunger issues because there would be enough land and resources to produce food for everyone on the planet.²⁸⁹ The discussion of the environment ties Christianity back to the notion of stewardship, which is mentioned as one of their core messages. Industrial factory farming hurts the environment, wastes precious resources, and causes climate change, whereas veganism fulfills the call for Christians to be good stewards of creation.²⁹⁰

The section called “To Fight Oppression” recapitulates the linchpin argument of the website: Christianity is a religion of social justice, working hard in its past and present on human rights issues. Such an orientation should be continued to include animals. “One hundred years from now, the church should look back and be proud to have been a leader in the animal protection movement.”²⁹¹ Again, these actions are a part

288. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how/fighting-oppression>. Accessed 08/17/15.

289. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how>. Accessed 08/17/15.

290. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how/meat-and-the-environment>. Accessed 09/20/16.

291. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how/fighting-oppression>. Accessed 08/19/15.

of being a “prophetic witness to the whole world.”²⁹² Highlighting oppression corresponds to the larger message that, according to JPFA, animal exploitation is a justice issue. Portraying Christianity as social justice oriented and countercultural is strikingly different than the mainstream Evangelical concerns, which tend to be more conservative in nature. The strain of Evangelical Christianity that leans progressive has highlighted concerns for the environment and other social justice issues,²⁹³ and JPFA’s message likely attracts people concerned with these issues.

The predominant focus on the website is the plight of animals in factory farming and promoting the solution offered by a vegan lifestyle. Animals on factory farms are portrayed as living in dire conditions that warrant the reader/viewer to stop participating in the furtherance of harm. The narrative told about factory farming and other issues on the website is undoubtedly one of animal suffering and misery. The centrality of veganism and factory farming is in line with their parent organization, which sees veganism as the best solution to the use of animals for human purposes.

In Joseph Davis’s terms, the “plot” of such a narrative is that the world is not what it used to be (2002:11; see also Jasper 2011). Animal agriculture has seen a shift from meadows, grazing, and free-roaming animals to factory farming. Animals are now crammed into small spaces and cages without room to adequately move around. According to JPFA, Christians should be concerned, because the justifications for eating meat are based on a time when the practices of raising animals were substantially

292. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how/fighting-oppression>. Accessed 08/19/15.

293. See, for example, Jim Wallis and the Sojourners, who seek to offset some of the typical “culture war” aspects of conservative Evangelical Christianity, especially in the last 15 years. Sojourners maintain that they are made up of people of all types of Christian denominations, “Christians who follow Jesus” and “seek the intersection of faith, politics, and culture.” <https://sojo.net/about-us/our-history>. Accessed 10/04/16.

different than they are today. JPFA invokes Jesus in the FAQ section, claiming that “Jesus would be horrified by today’s factory-farming practices,”²⁹⁴ even though it is likely that Jesus ate meat.²⁹⁵ Further, the industries are so abusive toward animals that the act is decisively sinful: “The mammoth meat, dairy, and egg industries are built on cruelty, oppression, and abuse—they are sinful structures, and Christians should reject them.”²⁹⁶ Davis argues that stories “request certain responses from their audience” (2002:12). Doubtless, the response JPFA wants from its audience is to become vegan and stop capitulating to these “sinful structures.” Consequently, like HSUS’s Faith Outreach and their push for better welfare for animals, for JPFA, becoming vegan is almost a Christian duty.

JPFA also relies heavily on testimony as a part of their website. In the Helping Animals²⁹⁷ section, a number of testimonials are devoted to why people are vegan and Christian. The reader/viewer is offered an opportunity to order an “activist starter pack.”²⁹⁸ Presumably, the hope is that by reading other people’s testimonies, the

294. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies/faqs>. Accessed 08/21/15.

295. Like the argument that a vegetarian/vegan diet is better for the environment, it is debated as to whether Jesus would have condoned vegetarianism and whether eating meat is wrong. The statement from JPFA is one way to bolster the position of many who believe that vegetarianism should be part of a Christian life. On the other hand, Wirzba notes that there is no scriptural evidence that “Jesus was vegetarian or that he, while protesting abuses, opposed the tradition of temple sacrifices” (2011:132). Yet Wirzba also acknowledges that most people receiving their meat packaged and sanitized at a grocery store do not recognize the sacrifice that occurred for their food and that there need to be changes to the factory-farm industry that currently produces and kills the animals for the meals that many eat (134; 136). In JPFA’s statement above, they argue that Jesus would object to factory farming and speak less about a blanket condemnation of meat eating.

296. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies/faqs>. Accessed 08/21/15.

297. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/get-active-for-animals/testimonies>. Accessed 08/18/15.

reader/viewer will want to become an activist for animals. It is significant that JPFA utilizes testimony in the way that it does because testimony and “witnessing” are frequent practices in many forms of Christianity. Christians are routinely compelled to share their faith with others and to give testimony and witness to their beliefs in the hopes of converting others. There is a particular narrative about both humanity and animals with the attention to testimony; JPFA pronounces that animals and the act of protecting them are unequivocally a part of what it means to be a Christian and to live faithfully. Accordingly, animals themselves should also be an integral part of the Christian faith.

Along with the focus on testimony, the website gives the reader/viewer tips on how to help animals in the reader/viewers own community.²⁹⁹ These recommendations include ideas for home, church, and “around town.” Some of these ideas include hosting a vegan dinner party, asking to invite a vegan speaker to speak at church, or including vegan literature in a church library or bookstore. The “around town” portion of the suggestions include several ideas about volunteering and leaving literature, similar to the practice of Evangelical Christians who leave “tracts”: “Take literature with you wherever you go—at the laundromat, in waiting rooms, on the bus, or in dressing rooms, bookstores, coffee shops, and grocery stores. Never pass a bulletin board without tacking up a leaflet or poster. How much easier can it get?”³⁰⁰ Many people have seen or experienced for themselves Christian tracts being placed in many of the areas that JPFA suggests, displaying condensed wording about “salvation messages.” This kind of

298. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/get-active-for-animals/free-activist-starter-pack>. Accessed 08/18/15.

299. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/get-active-for-animals>. Accessed 08/18/15.

300. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/get-active-for-animals>. Accessed 08/18/15.

leafleting would be familiar to the Christian reader/viewer, as would the idea of volunteering at soup kitchens and shelters that are a part of JPFA's recommendations. The program simply extends activities that are already recognized by this "adherent pool" (Snow et al. 1986:472) to the cause of animals.

Frame Analysis

The entire Jesus People for Animals program is an effort by PETA at frame extension. They are trying to expand their support base by connecting what often has been seen as conflicting frames: Christianity and animal rights (Mika 2006:933). Snow et al. contend that "values that some SMOs promote may not be rooted in existing sentiment or adherent pools, or may appear to have little if any bearing on the life situations and interests of potential adherents" (1986:472). Because JPFA connects social justice with the Christian church, the department and the larger PETA organization are using frame bridging to bring together "ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames" (467) that the Christian might already want to fuse. A person is reminded of positive social aspects of Christianity's past and is asked to take part in extending that legacy to animals. Further emphasis on these social issues and Christianity's involvement could be viewed as value amplification, in which particular standards and morals of potential adherents are promoted (1986:469).

Additionally, frame extension is used in a more nuanced way by broadening the rationales for veganism beyond animal rights and into causes that help humanity as well. Calling attention to these other justice issues might be particularly salient for the Christian viewer. Someone who wants to maintain that humans are hierarchically higher

than animals could still agree, in principle, with some of JPFA's grounds for veganism because of the extension to anthropocentric concerns. The stress on human rights, oppression, and the environment (not always an anthropocentric concern) may be a more palatable entry into animal rights than to concentrate exclusively on animal issues.

Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality in JPFA

As mentioned above, JPFA's website is more subdued than the main PETA site. One reason for this, despite the discourse, is the use of sentimentality throughout the site. JPFA's website is filled with many more pictures and graphics of "cute" animals and pastoral settings. For example, at the bottom of every page are bright, color-rich pictures accompanied with biblical verses: A whale jumping out of the water is pictured with mountains in the background. A woman is playing with and petting two baby pigs; a cow and her calf are eating grass next to a pond, and a pile of vibrant fresh looking vegetables greet the viewer. The Donate icon on the right-hand side of most pages displays a picture of a rabbit sitting in the grass, looking at the reader/viewer.

On JPFA's "Features" page, most of the images that are paired with headlines and taglines are "cute" and/or baby animals. One feature even includes the statement, "23 of God's Adorable Furry Friends: These 23 photos will melt your heart and change the way you think of fur"³⁰¹ paired with a picture of a baby fox. The headline of this example is an instance of blatant sentimentality. It tells the reader/viewer that he will change his mind about animals because of the sentimentality used. The pictures are classic uses of rhetorical sentimentality—baby animals stare out at the viewer from the page, and the "gut reaction" to many of these images is exactly what they say it will be: adorable. The

301. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/features>. Accessed 08/19/15.

feature of the “furry friends,” while not about promoting veganism, links thoughts about being vegan with adorable animals because JPFA and PETA are so associated with veganism. Compassion and mercy, as previously discussed, are frequently used words throughout the website that create a pattern of appealing to sentimentality. The program draws on a religious interpretation of mercy similar to the way in which HSUS Faith Outreach uses the concept. One striking instance of anthropomorphism is on the page that discusses “fighting oppression.” The page says:

God created animals with the ability to feel pain, joy, and fear and to suffer. Anyone who lives with an animal will tell you that each animal has a unique personality and strong needs and desires. When we treat animals like unfeeling commodities, we undercut God’s original design.³⁰²

The above quote reflects the earlier statement from JPFA about how all animals have feelings. This statement strongly echoes Marc Bekoff when he writes about animal emotions and anthropomorphism (2007, 2010). The statement is also a conspicuous example of farm animals being compared to companion species. While not explicitly comparing other animals to humans in this statement, maintaining that God made animals to feel pain, joy, and even to have personalities follows a logical path that animals are more humanlike than we may have considered.

Pictures of cute, cuddly animals and majestic wildlife are not exclusively presented on JPFA’s website. One example of this is the feature “Five Disturbing Facts About ‘Free-Range’ and ‘Organic’ Meat, Eggs, and Dairy Products.”³⁰³ This page displays a number of gruesome images along with long paragraphs of text describing the various processes. According to JPFA, these labels and statuses do not have any impact

302. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how>. Accessed 08/17/15.

on the actual animals' lives because their predicament is much the same as that of factory farmed animals.

The repellant pictures coupled with the vast majority of images that invoke sentimentality in the form of cuteness and compassion are a noticeable illustration of Jasper's moral batteries, where a negative and positive image or description are linked to intensify emotions (2011:147). There are bound to be "reactive" emotions such as anger and outrage involved when the reader/viewer receives information, particularly about animals on factory farms, that is new and startling, or to the undermining that organic meat means better treatment of animals (1998:399). JPFA's moral batteries type of presentation incorporates Jasper's concept of moods, which are calculated with sentimentality: compassion, sympathy, and pity. Moods are labeled by Jasper as "chronic" because they are long lasting emotions, somewhere in between reactive and affective emotions (1998:402). JPFA anticipates that the reactive emotions will turn into long-lasting sentimental moods that will cause readers to join PETA and give money and time to the organization to further its cause.

The audience for the Christian outreach program is decisively different than for the main PETA organization; thus the tactics and foci of each are distinct, but in such a way that goes beyond merely the obvious emphasis on religion to a more tempered packaging of the issues. The stronger use of sentimentality and the powerful story of a Christianity that is justice minded allow the religious reader/viewer to better envision a future in which animals no longer suffer. What is more, for JPFA and PETA, the hope is that the reader/viewer can see the end not only of suffering but of animal use altogether.

303. JPFA. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/features/five-disturbing-facts-about-free-range-and-organic-meat-eggs-and-dairy-products>. Accessed 08/18/15.

A thread that weaves its way throughout JPFA's website is the idea of a "peaceable kingdom,"³⁰⁴ which includes a powerful and frequent Christian image of the lion lying down with the lamb. Being vegan and working for the inclusion of animals into the moral sphere of Christianity is for JPFA a part of a "kingdom" mindset, a vision that is prophesied about, and one that Jesus would want. Although there is a drive for the reader/viewer to become vegan now, less focus is placed on individual change and responsibility for the predicament of animals today than in the main PETA website. JPFA is a "resource for Christians who want to learn about how our faith should influence our relationship with animals."³⁰⁵ The group is geared toward education and turning the tide of Christianity toward a greater respect for animals via the adoption of a vegan lifestyle. For JPFA, the Bible promises a better future, and the Christian reader/viewer can be a part of that future, together with the whole religion and its social justice inclination. A vision of the future without the exploitation of animals is a theme that is more readily available because of the way JPFA has framed the problem.

Conclusion

Some striking similarities and differences are apparent between the HSUS Faith Outreach and Jesus People for Animals. What is immediately noticeable is that the header for JPFA is almost identical to the header of HSUS's Faith Outreach—white lambs against a brilliant blue sky and a little bit of green grass on the right side of the page. The imagery of sheep on these websites seems intended to evoke the teaching that God, in

304. JPFA. [http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies.](http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/scripture-and-testimonies;); [http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how/fighting-oppression.](http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/why-vegan-how/fighting-oppression) Accessed 08/24/15.

305. JPFA. [http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/about-jesus-people-for-animals.](http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com/about-jesus-people-for-animals) Accessed 02/18/16.

Judaism and Christianity at least, is a shepherd to a flock of believers, whereas Jesus is often depicted as a sacrificial lamb (Perlo 2009:46; 83).

Each organization's religious outreach programs are somewhat less invasive than the parent websites. HSUS's Faith Outreach focuses less on the disturbing aspects of animal issues such as factory farms and experimentation. Blaming industries, individuals, and/or religion for animal abuses and suffering is a reduced focus. JPFA is markedly tame compared to PETA; both the language and the imagery contain much less blame. JPFA depends much more strongly on emotions of sentimentality than on moral shocks, anger, and outrage. The images and stories about animals may bring out guilt, which is not necessarily an emotion of sentimentality but is nonetheless a response to moral rule violation (Prinz 2007:35). Guilt is used to advance sympathy so that individuals will further the cause of animal advocacy. In order to move past the gut-level aspects of sentimentality that Faith Outreach and JPFA use, sympathy or empathy will need to be combined with moral imagination, envisioning how animals might feel about their circumstances, because this can further break down the species barrier while attending to differences (Donovan 2006; Gheaus 2012). Anthropomorphism, by its very definition, can support this moral imagination because understanding how much other animals are like us furthers the kind of compassion and care ethic that moral imagination implies.

A sense of duty goes along with the religious respect and care for animals rather than moral indignation. Both programs have a more outward-looking impulse, which corresponds with a religious duty often associated with "doing for others" in addition to proselytizing. For HSUS this is seen in its considerable emphasis on volunteering and in JPFA's stress on testimony and witness, even as the program discusses how people can

“help animals.” The aspects of duty and respect are very different than how All-Creatures operates, as seen in the previous chapter. Moral indignation and guilt are relied on heavily to motivate people.

Whereas the HSUS’s Faith Outreach deals with a breadth of religious traditions, JPFA is solely focused on Christianity. Faith Outreach is based on an assumption that religions and their faithful can be, and often are, affirming and supportive of animal protection. JPFA does the bulk of its work persuading the audience that cares for animals, and veganism is a natural extension of Christian principles. Perhaps also this work does more than convince; it could also serve to bolster and reinforce already held beliefs about a faithful Christian life and animal protection. Similarly, JPFA’s narrative theme of Christianity as a socially minded religion can be compared to Faith Outreach’s tacit acceptance that religions are a positive force for animal issues.

Katherine Willis Perlo, in *Killing and Kinship: The Animal in World Religions* (2009), argues that the trend in world religions has been to become more supportive of animal protection (133). When discussing religion, animals, and protection, she is almost exclusively concerned with vegetarianism because animal protection comes readily from religious writings. Both the Faith Outreach of HSUS and PETA’s Jesus People for Animals engage in what are typical “effective-defense strategies” for animal advocacy (133). Perlo argues that many religions (she examines Judaism, Christianity, Islam and Buddhism) have recognized an ethical problem with killing animals, and one way to deal with this unease is to become defensive, which all the religions she explored have done to some extent (8). Perlo defines “effective defense” as taking these defenses and changing them (10). JPFA and Faith Outreach are strongly Christian oriented in their arguments;

emphasizing a compassionate God and reinterpreting the dominion passage are common themes for such a religious justification of animal rights (180). However, the two groups are different in the language and audience. JPFA is much more geared toward evangelical Christianity, especially in the biblical verses and testimony it emphasizes. Although they do give some attention to evangelicals, Faith Outreach seeks to locate their audience in a larger religious category that encompasses outlooks beyond Christianity. These strategies weigh heavily in both organizations' programs. Equally strong is the argument for mercy, which Perlo finds in all Abrahamic religions (145). HSUS uses mercy more frequently, and it is a discourse for protection. JPFA uses the effective-defense strategy of "changed conditions" quite well, and the major narrative motif is how different factory farming is today from the more pastoral farming of the past (140). JPFA uses the term *compassion* habitually in their appeals for animals, and the group has much in common with Jewish Veg in that both groups pivot around the solution of veganism and concentrate on a justice tradition to persuade people of their arguments.

There is a connection between mercy and compassion in the way that Faith Outreach and JPFA use the terms. According to the *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (2015) defines *mercy* similarly: "A moral value essentially concerned with preventing or alleviating hardship or suffering on the part of others" (655). Additionally, it describes *mercy* as a subjective state of the person granting it, which includes compassion for another. According to the *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, mercy can also be a root of reasons that may or may not be "obligation imposing" (655). Relevant for the animal movement, mercy is tied to charity, which combines "love for others, including the promotion and protection of their interests" (655). Thus, Faith Outreach's frequent use of

the term *mercy* and JPFA's use of the word *compassion* both carry strongly the connotation of protection. Humans have the ability to harm animals, which is made powerfully evident to the reader/viewer by both Faith Outreach and JPFA, as well as other animal organizations; thus humans are seen as having the power, and perhaps even a duty, to protect animals.

By implementing their religious outreach programs and departments, the secular organizations HSUS and PETA are recognizing the value that religion brings to the animal advocacy movement and the progression of religions toward more animal-friendly interpretations of their gods, texts, and practices. With the growth of the animal movement in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, this progression and religion's place in it is bound to continue.

CHAPTER 6
BUILDING A CRITICAL ANTHROPOMORPHISM AND
SENTIMENTALITY: TOWARD AN ECOFEMINIST MORAL SENTIMENTALISM

From loud and graphic (PETA and All-Creatures) to pressing for reform and having less intense images (ASPCA and HSUS), the organizations examined in my dissertation provide a variety of ways in which the animal movement frames its cause. Social movement framing is essential because the way arguments are structured determines the reception of messages and how potential constituents respond. It is clear from looking at these groups that anthropomorphism and sentimentality are significant devices for framing animal arguments and persuasion. The concepts represent a considerable element for each of the groups. Anthropomorphism and sentimentality evoke moral emotions that additionally refine how arguments are received. Prompting an emotional response has proven indispensable for the animal movement and its growth, as is shown throughout my study.

The use of religion in framing the motivations for the animal movement is also very important to the ongoing pursuit for the betterment of animals. Two major animal groups, PETA and HSUS, have attempted to tap into that stream by developing their own religious departments. PETA has JPFA to address a largely Christian market, and HSUS has set up Faith Outreach to emphasize a broader religious outlook. All-Creatures and Jewish Veg furnish the animal movement with distinct takes on Christianity and Judaism, two religions that have not had the most positive legacy in their relationships toward

animals. These websites and organizations have tried hard to demonstrate religious arguments for animals in ways that would uniquely reach their respective audiences.

The overall impression of the websites, their content, and the emotions and feelings evoked by such content draws the individual into the cause; front pages are important frame settings. The ASPCA recently redesigned the style on their website; the most striking reorientation is the front page, where upon opening, the focal point is now dedicated to soliciting donations with bright, colorful pictures of dogs.³⁰⁶ PETA's website, on the other hand, is somewhat more chaotic than that of the ASPCA. PETA's front page has multiple news items, stories, and calls for action. The pictures, videos, and news alerts appear along with a large banner emblazoned with their motto, and all of these compete for the viewer's attention.³⁰⁷ The websites of Jesus People for Animals (JPFA) and the Faith Outreach part of the HSUS are more visually subdued. The website of Jewish Veg features mostly written text and graphics, with not as many pictures as other sites. All-Creatures is also very busy, because of the sheer amount of information that could potentially be examined by the reader. Consequently, their website is not as polished as the other sites. The ASPCA and HSUS websites have the most requests for financial support. Like the ASPCA, HSUS also has a pop-up window that asks for donations as soon as the homepage loads on the screen.³⁰⁸ For some, donating money is a relatively simple way for a person to be involved in the movement. As a result, the

306. ASPCA. <https://www.asPCA.org>. Accessed 11/05/15.

307. PETA. <http://www.peta.org>. Accessed 11/05/15.

308. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org>. Accessed 04/20/16.

ASPCA and HSUS are the two largest of the groups monetarily, and obviously, donations are key for their operation.

Each of the groups' emotional appeals is connected to pictures and images. For example, the ASPCA main page is filled with bright pictures of sad-looking and young dogs and cats, most of whom are looking out at the viewer. Sometimes these emotional appeals correspond with moral batteries, the combination of positive and negative emotions. Other times, the focus is more on compassion, ties to sympathy and compassion, and lasting moods rather than moral outrage. These images and snippets about companion animals engender many emotions associated with sentimentality and sympathy.

The overall message of ASPCA is one of protection that pivots around companion and farm animals. They identify their "key issues" as animal homelessness and animal cruelty. Many groups associate animal activism with choosing to be vegan; veganism is of the utmost importance for PETA, JPFA, Jewish Veg, and All-Creatures because they see it as the solution to many of the problems with animals. Not all religious groups, however, approach issues the same way. Jewish Veg and JPFA concentrate their religious appeals with a legacy of justice from Judaism and Christianity. Faith Outreach hones in on aspects of mercy and compassion that they find in all religions.

Framing and Blame

One strong frame that emerges is blame for the current problems, however they are defined. Blame is one of the most prevalent amplifications that Snow et al. found in social movement literature (1986:470). As was discussed throughout the dissertation,

they explain that using amplification to enhance an issue for a particular audience is one of the most crucial frame alignment strategies. Animal rights/welfare groups argue that a systematic problem exists with the poor conditions of animals in factory farming, companion animal abuse and puppy mills, and the vast mistreatment of wild animals and endangered species. Because of the entrenched system of instrumental animal use, I had expected to discover that placing fault on larger industries such as CAFOs and puppy mills would be the most frequent type of blaming that occurred. Blame is also behind seeking to change the system through legal means, especially for the large national/international ones such as PETA and the HSUS. Yet my findings show that the organizations blamed the individual almost as much as the larger industries. Therefore it may be that while the cause of animal protection discloses a structural situation, it has complex understandings of change. Change must focus on both the individual and institutional levels. One reason for the focus on individuals is the attempt to change beliefs. Beliefs are important because they “cognitively support or impede action in pursuit of desired values” (470). One of the ways this is done is to present ideas about the location of blame. Snow and colleagues articulate that “participation in movement activity is frequently contingent on the amplification or transformation” about where to place blame, opinions about antagonists, or the necessity of change (470).

A common feature for many of the groups to gain support and compel the reader/viewer is to make someone understand how their own actions contribute to the problem. This was especially true with PETA, All-Creatures, Jewish Veg, and JPFA. Both the secular and religious organizations used personal guilt to persuade and educate. Often these groups choose to answer a culturally ingrained problem, one that has deep

roots both socially and religiously in the United States, by asking the individual to change personal habits. Such a notion of change is thus—change enough individuals, and institutional change will follow. Further, Anna Peterson notes that ideas are most often thought to change practices: “mainstream moral theory assumes that wrong ideas cause destructive practices and therefore, that changed ideas will lead directly to changed practices” (2013:161). She argues that because of social conditions and practical circumstances the relationship between ideas and practices is complex (161). Granted, these groups also work hard to utilize legal means to change things and attempt to change laws at the local, state, and federal level for animals. This is especially true of the larger organizations, HSUS, the ASPCA, and PETA.

My findings on how groups frame their arguments hint at what Francione argues is a “micro versus macro” resolution in so far as the reduction of suffering (reform) is a micro focus on individuals, animal, and humans. A micro solution is different than addressing the larger industries involved in perpetuating the majority of atrocities against animals (1996:143). Such an approach can be both good and bad. Francione has a point about the way in which the animal movement may not be focused enough on the macro level. At the same time, changes need to be at all levels, and incremental reform is a positive step for animals even if it does not result in the absolute cessation of their use by humans.

Developing a sense of awareness and knowledge about the plight of animals necessitates having potential adherents take a step back and examine their practices. Dorothy Smith, in *The Everyday World As Problematic: A Feminist Sociology* (1987), notes that “The distinctive and deep significance of consciousness -raising...was

precisely this process of opening up what was personal, idiosyncratic, and inchoate and discovering with others how this was shared, was objectively part of women's oppression, finding ways of speaking of it and ways of speaking of it politically" (58). Coming to the realization of the extent of animal exploitation when it is so thoroughly enshrined in society can be a similar consciousness-raising experience. Understanding how one is personally affected by and simultaneously complicit in the system of animal exploitation and cruelty allows a person to be able to share that knowledge and speak about it politically. "Critical consciousness makes us aware of ourselves as oppressors. It transforms our understanding of reality in which the political has been naturalized" (Adams 1994:124). This is one of the purposes of using blame and guilt to show reader/viewers how they are responsible. Organizations want more activists, and they want people to spread their message; therefore it may be essential that individuals see how their "everyday world" is constructed within the power structures that keep animals oppressed. As Smith says, "Making the everyday world our problematic instructs us to look for the 'inner' organization and its generating features...and to look for that inner organization in the externalized and abstracted relations of economic processes and of the ruling apparatus in general" (1987:99). What we eat, wear, and use are essential parts of our "everyday worlds," and making the connections is important for the movement.

This focus on the individual is also necessitated by the difficulty of getting laws changed. Animal welfare and rights groups advocate legal changes to the system, but these laws have only made a small dent in the larger problem of animal exploitation. However, they have made some progress, as evidenced by the "victories" touted in their annual reports and on their websites. In the process of trying, public awareness of animal

issues has increased. For example, a 2015 Gallup poll found that 32% of Americans surveyed believe that animals should have the same rights as humans, and 62% of people polled believe that animals should have “some protection.” The rights view has gone up since the last poll, in 2008, when 25% agreed with animal rights.³⁰⁹ One way to motivate individuals is through guilt, a self-critical emotion that makes prospective constituents want to confess and rectify actions. It “motivates them to adjust their behaviors in ways that facilitate cooperation... guilt can lead to greater personal attunement and, indeed, empathy and sympathy with others” (Turner and Stets 2007:551). When people are able to deal with their complicity and the guilt induced by animal organizations, it influences them to do more by becoming a part of the organization.

The Use of Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality

In my study, anthropomorphism and sentimentality are frequently used as a device to frame the arguments and information presented by animal rights/welfare organizations. The concepts are important, because, as Daston, Mitman, and Bekoff have noted, among others, anthropomorphism is virtually unavoidable when discussing other animals. Additionally, anthropomorphism is necessary because humans only have a certain vocabulary to talk about the feelings and actions of emotions. As Mary Midgley writes, “Every new thing that we meet has to be understood in terms drawn from earlier human experience. This is inevitable because ‘understanding’ anything new simply *is* relating it to what we have already experienced” (1983:127). Animal rights groups seek, in some sense, to break down the divide between humans and animals (Cherry 2010:451).

309. Gallup. http://www.gallup.com/poll/183275/say-animals-rights-people.aspx?g_source=animal%20welfare&g_medium=search&g_campaign=tiles. Accessed 10/06/16.

One way this boundary can be challenged is through anthropomorphism, comparing other animals to humans in order to include them in the realm of moral consideration. Matthew Calarco argues that the legal constraints and discourse to which animal rights is confined necessitate that the movement defines what is animal by human standards in very particular, often contested, terms. He argues that by evaluating animals in exclusively human terms, such standards and definitions end up reinforcing anthropocentrism (2008:8). If breaking down the human/animal barrier is an attempt to erase differences, allowing people to understand once again that they are animals, it cannot be only on human terms. Anthropocentrism can be cemented by anthropomorphism and sentimentality because the concepts are constantly referring back to how animals are like humans, and sympathy is routinely drawn from allusions to similarities. Animal welfare groups use anthropomorphism but for a different objective. Their goal is to reform the agricultural system, factory farming, and the homeless pet population in order to “humanely” use animals for human benefits. The goal of reform still holds the attendant division between humans and other animals. Consequently, rights organizations, because they are attempting to dismantle the human/animal divide in ways that welfare groups are not, use anthropomorphism more frequently.

Anthropomorphism is most successful when it elicits feelings of sympathy, and as such, it is connected with sentimentality. When an organization presents an argument or illustration and is able to use anthropomorphism to diminish the line between humans and other animals, it helps the reader/viewer recognize that animals and humans are the same in many ways. The realization can lead to greater sympathy for other animals because as the reader/viewers reflect, they register that animals are like them. Companion animals

appear more frequently in this type of illustration than other types of animals, and many times, the animal pictured is a young animal, such as a kitten or puppy. Burghardt and Herzog indicate that “newborn or juvenile animals frequently share features that are the constituents of the almost universal “cuteness” response...as these characters are also possessed by human babies, the response to the young of another species is clearly one of generalization” (1980:766). The kind of sentimentality that animal groups use is more of a rhetorical device, designed to evoke emotions of compassion and concern, which is frequently paired with outrage and anger. Many times these emotions may be quick reactions to something read or seen. Organizations hope that these will turn into lasting “moods” (Jasper 1998).

Anthropomorphism enables the reader/viewer to engage the moral imagination that is connected to sentimentality to better understand animals. Donovan describes moral imagination as a “sympathetic imaginative construction of another’s reality is what is required for an appropriate moral response” (1996:152). By opening a space for imagination when discussing animals, groups are better able to convince the reader/viewer about the need for change. This “sympathetic imaginative construction” is a large part of what animal groups try to accomplish, but lacking a developed moral theory in this direction, the lasting moods that Jasper discusses may not be present. A sociologist at Manhattanville College, Elizabeth Cherry argues that eliminating the human-animal divide, both cognitively and discursively, is not only a tactic but is a primary goal of the animal rights movement (2010:455). In a sense, one aspect of their goals is to get the reader/viewer to identify with the animals in question. A sense of sentimental identification is facilitated in the comparison between certain animals and

companion animals and then with emotional responses. Cherry notes that a common strategy and goal of organizations is to have activists merge farm animals and companion animals rather than separating them because of species differences (458). One reason for this is that companion animals are familiar to almost everyone and are frequently doted upon, and people often feel they have insights into the emotions, desires, and feelings of companion animals. Thus if individuals can see the analogy between their companions and other animals, whether farm animals or another type, it is an additional layer of identification and sympathy. These comparisons then push the question, why is it acceptable to consume a pig, cow, or chicken but not one's own dog or cat? Such a sentiment is particularly applicable to the United States, where companion species are often considered family (458). All-Creatures played into these cultural differences when condemning the consumption of dog meat as practiced in some countries in Asia.³¹⁰ There was the sense that the disdain for the custom was not only based on the eating of animal flesh but, in the United States—presumably the target country for the audience of All-Creatures—a disdain for eating dogs. The aversion was because dogs are considered “honorary humans” (Cherry 2010:458) Other examples with the ASPCA include comparing pigs to dogs, asserting that swine are as intelligent or even more so than canines and using the companion animal connection to explain that pigs are one of the only farm animals to also be considered pets.³¹¹

Organizations, particularly animal welfare groups, connect the comparisons of companion and other animals to the idea of loving animals. As Jasper argues, love and

310. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/dog.html>. Accessed 10/12/15.

311. ASPCA. <https://www.asPCA.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty/pigs-factory-farms>. Accessed 10/20/15.

loyalty are long-lasting affective emotions, and he surmises that such lasting emotions can be developed by the love many people have for family members. In social movements, emotions for the group are formed by loyalty to a shared identity within the group or larger cause (1998:407). Such loyalty, I would argue, could begin outside the movement, in that there is often a deep bond and love and a sense of identity for humans and their companion animals, just as someone would have a part of their identity attached to being a mother or father. Prime examples are bumper stickers that distinguish a driver's sentiment: "I love my _____" (fill in the blank with a breed of dog or cat). In the same vein, there are loyalties to the shelter animals displayed in a bumper sticker, with type enclosed within a paw print, that asks, Who Rescued Whom? The sticker implies that the relationship between a shelter animal and human companion is a mutually beneficial one that may have saved the human as much as the animal. Again, both of these bumper stickers not only illustrate the depth of emotional connection but also convey these sentiments as basic to the identity of the driver.

Loyalties evoke strong emotional ties that help animal organizations frame their goals and issues with feelings and beliefs. It provides a bridge between those existing emotions and other issues about which the reader/viewer may only be vaguely aware (Snow et al. 1986:467). It is the hope of animal organizations that use this tactic that such loyalty and bridging can be translated into an allegiance with an animal organization while expanding the reader/viewer's knowledge of animal issues and perhaps even changing individual behavior.

Reactive emotions such as anger, moral outrage, and disgust are also frequently elicited by animal organizations. On the surface, it would seem that these are entirely

unrelated to sentimentality and anthropomorphism. However, Jasper's concept of moral batteries, as mentioned throughout this study, and the pairing of a negative and positive emotion to heighten the effect of the discourse helps to connect reactive emotions to affective ones (2011:147). One application of the concept of moral batteries is in the practice of juxtaposing "cute" pictures of animals with gruesome images of abuse in factory farming, wildlife, and companion abuse. Such juxtaposition was a common theme for combining anthropomorphism and sentimentality in my research (Burghardt and Herzog 1980; Jasper and Poulsen 1995). For instance, PETA and All-Creatures feature pictures of young and particularly endearing animals as a hyperlink to learn more about the abuses or exploitation of certain animals.³¹² All-Creatures also purposes such images to present "wishful thinking," how people may think certain animals are living versus how they actually are faring.³¹³ Wishful thinking for All-Creatures helps produce a story with a moral that things are not as they seem, which paints a vivid picture for the reader. The group is particularly good at using anecdotes, which help to generalize from the particular, with anthropomorphism to help build the story of what they are describing (Mitchell 1997). The ASPCA arranges pictures to compare what a chicken would look like growing at a normal rate versus the rapid-growth chickens being raised for consumption today.³¹⁴ These examples illustrate a number of situations that can provoke the reader/viewer into a heightened emotional state.

312. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues>; All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/index.html>. Accessed 10/13/15.

313. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/anex/deer.html>. Accessed 10/13/15.

314. ASPCA. <http://truthaboutchicken.org>. Accessed 10/13/15.

Additionally, Jasper's concept of moral shocks can connect sympathy with emotional reactions that are fleeting. Just as certain loyalties and identities can be bridged to encompass other animal issues, moral shocks work well to garner support from "strangers," those that have no previous connection to the animal movement (Jasper and Poulsen 1995:498). Jasper and Poulsen argue that the animal rights movement primarily recruits strangers utilizing diagnostic framing, which is to say by setting up the problem as the primary type of framing (501). It may be that moral shocks work better with strangers because these shocks are typically characterized by graphic images and harrowing tales of animals' plights. However, moral shocks, one could argue, are equally effective with those already sympathetic to the animal movement given the propensity toward disgust at particularly graphic images (Herzog and Golden 2009:493). When people are sensitive to the animal movement, their "plausibility structures should make them susceptible to the condensing symbols wielded by animal rights organizers, including a positive 'one of the family' or 'one of us' master frame" (Jasper and Poulsen 1995:505). In the organizations that I studied, the rights-oriented groups relied heavily on moral shocks and graphic pictures, but these moral shocks were always accompanied by prognostic framing to give the reader/viewer ideas about what to do about them. Welfare organizations were similar but with a greater pivot on prognostic framing. For example, a main push of the ASPCA's Truth About Chicken campaign is providing solutions for consumers. These solutions include encouraging the reader/viewer to pressure stores and industries for change. Just as sentimentality and anthropomorphism are used together, so are negative and positive emotions and reactive and long-standing sentiments. Groups utilize these in conjunction with one another to garner particular emotional responses.

Rights groups exploit the two strategies of graphic images and anthropomorphism in order to elicit both sympathy and outrage (Jasper's moral batteries), whereas welfare groups focus more heavily on sentimentality and adorable images in order to generate sympathy for the causes of animals. Thus in general, there does appear to be somewhat of a difference between how animal rights groups use sentimentality versus how it is used by animal welfare groups.

Risks and Pitfalls of Using Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality

As I have tried to show, anthropomorphism is a key tactic that animal organizations use to solicit support and gain public recognition. Serpell argues that “modern humans... seem to have great difficulty thinking about animals *except* in anthropomorphic terms” (italics mine), even as children, humans cast animals with “human-like intelligence, desires, beliefs, and intentions” (2002:440). The connection that millions of people have with their companion animals is one reason why anthropomorphism and sentimentality work so well.

Although animal organizations regularly combine anthropomorphism and a rhetorical sentimentality, a differentiation from moral theories of sentimentality is evident. Lori Gruen, in her book *Entangled Empathy: An Alternative Ethic For Our Relationships with Animals* argues that the traditional ethics used by animal philosophers are not ultimately helpful (2015:10). This is the case because whereas Singer and Regan's theories are easy to understand, they downplay the complexities of the situation: “this sort of reasoning not only reduces moral agents to calculators but it stereotypes the individual's suffering as objects to be aided” (11). She sees their moral theories as too

abstract to attend to an individual animal's particular relationships. Considering the depth of an animal's world "helps us to understand what makes life meaningful, interesting, and valuable to them and thus what is lost or gained when we act or fail to act" (12). What Gruen proposes ties together well with Josephine Donovan's moral imagination and Curtin's conception of care ethics. Gruen argues that the abstract individual does not exist and we are already in relationships of all kinds; because of this, relationality should be the basis of our ethical decisions (64). Like Donovan's worry about empathy as "projecting oneself into another" (1996:150), Gruen contends that a typical understanding of empathy as "putting oneself in another's shoes" (66) should be jettisoned, especially in the case of animals, because it can lead to an inappropriate anthropomorphism (66). "Entangled empathy," as she calls it, involves both affect and cognition, where learning as much as possible about another's life and situation and alternating between our own perspective and that of the animal can help guard against a merging of perspectives (66). Gruen's caution about merging perspectives is similar to Bekoff's concept of inappropriate anthropomorphism, where humans see in animals what they want to see. Both Gruen and Bekoff emphasize a period of time and observation with animals in order to anthropomorphize and empathize appropriately (Gruen 2015:67; Bekoff 2007:128). Otherwise, empathy and anthropomorphism can be too easy to turn into a projection of our human desires (Gruen 2015:73).

Nonetheless, there are several hazards associated with such tactics on the websites and with the use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality in general. It is important to recognize that the use of these concepts as ways to frame animal causes and as strategies to build a connection is not always foolproof. One major hindrance to anthropomorphism

and sentimentality is that when animal groups utilize these concepts, they can be seen as overly emotional (Groves 1997:139). For a long time, the movement in general was viewed as caring too much about animals and not enough about humans. The animal movement has tried hard to lessen this characterization. As mentioned in the first chapter, Tom Regan and Peter Singer originally sought to give a more “rational” grounding to the movement through philosophy and ethics rather than through sentimentality. This perception is a legitimate concern, as Julian Groves noticed in his study of an anti-experimentation animal group. He found that the majority of the people who were in the organization admitted to joining the movement because they loved animals or were emotional about them (sentimentality), but after protracted involvement with the movement, they shied away from counting strong emotions as acceptable (1997:127).

Groves found that many people involved in animal welfare were viewed as being too emotional or caring “only for cats and dogs.” Rights activists viewed the welfare side as irrational because it was perceived as being tied predominantly to emotional appeals (1997:135; 137). Websites in my dissertation played into this stereotype of prevailing emotion only for companion species. For instance, the focus of the ASPCA is primarily the adoption of companion animals, and they do not deal with wildlife as a major aspect of their campaigns. The HSUS is slightly different given that they focus on a wider range of issues, and it is closer to PETA in some of its concerns, such as promoting cruelty-free cosmetics and providing an abundance of information on individual animals. HSUS’s discourse is less harsh than the rights organizations, and the HSUS calls for the reform of certain systems, such as factory farming, rather than abolition; their message utilizes more sentimentality, like other welfare groups. As I have shown, PETA and All-

Creatures—two of the most rights-oriented groups in my study—use sentimentality in a way that clearly produces emotions of compassion and empathy, yet these are almost exclusively done by coupling a negative emotion with a pull for sympathy. Additionally, there is still the perception that PETA and other animal rights groups are too fanatical (overemotional), juxtaposed with welfare groups like HSUS, who work for reform to protect animals because operating in that way seems to the broader public to be the more sensible choice (Greenebaum 2009:298). Animal rights groups tend to have a more limited use of positive animal-related emotions except when comparing certain animals with companion species. There seems to be a difference between the desire to manage emotions like sympathy, empathy, anger, and disgust.

Another potential pitfall is clearly seen with groups like PETA and All-Creatures, whose discourse and images presented on their websites are more graphic in nature. The shocking nature of the images and, in PETA's case, some controversial campaigns,³¹⁵ slogans, and media attention can have downfalls outside of a consideration of anthropomorphism and sentimentality; such groups run the risk of turning both insiders and outsiders away from the movement. People inside the movement may not want to be continually confronted with an image of a duck having a tube shoved down its throat; others may not return to the website, fearful of what they might see next time. There are also ways in which PETA conducts its work that has been considered offensive and

315. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/why-peta/>; <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/faq/what-was-the-rationale-behind-your-got-beer-campaign/>; <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/faq/i-cant-bear-to-look-at-some-of-the-graphic-photos-you-use-cant-you-tone-it-down-a-little/>; <http://www.peta.org/about-peta/faq/what-inspired-your-got-prostate-cancer-campaign>. Accessed 04/21/16. PETA acknowledges and is unapologetic about their tactics, campaigns, and stances being controversial. One way they do this is by addressing these in their FAQ section.

sexist.³¹⁶ These tactics definitely produce emotions, but they are not the positive emotions associated with sentimentality.

A drawback to how animal groups use anthropomorphism can have serious consequences for actual animals. Serpell argues that “anthropomorphic selection,” where humans parse particular “physical and behavioral traits that facilitate the attribution of human mental states to nonhumans—imposes unusual and unique pressures on the objects of its attentions” (2002:446). His primary example is that of the bulldog, whose respiratory system, in order to appeal to the “cute” factor with a snub nose and short snout, has detrimental effects on the animals in that they can’t breathe and have frequent health problems. Hobgood-Oster also describes how, in the domestication of dogs, some breeds have been produced for reasons of human aesthetics and have serious genetic problems as a result, such as Boston terriers’ “bulging eyes,” meant to be cute, likening them to Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (Hobgood-Oster 2014:113). Animals are, in Serpell’s opinion, “being deliberately bred to preserve, and even accentuate, the same disabling characteristics” that would, if found in humans, cause people to search for a cure (2002:447).

Whereas Serpell and Hobgood-Oster’s discussions pertain to the breeding of companion animals, certain images among movement groups do the same to generate an emotional draw that connects to anthropomorphism in that they select certain animals to highlight and draw attention to. The groups in my dissertation concentrated on images of animals staring into the camera and out at the viewer, large-eyed young animals peering,

316. The article lists just a few examples of some PETA campaigns that have been viewed as distasteful. It gets at the general tone of how PETA attempts to capitalize on certain cultural moments. The article was included because of its succinct examples and analysis. <http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2014/07/peta-dumb>. Accessed 10/21/15.

sometimes interpreted as mournfully, at the viewer. This phenomenon, however, is more frequent with welfare groups than with rights organizations. Some animals are more captivating than others in this respect. It is easier to feel sympathy, pity, or sorrow for a dog, pig, or fox than it is for a fish or a spider because of their anthropomorphic attributes. Even advertisers in the marketing of consumer products have found that if a commodity appears humanlike, such as a car with the front grill turned upward giving the impression of a smile, it is perceived as more appealing and has a greater potential for purchase because of this feature (Aggarwal and McGill 2007).

The anthropomorphizing of certain animals, rather than others, occurred with several organizations. For example, fish were not anthropomorphized at all, in most cases, emphasizing no similarities whatsoever with humans. However, PETA highlighted very specific aspects of a fish's attributes. For instance, they stressed the ability of fish to feel pain and to suffer greatly when caught on a fishing line. The stated reason for the emphasis on fish experiencing pain is that these animals are not thought of as creatures that have senses.³¹⁷ PETA showcased the intelligence and sentience of rats, mice, creatures used frequently in research. Rats and mice are animals who are frequently thought to be unappealing vermin and gross pests. Anthropomorphism was used a great deal with rats and mice because of the negative connotations associated with these animals. HSUS's main site anthropomorphizes crustaceans, arguing that they suffer when killed and that lobsters remember things that they learn.³¹⁸ It is rare to think of lobsters and other crustaceans outside of consuming them. HSUS also anthropomorphizes snakes,

317. PETA. <http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/animals-used-food-factsheets/fishing-aquatic-agony-3>. Accessed 04/29/16.

318. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/animals/crustaceans/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 11/09/15.

animals that many people fear or at the least think are loathsome, which is similar to how spiders and other insects are viewed. HSUS explains that these feelings are “inherited from our distant primate ancestors,”³¹⁹ bringing forth the connection to humans but appealing to rationality to move beyond these past connections.

Thus we categorize animals as good, bad, pests, or companions. In her book *Animals and Sociology* (2012), Kay Peggs discusses how dogs, cats, and other small animals are good because they are companions to humans regardless of whether the “pet keeping” is good for the animal (76). Other animals, however, are good because of their utility to humans. Wildlife kept in zoos and aquariums are included in this category because humans are not in frequent contact with them, therefore zoos and aquariums allow people to see exotic and “wild” animals. These animals are treated as educational devices and are kept in captivity supposedly for their own good (79). Interestingly, Peggs points out that rats and mice, animals that PETA anthropomorphizes heavily, can be placed in each of the categories, depending on the context. They are good companions when they are “pets” and also as experimental devices in laboratories. Mice and especially rats are “vermin” when they are found to be abundant in cities and homes (81, 82; see also Birke, Arluke, and Michael 2007). The socially constructed meanings about animals are the basis upon which emotional reactions about them are made (Aaltola 2015:204). Elisa Aaltola argues that the emotional reactions and socially constructed meanings about animals are not reflected upon by animal organizations (204). I have argued similarly throughout this dissertation that animal groups use anthropomorphism and sentimentality in a rhetorical way to convince and to get an instant emotional

319. HSUS. http://www.humanesociety.org/animals/snakes/?credit=web_id93480558. Accessed 02/10/16.

response. What organizations hope to gain is something like Jasper's long-lasting moods, which they hope will lead to sustained involvement with animal issues. Using a moral sentimentalism like the one Aaltola discusses, which stems from eighteenth-century philosophy and is making a resurgence in contemporary moral philosophy, can allow for greater reflection on the uses of anthropomorphism and sentimentality by animal organizations (215).

For PETA and HSUS, then, in addition to repeating the kinds of common anthropomorphic strategies that Serpell hints at with his bulldog example, they also turned it on its head and chose to anthropomorphize animals who were potentially more difficult for people to identify with compared to companion animals. Recognition of this shows awareness of the socially constructed meanings of animals that Peggs discusses above. There is a good reason for doing this, as Knight, Nunkoosing, Vrij, and Cherryman observed in their study of participants and their attitudes toward animals. One of their findings was that "the more attractive and appealing animals were perceived to be, the more animals were liked and the less likely participants were to support the use of that animal" (2003:316). These researchers learned that animals viewed as being more humanlike were treated with more respect than those deemed different or unappealing (316). One of the consequences of anthropomorphizing certain animals over others can mean that less attractive animals do not get as much attention in the public eye. Sometimes the unattractive animals need more help than ones that are popular. Making rats, mice, fish, and lobsters seem more appealing to the audience can advance sympathy and identification with those animals. Using anthropomorphism and sentimentality, animal organizations run the risk of being perceived as overly emotional, either too

sympathetic or too angry and extreme. Additionally, anthropomorphism can be used on particular animals, and that can have both positive and negative ramifications for those animals.

The Importance of Religion in the Animal Movement

Judaism and Christianity have a long history of both helping and hindering people in making ethical decisions about animals. Despite the close connections early in the movement's history, religiously oriented animal groups remain rarer than their secular counterparts. Throughout the world, there are now thousands of animal organizations, and perhaps only a handful are religious. Groups range from focusing on one issue to others that treat a gamut of animal concerns (Waldau 2011:79). Two of the groups I studied, Jewish Veg and All-Creatures, were formed in the early years of the modern movement. HSUS's and PETA's religious departments were developed much later, indicating their recognition of the appeal to religiously grounded animal advocacy.

In this study, the main difference with religious departments and groups was that the moral premise for caring about animals and demanding change has its basis in religious values and scriptural verses. Duty and obligation are familiar ethical paradigms for Christianity and Judaism. For religious individuals, it may be more helpful to understand animal issues in light of a belief system and behavior that they already embrace, one that is likely a guide for life. There has been resistance in the past on the part of both the animal movement and religious organizations to unite. This may be due to a belief that the animal movement and its causes do not have relevance for a religious person or perhaps because of lingering suspicions that religions are part of the problem

(Singer 2006; Linzey 1998; Adams 2001). This is why the religious organizations and departments are so important: they cite religious grounds to show how animals should matter in the context of their moral sensitivities; some of the ways this was done include how All-Creatures tied anthropomorphism to the idea that animals have souls. Concern for animals was linked to a justice tradition as in the case of Jewish Veg and JPFA, and compassion for animals was framed as merely an extension of the already innate mercy that religions include, as was seen with the HSUS. Thus some of the framing for religious groups is different, but the use of anthropomorphism and sentimentality are not much different from their secular counterparts.

Each of these groups proclaims that something unique about religion makes it (or should make it) sensitive to the plight of animals. Within the religious milieu of Christianity and Judaism, a sense of specialness often comes with being a person of faith, including sometimes a perception that religious believers have an insight that outsiders lack. Bringing animal rights/welfare awareness into this uniqueness can make animal issues substantially important. Potentially for a believer, if the case can be made that God finds animals and their interests important, more explanation is not necessary. Consequently, frame transformation, which has been a common feature of the animal movement at large, is pivotal for religious groups and departments. Christianity and Judaism ask constituents to change, whether through an initial conversion or on a continual basis. They summon the individual to modify behavior and beliefs in order to be more in line with a particular moral code that is seen as necessary to be a good follower. These changes and adaptations can be large or small. Sacrifices may be significant or minor. The religious justifications and explanations of animal suffering call

for a reorientation of beliefs about one's religion in addition to changes in practices. Religion can add something very crucial to the animal movement. Frans de Waal argues that religion is not providing people with anything new but rather reiterating altruistic behavior that is already within humans, sympathy and empathy that evolved with the species, which is also evidenced in other animals such as apes (2005:181). He writes that "in stressing kindness, religions are enforcing what is already part of our humanity. They are not turning human behavior around, only underlining preexisting capacities" (181). It would seem that religions provide one more layer of connection to animals, thus the moral emotions enacted in religions are the ones needed for an empathetic response to animal suffering. If highlighted within the movement, religion could add a key component to an anthropomorphic and sentimental identification with other animals. Accordingly, religious animal organizations ask individuals to transform their understanding and actions regarding animals, and such a transformation may be viewed as just another facet of a person's religious practice.

The extension of an individual's religious practice also comes into play in some of the strategies for involvement developed by animal groups. Promoting volunteerism and outreach was a common feature of all the religious groups and especially with the HSUS and JPFA. Religious believers are often good at outreach and proselytizing. Seeking to convert others is typical for Christianity, and thus it is easily transferred to causes with religious legitimization. The practices that groups attempt to enact in people can become part of an individual's lived religion. Such suggestions can turn into rituals for people, such as volunteering on behalf of a group, and they can incorporate the tenets of the animal movement into "embodied practices," everyday activities that can connect a

person's material life with their spirituality (McGuire 2008a:13). The HSUS actively recruits religious volunteers on their website, and JPFA's language regarding leafleting is similar to the promotion of "witnessing tracts" that are familiar in some segments of Christianity.

Jasper describes "interaction rituals" as practices of organizational gathering that can reinforce movement perspectives, and he explains that "if any interaction can generate emotional energy, and if that energy translates into confidence that aids strategic engagement... it traces reflex emotions as they evolve into moods and ultimately into affective loyalties and occasionally moral emotions" (2011:14.10). When groups come together in celebration or solemnity, if it is effective, constituents will be more likely to engage in movement activities. These occasions, if they are successful, help produce moods that can potentially develop into loyalty for the organization. I found a few examples of how groups might do this, such as the fortieth-anniversary party for Jewish Veg, celebrating the existence of the organization, or the ASPCA's Annual Humane Awards Luncheon, where members gather to celebrate one another and the organization.³²⁰ The HSUS gives the reader/viewer information about the blessing of animals with their St. Francis Day in a Box kit.³²¹ The kit provides an alternative ritual of a church service, where involvement directly with animals can bring new meaning to how churches and people of faith come together when they worship. It may seem difficult for websites to create interaction rituals or for a group like All-Creatures, which exists as

320. Jewish Veg. <http://www.jewishveg.org>. Accessed 10/29/15. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-events/aspc-annual-humane-awards-luncheon>. Accessed 10/06/16.

321. HSUS. https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/SPageServer?pagename=st_francis_day_box&s_src=web_id96887623_id118612260. Accessed 04/22/16.

only a website, to further interaction; yet they do provide interaction between themselves and followers through text alerts and an e-mail group.

One function of religion is that it provides a sense of community and belonging (McGuire 2008b:25). Motivating religious individuals to see community in a new way, one that includes animals and educates people on the plight of animals, can have an immense impact. Because people are already involved in a religious body, it is easier for the movement convictions to spread to other members. Others may be alienated from their religious tradition over its stance toward animals, and finding community that connects the two can empower them in both arenas. Additionally, “evangelism”—or in the language of PETA’s Jesus People for Animals, *vegangelicalism*—can allow emotions generated by some aspects of the website that might be disturbing, like outrage and anger, to develop into long-lasting moods that facilitate the potential for the longevity of support for the organization and various aspects of the movement. Judaism does not evangelize, but Jewish Veg does encourage people to volunteer for the cause of animals. Evangelism and volunteering could help dissuade despair and the feeling that one person alone cannot do anything to stop animal abuse, cruelty, or exploitation. Such types of interaction also require less self-modification than do requests to become vegan.

Asking people to become involved in the animal movement or with a specific organization in the above-mentioned ways then becomes yet another aspect of living out one’s religious devotion that is imbued with “collective solidarities” (Jasper 2011:14.10) and a feeling of being a part of something bigger than one’s self. Religions in the general sense are also able to give a person a feeling of being connected to something larger as well, hence similarities exist between the animal movement and religious movements.

Scholars have surmised that the animal movement can serve as religion for some individuals by engaging members in rituals and “sacred texts” and by providing inspiration concerning behavior and moral direction. Even the language that is important for the movement can be seen as evocative of religious language, such as with terms such as *compassion* and *suffering* (Lowe 2001:42).

The religious animal rights/welfare organizations specifically challenge Christian and Jewish tendencies to view animals as only through an instrumental lens or dismiss animals as irrelevant for ethical consideration. Such attitudes dominate a large part of each religion’s identity, particularly because of the dominion passage in Genesis. Jewish Veg, JPFA, and All-Creatures combine the impulse for justice in Judaism and Christianity to counter these attitudes, whereas Faith Outreach uses the idea that all religions espouse the virtues of kindness and mercy to make the point. Mercy connects to justice coming out of the Hebrew Scriptures in Micah 6:8: “And what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?” (NRSV;919, 20). Animals are included in the call for justice in kindness in the way that religious groups use the concepts.

An example of how the animal and environmental movements have had an impact on religion is through a renewed interest in food ethics. As messages about animal concerns have spread, so has the growing interest on the importance of knowing from whence one’s food comes. The “slow-food” movement, farmers markets, and “farm-to-table” restaurants that use locally sourced ingredients are increasingly popular (Rudy 2011; Wirzba 2011). For example, in her book *Good Food* (2013), Jennifer Ayers examines the importance of food in Christianity. Some of what she deals with

extrapolates from the centrality of food in the religion; for instance, in the ritual of Eucharist, a symbolic meal is shared in a community of like-minded people (4, 64). Further, she explores how it connects to sustainable farming and industrialized meat and how this affects hunger in the United States and the workers involved in producing, harvesting, and farming food (67, 111). Norman Wirzba also discusses food and the Eucharist in *Food and Faith: A Theology of Eating* (2011). His chapter entitled “Eating in Exile” has particular relevance to the concepts discussed throughout this dissertation. He maintains that the majority of people do not know where their food comes from and have lost a connection to the land and to animals (72). He argues that people need to be more connected to the places in which they live and to the memberships and communities that they inhabit. Wirzba explains that humans, particularly in the United States, feel that they must be in control and forget about the interdependence that makes the world possible (103). Thinking about and understanding food properly can help with this: “Eating is the daily confirmation that we need others and are vulnerable to them. When we eat well, we honor and accept responsibility for the gifts of God given to each other for the furtherance of life. We move more deeply and more sympathetically into the memberships of creation” (77). Affection, sympathy, and caring are essential pieces for Wirzba when thinking about food, God, and the relationship between faith and eating (197).

Caring about food, where it comes from, and the ethical considerations of the animals involved is another way for embodied practices to become a part of an individual’s lived religion. By asking audiences to become vegan or to adopt a “meatless Monday,” groups are giving an opportunity for food to become a mindful practice

(McGuire 2008a:105). McGuire notes how many people in her research felt that cooking, eating, and growing food “valorized mundane domestic materiality,” and that in today’s convenience-driven world, highly processed fast food is the opposite of food and eating being a mindful practice (105). In order to abstain or reduce one’s meat and animal product consumption, a person must reflect on the ingredients and preparation of certain foods. A meal has the potential to become an expression of the religious justice and mercy for which groups call.

The trend of thinking more carefully about food in religions includes caring about how food animals are treated and caring about the environmental impact of industrial farming, whether for animals or plants. Many of the religious organizations examined use food issues to open up conversations about other animal issues. Churches and synagogues have also seen the religious import of caring about animal issues. There are also Jewish and Muslim environmental organizations that seek to figure out an environmentally responsible position concerning kosher and halal food ethics.³²² Religious organizations and departments concerned with the environment and animals are one reason for a push toward ethically and sustainably sourced food in religious communities. Christian and Jewish animal organizations resonate with Clifford Geertz’s definition of religion in that they “establish long-lasting moods and motivations” (1973:90). All-Creatures and Jewish Veg give adherents a supplementary motivation for their commitment to animal issues and an additional expression of it. If the groups are successful at transforming a person’s understanding of animals into a new “master frame,” in which new values are cultivated and fostered (Snow et al. 1986:473; 475), it can further Geertz’s understanding of

322. The following are some examples: <http://www.greenmuslims.org/about>; <http://www.islamicconcern.com>; <http://hazon.org>; <http://jewishinitiativeforanimals.org>. Accessed 04/22/16.

religion as “formulating conceptions of a general order of existence” (1973:90). Transformation is able to give people a changed religious worldview, and it can create order out of a chaotic picture of animal suffering. The change in worldview is one that includes the protection of animals. Jewish Veg and All-Creatures and the religious departments of the HSUS and PETA have been able to mine the similarities and the religious nature of commitment to a cause in order to combine religious principles and the convictions of the animal movement. Moods, motivations, and a conception of an order of existence come together in religious ritual (112). Religious animal groups give people rituals that help them can enact new motivations and moods. For example, Faith Outreach’s St. Francis Day in a Box allows a person to perform a blessing of the animals, and the meatless Monday mentioned above can be observed by anyone anywhere. The volunteering that most of the religious groups promote can become a significant part of a person’s everyday religious practice (McGuire 2008a:13). All-Creatures includes a page with “prayers of compassion”³²³ for animals, which can help individuals focus their supplications and thoughts toward animals when praying to God. Each of these things can become rituals and deeply informed aspects of people’s lived religion. Although they are not all a part of institutional religion, they can yield strong motivations for animal protection and moods such as compassion, sympathy, and even enthusiasm to continue working for animals (McGuire 2008a:16; Jasper 1998:406).

The groups in my dissertation can potentially enact the criticism of new materialism into their discussions of religion and animals. First, by further critiquing consumption and capitalism as I suggest of the entire movement in more detail below. A greater attention on the environment and the consequences animal agriculture has on all

323. All-Creatures. <http://www.all-creatures.org/prayers/index.html>. Accessed 11/19/16.

life can bring forward a new challenge to religion as well as to the industries that reinforce animal exploitation. Second, a focus on immanence can connect to anthropomorphism by privileging the similarities and interdependence of humans and animals. Religion provides a moral dimension that comes from a different ethical source than the traditional ethical basis of the animal movement. Religious groups contribute in attracting to the movement a segment of the population that might not otherwise pay attention to animal issues, and it imbues their involvement with particularly salient and long-lasting motivations.

When the cause of animals can be included into the religious moral structure, it can be a powerful tool for recruitment and retention. By embracing the best aspects that religions offer—such as ideas of community, connection, mercy, and compassion—religions can be a tributary to an expansive notion of anthropomorphism and sentimentality. These elements can open space for drawing the circle of moral inclusion wide.

The Animal Movement in General

Through the influence of a wide range of animal welfare and rights organizations in the United States, the animal movement has grown from a burgeoning movement with potential in the early nineteenth century to being a widely recognized social movement. In the late 1970s, a shift occurred in the types of causes and strategies as people began to call for a more abolitionist approach to animal use. Groups such as In Defense of Animals and PETA and philosophers such as Peter Singer and Tom Regan embarked on building this different understanding of animals. The causes expanded from homeless

animals and companion species to a stronger critique of animal experimentation and animals raised for food. Increased use of demonstrations and protests highlighted the grievous nature of how animals were treated in cosmetics testing and medical experimentation. Vegan advocacy has now become a major theme of the “new” animal rights groups, focusing on animal rights by disavowing all animal flesh and other by-products as well as by connecting with other salient concerns over food and the environment. This highlights the main difference between rights and welfare groups: the latter wants reform in the current system and believes that it is appropriate to use animals for a variety of human ends.

Bernard Rollin, a long-time scholar and advocate of the movement, argues in “Animal Rights As a Mainstream Phenomenon” (2011) that many convictions associated with the animal movement are now more readily accepted and that there have been dramatic changes over the last 50 years in terms of how animals are treated. More people have companion species, and fewer individuals are directly involved in agriculture. According to Rollin, these facts mean that animal welfare is legislated more than in the past because in a more agriculturally centered society, it was just smart business to take care of animals (109). The fact that legislation of animal welfare has increased signifies for Rollin that the movement has permeated the public consciousness (114). To further the cause, the animal movement has made progress on the coattails of other social justice movements that have been successful in gaining rights and access for groups such as racial/ethnic minorities, women, and people with disabilities. The animal movement has learned tactics and organizational skills from these other social movements. Animal rights and welfare groups have also benefited from a greater openness to justice

movements that the former movements have generated (Rollin 2011:108; Singer 2009; Jasper and Nelkin 1992). Through campaigns and media attention has come more awareness, albeit gradually, of the drastic changes that factory farming has had on the animals that it produces and kills. One example of this is a 2014 survey conducted by the ASPCA in which 80% of their respondents said that it was important for the chicken they consume to be raised humanely.³²⁴ In another instance of product-driven change is evidenced by companies such as Fairlife, which markets itself as providing healthier, more sustainable, humane dairy products.³²⁵ Commercials for their products are widely circulated in the New York area viewing market.

Additionally, the media has found that stories about animals are popular. Rollin writes, “One cannot channel surf across normal television service without being bombarded with animal stories, real and fictional” (2011:108). Yet McKendree, Croney, and Widmar conducted an online survey of 798 households in 2012 to look at the connection that details such as location, personal experiences, and demographics had on concern for animal welfare (2014:3161). They discovered from their survey that most of the participants did not have any reference for animal welfare issues (3170). Further, a 2012 Gallup poll noted that 5% of surveyed adults consider themselves vegetarian, and 2% are vegan. These numbers are virtually unchanged in the thirteen years since Gallup’s previous survey on the topic, implying that the animal movement has made little difference in connecting eating with the treatment of farm animals.³²⁶

324. ASPCA. <http://www.aspc.org/about-us/press-releases/treat-my-chicken-right-aspc-survey-shows-consumers-want-more-humanely>. Accessed 04/25/16.

325. Fairlife. <http://fairlife.com/our-farms/animal-care>. Accessed 04/25/16.

326. Gallup. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/156215/consider-themselves-vegetarians.aspx>. Accessed 04/25/16.

My observations and general analysis of animal movement websites is consistent with the above survey results. For example, welfare and rights organizations link factory farming to human health. A concentration on human health and factory farming affirm that some of the largest welfare groups have taken on the concerns and strategies of the animal rights organizations in the last 20 years, evidence that the animal movement is well established in the United States and that traditional welfare organizations are expanding their scope. An example is the ASPCA's massive campaign against factory-farmed chicken and the multiple pages that discuss the problems encountered in raising other animals for food. The information is almost identical to the information provided by PETA, even though the proposed solutions are different. PETA is looking to end the instrumental use of animals entirely, whereas the ASPCA wants animals treated better but still finds it acceptable to eat animals and use them for other human purposes.³²⁷ In 1996, Gary Francione reported that the HSUS did not promote vegetarianism (30). Today, the HSUS website, while not advocating exclusively for vegetarianism, encourages it strongly by asking viewers to reduce their meat consumption and by providing recipes and food ideas for "Meatless Mondays" to help them transition.³²⁸

As confirmation of the influence of animal organizations, PETA and the HSUS are two of the most frequent sources that the public turns to when looking for information on animals and food issues (McKendree et al. 2014:3161). McKendree, Croney, and Widmar's analysis also suggests that organizations such as PETA and the HSUS did not necessarily cause increased interest in a concern for animals, but rather provided points of

327. ASPCA. <http://truthaboutchicken.org>; <https://www.aspc.org/fight-cruelty/farm-animal-cruelty>. Accessed 10/23/15.

328. HSUS. <http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/eating/meatfree-guide-2011>; <http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/eating/recipes/recipes.html>. Accessed 10/22/15.

contact for people already captivated by the issues. Moreover, they comment that PETA and the HSUS' websites were more appealing to the viewer than other sources of information such as other websites and television ads not related to the animal movement. The reason for this was that HSUS and PETA furnish easily accessible information to the public via "attractive" websites (3169). The authors found, however, that a large portion of participants in the survey (56%) did not utilize any source regarding animal issues and noted that they did not notice media accounts of animal stories or news (3165). The study's findings of PETA and the HSUS are germane regarding to discern some of what has been explored in this dissertation. How groups use their websites, including how they utilize anthropomorphism and sentimentality, are strongly related to how public support is gained. The study by McKendree and colleagues affirms that there is still work that needs to be done regarding education and awareness because a large number of people were unacquainted with animal welfare. Yet for those who are aware, PETA and the HSUS are popular sources of information (3170). However, the fact remains that actual animals are still in terrible conditions, and not that much has changed; indeed, in some instances, things are worse. The above examples show that despite the fact that information is more widely available, the majority of the American population is not taking advantage of it or are not willing to change.

In contrast to groups like PETA and the HSUS, other radical organizations have entered the movement. Loosely organized groups such as the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and EarthFirst! are involved in direct action to help animals and the environment in ways that they consider uncompromising. The focus and approach for these groups are significantly different than the others in my study. Both groups concentrate almost solely

on the system, industry, and corporations and the direct rescue of individual animals. This sometimes entails property destruction of buildings, thus harming the finances of those associated with what they see as the larger problem. For instance, the stated “credo” of ALF is:

The Animal Liberation Front (ALF) carries out direct action against animal abuse in the form of rescuing animals and causing financial loss to animal exploiters, usually through the damage and destruction of property. The ALF’s short-term aim is to save as many animals as possible and to directly disrupt the practice of animal abuse. Their long-term aim is to end all animal suffering by forcing animal abuse companies out of business.³²⁹

ALF succinctly describes its goals and its preferred mode of action. They argue that rescuing animals and causing financial loss are some of the best ways to accomplish their goals, which is a significantly different approach than that of other groups in my study. EarthFirst! places the core of its attention on environmental issues, but their website includes many updates and information on animal liberation efforts.³³⁰ The group is wary that legal action can really change the dire situation of the environment, and they seek direct action:

It is not enough to ask politicians and corporations to destroy less wilderness. We need to preserve it all, to recreate lost habitats and reintroduce extirpated predators. We need to stop and reverse the poisoning of our air, water, and soil, as well as the modification of life’s genetic code. It is not enough to oppose the construction of new dams and developments. It is time to free our shackled rivers and restore the land.” . . . “When the law won’t fix the problem, we put our bodies on the line to stop the destruction. EarthFirst!’s direct-action approach draws attention to the crises facing the natural world, and it saves lives.³³¹

329. Animal Liberation Front. http://animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/alf_credos.htm. Accessed 05/04/16.

330. EarthFirst! <http://earthfirstjournal.org/newswire/category/animal-liberation-2>; <http://earthfirstjournal.org/newswire/category/animal-rights-2>. Accessed 05/04/16.

331. EarthFirst! <http://earthfirstjournal.org/about>. Accessed 05/04/16.

The group is wary about whether legal action can really change the dire situation of the environment, which is why they seek direct action instead. The purpose of their direct action is to both save the planet and to bring awareness to the issues. All of the groups in my research oppose violence. ALF and EarthFirst! are no different, but it is common for groups like theirs to be deemed violent because while they will not hurt humans or animals, they feel that other types of violence are justified to create real change. The difference between these two groups and PETA, the HSUS, and the ASPCA are significant. There has long been a debate, both within the movement and outside it, as to how to approach the issues of animal suffering and exploitation (Francione and Garner 2010). It is hard to determine which style of work is more successful or has more impact. Earth First! and ALF have, at times, delayed or even stopped practices harmful to the earth and animals through their direct action (Pellow 2014:33). Given the recent passing of the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (AETA) and of various ag-gag laws, where disrupting any form of production or output in the animal industry can lead to a charge of terrorism and jail time, that makes the positions of ALF and EarthFirst! all the more precarious. The more moderate approaches of the organizations in my study have certainly helped grow awareness and have passed laws to make the treatment of animals more humane. On the one hand, PETA, the HSUS, and the ASPCA can be viewed as more successful because they reach a wider audience. On the other hand, there is also something appealing about the uncompromising nature of EarthFirst! and ALF, with no central leadership and “membership,” people might be better able to better feel that they belong, and their commitment may be stronger. The direct action of the groups is an immediate way to have something done for animals, whether it is releasing animals from

cages and farms or damaging equipment for animal experiments and machines for logging forests. In the long term, the actions of such groups and the new laws mentioned above serve to accentuate the dire nature of animals' circumstances and the lengths to which industries will go to keep it hidden from public view.

“Critical” Anthropomorphism and Sentimentality

The animal movement has had many criticisms from outside, as well as disagreements within the movement, about which tactics and strategies are appropriate to best serve animals. For example, ecofeminism has long been critical of animal rights and its philosophical background. Part of the ecofeminists' disappointment is with the more mainstream philosophy, mainly of Singer and Regan, who are viewed as not taking emotion and care into the equation when formulating a theory of animal rights (for example: Adams 2010; Slicer 1991; Donovan and Adams 1996; Donovan 2006; Adams and Gruen 2014). However, the rationalist focus of Singer and Regan is an ecofeminist concern because it critiques dualisms. Rationality and emotion are seen as a part of a dualism that privileges “abstract, universal principles deduced through detached reasoning over particular sympathies and sensitivities” (Adams and Gruen 2014:3). Some animal studies theorists have argued that the animal movement has focused too heavily on the status of animals before the law and that it is overly reliant on human constructions that reinforce anthropocentrism (Calarco 2008; Wolfe 2009).

Similar to ecofeminist observations, Kathy Rudy argues that the abolitionist approach of some animal rights groups does not do justice to the love that so many people have for the animals with whom they share their lives. For others, however,

animal welfare does not go far enough, still keeping humans in the seat of power over animals (2011). Rudy argues that affect and loving relationships need to be more of a foundation in animal advocacy: “I begin with the conviction that affective attachments sometimes lead and set the pace for policy change” (2011:24). Rudy’s argument about the need for affect in animal organizations is one more outline for why emotion and sentimentality as a developed theory should have a place in the groups in this dissertation.

The above criticisms have some similarities that are important to take into account when considering the movement as a whole. The focus on the idea of rights is a problem with the philosophical foundation of the movement. Legal avenues have been helpful in some ways, but they do not go far enough and end up strengthening anthropocentric ideas of animals in our world and the mode of human interactions with them. Further, they sometimes lead to legislation that is more restrictive to stop such actions and lawsuits in the future. As discussed in the introduction, Josephine Donovan and Anca Gheaus are two scholars whose concept of “moral imagination” I use as a way to move forward with sympathy and sentimentality. Gruen and Curtin’s notion of compassion and empathy, along with sentimentalist theories, have the potential to bring the emotional reactions and rhetorical use of sentimentality by animal organizations to a deeper level that can foster a genuine connection to animals that are close to us in proximity and also phylogenetically. These nuanced theories of emotion, sentimentality, and care ethics connect to bring together what Daston and Mitman argue is a particular understanding of anthropomorphism having to do with thinking *with* animals and not only *about* them (2005:5). Learning to think with animals, rather than about them, can provide a deeper

insight and connection than some previous iterations of how to create change and challenge the separation between humans and other animals.

My dissertation has shown that animal rights and welfare organizations use anthropomorphism and sentimentality on their websites to educate and initiate potential compassion and participation from the reader/viewer. Moreover, anthropomorphism and sentimentality work in conjunction to build identification and connection with the animals in question. Animal groups could build a deeper identification by adopting sentimentality as a moral theory alongside the traditional ethical theories of Singer and Regan. By doing so, potentially the reader/viewer would have an opportunity to think relationally about animals. If this can happen, and more people begin to understand our relationships with other animals, I maintain that there is a greater chance for lasting change in regard to the instrumental use of animals. Therefore the two concepts, along with the emotions they engender, are not to be disparaged as much research has done in the past. They can be used as affirmative tools to gain public support and frame the issues surrounding animals.

Suggestions for an Expanded Movement

My observation has been that animal organization websites do not necessarily use the concepts of anthropomorphism and sentimentality in a “critical” way that goes beyond adopting the terms for only persuasive effect. Critical anthropomorphism recognizes the similarities between humans and other animals while still attending to differences. As mentioned in my dissertation, there have been criticisms of the animal movement for making too much of the similarities between humans and other animals

because too often, animals that are less similar to us are deemed to deserve less consideration (Oliver 2008:216). Attending to differences as well as anthropomorphism is important so that a human perspective on the needs and preferences of animals does not become a projection of human desires (Gruen 2015:73). Critical sentimentality is understood as necessary for justice and connection rather than making emotion a dichotomy of justice (Donovan 1996). However, I want to identify some ways in which animal groups might become more versed in a critical use of the concepts that could further the goals of the animal movement. A “critical” aspect of sentimentality goes back to Donovan’s premise that there needs to be a “dialogical mode of ethical reasoning,” wherein “humans pay attention to—listen to—animal communications and construct a human ethic in conversation with the animals” (2006:306). Rudy prescribes something similar: “We need to make...deep connections with them in order to see the world from their eyes, in order for them to become their own advocates through relationships with us” (2011:199). Part of the problem with the animal rights/welfare discourse is that in determining who counts and who does not, the prerequisite for who counts often hinges on whether or not animals are like humans (Oliver 2008:216). “Rights or equal consideration are deserved if one possesses certain characteristics. The connection between rights or equality and identity is a mainstay of not only animal rights but also of rights discourse more generally” (Oliver 2008:216). This is seen in both Regan and Singer’s work, discussed in the first chapter, as well as how organizations chose to highlight particular animals and causes over others. Gruen expresses reservations about how the animal movement relies too heavily on sameness, saying that concentrating on the numerous similarities between humans and other animals can both help to break

down the species barrier and reinforce anthropomorphism (2015:24). She is concerned that the abstractness of Regan and Singer's arguments "substitute our own judgments of what is beneficial for other animals for what may actually be their well-being" (25).

Within the organizations explored in my dissertation, anthropomorphism and sentimentality can contribute to favoring some animals over others. As was mentioned above, many animals that appear to behave, feel, and look like humans are those most often anthropomorphized. Similarities between humans and other animals are emphasized more than differences. The same can also be said of how frequently certain animals are compared to companion animals. What is highlighted hinges on getting the reader/viewer to identify with the animal or problem. A focus on similarities can be extremely important so that people begin to recognize that they, too, are animals just like those whom movement groups are trying to protect. Yet it is also paramount that differences not be neglected in the process because overlooking them can lead to dangerous consequences for animals, such as breeding animals with traits that are harmful to them but beneficial to humans; for instance, breeding dogs with short snouts that cannot breathe well or clipping the beak from a chicken so that it cannot peck (Serpell 2002; Nussbaum 2006).

In order to be attentive to animals in the way that Donovan and Gheaus urge, anthropomorphism cannot only be about how animals are like humans. Midgley and Bekoff discuss anthropomorphism as a way to describe animal behavior and feelings in human terms as a way for people to put animals into the realm of their own experiences (Midgley 1983; Bekoff 2007). Their definitions do not necessarily mean that animals must be like humans, but rather that anthropomorphism is a way for humans to

understand the lives and predicaments of animals in ways that we can relate to. Moreover, the type of sympathy and affect that encourages listening and takes relationships with animals seriously is reminiscent of Daston and Mitman's question of how animals can be participants in human analysis of them (2005:5). Thus one way for websites to better use anthropomorphism is to balance it with highlighting the uniqueness and differences of the varieties of species on the Earth.

A way for organization websites to incorporate this kind of "critical" anthropomorphism and sentimentality could come in the form of a revision or addition to a prominent feature on all of the websites. In one way or another, each of the websites offers suggestions for action that the reader/viewer can take to support animals related to information shared about cruelty, abuse, and exploitation. Groups dispense ideas about volunteering, leafleting, and outreach where humans are the target. Adding volunteering opportunities that model concerns about animals other than companions is a good way to engage more seriously with farm or wild animals that may help build identifications with individuals and animals. An example of this would be to volunteer at an animal sanctuary or even national parks in a manner that is respectful to both open spaces and to animals.

For religious animal organizations and individuals, these volunteer opportunities can become powerful rituals, practices that become a part of the daily lives of religious individuals (McGuire 2008a). If—along with Donovan, Schaefer, and De Waal—groups can understand religion as a "pulsing network of embodied affects" (Schaefer 2015:143), this can be connected to a critical sentimentality, one that is attentive and listens to the needs, preferences, and desires of animals through their bodily movements, facial expressions, and vocalizations (Donovan 2006:321). Schaefer argues that there is affect

and feeling in these movements and suggests that all animals can have the possibility of religion (2015:211). Religions and ecofeminist theories of care seek to bring out positive prosocial emotions of compassion, empathy, and care.

It has been widely asserted that a major reason for our society's lack of compassion and understanding about animals is due to the fact that animals are at once both more present than ever and less visible than ever before. Humans do not spend as much time outside communing with other animals and nature, yet television cartoons, shows about nature, even entire channels are devoted to animals and cute pet videos on the Internet, in addition to the ubiquitous presence of companion animals in people's lives. The organizations I studied have each drawn the connection between the environmental problems faced by our world and the terrible plight of animals of all classifications. Encouraging reader/viewers to become interconnected with nature and the environment could serve the purpose to help people develop new relationships with all aspects of the natural world.

Developing a relationship with nature demands attention to consumption other than just that of animals. Humans consume natural resources in many ways other than just by eating animals. For instance, habitat destruction, water pollution and depletion, and the consumption of fossil fuels are all deleterious to animals and their habitats. Many proclaim that we are now in the sixth extinction period. Despite the disagreements as to the severity of its influence, it is difficult to ignore the environmental impacts of industrial animal agriculture. Each of the organizations in my study addresses the environment, yet their scope is still limited to the larger issues with consumption, besides how animal use effects the environment. For instance, the more radical groups briefly

discussed above strongly eschew the capitalist economy and the legacy it has had on animals and the environment (Pellow 2014:33). Groups like ALF and EarthFirst! are also critical and wary of some of the relationships more mainstream groups have built with industries and businesses (37). Wirzba also addresses the larger problems of the economy: the way it encourages competition between people over the desire for consumption and “stuff” (2011:103) and competition in the market that motivates the “efficiency” of industrial agriculture (94). One example of the lack of critical treatment of consumption is that all of the organizations that I examined closely, except All-Creatures, had a “store” on their website that sold a variety of goods, often with the groups’ logos. These stores were often a prominent feature of the website and were advertised on many pages. The stores add value to the monetary gifts that make up the financials of the nonprofit organizations. At the same time, a deeper discussion about how people consume and the impacts of that consumption should give one pause with regard to how these stores are contributing to patterns of consumption and benefitting from the modes of production of products that are harmful to the environment and animals. In another example, Bob Torres, in his book *Making a Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights* argues that the veganism promoted by much of the animal rights movement makes it into another form of consumerism by promoting “expensive consumer trinkets produced without animal cruelty” (2007:137). While veganism is a lifestyle change that can be a powerful political statement, it must be connected to other justice causes and not focus so much on an “intervention that appeals to upper class white folks” (137). Torres’ contention can be witnessed in the extensive “Living” section on PETA’s website, which

discusses everything from vegan fashion and beauty to food and recipes. Many aspects associated with veganism are often expensive and unattainable for many people.³³²

A third example of the contradictory messages about consumption comes from HSUS president Wayne Pacelle's newest book, *The Humane Economy* (2016), where he discusses the reforms that some of the largest corporations are making toward ending animal cruelty as well as the entrepreneurs and "innovators" that are creating cruelty free products. These changes in corporations are evidence of evolving mindsets of people because of the animal movement. The tone of the book expresses admiration for new methods of consuming animals, if that consumption is directed to things that are less cruel to animals or eliminate animals for consumption all together. For example, in the introduction he writes, "While we celebrate the innovators and the scientists, you'll also meet the inventors—the people who recognize that capital drives the humane economy, producing profits for society alongside a range of other social benefits" (xiii). Pacelle discusses throughout the book billionaires and mega-corporations that are making profits from the humane economy, such as the economic advantages ecotourism has on countries' Gross Domestic Products (239). Other cited examples are McDonalds and Wal-Mart agreeing to begin increasing their welfare standards (43). He argues that these changes are lucrative because consumers desire these changes and will spend their money for it: "When it comes to the humane economy, making money and doing good is precisely the point. If ideas about compassion are going to prevail, they must triumph in the marketplace" (xi). These changes are central to what the animal movement is trying to accomplish, and they are very important. But a valid critique is that consumption and

332. PETA. <http://features.peta.org/how-to-wear-vegan>. Accessed 11/17/16. Many of the "top retailers and brands," for instance, are high priced.

the capitalist desire for profits are what helped create the dire situation for animals and the environment in the first place. A more careful dialogue about how we consume and discard products other than animals could be another way that animal rights and welfare organizations can gain additional support and make a greater impact.

Celebrating the differences between animals and humans as an example of the incredible diversity on the planet, rather than out of a sense of human superiority or responsibility, would help build a more nuanced anthropomorphism in animal groups' websites. Further, an expanded focus on the diversity along with sameness of animals, nature, and wildlife could bridge the tensions between animal rights and environmental groups (Hargrove 1992:xxiv). With the already extensive scope that large international organizations have, expanding more into these areas might not be immediately possible, but it could be a start. Comparing the similarities between humans and other animals with anthropomorphism is as important as comparing the differences. A balance must be struck between the two aspects. Emphasizing the differences and similarities between animals and humans in a way that takes animals' particular needs into consideration (Oliver 2008:216) could allow the reader/viewer to appreciate them in a new way. Such an appreciation may foster a deeper sympathy and could lead to a "dialogic mode of ethical reasoning" (Donovan 2006). In general, the animal movement is growing in size and influence, and anthropomorphism and sentimentality are an important part of that success.

Religious groups and individuals can engage critical anthropomorphism by focusing not only on challenging interpretations and reinterpreting texts but also by enhancing texts with practices. Many of the groups pay significant attention to scriptures,

but they also attempt to enact practices that could become meaningful rituals. Within their focus on religious texts is a common thread of the multiplicity and diversity of creation and the care that God has for it. Privileging this multiplicity can enable a critical anthropomorphism that considers the similarities and the differences between humans and other animals through careful observation.

One way this could be practiced is with HSUS Faith Outreach's suggestions and tools for creating a humane backyard. In religious spaces, assembling such an area can empower a living and practicing of the text, a physical manifestation of celebrating the diversity of beings. Developing these spaces as intentional practices, they can become places to reflect on the similarities and differences between humans and other animals by encouraging people to actively observe the creatures that are nurtured in a humane backyard or other spaces. Donaldson and Kymlicka discuss the idea of "liminal animals," those that range from ones we think of as pests, such as rats and pigeons but also squirrels and birds, which are animals that are welcome in human communities (2011:216). Liminal animals are those who hover in the in-between spaces of human society, ones that have adapted to human presence, sometimes using that presence for food sources and shelter and sometimes not (210). These animals, Donaldson and Kymlicka say, are "invisible in our everyday worldview" because humans have drawn such a sharp line between nature and human societies and cultures (211). Creating reflective embodied practices out of dedicated spaces in religious places such as synagogues and churches can be a way of recognizing more fully these liminal animals and appreciating their sameness and difference from humans. There is an opportunity for animals to become partners in the reflection, and people can think *with* the animals. Utilizing critical anthropomorphism

can create a greater awareness and appreciation for the other animals that live among us and also those that seem far away.

I offer a prescriptive argument that animal groups could go one step further and use the type of moral imagination that Donovan argues for as a dialogical ethics that listens and takes into consideration animals' wants and preferences (2006). I contend that Donovan's dialogical ethics and moral imagination can thoroughly coincide with an anthropomorphism like that of Bekoff, Daston, and Mitman that allows animals to be a participant in the analysis through careful observation of the material bodily expressions, such as movements and vocalizations, as well as attention to sameness and difference. With careful observation, empathetic caring, and understanding humans can be animals' representatives in a way that is not paternalistic but that considers animals' subjective needs (Kelch 1999:11; Laws 2016:254). It is this kind of sentimentality and anthropomorphism that I assert should be a part of animal organizations' repertoire in a way that it currently is not. Anthropomorphism and sentimentality used in this way furthers the dismantling of the human/animal barrier and closes the gap between scholarship and activism. Further, an overreliance on an understanding of rationality as that which sees emotion as frivolous and not useful for animal ethics can be adjusted by using anthropomorphism and sentimentality in a way that contributes to a dialogical mode of ethics and moral imagination. By describing how animal organizations use these concepts, this work contributes to the larger discussion by showing that major organizations already have the foundations for developing such an alternative moral theory; one that privileges emotions, such as the ones described throughout this study, can move animal organizations in a direction that respects differences as much as

similarities and one that can use emotions for more than just persuasion. Ultimately, this kind of concern, advocacy, and protection of animals helps break down the former three dichotomies of emotion and reason, human and animal, and scholarship and activism.

This is what I would like to see from animal organizations, and it is a stance that would foreseeably better serve all animals, humans included.

Bibliography

- Aaltola, Elisa. 2015. "The Rise of Sentimentalism and Animal Philosophy." In *Animal Ethics and Philosophy: Questioning the Orthodoxy*, 201-18, Edited by Elisa Aatola and John Hadley. London: Rowman & Littlefield International, Ltd.
- "About Earth First!: No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth." *Earth First!*, Accessed May 4, 2016. <http://earthfirstjournal.org/about>.
- "About Peta: Our Mission Statement." *People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://www.peta.org/about-peta>.
- "About Us: First To Serve." *American Humane*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://www.americanhumane.org/about-us>.
- "About Us." *Friends of Animals*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://www.friendsofanimals.org>.
- "About Us." *Jewish Initiative For Animals*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://jewishinitiativeforanimals.org>.
- "About Us." *The Humane Society of the United States*, Accessed November 27, 2016. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/?credit=web_id93480558.
- "About Us: We Are Their Voice." *The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://www.asPCA.org/about-us>.
- "About Us: What's Jewish About Being Veg." *Jewish Veg*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <https://www.jewishveg.org>.
- "Annual Report 2014 pdf." ASPCA, Accessed 01/06/16. <http://www.asPCA.org/about-us/annual-report>.
- "Annual Report 2014." HSUS, Accessed 02/15/16. <http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/2014-hsus-annual-report.pdf>.
- "Annual Review 2015." PETA, p. 7,11 pdf. Accessed 09/22/16. <http://features.peta.org/annual-review-2015>.
- Abusch-Magder, Ruth Ann. 2005. "Kashrut: The Possibility and Limits of Women's Domestic Power." In *Food and Judaism*, edited by Leonard J. Greenspoon, Ronald A. Simkins and Gerald Shapiro, 169-92. Omaha, NE: Creighton University Press.
- Adams, Carol J. 1994. *Neither Man Nor Beast*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.

- . *The Pornography of Meat*. 2004. New York: Continuum International Publishing.
- . *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory, 20th Anniversary Edition*. 2010. New York: Continuum.
- Adams, Carol J., and Lori Gruen, eds. 2014. *Ecofeminism: Feminist Interactions with Other Animals and the Earth*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Adar, Zvi. 1990. *The Book of Genesis: An Introduction to the Biblical World*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.
- Adaval, Rashmi, and Robert S. Wyer, Jr. 1998. "The Role of Narratives in Consumer Information Processing." *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 7 (no. 3): 207-45.
- Alexis-Baker, Nekeisha. 2012. "Doesn't the Bible Say that Humans Are More Important than Animals." In *A Faith Embracing All Creatures*, edited by Tripp York and Andy Alexis-Baker, 39-52. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- "All-Creatures.org Traffic Overview." *Similar Web*, Accessed September 9, 2016. <https://www.similarweb.com/website/all-creatures.org>.
- Aquinas, Thomas. 1999. *A Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima*, translated by Robert Pasnau. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Aggarwal, Pankaj, and Ann L. McGill. 2007. "Is that Car Smiling at Me? Schema Congruity as a Basis for Evaluating Anthropomorphized Products." *Journal of Consumer Research* 34: 468-79.
- Arluke, Arnold, Jack Levin, Carter Luke, and Frank Ascione. 1999. "The Relationship of Animal Abuse to Violence and Other Forms of Antisocial Behavior." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14, no. 9 : 963-75.
- Arnold, Denis G. 1995. "Hume on the Moral Difference between Humans and Other Animals." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 12 (3): 303-16. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27744668>.
- Ayers, Jennifer E. 2013. *Good Food: Grounded Practical Theology*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Baer, Marc. 2013. *Mere Believers: How Eight Faithful Lives Changed the Course of History*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- Bailey, Sarah Pulliam. "Inside the Evangelical Push to Rally Around Animal Ethics," *The Washington Post.com*. Last modified April 10, 2015, Accessed April 10, 2015. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2015/04/10/inside-the-evangelical-push-to-rally-around-animal-ethics/>.

- Bakhos, Carol. 2009. "Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Attitudes Toward Animals." *Comparative Islamic Studies* 5 (2): 177-219, DOI: 10.1558/cis.v5i2.177.
- Bastian, Brock, Steve Loughnan, Nick Haslam, and Helena R.M. Radke. 2012. "Don't Mind Meat? The Denial of Mind to Animals Used for Human Consumption." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 38 (2): 247-56, DOI: 10.1177/0146167211424291.
- Bauman, Whitney. 2009. *Theology, Creation, and Environmental Ethics: From Creatio Ex Nihilo to Terra Nullius*. New York: Routledge.
- Beers, Diane. 2006. *For the Prevention of Cruelty: The History and Legacy of the Animal Rights Movement in the United States*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Bekoff, Marc. 2006. *Animal Passions and Bestly Virtues: Reflections on Redecorating Nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- . 2007. *The Emotional Lives of Animals: A Leading Animal Scientist Explores Animal Joy, Sorrow, and Empathy and Why They Matter*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
- . 2010. *The Animal Manifesto: Six Reasons For Expanding Our Compassion Footprint*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
- Bekoff, Marc, and Colin Allen. 1997. "Cognitive Ethology: Slayers, Skeptics, and Proponents" In *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*, edited by Robert W. Mitchell, Nicholas S. Thompson, and H. Lyn Miles, 313-34. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bekoff, Marc, and Jessica Pierce. 2009. *Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Benford, Robert D. 1993. "Frame Disputes Within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement." *Social Forces* 71 (3): 677-701. DOI: 10.2307/2579890.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611-39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/223459>.
- Bentham, Jeremy. 1789/2004. "Duty to Minimize Suffering: Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832" In *Animal Rights: A Historical Anthology*, edited by Andrew Linzey and Paul Barry Clarke, 135-37. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Birke, Lynda, Arnold Arluke, and Mike Michael. 2007. *The Sacrifice: How Scientific Experiments Transform Animals and People*. West Lafayette, IN: Perdue University Press.
- Boggs, Carl. 2011. "Corporate Power, Ecological Crisis, and Animal Rights." In *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation*, edited by John Sanbonmatsu, 71-96. Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bouma-Prediger, Steven. 2010. *For the Beauty of the Earth: A Christian Vision for Creation Care*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Burle, Karl J. and Robert D. Benford. 2012. "From Game Protection to Wildlife Management: Frame Shifts, Organizational Developments, and Field Practices." *Rural Sociology* 77 (1): 62-88. DOI: 10.1111/j.1549-0831.2011.00067.x.
- Brumberg-Kraus, Jonathan D. 2005. "Does God Care What We Eat? Jewish Theologies of Food and Reverance for Life." In *Food and Judaism*, edited by Leonard J. Greenspoon, Ronald A. Simkins and Gerald Shapiro, 119-32. Omaha, NE: Creighton University Press.
- Burghardt, Gordon M., and Harold Herzog, Jr. 1980. "Beyond Conspecifics: Is Brer Rabbit Our Brother?" *BioScience* 30: 763-68.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1308337>.
- Butler, Kiera. 2010. "Steak or Veggie Burger: Which is Greener? A Lifelong Vegetarian Eats Her First Hamburger-To Find Out The Truth." *Mother Jones*, July/August, Accessed July 27, 2016. <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2010/07/is-vegetarian-diet-green>.
- Butterfield, Max, Sarah E. Hill, and Charles G. Lord. 2012. "Mangy Mutt or Furry Friend? Anthropomorphism Promotes Animal Welfare." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48: 957-60.
- Calarco, Matthew. 2008. *Zoographies: The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cantrell, Katie. 2016. "The True Cost of a Cheap Meal." *Tikkun*, April 18. Accessed July 27, 2106. <http://www.tikkun.org/nextgen/the-true-cost-of-a-cheap-meal>.
- Cherry, Elizabeth. 2010. "Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement." *Sociological Forum* 25 (3): 450-75. DOI: 10.1111/j.1573-7861.2010.01191.x.
- Clines, David J.A. 2013. "The Worth of Animals in the Divine Speeches of the Book of Job" In *Where the Wild Ox Roams: Biblical Essays in Honour of Norman C. Habel*, edited by Alan H. Caldwell with Peter L. Trudinger, 101-113. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.

- Clough, David L. 2012. *On Animals: Volume one Systematic Theology*. London: T&T Clark.
- Coetzee, J.M. 1999. *The Lives of Animals*, edited by Amy Gutmann. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Coventry, Angela, and Avram Hiller. 2015. "Hume on Animals and the Rest of Nature." In *Animal Ethics and Philosophy: Questioning the Orthodoxy*, edited by E. Aatola and J. Hadley, 165-84. London: Rowman & Littlefield International, Ltd.
- Crist, Eileen. 2000. *Images of Animals: Anthropomorphism and Animal Mind*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Crockett, Clayton and Jeffrey W. Robbins. 2012. *Religion, Politics, and the Earth: The New Materialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crockett, Clayton and John Reader. 2016. "Ecology and Social Movements: New Materialism and Relational Christian Realism." In *Religious Experience and New Materialism: Movement Matters*, edited by J. Rieger and E. Waggoner, 83-103. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Curtin, Deane. 2014. "Compassion and Being Human." In *Ecofeminism: Feminist Interactions With Other Animals and the Earth*, edited by Carol J. Adams and Lori Gruen, 39-57. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
- Daston, Lorraine. 2005. "Intelligences: Angelic, Animal, Human." In *Thinking With Animals: New Perspectives on Anthropomorphism*, edited by Lorraine Daston and Gregg Mitman, 37-58. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Daston, Lorraine, and Gregg Mitman, eds. 2005. *Thinking With Animals: New Perspectives on Anthropomorphism with Animals*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Davis, Hank. 1997. "Animal Cognition Versus Animal Thinking: The Anthropomorphic Error." In *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*, edited by Robert W. Mitchell, Nicholas S. Thompson, and H. Lyn Miles, 335-47. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Davis, Janet M. 2015. "The History of Animal Protection in the United States." *The Organization of American Historians*, November. Accessed July 26, 2016. <http://tah.oah.org/november-2015/the-history-of-animal-protection-in-the-united-states>
- Davis, Joseph E. 2002. "Narrative and Social Movements: The Power of Stories." In *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*, edited by Joseph E. Davis, 3-30. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- De Waal, Frans. 2016. *Are We Smart Enough to Know How Smart Animals Are?*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- . 2005. *Our Inner Ape: A Leading Primatologist Explains Why We Are Who We Are*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- . 2006. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*, Edited by Steven Macedo, Ober Josiah. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2009. *The Age of Empathy: Nature's Lessons for a Kinder Society*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Deane-Drummond, Ceila, and David L. Clough. 2009. *Creaturely Theology: On God, Humans, and Other Animals*. London: SCM Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2008. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, edited by M.L. Mallet, translated by D. Willis. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Descartes, Rene. 2004. "Animals as Automata: Rene Descartes 1596-1650" In *Animal Rights: A Historical Anthology*, edited by Andrew Linzey, and Paul Barry Clarke 14-17. New York: Columbia University Press.
- "Dharma Voices: Bringing Awareness to the Suffering of Animals." *Dharma Voices For Animals*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://dharmavoicesforanimals.org>.
- Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. 2011. *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Donovan, Josephine. 1996. "Animal Rights and Feminist Theory." In *Beyond Animal Rights: A Feminist Caring Ethic for the Treatment of Animals*, edited by Josephine Donovan and Carol J. Adams, 34-59. New York: Continuum Publishing.
- . 1996. "Attention to Animal Suffering: Sympathy as a Basis for Ethical Treatment of Animals." In *Beyond Animal Rights: A Feminist Caring Ethic for the Treatment of Animals*, edited by Josephine Donovan and Carol J. Adams, 147-69. New York: Continuum Publishing.
- . 2006. "Feminism and the Treatment of Animals: From Care to Dialogue." *Signs* 31: 305-29. DOI: 10.1086/491750.

- Donovan, Josephine, and Carol J. Adams. 2007. "Introduction" In *The Feminist Care Tradition in Animal Ethics: A Reader*, Edited by J. Donovan and C.J. Adams, 1-20. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Earl, Jennifer and Katrina Kimport. 2011. *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Einwohner, Rachel. 1999. "Gender, Class, and Social Movement Outcomes: Identity and Effectiveness in Two Animal Rights Campaigns." *Gender and Society* 13 (1): 56-76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/190240>.
- "Faith Outreach." *The Humane Society of the United States*, Access November 27, 2016. <http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith>.
- Filonowicz, Joseph Duke. 2008. *Fellow-Feeling and the Moral Life*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fine, Gary Allen. 2002. "The Storied Group: Social Movements as 'Bundles of Narratives'." In *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*, edited by Joseph E. Davis, 3-30. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Finsen, Lawrence, and Susan Finsen. 1994. *The Animal Rights Movement in America: From Compassion to Respect*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Fitzgerald, Amy J., Linda Kalof, and Thomas Dietz. 2009. "Slaughterhouses and Increased Crime Rates: An Empirical Analysis of the Spillover from "The Jungle" Into the Surrounding Communities." *Organization and Environment* 22 (2): 158-84. DOI: 10.1177/1086026609338164.
- Foltz, Richard. 2006. "'This she-camel of God is a sign to you': Dimensions of Animals in Islamic Tradition and Muslim Culture." In *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*, edited by Paul Waldau and Kimberley Patton, 149-59. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fraiman, Susan. 2012. "Pussy Panic versus Liking Animals: Tracking Gender in Animal Studies" *Critical Inquiry* 39: 89-115. DOI: 10.1086/668051.
- Francione, Gary L. 2000. *Introduction to Animal Rights: Your Child or the Dog?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- . 1996. *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Francione, Gary L., and Robert Garner. 2010. *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Fredrick, Bruce. 2002. "Discussing Animal Rights With People of Faith." *Animals Agenda* 22 (2): 36.
- Freeman, Carrie P. 2015. "Earthlings Seeking Justice: Integrity, Consistency, and Collaboration." In *Animals and the Environment: Advocacy, Activism, and the Quest for Common Ground*, edited by Lisa Kemmerer, 50-58. New York: Routledge.
- Freeman, Carrie Packwood. 2010. "Framing Animal Rights in the "Go Veg" Campaigns of U.S. Animal Rights Organizations." *Animals and Society* 18: 163-82.
- Gaard, Greta. 2011. "Ecofeminism Revisited: Rejecting Essentialism and Re-Placing Species in a Material Feminist Environmentalism." *Feminist Formations* 23 (2): 26-53.
- . 1993. "Living Interconnections with Animals and Nature." In *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*, Edited by Greta Gaard, 1-12. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gaarder, Emily. 2011. *Women and the Animal Rights Movement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gee, James Paul. 1999. *Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gheaus, Anca. 2012. "The Role of Love in Animal Ethics". *Hypatia* 27: 583-600. DOI:10.1111/j.1527-2001.2012.01284.x.
- Gilhus, Ingvig Saelid. 2006. *Animals, Gods, and Humans: Changing Attitudes in Greek, Roman, and Early Christian Ideas*. Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Glasser, Carol L. 2015. "Beyond Intersectionality to Total Liberation." In *Animals and the Environment: Advocacy, Activism, and the Quest for Common Ground*, edited by Lisa Kammerer, 41-49. New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, Irving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, Jeff, and James M. Jasper. 2003. "Editors' Introduction." In *The Social Movement Reader: Cases and Concepts*, edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jasper, 3-7. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gorman, Antonia. 2007. "Surrogate Suffering: Paradigms of Sin, Salvation, and Sacrifice Within the Vivisection Movement." In *Ecospirit: Religions and Philosophies for*

the Earth, edited by Laurel Kearns and Catherine Keller, 373-91. New York: Fordham University Press.

Greenebaum, Jessica. 2009. "I Am Not an Activist! Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare in the Purebred Dog Rescue Movement." *Society and Animals* 17: 289-304. DOI 10.1163/106311109X12474622855066.

---. 2004. "It's a Dog's Life: Elevating Status from Pet to 'Fur Baby' at Yappy Hour." *Society and Animals* 12 (2): 117-35.

Groenhout, Ruth E. 2004. *Connected Lives: Human Nature and an Ethic of Care*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc..

Gross, Aaron S. 2015. *The Question of the Animal and Religion: Theoretical Stakes, Practical Implications*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Groves, Julian McAllister. 1995. "Learning to Feel: The Neglected Sociology of Social Movements." *Sociological Review* 43: 435-61. DOI 10.1111/1467-954X.ep9508225681.

Groves, Jullian. 1997. *Hearts and Minds: The Controversy Over Laboratory Animals*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gruen, Lori. 2015. *Entangled Empathy: An Alternative for Our Relationships with Animals*. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Books.

---. 2014. "Facing Death and Practicing Grief" In *Ecofeminism: Feminist Interactions With Other Animals and the Earth*, edited by Carol J. Adams and Lori Gruen, 127-41. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Guthrie, Stewart Elliott. 1997. "Anthropomorphism: A Definition and a Theory." In *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*, edited by Robert W. Mitchell, Nicholas S. Thompson, and H. Lyn Miles, 50-58. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gutleben, Christine. 2016. "The Development of Evangelical Perspectives on Animals." Presentation at the 64th Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Milwaukee, WI, November 14, 2016, Accessed November 27, 2016. http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/evangelical_theological_society_speech.html.

Habel, Norman. 2011. *The Birth, the Curse, and the Greening of the Earth: An Ecological Reading of Genesis 1-11*. The Earth Bible Commentary Series 1. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Press, 2011.

- Hargrove, Eugene C, ed. 1992. *The Animal Rights/Environmental Ethics Debate: The Environmental Perspective*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Harrison, Melissa A., and A.E. Hall. 2010. "Anthropomorphism, Empathy, and Perceived Communicative Ability Vary with Phylogenetic Relatedness to Humans." *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology* 4 (1): 34-48.
- Herzog, Harold A. and Galvin, Shelley. 1997. "Common Sense and the Mental Lives of Animals: An Empirical Approach." In *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*, edited by Robert W. Mitchell, Nicholas S. Thompson, and H. Lyn Miles, 277-95. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Herzog, Harold A., and Lauren L. Golden. 2009. "Moral Emotions and Social Activism: The Case of Animal Rights." *Journal of Social Issues* 65 (9): 485-98. DOI 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01610.x.
- Hillyer, Barbara. 1993. *Feminism and Disability*. Norman OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hirschman, Elizabeth C. 1994. "Consumers and Their Companion Animals." *Journal of Consumer Research* 20: 616-32.
- Hobgood-Oster, Laura. 2014. *A Dog's History of the World: Canines and the Domestication of Humans*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Hobgood-Oster, Laura. 2008. *Holy Dogs and Asses: Animals in the Christian Tradition*. Urbana, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- "HSUS Exposed." *Protect The Harvest*, Accessed on October 2, 2016. <http://protecttheharvest.com/hsus-exposed>.
- "Humane Society Wildlife and Trust." *Humane Society of the United States*, Accessed February 15, 2016. <http://www.wildlifelandtrust.org/about>.
- Isaacs, Ronald H. 2000. *Animals in Jewish Thought and Tradition*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Jamison, Wesley V. et al. 2000. "Every Sparrow That Falls: Understanding Animal Rights Activism as Functional Religion." *Society and Animals* 8: 305-30.
- Jasper, James M. 2011. "Emotions and Social Movements: Twenty Years of Theory and Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37: 14.1-14.19. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150015.
- . 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- . 1998. "The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and Around Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 13: 397-424.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/684696>.
- Jasper, James M. and Dorothy Nelkin. 1992. *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest*. New York: Free Press.
- Jasper, James M. and Jane D. Poulsen. 1995. "Recruiters and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests." *Social Problems* 42 (4): 493-512. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3097043>.
- "Jesus People for Animals: Because Animals Are Not Ours (They're God's)." *PETA*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com>.
- "Jewishveg.org Traffic Overview." *Similar Web*, Accessed November 12, 2016.
<https://www.similarweb.com/website/jewishveg.org>.
- Johnson, Elizabeth A. 2014. *Ask the Beasts: Darwin and the Love of God*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Jones, Michael D. and Geoboo Song. 2014. "Making Sense of Climate Change: How Stories Frames Shape Cognition." In *Political Psychology* 35(4): 447-76. DOI: 10.1111/pops.12057.
- Jones, Tamsin. 2016. "New Materialism and the Study of Religion." In *Religious Experience and New Materialism: Movement Matters*, edited by J. Rieger and E. Waggoner, 1-23. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kelch, Thomas G. 1999. "The Role Of The Rational And The Emotive In A Theory Of Animal Rights." In *Environmental Affairs* 27 (1):1-41.
- Kalechofsky, Roberta. 1998. *Vegetarian Judaism: A Guide for Everyone*. Marblehead, MA: Micah Publications.
- Kalechofsky, Roberta. 2006. "Hierarchy, Kinship, and Responsibility: The Jewish Relationship to the Animal World." In *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*, edited by Paul Waldau and Kimberley Patton, 91-102. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kappeler, Susanne. 1995. "Speciesism, Racism, Nationalism...or the Power of Scientific Subjectivity." In *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*, edited by C.J. Adams and J. Donovan, 320-52. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kemmerer, Lisa. 2006. *In Search of Consistency: Ethics and Animals*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Academic.

- Kemmerer, Lisa, ed. 2015. *Animals and the Environment: Advocacy, Activism, and the Quest for Common Ground*. New York: Routledge.
- Kemmerer, Lisa and Daniel Kirjner. 2015. "Conflict and Accord: A Critical Review of Theory and Methods for Earth and Animal Advocacy." In *Animals and the Environment: Advocacy, Activism, and the Quest for Common Ground*, edited by Lisa Kammerer, 15-38. New York: Routledge.
- Kessler, Martin and Karel Deurloo. 2004. *A Commentary on Genesis: A Book of Beginnings*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Kheel, Marti. 2008. *Nature Ethics: An Ecofeminist Perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Kim, Claire Jean. 2014. "The Wonderful, Horrible Life of Michael Vick." In *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections With Other Animals and the Earth*, edited by Carol J. Adams and Lori Gruen, 175-90. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kinghorn, Kenneth Cain. 2002. *John Wesley on The Sermon on the Mount: The Standard Sermons in Modern English 2*, 21-33. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Knight, Sarah, Karl Nunkoosing, Aldert Vrij, and Julie Cherryman. 2003. "Using Grounded Theory to Examine People's Attitudes Toward How Animals are Used." *Society and Animals* 11 (4): 307-27.
- Kook, Abraham Issac. 2001. "A Firm and Joyous Voice of Life." In *Religious Vegetarianism: From Hesiod to the Dalai Lama*, Edited by K.S. Walters and L. Portmess, 118-21. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- "Kosher Shopping." *Hazon.org*, Accessed April 4, 2016. <http://hazon.org/jewish-food-movement/food-choices/kosher-shopping>.
- "Kosher Sustainable and Humane Meat." *Hazon.org*, Accessed April 4, 2016. <http://hazon.org/jewish-food-movement/food-choices/kosher-shopping/kosher-sustainable-meat>
- Ladd, Anthony E. 2011. "Feedlots of the Sea: Movement Frames and Activists Claims in the Protest Over Salmon Farming in the Pacific Northwest." *Humanity and Society* 35: 343-75. DOI:10.1177/016059761103500402.
- Laws, Charlotte. 2015. "Recipe for Cooperation: Omnicracy and the Definitional Good." In *Animals and the Environment: Advocacy, Activism, and the Quest for Common Ground*, Edited by Lisa Kammerer, 249-58. New York: Routledge.

- Linzey, Andrew. 1998. *Animal Gospel: Christian Faith as Though Animals Mattered*. London: Hodder And Stoughton, 1998.
- . 2009. . *Creatures of Same God*. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Books.
- Linzey, Andrew and Dan Cohn-Sherbok. 1997. *After Noah: Animals and the Liberation of Theology*. London: Mowbray.
- Lowe, Brian M. 2001. "Animal Rights as a Quasi-Religion" *Implicit Religion* 4: 41-60.
- Lowe, Brian and Cayrn F. Ginsberg. 2002. "Animal Rights as a Post-Citizenship Movement." *Society and Animals* 10(2): 202-15. DOI 10.1163/156853002320292345.
- Luke, Brian. 2007. *Brutal: Manhood and the Exploitation of Animals*. Urbana, IL: University of Chicago.
- Maheswaran, Durairaj and Joan Meyers-Levy. 1990. "The Influence of Message Framing and Issue Involvement." *Journal of Marketing Research* 27(3): 361-67.
- Mason, Jennifer. 2005. *Civilized Creatures: Urban Animals, Sentimental Culture, and American Literature, 1850-1900*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- McDaniel, Jay. 2006. "Practicing the Presence of God: A Christian Approach to Animals." In *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*, edited by Paul Waldau and Kimberley Patton, 132-48. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McFague, Sallie. 2008. *A New Climate for Theology: God, the World, and Global Warming*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- McGrath, Alister. 2013. *C.S. Lewis: A Life—Eccentric Genius, Reluctant Prophet*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.
- McGuire, Meredith B. 2008a. *Lived Religion: Faith and Practice in Everyday Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2008b. *Religion: The Social Context*. 5th ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- McKendree, M. G. S., and C. C. Croney, and N. J. O. Widmar. 2014. "Effects of Demographic Factors and Information Sources on United States Consumer Perceptions of Animal Welfare." *American Society of Animal Science* 92: 3161-73. DOI: 10.2527/jas2014-6874.
- Midgley, Mary. 1983. *Animals and Why They Matter*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

- Mika, Marie. 2006. "Framing the Issue: Religion, Secular Ethics and the Case of Animal Rights Mobilization" *Social Forces* 85: 915-41.
- "Mission Statement: Your Rights and Ability to Feed Your Family Are Under Attack." *Protect The Harvest*, Accessed on October 2, 2016. <http://protecttheharvest.com/who-we-are/mission-statement>.
- Mitchell, Robert W. 1997. "Anthropomorphic Anecdotalism As Method." *In Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*, Edited by Robert W. Mitchell, Nicholas S. Thompson, and H. Lyn Miles, 151-69. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mitchell, Robert W., Nicholas S. Thompson, H. Lyn Miles, eds. 1997. *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Mitchell, Sandra D. 2005. "Anthropomorphism and Cross-Species Modeling." *In Thinking With Animals: New Perspectives on Anthropomorphism with Animals, 100-18*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mullins, Alisha. "Do Women Make Better Animal Rights Activists?" Accessed August 08, 2016. <http://www.peta.org/blog/do-women-make-better-animal-rights-activists-ingrid-e-newkirk-animal-rights-feminism/>
- Nelson, Lance. 2006. "Cows, Elephants, Dogs, and Other Lesser Embodiments of Atman: Reflections on Hindu Attitudes Toward Nonhuman Animals." *In A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*, edited by Paul Waldau and Kimberley Patton, 91-102. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Newport, Frank. 2012. "In U.S., 5% Consider Themselves Vegetarians." Gallup, July 26. Accessed April 25, 2106. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/156215/consider-themselves-vegetarians.aspx>.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2006. *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2001. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- "Nutritional & Ingredient Quality Questions." *Rachael Ray Nutrish*, Accessed September 7, 2016. <http://nutrish.rachaelray.com/faq/Nutrition-and-Ingredient-Quality-Questions>.
- "Nutrition Philosophy." *Blue Buffalo Co*, Accessed September 7, 2016. <http://bluebuffalo.com/why-choose-blue/nutrition-philosophy>.

- Obar, Johathan A., Paul Zube, and Clifford Lampe. DATE? "Advocacy 2.0: An Analysis of How Advocacy Groups in the United States Perceive and Use Social Media as Tools for Facilitating Civic Engagement and Collective Action." *Journal of Information Policy* 2:1-25.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/jinfopoli.2.2012.0001?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents.
- Oliver, Kelly. 2010. "Animal Ethics: Toward an Ethics of Responsivness." *Research in Phenomenology* 40: 267-80. DOI: 10.1163/156916410X509959.
- . 2008. "What Is Wrong with (Animal) Rights?" *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 22: 214-24. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25670714>.
- "Our Farms." *Fairlife LLC*, Accessed April 25, 2016. <http://fairlife.com/our-farms/animal-care>.
- "Our History." *Sojourners*. Accessed October 04, 2106. <https://sojo.net/about-us/our-history>.
- Pacelle, Wayne. 2016. *The Humane Economy Animal Protection 2.0: How Innovators and Enlightened Consumers Are Transforming the Lives of Animals*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Peek, Charles W., Mark A. Konty, Terri E. Frazier. 1997. "Religion and the Ideological Support for Social Movements: The Case of Animal Rights." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36 (3): 429-39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1387859>.
- Peggs, Kay. 2012. *Animals And Sociology*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pellow, David Naguib. 2014. *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Perlo, Katherine Willis. 2009. *Killing and Kinship: The Animal in World Religions*. New York. Columbia University Press.
- "Peta's Five Most Tone-Deaf Stunts." *MotherJones.com*, July 25, 2014, Accessed October 21, 2016. <http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2014/07/peta-dumb>.
- Peterson, Anna L. 2013. *Being Animal: Beast and Boundaries in Nature Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Philpott, Tom. "Lay Off the Almond Milk, You Ignorant Hipsters." *Mother Jones*. July 16, 2014. Accessed on July 27, 2016. <http://www.motherjones.com/tom-philpott/2014/07/lay-off-almond-milk-ignorant-hipsters>.

- Pitson, Anthony E. 1993. "The Nature of Humean Animals." *Hume Studies* 19 (2): 301-16. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/hms/summary/vo19/19.2.pitson.html>.
- Polletta, Francesca. 2002. "Plotting Protest: Mobilizing Stories in the 1960 Student Sit-Ins." In *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*, edited by Joseph E. Davis, 31-52. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pope Francis, "Encyclical Letter Laudato Si'." *Vatican Website*, Accessed April 6, 2016. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html.
- Preece, Rod. 2008. *Sins of the Flesh: A History of Vegetarian Thought*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Prinz, Jesse. 2006. "The Emotional Basis of Moral Judgments." *Philosophical Explorations* 9 (1): 29-43. DOI: 10.1080/13869790500492466.
- . 2007. *The Emotional Construction of Morals*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rashi. 1928. "*Rashi*" on the Pentateuch: Genesis. translated and Annotated by James H. Lowe. London: The Hebrew Compendium Publishing Company.
- Regan, Tom. 1983. *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.
- . 1991. *The Thee Generation: Reflections on the Coming Revolution*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Rees, Amanda. 2007. "Reflections on the Field: Primatology, Popular Science, and the Politics of Personhood." *Social Studies of Science* 37: 881-907. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25474555>.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. "The Vegetarian Ideal in the Bible." In *Food and Judaism*, edited by Leonard J. Greenspoon, Ronald A. Simkins and Gerald Shapiro, 319-34. Omaha, NE: Creighton University Press, 2005.
- Riffkin, Rebecca. "In U.S., More Say Animals Should Have Same Rights as People." *Gallup*, May 18, 2015, Accessed October 06, 2106. http://www.gallup.com/poll/183275/say-animals-rights-people.aspx?g_source=animal%20welfare&g_medium=search&g_campaign=tiles.
- Ritvo, Harriet. 2007. "On the Animal Turn" *Daedalus*, (Fall): 118-22.
- Rollin, Bernard E. 2011. "Animal Rights as a Mainstream Phenomenon." *Animals* 1: 102-15. DOI:10.3390/ani1010102

- Rudy, Kathy. 2011. *Loving Animals: Toward a New Animal Advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Santoro, Lily. "Our History." *American Anti-Vivisection Society*, Accessed September 16, 2016. <http://aavs.org/about/history>.
- Schaefer, Donovan O. 2015. *Religious Affects: Animality, Evolution, and Power*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schmitt, Christopher S. and Candace Clark. 2007. "Sympathy" In *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, edited by J.E. Stets and J.H. Turner, 476-92. New York: Springer.
- Schochet, Elijah Judah. 1984. *Animal Life in Jewish Tradition: Attitudes and Relationships*. New York: KTAV Publishing House.
- Schwartz, Richard H. 2011. "Global Warming, Animal Products, and the Vegan Mandate" In *Call to Compassion: Religious Perspectives on Animal Advocacy*, edited by L. Kremmerer and A. J. Nocella, II, 107-25. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Books.
- Sears, David. 2015. *The Vision of Eden: Animal Welfare and Vegetarianism in Jewish Law and Mysticism*. Lexington: Meorei Ohr.
- Serpell, James T. 2002. "Anthropomorphism and Anthropomorphic Selection: Beyond the "Cute Response"" *Society and Animals* 10: 437-54. DOI: 10.1163/156853003321618864.
- Singer, Peter. 2009. *Animal Liberation: The Definitive Classic of the Animal Movement: Updated Edition*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- . 2006. "Animal Protection and the Problem of Religion." In *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*, edited by Paul Waldau and Kimberley Patton, 616-20. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 2011. *Practical Ethics*. 3rd Ed. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Shapiro, Kenneth and Margo DeMello. 2010. "The State of Human-Animal Studies" *Animals and Society* 18: 307-319. DOI: 10.1163/156853010X510807.
- Shevelov, Kathryn. 2008. *For the Love of Animal: The Rise of the Animal Protection Movement*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Slicer, Deborah. 1991. "Your Daughter or Your Dog? A Feminist Assessment of the Animal Research Issue." *Hypatia* 6 (1): 108-124. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3810036>.

- Silverman, Paul S. 1997. "A Pragmatic Approach to the Inference of Animal Mind." In *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals*, edited by Robert W. Mitchell, Nicholas S. Thompson, and H. Lyn Miles, 170-85. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Slote, Michael. 2010. *Moral Sentimentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. *The Ethics of Care and Empathy*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Bill Leon. 2012. "Animals Made Americans Human: Sentient Creatures and the Creation of Early America's Moral Sensibility." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 2 (2): 126-40. DOI 10.5406/janimalethics.2.2.0126.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1987. *The Everyday World As Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, Kevin John. 2011. *The Origins, Nature, and Significance of the Jesus Movement as a Revitalization Movement*. Lexington, KY: Emeth Press.
- Snow, David A, E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation" *American Sociological Review* 51: 464-81. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095581>.
- Sober, Elliott. 2005. "Comparative Psychology Meets Evolutionary Biology: Morgan's Canon and Cladistic Parsimony." In *Thinking With Animals: New Perspectives on Anthropomorphism*, edited by Lorraine Daston and Gregg Mitman, 85-99. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sorenson, John. 2016. *Constructing Ecoterrorism: Capitalism, Speciesism, and Animal Rights*. Black Point, Nova Scotia, CA: Fernwood Publishing.
- Stibbe, Arran. 2001. "Language, Power, and the Social Construction of Animals" *Society and Animals* 9: 145-61. DOI: 10.1163/156853001753639251.
- Strom, Stephanie. 2008. "Ad Featuring Singer Proves Bonanza for the A.S.P.C.A." *New York Times*, December 26. Accessed September 22, 2106. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/26/us/26charity.html?_r=2.
- Sutherland, Anne, and Jeffery E. Nash. 1994. "Animal Rights as a New Environmental Cosmology" *Qualitative Sociology* 17: 171-86.
- Swan, Davina and John C. McCarthy. 2003. "Contesting Animal Rights on the Internet: Discourse Analysis of the Social Construction of Argument." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 22 (3): 297-320. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X03252279.

- “The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Consolidated Financial Statements 2015.” ASPCA. Accessed 01/06/16.
http://www.asPCA.org/sites/default/files/financial_statement_2015.pdf.
- “The ALF Credo and Guidelines.” *Animal Liberation Front*, Accessed May 4, 2016.
http://animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/alf_credo.htm.
- “The Truth About Chicken.” *ASPCA*, Accessed on October 13, 2015.
<http://truthaboutchicken.org>.
- “Thirteen Things You Didn’t Know About HSUS.” *Humanewatch.org*, Access October 2, 2016. <http://www.humanewatch.org/13-things-you-didnt-know-about-hsus>.
- Tilly, Charles. 2008. *Credit and Blame*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2002. *Stories, Identities, and Political Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- . 2006. *Why?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tilly, Charles, and Sidney Tarrow. 2015. *Contentious Politics*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Torres, Bob. 2007. *Making a Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Turner, Jonathan H. and Jan E. Stets. 2007. “Moral Emotions” In *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, edited by J.E. Stets and J.H. Turner, 544-66. New York: Springer.
- Twine, Richard. 2014. “Ecofeminism and Veganism: Revisiting the Question of Universalism.” In *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections With Other Animals and the Earth*, edited by Carol J. Adams and Lori Gruen, 191-207. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Unti, Bernard Oreste. 2004. “Every Field of Humane Work-Everywhere.” In *Protecting All Animals: A Fifty-Year History of the Humane Society of the United States*, 1-40, Humane Society of the United States. Accessed November 27, 2106
http://www.humanesociety.org/news/interview/2012/berni_unti_021612.html.
- Varner, Gary E. 1997. *In Nature’s Interests?: Interests, Animal Rights, and Environmental Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vasquez, Manuel. 2011. *More Than Belief: A Materialist Theory of Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vitello, Paul. 2012. “John A. Hoyt, Champion for Animals, Is Dead at 80.” *New York Times*, April 4, 2012. Accessed October 2, 2106.

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/23/us/john-a-hoyt-dies-guided-humane-society-to-prominence.html?_r=0.

Waldau, Paul. 2002. *The Specter of Speciesism: Buddhist and Christian Views of Animals*. New York: Oxford University Press.

---. 2010. *Animal Rights: What Everyone Needs to Know*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Waldau, Paul, and Kimberly Patton. 2006. "Introduction." In *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*, edited by Paul Waldau and Kimberly Patton. 11-23. New York: Columbia University Press.

Webb, Stephen. 1998. *On God and Dogs: A Christian Theology of Compassion for Animals*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weil, Kari. 2012. *Thinking Animals: Why Animal Studies Now?* New York: Columbia University Press.

"Welcome to The Christian Vegetarian Association." The Christian Vegetarian Association, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://christianveg.org>.

"Welcome to All-Creatures.org." *All-Creatures.org*, Accessed November 27, 2016, <http://www.all-creatures.org>.

Wendell, Susan. "The Social Construction of Disability." In *Reading for Diversity and Social Justice 2nd Edition*, edited by Maurianne Adams, Warren J. Blumenfeld, Carmelita Rosie Castaneda, Heather W. Hackman, Madeline L. Peters, and Ximena Zuniga, 477-81. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Westermann, Claus. 1984, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*. Trans J.J. Scullion. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing.

"Who's Really Attacking." *The Humane Society of the United States*, Accessed on August 5, 2015. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org>.

"Who's Really Attacking The Humane Society Of The United States?" *The Humane Society of the United States*, Accessed on February 15, 2016. <http://www.whoattackshsus.org/protect-the-harvest>.

"Who We Are." Animal Welfare Institute, Accessed November 27, 2016. <https://awionline.org/content/who-we-are>.

"Why HumaneWatch." *Humanewatch.org*, Accessed October 2, 2016. <http://www.humanewatch.org/why>

- Wirzba, Norman. 2011. *A Theology of Eating*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wise, Steven M. 2000. *Rattling the Cage: Toward Legal Rights for Animals*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Wolfe, Cary. 2003. *Animal Rites: American Culture, The Discourse of Species, and Posthumanist Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2009. Human, All Too Human: Animal Studies and the Humanities *PLMA* 124: 546-75. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25614299>.
- Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy: Revised Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- “Working to Protect The Rights, Welfare and Habitats of Animals.” *In Defense of Animals*, Accessed November 27, 2016. <http://www.idausa.org>.
- Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2013. “Resonance of Moral Shocks in Abolitionist Animal Rights Advocacy: Overcoming Contextual Constraints.” *Society and Animals* 21: 379-94. DOI: 10.1163/15685306-12341271.
- Young, Shawn David. 2015. *Gray Sabbath: Jesus People USA, the Evangelical Left, and the Evolution of Christian Rock*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

Primary Sources and Websites

- All-Creatures: <http://www.all-creatures.org>
- American Humane: <http://www.americanhumane.org>; <http://www.humaneheartland.org>
- Animal Liberation Front: <http://www.animalliberationfront.com>
- American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty of Animals: <https://www.asPCA.org>
- Animal Welfare Institute: <https://awionline.org>
- Christian Vegetarian Association: <http://christianveg.org>
- Dharma Voices for Animals: <http://dharmavoicesforanimals.org>
- Earth First!: <http://www.earthfirst.org>; <http://earthfirstjournal.org>
- Friends of Animals: <http://www.friendsofanimals.org>
- In Defense of Animals: <http://www.idausa.org>

Jewish Initiatives for Animals: <http://jewishinitiativeforanimals.org>

Jewish Veg: <https://www.jewishveg.org>

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals: <http://www.peta.org>

Jesus People for Animals: <http://www.jesuspeopleforanimals.com>

The Humane Society for the United States: <http://www.humanesociety.org>

The Humane Society for the United States-Faith Outreach Department:
<http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/faith/>