How Animal Rights and Animal Welfare Nonprofits and NGOs Use Theories of Effectiveness and Inclusivity to Promote an End to Factory Farming

Tarun Bishop
Master's Thesis in Environmental Policy & Law
University of Eastern Finland
Faculty of Social Sciences and Business Studies
Department of Geographical and Historical Studies
Supervisor: Professor Lasse Peltonen
31 May 2024

Abstract

UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND

Faculty Faculty of Social Sciences and Business Studies	Department Department of Geographical and Historical Studies
Author Tarun Bishop	
Title How Animal Rights and Animal Welfare Nonprofits and NGOs Use Theories of Effectiveness and Inclusivity to Promote an End to Factory Farming	

Main subject	Type of thesis	Date	Number of pages
Environmental Policy & Law	Master's Thesis	31 May 2024	116

Abstract

This thesis examines ideologies, tactics and strategies of animal rights and animal welfare nonprofits and NGOs. Animal rights and welfare movements (collectively referred to as animal protection movements) stem from schools of thought that advocate for the interests of non-human animals. This thesis focuses primarily on movements against factory farming, in the context of nonprofits and NGOs that promote animal rights and/or animal welfare. Two overarching themes are present in both animal rights and animal welfare movements: effectiveness and inclusivity. In addition, some nonprofits and NGOs have more grassroots approaches, while some have more corporate focuses. Thus, this thesis examines nonprofits along the animal rights vs. welfare distinction, the effectiveness vs. inclusivity distinction, and the grassroots vs. corporate distinction. This thesis then addresses the question of whether there are correlations, in terms of whether nonprofits that tend to focus on rights vs. welfare tend to be more likely to focus on effectiveness vs. inclusivity, and whether they tend to be more grassroots vs. corporate. This thesis also looks at whether, or how much, animal rights vs. animal welfare language affects a nonprofit's tactics. To answer these questions, I examine mission statements of selected nonprofits, and evaluate whether each mission statement suggests a greater focus on animal rights vs. welfare, utilitarianism vs. inclusivity, and grassroots vs. corporate. I also conduct interviews with people who have worked for and/or founded some of these nonprofits. Ultimately, I conclude that, in terms of overall leanings, there does not seem to be a strong correlation between this and whether said nonprofits'

mission statements are more likely to focus on utilitarianism or inclusivity. However, when looking at specific campaigns and goals, it seems that an animal rights leaning correlates with a focus on inclusivity, while an animal welfare leaning correlates with a focus on utilitarianism or effectiveness. A focus on animal rights also seems to correlate with a grassroots focus, and a focus on animal welfare seems to correlate with a corporate focus. In addition, the animal protection movement is examined in historical and modern contexts, particularly in terms of how the animal protection movement fits into the sphere of social movements.

Key words: animal rights, animal welfare, animal protection, utilitarianism, effective altruism, inclusivity, intersectionality, interconnectedness.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis explores animal rights and welfare movements, and focuses primarily on nonprofits and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and their tactics. I begin with a general framework, including historical and modern animal rights and welfare movements, other historical and modern social movements, and common definitions of "nonprofit," "social movement," and similar terms. I conclude the first chapter with my research questions, which I aim to answer (or explore if they are not answerable) throughout this thesis. The second chapter looks somewhat more in-depth at theories and perspectives that inform animal protection[1] movements and the tactics used in these movements. Specifically, it discusses social movements, animal rights and welfare ideologies, utilitarianism and inclusivity, consumer-oriented tactics used by nonprofits and NGOs, communication within the larger animal protection movement and between factions of the movement, and broader considerations of the issues of "rights." The third chapter begins by discussing research tactics, and continues in an analysis of animal protection groups, their goals and tactics, and interviews I conducted with employees of animal rights and welfare nonprofits. The final two chapters go into a further analysis of my research processes, and discuss possibilities for future research in this area.

In my analysis of animal protection nonprofits and NGOs, I focus on mission statements and strategies of selected nonprofits and NGOs. For example, as discussed below, some groups identify as animal rights groups, and some identify as animal welfare groups; some have more grassroots strategies, while some are more business-oriented; and some focus on doing the most net good (e.g., utilitarianism or effective altruism), while some focus on employing the most intersectional and inclusive strategies. Between the 1800s and the present, a variety of animal protection groups have developed, many of which are discussed in later chapters. Animal protection groups may evolve; for example, some may begin as grassroots efforts and then develop more corporate structures. This thesis focuses on perspectives in the animal rights and welfare movements, and how animal rights vs. welfare terminology, focus on effective altruism vs. inclusivity, and grassroots vs. business-oriented models may have advantages and disadvantages.

With a variety of animal rights and welfare groups, there are a variety of schools of thought on which groups are best to support. This has led to the formation of evaluation groups, which evaluate which charities are most effective and best to support. Evaluation groups include Animal Charity Evaluators, Charity Navigator, and Guidestar. This thesis explores criteria these key actors (i.e.,

[1] Note: This thesis discusses differences between "animal rights" and "animal welfare." I use the term, "animal protection," as an all-encompassing term to include both animal rights and animal welfare.

nonprofits, NGOs, and evaluation groups) use to evaluate the effectiveness of activist tactics, including law and policy campaigns, corporate campaigns, and public outreach.

1.1. Earlier History

Notions of animal rights and welfare have ancient historical roots. Pythagoras was a vegetarian, and advocated for both vegetarianism and "moral consideration" of all "living things" (Knopp, 2023; Walters and Portmess, 1999, pg. 11). By contrast, Aristotle believed non-human animals did not matter morally, and in Ancient Greece, people regarded non-human animals as incapable of feelings, experiences, etc., and instead considered them "robots" (Wise, 2001). Aristotle's view has largely prevailed in Western societies, as throughout history, animals have often been thought to exist for the purposes of humans; indeed, at various points in history, pigs have been thought to exist to be killed, and monkeys have been thought to exist to make humans laugh (Wise, 2001). Jainism, and some sections of Hinduism and Buddhism have practiced vegetarianism or veganism; in fact, Jainism is thought to "closely reflect" the ideology of "ethical veganism" (Kumar, 2021). Because I lack the qualifications to speak in-depth about veganism and animal protection movements in non-Western societies, this thesis focuses primarily on the movements in Western societies.

In the early phases of recognition of animal cruelty in early modern history, it was more common in Western societies to acknowledge indirect duties to non-human animals and/or to acknowledge the rights of animals as property. For example, Immanuel Kant believed that non-human animals did not matter in their own right, but practiced that it was wrong to be cruel to animals, on the basis that cruelty to animals would foster cruelty to humans (Branham, 2005).

In Great Britain, "Dick Martin's Act…An Act to Prevent the Cruel and Improper Treatment of Cattle" of 1822 was a significant development, as it likely marked one of the first instances in which a complete legislative body had significant deliberation on the issue of animal protection. Indeed, 13 years earlier, in 1809, a similar bill had passed in the House of Lords but failed to pass in the House of Commons (Favre and Tsang, 1993). Soon after Dick Martin's Act, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) was established in Great Britain in 1824 (Wrenn, 2019, pg. xvii).

The early animal rights movement, in the early 1800s, was primarily to advocate for stray dogs and "urban work horses." By the mid-1900s, the movement broadened to focus on the well-being of companion animals, working animals, animals used in research facilities, and animals used for food;

and by the 1970s, it was common to advocate for a complete ban on “nonhuman animal exploitation” (Wrenn, 2013, pg. 178). Tactics of the earlier animal rights movement often included petitions, educational outreach, and journalism. An anti-vivisection protest was one of the largest similar protests. Around World War I and World War II, this wave of “protest” diminished, and had a resurgence around the 1950s, around when much of the public heard stories of animal cruelty (Wrenn, 2019).

The animal rights movement in earlier modern history, particularly in the United States and Western Europe in the 1700s and 1800s, coincided with other social movements, such as the anti-slavery movement, and tactical comparisons have been made between these two movements. In the mid-1900s onward, the animal rights movement has largely coincided with the Civil Rights movement. In exploring parallels between these movements, lessons have been drawn, in terms of how earlier movements may inform later movements (Wrenn, 2013). However, there has also been effort to avoid making comparisons between movements, lest it lead to misunderstanding and a lack of inclusivity in addressing various forms of oppression (see, e.g., Harrington, 2024).

1.2. Advent of Large-Scale Industrial Animal Agriculture: How This Affects the Movement

With an advent of large-scale industrial animal agriculture, the animal rights and welfare movements have increasingly operated in a world in which tens of billions of animals are raised in factory farms and are killed for human consumption (see, e.g., Runkle and Stone, 2017; Wrenn, 2013). Indeed, an estimated “40.5 billion farmed land animals and 125 billion farmed fishes alive at any given time” (Animal Charity Evaluators, 2022). This has shaped the priorities of various nonprofits and NGOs, in that many nonprofits and NGOs strive to focus on issues that have the most impact; there is more in-depth discussion on this in Chapter 2, especially in the “Effective Altruism” and “Utilitarianism” subsections of Section 2.3, as well as in my interviews in Section 4.2.

Large-scale agriculture was introduced in the United States following the Chicago meatpacking industry’s initiatives in the late 1800s, with innovations in refrigeration techniques. The notion of factory farming became popular in the 1930s, with the goals of increasing profit and reducing costs (New Roots Institute, 2022).

Factory farming increased following World War II. During World War II, meat was used as a quick resource to feed soldiers in the war, and so demand for meat increased. Because of this, for

example, the United States government provided subsidies to large agricultural corporations, and these corporations became powerful enough that they continued to grow after the war ended. The government discontinued large subsidies to these corporations, but these corporations lowered their prices to encourage consumers to purchase their meat. This led small farmers to largely go out of business (Runkle and Stone, 2017).

Along with the increases in factory farming, meat consumption has dramatically increased in recent decades. According to a 2021 study by the University of Illinois, consumption increased significantly in even the past seven years (Lowrey, 2024). These trends can create a vicious cycle: higher rates of consumption lead to more animals raised, which can lead to animals being intensely confined; and intensive methods can lead to more consumption, because intensive methods mean less land is used per animal (Anderson, 2014).

As a result of this, there are numerous animal welfare concerns. There are many exemptions in animal cruelty laws that allow "common" or "normal" practices. In addition, in many cases (particularly many jurisdictions in the United States), "normal" is essentially defined by the animal agricultural industry, and if the industry asserts that a certain practice is normal, it may be considered legally permissible (Lowrey, 2024). For example, growing chickens so large that they fall over has been deemed not to be illegal, because it is a common practice (Evans, 2024). However, activists have argued that exemptions from this should be construed narrowly, because the exemption is only for customary practices within the scope of industry practice, and does not exempt animal cruelty simply because it is on a farm or enacted on a farmed animal (Gold, 2024). In addition, some states have laws that require standards of care for farmed animals; for example, Iowa Livestock Neglect Law requires care in line with "customary husbandry" practices (Evans, 2024). The case, *In re Massey Energy* (Del. 2011), ruled that companies are not permitted to violate the law to make a profit. However, when company operations handle millions of animals, it can be far more difficult for companies to monitor these things (Evans, 2024).

In addition to animal rights and welfare concerns, there are a plethora of environmental and human rights concerns. Zoonotic diseases have increased; this has increased . As an example, COVID-19 risks were far higher in and around slaughterhouses; in *RCWA v. Smithfield* (W.D. MO) and *McDonald's Litigation (III.)*, there was a lawsuit about the public health risk of this, and the latter was successful (the former was not, as the Court considered it the jurisdiction of OSHA) (Muraskin, 2024). In addition, workers in this type of profession are disproportionately people of color (Muraskin, 2024). Air pollution from animal agriculture is estimated to cause 13,000 deaths per year (ALDF, N.d.). The

IPCC (2023) called for a reduction in consumption in animal products in "high-consuming" countries; some of these "high-consuming" countries pushed back and tried to "lobby" to remove this language from the IPCC (Bray, 2024). Dangers to workers have also been documented; a worker in a chicken slaughterhouse may work eight hours per day, six days per week, and hang 14,000 chickens per shift (Muraskin, 2024).

These issues have shaped the priorities of many activists and researchers, as well as nonprofits and NGOs, in the animal protection movement and related social justice movements. More discussion on this features in the next section and throughout this thesis.

1.3. Recent Developments in the Animal Protection Nonprofit Sphere

The founding of the Farm Animal Rights Movement (FARM) in 1976, the founding of the Nonhuman Rights Project in 2007, animal rights and animal law conferences, and similar developments marked growth of the animal rights movement that put emphasis on anti-speciesism and plant-based eating. By the 1970s, many activists advocated for a total ban on animal exploitation (Wrenn, 2013); prior to this point, the movement was largely limited to advocacy in favor of treating animals "humanely" and preventing "unnecessary suffering" of animals, which (as discussed in the next chapter) is often considered an animal "welfare" view rather than an animal "rights" view (Francione, 2007, pg. 1). Interestingly, in recent years, "welfare reform" has become "standard protocol," which has led to discussions on trade-offs surrounding this type of approach (Wrenn, 2013, pg. 178).

Many animal protection nonprofits have gotten involved in other recent developments in the social justice sphere. Two that I focus on are the effective altruism movement and the drive for inclusivity. The effective altruism movement is largely based on the idea of doing as much good as possible, and taking actions that have the greatest net benefit. The drive for inclusivity is largely based on goals of diversity, inclusion, and intersectionality within the animal protection movement. I discuss these more in-depth in Section 2.3.

Another type of group is an evaluation group. Evaluation groups assess the effectiveness of, for example, animal rights and welfare nonprofits, and/or people who wish to make the biggest difference possible in their careers. Evaluation groups largely came about as a means to guide people who wished to be effective in their activism, careers, and/or donations.

The evaluation group, 80,000 Hours, was founded in 2011, by two then-university students who wanted careers that meaningfully contributed to the world. As the more "standard" career advice (to become, e.g., a teacher or doctor) did not appeal to them, and it seemed prior research had not tackled their questions of whether it was best to have research-based careers, join political campaigns, or something else, they decided to start their own research and present their ideas. When they presented ideas, several audience members suggested they launch an organization, which inspired 80,000 Hours. Initially a part-time project, 80,000 Hours started a full-time team in 2012. 80,000 hours now provides advice to people on how to make the best possible difference in their careers; the name, "80,000 Hours," is inspired by the estimate that a single person works 40 years x 50 weeks x 40 hours (80,000 Hours, 2024).

80,000 Hours gave birth to Animal Charity Evaluators (ACE), which is one of the most well-known evaluation groups. ACE was founded in 2012, and was originally called "Effective Animal Activism" ("EAA"). At that time, EAA was a subdivision of 80,000 Hours. In 2013, EAA began putting more focus on creating research and educational materials. EAA merged with the charity, Justice for Animals, and later changed its name to Animal Charity Evaluators. (ACE, 2022).

1.4. Research questions

Main question: What strategies do anti-factory farming nonprofits and NGOs use to promote an end to factory farming and interconnected oppression?

Sub-questions:

1. Are there correlations between animal rights vs. welfare nonprofits/NGOs and their tactics/strategies, whether they are more likely to be grassroots or business-oriented,[2] and whether they are more likely to focus on utilitarianism or inclusivity? And is this reflected in their mission statements?
2. How does the shift in language or focus, from animal welfare to animal rights, influence the strategies of movements against factory farming?

[2] Note: I discuss grassroots and business-oriented approaches more in Chapter 3 onward, but I define "grassroots" to mean focusing their activism on consumers and communities, or making institutional decisions in a "bottom-up" manner; and "business-oriented" or "corporate" to mean focusing activism on companies or legislative change or another form of advocacy that is "removed" from consumers, or being institutionally "professionalized."

3. How do anti-factory farming nonprofits and NGOs effectively focus on interconnectedness between factory farming, speciesism, and related forms of oppression?
4. How do animal rights/welfare activists, researchers, nonprofits and NGOs evaluate how (and how much) animal rights and welfare campaigns reduce animal suffering in factory farming? For example, what perspectives do these actors use to improve effectiveness and inclusivity?

Chapter 2. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, I discuss the framework within which animal protection nonprofits and NGOs operate, and I examine literature on philosophical frameworks that inform the animal protection movement, as well as nonprofit and NGO strategies. Section 2.1 examines social movements as a whole, and nonprofits and NGOs within social movements. Section 2.2 examines animal rights and animal welfare philosophies, and how these philosophies inform nonprofit and NGO strategies. Section 2.3 examines additional philosophies that inform nonprofit and NGO strategies, such as effective altruism, utilitarianism, deontology, intersectionality, inclusivity, natural law and natural rights. Section 2.4 examines literature about activist tactics in the animal protection movement, including media tactics, leafleting, other consumer education tactics, and a comparison of the effectiveness of animal rights vs. animal welfare vs. environmental messaging. Section 2.5 discusses the relationship between the animal rights movement and other social justice movements, as well as relationships between sub-movements of the animal protection movement.

2.1. Ideas, Tactics, Strategies, and Frameworks of Social Movements

2.1.1. Definition of "social movement," and how nonprofits and NGOs fit into this framework

A "social movement" may have a variety of definitions, and it is somewhat debated what qualifies as a "social movement." Suzanne Staggenborg (2011, pg. 4) argues that a "social movement" is generally considered to be substantial in size; a single "incident" is generally not considered part of a social movement unless it is "part of a series of collective actions rather than one incident, and enacted by participants with common interests and a distinct identity," who have "broader goals." Staggenborg further contends that social movements may use a variety of tactics, and that while social movements may use "institutionalized" tactics, such as legislative activism, many would argue that a social movement is only truly a "social movement" if it also uses "noninstitutionalized" tactics, such as demonstrations (pg. 6).

All of the social movements I reference in this thesis meet Staggenborg's suggested criteria. However, the definition of "social movement" can be dynamic and debatable, and I thus explore this

question as it relates to my research questions in my later sections of this thesis. In addition, some of the actors, such as nonprofits and NGOs, are more structured and "centralized," while others are less structured and more "diffuse." Some have more defined roles for their employees and volunteers, while others are a bit more "organically" developed. The concepts of "professionalization," "grassroots," and "factionalism" are also important in social movements. As Wrenn (2013) states, "In many social movement environments that have experienced … professionalization and moderation, radical factions have emerged (Zald and Ash 1966) and this has certainly been the case for nonhuman animal rights."

Nonprofits and NGOs serve important roles in social movements. A nonprofit may be a social movement organization, but a nonprofit is not a movement unto itself; rather, nonprofits and NGOs can be actors within social movements. Thus, throughout this thesis, my discussion of nonprofits and NGOs assumes they are actors within social movements.

2.1.2. Definitions of "nonprofit" and "NGO"

Definitions of "nonprofits" and "NGOs" vary; however, in this thesis, I use the definitions laid out in this subsection. Under United States Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3), an organization must meet certain requirements to be tax-exempt. Specifically, it must "be organized and operated exclusively for exempt purposes set forth in section 501(c)(3), and none of its earnings may inure to any private shareholder or individual. In addition, it may not be an **action organization**, i.e., it may not attempt to influence legislation as a substantial part of its activities and it may not participate in any campaign activity for or against political candidates" (IRS, 2023). A "charitable trust" qualifies, while an individual does not. As much as possible, in this thesis, I use the 501(c)(3) standards, and all groups I refer to as "nonprofits" meet the 501(c)(3) criteria. However, certain sources may define "nonprofit" differently, or may not explicitly define "nonprofit"; if this is the case for any source I use, I strive to be as consistent as possible in my usage of this term.

In addition to this legal definition, there are various definitions of "nonprofit" across academic disciplines. For example, the "structural-operational" definition of the "nonprofit sector" is said to exclude "mutual aid" organizations, which have been considered important parts of the nonprofit sector at certain points in history (Morris, 2000, pg. 25). This is largely because the "structural-operational" definition states that nonprofits may not "distribute profits to members," as

they are expected to use such funds for the "collective good" (pg. 34). "Mutual aid" has been posited against "philanthropy," within Beverige's paradigm of "voluntary action" (pg. 34). This exclusion of "mutual aid" groups has been controversial, because such groups have been considered key in "civil society"[3] (pg. 40).

NGOs began in 1945, with the United Nations (University of the People, 2024). The United States Department of State discusses various processes to start an NGO, and mentions that some NGOs are able to run as nonprofits; thus, there is overlap between nonprofits and NGOs, as some organizations are both nonprofits and NGOs. One of the most fundamental similarities is that both nonprofits and NGOs generally strive to promote betterment in society (University of the People).

2.2. Ideologies of Animal Protection Nonprofits/NGOs: Rights vs. Welfare

2.2.1. Rights

An animal rights framework typically advocates against the use of animals for human gain. For example, this framework generally advocates against human consumption of animals, laboratory testing on animals, and use of animals in entertainment (Lingel, 2019). Definitions of "rights" have evolved. The animal rights framework largely connects to the theory of deontology, which is derived from "deon," meaning duty, and "logos," meaning "science" (Alexander and Moore, 2020). "Rights" may include a variety of rights, and often include (perhaps most fundamentally) the right not to be used for human interests. Gary Francione, a prominent figure in the animal rights movement, takes the position that animals have the right not to be property of humans. Francione takes the position that veganism is the best path, and that a vegan-centric approach can lead to incremental progress away from the exploitation that happens today. Francione argues that in order to achieve the animal rights and abolitionist goals, we must stop bringing about domesticated animals, and that we must also stop killing non-domesticated animals (Francione and Garner, 2010). Thus, Francione's position is that "vegan education" is the best path, rather than advocating for "humanely raised" meat or similar (Wrenn and Johnson, 2013).

Many argue that rights are paired with duties. For example, if animals have the right not to be

[3] Note: I understand that the word "civil" has been used in a variety of contexts, and the concept of "civility" has been used to

exploited, humans may have a corresponding duty not to exploit animals. Some argue that in a “rights” framework, it is possible to look at the “equity” of what happens to the animals, rather than having to identify specific human “behaviors” toward animals (Todorović, 2023). This latter view places emphasis on the well-being of the animals, rather than any particular action that humans may or may not take.

The distinction between “positive” and “negative” rights or freedoms is important. A negative freedom is a freedom “from” something, such as freedom from harm, while a positive freedom is a freedom “to” do something (Wise, 2001). For example, Francione’s animal “rights” position focuses on the right of animals not to be property of humans. Francione also focuses on the animals killed for food, as they are higher in number (56 billion annually not including aquatic animals, according to this text, though I have read higher numbers than this) (Francione and Garner, 2010). It can be important to grant non-human animals negative freedoms, because, for example, a negative freedom may allow an animal to live or to be free from harm. In the legal system, there are countless more examples of negative freedoms being granted only based on who is considered a legal person. On the other hand, it can be important to exercise caution surrounding positive freedoms, because positive freedoms may be used in harmful ways. For example, a positive freedom may allow a laboratory to kill an animal. Indeed, “rights” have historically been given to Hitler, Stalin, and the like, and may come up against genocidal political interests. Thus, in speaking of rights, however, it may be important that rights be sufficiently specific (Wise, 2001). One potential analogy here is the distinction here is between “freedom” and “license,” the latter being the right to impose on others. In other words, “license” is encroaching on the freedoms of others (Niell, 1996).

Animal protection groups that operate under an animal rights framework include People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), Direct Action Everywhere (DxE), and the Food Empowerment Project (FEP) (see later Chapters 3 and 4 for PETA and FEP; for DxE, see Direct Action Everywhere, 2024).

In an animal rights or deontological framework, it is important to ask the following question: Are rights “recognised” and “protected” (Shanker, 2023)? Indeed, "rights" and "duties" may be encoded into law, dictum, policy recommendations, etc., but such are far more meaningful if they are actually incorporated. In a legal context, “rights” may refer to specific rights to legal processes, including the right to bring a legal action, and a right to representation by legal counsel. However, in most cases, the legal system only considers non-human animals to be legal “things,” and only humans (out of millions of species on earth) are typically considered legal persons (Wise, 2001). Animal

protection groups that operate under an animal rights framework from a legal standpoint include the Nonhuman Rights Project (Wise, 2001 and 2010) and the Animal Legal Defense Fund (Animal Legal Defense Fund, n.d.).

2.2.2. Welfare

An animal welfare framework takes a somewhat different position from an animal rights position. An animal welfare framework advocates against animal abuse, and takes the position that animals should be treated in a respectful manner that maximizes their well-being, but does not necessarily advocate against the use of animals for human gain (Lingel, 2019). For example, an animal welfare philosophy may allow human consumption of animals, as long as the animals were not subjected to unnecessary or unjustified suffering (what constitutes "unnecessary" or "unjustified" or "excessive" suffering is certainly another debate). Definitions of "welfare" have also evolved over the years. For example, some farmers and veterinarians have defined it to mean an animal is "healthy" and "producing well," while others may define it in terms of the animal's feelings (Hewson, 2003). These definitions shine light on the perspectives of the people who use these definitions. For example, if one defines it in terms of how an animal is "producing," this may suggest a focus on the animal's usefulness from a standpoint of human gain (particularly if a farmer uses this definition); this highlights a difference between animal rights and animal welfare, as an animal rights advocate may object to this definition, because under an animal rights philosophy, use of animals for human gain is generally not considered ethical. However, even within the animal welfare field, it is generally considered valuable to maintain integrity about the true goals; thus, if one uses an anthropocentric definition of "welfare," it may be useful to acknowledge that the goal is to increase the animal's value to human gain, and not necessarily for the animal's own well-being. On the other hand, it can be difficult to assess animals' welfare based on animals' "mental experiences," and for the sake of practicality, some may prefer to use "behavioural, physiological and pathological variables" (Gonyou, 1993).

One argument in favor of welfare policies is that they are "stepping stones" to further policies. For example, as certain cruel practices are banned, these may be stepping stones to ban factory farming across the world (Bray, 2024). More generally, incremental welfare reforms may lead to larger welfare reforms.

These questions are important in how animal protection groups assess the effectiveness of their

work. For example, as discussed in certain other sections, effective altruists and utilitarians may focus on how many animals are helped. Scientific findings, such as scientific research that gives evidence of how much animal suffering can be alleviated via certain forms of advocacy, are important to animal protection nonprofits. However, there are ethical questions about how this evidence is gathered, because in order to gather data, it may be necessary to study animals, and this process may entail invasive procedures to the animals. For example, in order to tell whether a certain procedure causes animal suffering, it may be necessary to subject animals to this procedure, and thereby risk causing these animals suffering. For example, in a study, researchers injected a substance with vinegar into fishes' lips, and the fish stopped eating, rocked back and forth, and demonstrated other signs, and only stopped doing these things when researchers injected them with morphine (Yong, 2023); this procedure likely caused the fish substantial suffering. As another example, when researchers subject crustaceans to electric shocks, the crustaceans are found to try to avoid the electric shocks (Elwood and Adams, 2015). Other signs of pain include physiological responses, including "hormonal changes" and similar responses to "stressful stimuli" (Atrooz et. al., 2021). An animal rights framework would likely avoid such procedures, because it would assume it unethical to use animals for human gain, including for research purposes. While not the primary focus of this thesis, these questions serve as important reminders to maintain integrity in the research process itself.

Animal protection groups that operate under an animal welfare framework include animal welfare labeling programs, such as Certified Humane (2024), American Humane (2024), and A Greener World (n.d.).

2.2.3. Overlap and additional (potential) distinctions between welfare and rights

There is considerable overlap between rights and welfare frameworks. For example, both frameworks typically acknowledge that non-human animals have interests. In addition, many activists believe in animal rights and animal liberation, and ultimately hope for rights and liberation, but support animal welfare campaigns on the basis that welfare campaigns can alleviate a significant amount of animal cruelty and suffering. Similarly, some activists believe ending animal use should be the goal, but that this may be achieved (at least in some cases) via animal welfare campaigns that seek to abolish certain cruel conditions (Wrenn and Johnson, 2013). For example, Garner's main critique of animal rights philosophies espoused by Francione is that these philosophies are too unwilling to compromise to achieve incremental goals. For example, some abolitionists eschew campaigns to ban

cages for hens on farms, because such campaigns fall short of banning the property status of animals. Garner disagrees with this approach, as Garner does not accept the notion that incrementalist campaigns prevent future abolition. Hence, Garner practices that it is best to be willing to work to achieve incremental goals that fall short of the ultimate goal. Garner states that "empirical" arguments can strengthen "normative" arguments, but cannot be their "ultimate judge." Garner takes the position that humans may be justified in using non-human animals in certain situations, and that the reformist approach can be adapted to be effective (Francione and Garner, 2010). In contrast, Francione argues that some groups "reinforce commodification through regulationist measures and a reluctance to promote veganism" (Wrenn, 2013, pg. 178). Thus, Francione and Garner agree that non-human animals deserve some moral consideration; the main point of disagreement is on how to attain this (Francione and Garner, 2010).

There is also some debate on the meaning of terms, such as "animal rights." For example, Francione expresses concern that some have used the term "animal rights" to really mean something more welfarist, and states that PETA says it is an "animal rights" group but focuses on welfare campaigns,[4] and that a farmer stressed the importance of "animal rights," and wanted to increase veal production by reassuring consumers that the veal calves were treated humanely (Francione and Garner, 2010). Thus, there is disagreement on the precise meanings (or usages) of terms such as "animal rights," and terms like this may be co-opted to mean something other than their original meanings.

Another potential distinction between animal rights and animal welfare is on the "demand" vs. "supply" side. Francione argues that veganism affects the "demand" side, while welfare reforms affect the "supply" side (Wrenn, 2013). Thus, those working with consumers may be more inclined toward animal rights, while those working with producers and suppliers may be more inclined toward animal welfare. This is not necessarily always the case, however; for example (as discussed, e.g., in Section 2.4.2), consumers may pay more attention to welfare labels on animal-based food products, and (as discussed, e.g., in Section 2.4.5) producers (e.g., animal farmers) may transition to producing more plant-based products.

Some rights are considered "welfare rights," and may be derived from the Five Freedoms (Todorović, 2023). These are sometimes referred to in conjunction with "membership rights" in terms of rights as members of human societies. For example, animals can be seen as holders of rights to public goods; animals in laboratories may be considered labourers, perhaps similar to human

[4] This perception of PETA is not universally shared; indeed, as will be discussed in my sections on nonprofits' mission statements in Chapters 3 and 4, PETA often focuses on abolitionism.

labourers, and some animals may be considered "personnel" rather than "property," such as police dogs. Alasdair Cochrane (2017) argues that "membership" is critical to safeguard fundamental animal interests. This may mean they have rights, such as a right to limited working hours and safe working conditions; this can be applied to animals on farms as well. The Five Freedoms can be referred to as "rights" as well (Martin, 2022, pg. 61). In some cases, this can lead to positive rights, such as the right "to be cared for" (Todorović, 2023).

Another principle that may be applicable to both animal rights and animal welfare nonprofits and NGOs is the precautionary principle. As detailed in the previous subsection, when research is done to gain evidence that animals experience feelings, this research may cause the animals suffering. One possible way to avoid or mitigate these problems is to apply the precautionary principle. The precautionary principle has been adopted worldwide. For example, the European Union precautionary principle has been applied by the European Court of Justice. The Court has, for example, required Finland to ban certain forms of wolf hunting, if such may be harmful to wolf conservation (Epstein and Kantinkoski, 2020). The precautionary principle gives animal rights and animal welfare groups a basis upon which to advocate, even if the evidence is not completely definitive

Many animal protection groups embrace both animal rights and animal welfare approaches. Animal rights and welfare may be regarded as a continuum rather than a binary, because some activists and groups generally lean toward rights or welfare, but this does not necessarily mean they completely eschew welfare or rights, respectively. For example, some groups have animal rights ideals and still employ welfare tactics and campaigns. Thus, the most effective way to bridge this divide is likely to decide how to allocate resources. This is explored further in tactical comparisons in later chapters, including analyses of mission statements of nonprofits and NGOs. Nonprofits that take this approach include The Humane League and Mercy for Animals (see Chapters 3 and 4).

2.3. Approaches, Philosophies, Frameworks, and Contexts that Inform Nonprofit/NGO Activism

2.3.1. Effective altruism

The "effective altruism" philosophy takes the position that it is best to make the best difference possible. The term, "effective altruism," was coined by the Centre for Effective Altruism, and while there is no single definition of "effective altruism," here are a few examples: "trying to do as much

good as possible with each dollar and each hour that we have"; "asking 'How can I make the biggest difference I can?' and using evidence and careful reasoning to try to find an answer"; "a research field which uses high-quality evidence and careful reasoning to work out how to help others as much as possible"; and "a philosophy and social movement that uses evidence and reason to determine the most effective way to benefit others" (MacAskill, 2019, pgs. 12-13). All of these definitions speak to the central theme of "doing the most good possible" or similar. For example, under this philosophy, if one approach would save one animal from a lifetime of suffering on a factory farm, and another approach would save 100 animals from this same lifetime of suffering, it is better to take the approach that would save 100 animals. One exception may be if this approach had some other negative aspect; for example, if it would save 100 animals, but then it would subject 99 other animals to this lifetime of suffering, it may not have an overall greater benefit than the approach that would save one animal. Another aspect that the last two definitions above mention is research or evidence. Effective altruism tends to select campaigns that are "neglected" and/or "scaleable" (Webermann, 2023). For example, many charities rated most effective have joined the Open Wing Alliance (OWA), which aims to end battery cages for chickens worldwide (OWA, n.d.). At a general level, effective altruists likely give priority to animal rights and welfare causes that benefit farmed animals, because of the sheer number of farmed animals in the world (Animal Charity Evaluators, 2022).

On its face, this may appear to be a fairly straightforward concept: help the most we can. However, in many cases, it is difficult to assess this, for a variety of reasons. First, many animal rights and welfare activist tactics are new, and the effective altruism movement simply lacks the necessary data to assess whether new tactics are more or less effective. For example, many legal strides in the realm of animal protection are fairly new developments (as can be seen in Sections 1.1 and 4.1), and the field of animal law as a degree-granting academic field scarcely existed until recent decades (e.g., the first ever "advanced legal degree" in animal law came about in 2012) (Center for Animal Law Studies, n.d.). Thus, it may be difficult to assess whether animal law research in the academic realm, and legal activism in the animal rights and welfare movements, are more or less effective than other forms of activism. Second, many things are difficult to quantify, because if an animal rights or welfare activist engages in a particular form of activism, it can be difficult to measure how many people change their consumption of animal products and other habits as a result of said form of activism. For example, if an activist hands out leaflets, it can be difficult to keep track of who changed their habits as a result of the leaflets, how much these habits changed, how long these people kept up these changed behaviors, etc. Fourth, data can be misleading. Indeed, many people acknowledge the value of

measurements and acknowledge that it can be misleading (Özden, 2023). Fifth, when the movement focuses on one goal, this may lead opponents to give into that goal on "their terms"; for example, in India, middle-class consumers were convinced that buying cage-free eggs was good, and would buy those instead of those from more non-factory farmers (Channin, 2023). In this example, this single-issue focus may backfire, as conditions on factory farms that use cage-free operations may still be more inhumane than those of non-factory farms. However, this is likely not always the case, as companies do push back against goals of the effective altruism movement, which would likely not happen if the companies actually wanted these changes (Channin, 2023).

Animal Charity Evaluators (ACE) and similar evaluation groups often lean toward effective altruism in their approaches. For example, each year, ACE conducts a comprehensive research-based analysis of animal protection groups, and estimates how many animals are saved with each U.S. dollar donated to each group.[5] In my research on leafleting in Section 2.4, I cite research on which types of leaflets save the most animals; this leans toward an effective altruism approach, because it focuses on which leaflets make the biggest difference, and how to make the biggest difference with our resources.

2.3.2. Utilitarianism

Effective altruism largely leans toward utilitarianism. Utilitarianism, or a utilitarian philosophy, generally practices that a "morally right" action is one that does the "most good." Utilitarianism looks at the "overall good" that is accomplished by a certain action, and is a form of consequentialism, because evaluates actions purely based on their consequences. Additionally, utilitarianism gives equal consideration to goodness, regardless of whose goodness (or goodness to whom). Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, "classical utilitarians," equated good with "pleasure." While the term "utilitarian" was not formally articulated before the 1800s, the philosophy has been around throughout the "history of ethical theory," and similar schools of thought have been observed in Ancient Greece (Driver, 2014).

One question that a utilitarian may ask is, "What is inevitable?" (Lercier, 2023). For example, if it is inevitable that human societies will continue to exploit animals, would it be better to focus on ways in which animals can be raised (e.g. for food) that at least reduce their suffering and maximize their well-being as much as possible? This line of thinking informs the strategies of nonprofits and NGOs that focus on animal welfare campaigns, for example, to stop the use of cages for egg-laying

[5] See: https://animalcharityevaluators.org/donation-advice/recommended-charities/.

hens, and to stop the use of inhumane crates for pigs and calves on farms. The other side of this question is, “What can practically and meaningfully change?” This question, similarly to the previous one, acknowledges the reality of the situation as it is, because it asks what can be “practically” changed (Lercier, 2023).

Both questions may give rise to another question: Should we use arguments we do not agree with, if our ultimate goal will be achieved? For example, many legal cases in some legal systems cite the bible, and there are certainly ethical implications in blending law and religion (especially the religion “in power”), but if we believe a bible verse will convince a judge to grant protections to animals, are we justified in citing the bible? As another example, many animal activists do not believe in Christianity, but some nonprofits distribute leaflets that use Christian arguments in favor of veganism. These leaflets may be titled, "Would Jesus Eat Meat Today?" (see, e.g., Ball, n.d.).

While utilitarianism has many supporters, it also has critics. Under utilitarianism, it is best to look at the “overall good” of an action; this suggests that the best action is one that has the best net benefit. This seems logical; however, there are potential problems that may arise. For example, it may be difficult to measure net benefits and losses. This is especially true when it comes to measuring pleasure, because there are many schools of thought on how to quantify and define “pleasure.” In addition, one may underestimate others’ pleasure, suffering, and other measures of benefit and loss. Finally, utilitarian arguments can be used to justify solutions that are not intersectional or inclusive. For example, an often-cited “trolley problem” puts a hypothetical bystander in a position in which five people are tied to a train track and will get run over by the train if the bystander does nothing . If the bystander flips a switch, the train will switch course, and will not run over these five people, but will run over another person (D'Olimpio, 2016). From a strictly utilitarian standpoint, the more moral course of action would likely be to flip the switch, as it saves five people and kills one, leading to a net benefit of saving four people. However, this logic can be problematic, as this logic can be used to say “well, it’s an overall net benefit, as we saved five people, even though we killed one,” while in reality, many situations are not that simple, and in many situations, there may be ways to save everyone. In the trolley problem example, it may be possible to signal the train driver to stop, and thus save everyone. In the context of animal rights and welfare activism, there are many contexts in which it is possible to save many humans and non-human animals at once. For example, as discussed in Sections 1.2, 2.3 and 2.4, and Chapters 3 through 5, a reduction in human consumption of animal products is associated with extensive benefits to both human and non-human animal communities, particularly when the activism is done in an inclusive manner. As another example, as discussed in Sections 3.5 through 3.7, the Food

Empowerment Project and Charity Doings Foundation have conducted many projects that can benefit large numbers of humans and non-human animals.

2.3.3. Intersectionality and inclusivity

Intersectionality has been studied in a variety of social justice contexts. In particular, the term and/or concept of "intersectionality" has been used in academic contexts (e.g. high schools and universities, particularly in social scientific disciplines), policy-oriented contexts (e.g. government officials), and a wide variety of activist contexts (especially human rights activism, including, e.g., reproductive justice, gender relations, race relations, and socioeconomic relations). There is considerable room for debate on what constitutes "intersectionality," or how the term is best defined. However, one definition revolves around the idea that intersectionality examines "how intersecting power relations influence social relations across diverse societies as well as individual experiences in everyday life," and that intersectionality "views categories of race, class, gender, sexuality, class [sic], nation, ability, ethnicity, and age – among others – as interrelated and mutually shaping one another … [and] is a way of understanding and explaining complexity in the world" (Collins and Bilge, 2020).

While the above definition and examples focus on human-centric contexts, intersectionality can play a role in animal rights and welfare contexts too.[6] For example, in reducing or eliminating industrial animal agriculture, and partially or fully replacing it with plant-based alternatives, it is possible to save tens of billions of animals on factory farms from lifetimes of suffering (Francione and Garner, 2010), reduce water contamination and thereby save wildlife and human communities that are affected by water quality (FAO, 2006), and reduce air pollution and thereby save wildlife and human communities that are affected by air quality (FAO, 2006). This can address systemic racism and classism, because socioeconomically poorer communities and communities of color are disproportionately affected by pollution from farms (Cooke, 2016). Some nonprofits focus on these interconnected issues; for example, the New Roots Institute (2023) (formerly called the Factory Farming Awareness Coalition) gives presentations and distributes educational materials concerning the animal welfare, environmental, and human health implications of animal agriculture; the Food Empowerment Project focuses on animal rights, workers' rights, and food justice issues related to the food system (see Section 3.4 and Chapter 4); and The Raven Corps (2020) addresses a variety of

[6] Though, some try to only use the term "intersectionality" in human-centric contexts, and instead use "interconnectedness" in contexts of non-human animal protection (Winders, 2021). Thus, in this thesis, I often use the term "interconnectedness."

human rights and animal rights issues with animal agriculture and diets that include animal products. In addition, some animal protection nonprofits have groups that focus on inclusivity within the nonprofits (e.g. in terms of inclusive working environments) and in the animal protection movement at large; more discussion of this appears in interviews in Section 4.2.

Thus, in many cases, intersectionality and interconnectedness can present themselves in contexts in which many issues can be addressed at once. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic and other pandemics can be largely traced to animal agriculture (Powell, 2023). Carol J. Adams, in *The Sexual Politics of Meat*, discusses interconnectedness between exploitation of women and exploitation of non-human animals. On the flip side, it has also been argued that human and nonhuman oppression "reinforce" and "aggravate" each other[7] (Francione and Garner, 2010). This highlights the potential importance of anti-factory farming nonprofits and NGOs addressing both animal protection causes and interconnected forms of oppression.

A related concept is inclusivity, which has considerable overlap with intersectionality and interconnectedness. Inclusivity has been studied in educational contexts, for example, in the context of "special education and disability studies," "multiculturalism and anti-racist education," "gender and women's education," and "queer studies" (DeLuca, 2013, pg. 305). This can present itself in humane education as well, and there are nonprofits that focus on this, such as Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers (2024) and the New Roots Institute. Some curricula have been designed for animal rights and welfare in education, including in primary and secondary schools, as well as higher education, including animal law and policy curricula (Frasch and Wahlberg, 2023).

2.3.4. Natural law and rights ("prima facie") and "invisible" legal elements

"Natural law" and "natural rights" have been studied in various contexts. According to Finnis (2011, pg. 18), "A theory of natural law claims to be able to identify conditions and principles of practical right-mindedness, of good and proper order among persons, and in individual conduct." Finnis continues that the idea of "natural law" includes the idea that there is "a set of practical principles which indicate the basic forms of human flourishing as goods to be pursued and realized, and which are in one way or another used by everyone who considers what to do" (pg. 23). This is, admittedly, quite abstract. "Natural law" is sometimes likened to principles of justice; for example, St.

[7] I discuss related topics further in my interviews, as "reinforcement" and "aggravation" relate to my sections on interconnectedness. In addition, my Bachelor's thesis had a section on related topics, and I two years ago, I did a grant project on interconnectedness between animal cruelty and child abuse.

Augustine stated "[a]n unjust law is no law at all," and Martin Luther King used this quote to respond to accusations that he was encouraging lawlessness in his activism, and stated that an "unjust law" would be a "human law that is not rooted in eternal and natural law" (Zuckert, 1997). This line of thinking can influence the legal system; for example, Steven Wise (2001) references a case in which a judge crushed human slavery in England; Wise states that common law judges are thus obligated to take action when they learn of a grave injustice. The idea of "natural rights," in some sense, is even more abstract, as the idea of "rights" dates back to ancient times, yet the term "right" back then was not as "differentiated" as it is today, and did not distinguish itself from "duty" (Zuckert).

This line of thinking can inform animal protection groups. For example, some rescuers of animals from factory farms have been prosecuted for theft of property and/or for trespass (see, e.g., Bolotnikova, 2023), because the animals are the farms' property, and the farms may be considered private property. Using St. Augustine's quote, if the law is "unjust," it lacks legal value. Using Martin Luther King's reasoning, this can be a strong justification for the right of animal rescuers to rescue animals from factory farms. Using the case Wise references above, a judge could be empowered to strike down laws that criminalize rescues in this way. On the other hand, this could work the other way, if a judge were to be sympathetic to the factory farms and consider it a grave injustice to steal the animals from the farms. Nonetheless, nonprofits and NGOs that conduct rescues can use these lines of reasoning, and if judges, policymakers, and the general public are sympathetic to this reasoning, this can improve the ability of nonprofits to be effective. Nonprofits can also use this reasoning in another way, to hire lawyers to defend activists who rescue animals from farms or laboratories. As another example, the Animal Terrorism Enterprise Act (in the United States) potentially opens the door to criminal charges for any interference with a facility that uses non-human animals; this statute is so vague that it leaves many animal rights activists in a treacherous position (Wrenn, 2013). Thus, lawyers can be useful in defending activists' legal and constitutional rights, and can even use St. Augustine's and Martin Luther King's reasoning.

A somewhat similar concept is that of "prima facie" rights. A prima facie right "links the entitlements of the coherent right with the human interests or choices that the right was designed to facilitate or promote"; this can appear in "paradigm cases" or "fundamental cases" that are are within a right's "central range of application" (Breakey, 2014, pg. 581). This explanation focuses on "human interests," but this concept can be extended to non-human animal interests. Indeed, it can drive nonprofits and NGOs in advocating against factory farming, because it can identify many rights thwarted by factory farming, such as rights to autonomy (which ties in well with "interests" and

"choices"), bodily integrity, and a life free of undue suffering. Because of the prevalence of factory farming, and the vast amounts of suffering it causes, factory farming is within plenty of rights' "central range of application."

In the legal system, some theorists argue that there are implied parts of legal doctrines; for example, Jessica Eisen (2023) argues that "invisible" or "extra-textual" elements of constitutions, and that some people are "bound" by elements of constitutions that even legal actors do not know about. Eisen argues that these elements are "core" or "central" to the system, and that they limit possible "interpretations" of the constitution in a seemingly progressive or regressive way; for example, the Supreme Court of Canada has identified "democracy," "rule of law," "minority protection," and "federalism"; while on the other hand, Tomkins argued that a constitution from 1867 is predicated on "elitism, racism, sexism, and imperialism." Many invisible elements may have positive and negative implications for animal protection; on the one hand, all legal systems clearly allow animal exploitation, and seem to actively encourage it in many ways; on the other hand, for example, when the United Kingdom left the European Union, there was concern that this would have negative implications because the UK would no longer be bound by the European Union Declaration of Sentience of Animals, but UK ministers said "of course animals are sentient."

In determining what this actually looks like, it can be useful to examine the world from non-human animals' perspectives. For example, the concept of the "umwelt" is useful. This gives us a wide spectrum of possibilities in terms of animals' experiences with pain, and nociception processes that occur in animals. It also gives rise to the problems of "sensory pollution," including light and noise pollution (Yong, 2023).

In addition, even if politicians and legal doctrines declare that animals are sentient, it is important to investigate whether this declaration translates to stronger protections that actually alleviate animal suffering. Such a declaration may or may not involve implementation of actual laws and procedures to safeguard animal rights or welfare.

2.3.5. Personhood

Personhood for animals gives a potential framework for animal well-being to be a primary consideration in the legal system. Recently, academia has developed more of a focus on welfare or rights individual animals, but the legal system still has the tools that are primarily due to indirect interests (e.g. interests of the animal's owner); thus, there is a goal to develop animal law as a field in

which the well-being of the animals is the primary goal (Frasch and Wahlberg, 2023).

Personhood changes non-human animals' status from legal objects to legal subjects. Personhood can be "substantive" or "procedural" (Kladis, 2023). One of the benefits of personhood is that it can bring legal standing. Indeed, oftentimes, only legal "persons" are viewed as existing for their own sake (as opposed to, for example, their owner's sake (Wise, 2010)), and under some schools of thought, one is a legal "person" when they get at least one legal "right" (Wise, 2001). In many cases, the law has only acknowledged indirect interests; for example, in the case *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* (1992), the Supreme Court of the United States has acknowledged an interest in the human public in observing a species, and that this grants "standing." This is important, because animals do indeed have a stake in the matter in many court decisions, including harm that is "traceable" to the defendant's conduct as well as capability of benefiting from a "favorable" decision, such as when the chimpanzees are held in cages or infected with a toxic pathogen, or when dolphins are confined at amusement parks, but courts often do not hear the animals' "pleas," because courts do not consider them to have rights at all (Wise, 2001). Some nonprofits explore issues like this; the Nonhuman Rights Project focuses on substantive personhood, while the Animal Legal Defense Fund focuses on procedural personhood.

Some jurisdictions have laws that give non-humans rights. Mendocino County protects nature, which includes "wildlife" and gives Mendocino County residents the right to sue on behalf of nature; this is procedural. Ojai, California grants "bodily liberty"; this is substantive. However, pitfalls can occur; for example, states may preempt localities (e.g. cities and counties) from enacting stricter laws, or creating private rights of action not granted by the states themselves (Kladis, 2023).

Some cases acknowledge certain rights for nonhuman animals too. For example, while the Supreme Court of Chile did not grant Sandai personhood, it acknowledged Sandai's "deprivation of freedom" and "deconstitutionalized constitutional guardianship." In another case, Argentina recognized 55 dogs as "subjects of rights." In yet another case, Argentina allowed an NGO that "specialized in animal rights" to represent Mateo, a dog who experienced abuse and was not owned by anyone; here, too, the court's decision was based on recognition of animals as "subjects of rights" (Plaza, 2023). Some cases in Pakistan and India have also acknowledged personhood for non-human animals. Both India and Pakistan have divisions of powers between the national and subnational levels. In Pakistan, the first such case (in 2020) involved an elephant named Kaavan, who was kept in a zoo and known as the "world's loneliest elephant." Article 9 of Pakistan's Constitution grants a "right to life"; the Court acknowledged "interdependence on nature" and the "link" between violence against

humans and against nonhuman animals, and thus acknowledged a link between human rights and respecting animals. “Wild animals have to be treated as an end in themselves and not as a means for the mere entertainment of humans”. Two cases in 2021 were based on the case involving Kaavan. Largely, the Court acknowledged that humans have a constitutional “right to life,” animals had a legal “right to life,” and that the constitutional “right to life” was violated when certain nonhuman animals’ rights were violated. Indeed, in India and Pakistan, this “right to life” has been interpreted to include a right to a “healthy environment.” In India, sports of Jallikattu and bull cart racing were challenged; the Court acknowledged that animals had legal rights, and acknowledged the link between non-human animal rights and human rights. The states that practiced it reinstated them with some more protections for animals’ welfare. In response to this, petitioners argued that these laws were largely decorative and unlikely to be well-enforced, and thus did not actually grant meaningful protection to animals. The Court stated that animals did not have “fundamental rights,” and the holding of the case was that these new laws “sufficiently” addressed the “animal protection deficiencies” earlier present in these practices. India’s Constitution contains language that may protect animals. Another case acknowledged that citizens were “in loco parentis” of animals, though the precise implications of this are not completely clear. In this region, the question of whether it affects “public interest” is often taken seriously; thus, perhaps the question of “personhood” or “standing” is not as crucial as it is, e.g., in the United States (Jaleel, 2023). In some cases, even if a court does not grant personhood to an animal, a dissenting opinion may advocate for it. This occurred, for example, in the case of an elephant named Happy (Jaleel).

It can be hard to apply this to animals owned by others (Kladis, 2023). Perhaps the “right of nature” framework could apply this to farmed animals; one may need to be more careful in a jurisdiction such as the United States, where judicial decisions are binding, compared to South American nations that have civil law systems under which a decision may be made that is beneficial in a specific case, even if it is not as beneficial in other cases (Plaza, 2023).

Getting personhood for nonhuman animals is a goal for the Nonhuman Rights Project, and gives a “pyramid” of rights. The bottom rung of this pyramid is “legal personhood,” which is considered the most fundamental, and which means one is capable of having rights; the next level up is “legal rights personhood,” which may include a plethora of rights, such as bodily integrity, the right to sue, or the right to have a third party sue on one’s behalf; the next level up is “private right of action,”

such as a right to start a "civil" suit[8]; and the top level is "standing," which basically means the plaintiff has sufficient "stake" in a matter to sue, which may require that one has incurred harm that is "traceable" to the defendant's conduct, and would reasonably likely benefit if the court were to rule in the plaintiff's favor. According to the framework of this pyramid, each "level" of rights is a prerequisite for the next level up; for example, if courts do not consider someone to have the first three levels, then the courts would not consider this individual to have standing. However, in certain cases in the US, courts have ruled that non-human animals lacked standing, but did not go through all three of the lower levels; according to the framework of this pyramid, if any of the lower levels were not reached, courts would not even ask the question of whether this individual has standing (Wise, 2010).

The Nonhuman Rights Project (NRP) works to change the legal paradigm in the United States, which generally asserts that humans may have certain rights, but that nonhuman animals cannot. The NRP's Legal Working Group tends to research jurisdictions that may be most receptive to the idea that nonhuman animals may have rights. In considering questions of rights, NRP's founder, Steven Wise, considers what "qualities" may be sufficient (but not necessarily prerequisites) to satisfy the most fundamental level of the pyramid; Wise has considered, for example, "autonomy," "dignity," and "bodily integrity." In examining legal history, Wise notes habeas corpus, as well as "de homine replegiando," and suggests that if the former is unattainable, the latter should be attainable (Wise, 2010).

Many personhood/rights cases focus on individual animals. This has questionable implications for the greater good, because it is often argued that the most effective possible activism will help large numbers of animals. In essence, when time and resources are put into litigation on behalf of the personhood of individual animals, perhaps all of these resources, energy, and time can be put into helping thousands (perhaps millions) of animals escape the cruel conditions of factory farms. However, this "personhood" approach can guard against approaches which may use the "greater good" to sacrifice individual animals. In addition, it is theoretically possible to advocate for personhood of many animals in a single legal case; and even if any given case is only about one animal, this case may set precedent that can help more animals in future cases.

2.3.6. Anthropocentrism vs. ecocentrism vs. biocentrism

[8] Note: "civil" here means civil as opposed to criminal (at least in the United States [U.S.] — I am not as familiar with the terminology outside the US, but tort law is an example of civil law in the US), not civil law as opposed to common law.

Theories of anthropocentrism, ecocentrism, and biocentrism can also influence nonprofit and NGO goals and tactics.

Anthropocentrism

Anthropocentrism can fit into the animal protection movement in terms of animals having "extension of rights of humans" (Shanker, 2023). There can also be public policy anthropocentric arguments to further the welfare of animals. For example, there is a correlation between violence against animals and violence against humans, known as "the link" (Bishop, 2021). This can even link in the ways in which animals may harm humans by means of injury and disease. It can also come up in human conflicts and wars, and with people who are struggling financially and have companion animals. Animals are sometimes killed in times of war and famine (IFAW, 2023).

Ecocentrism

"Ecocentrism" can be framed in terms of animals having an "extension of rights of … nature" (Shanker, 2023). It can also be framed in terms of animals having rights due to membership. In many cases, this still gives priority to human interests. In some cases, this may justify sacrifice of individual animals for the "greater good" of the ecosystem. In the legal system, around the 1970s and 1980s, there was a wave of environmental legislation, and out of this, animal law as a discipline emerged, primarily focused on wildlife law with a "species-wide" approach (Frasch, 2023).

Biocentrism

Biocentrism is the theory that "life and consciousness are absolutely fundamental to our understanding of the universe" (Lanza and Berman, 2009, pg. 2). This fits somewhat better with the notion that non-human animals have their own rights, as opposed to the idea that animals have rights that are extensions of human rights, or extensions of ecosystem rights or interests.

2.3.7. The role of science

Many nonprofits and NGOs use science in various respects. This has long been mainstream in the environmental movement. For example, The Raven Corps has started a campaign against dairy (see interview with Claire Howe), and The Raven Corps and the Food Empowerment Project have championed this cause (see discussion in Sections 3.4 onward). Campaigns such as this are bolstered by the science of lactose intolerance; in fact, the term, "lactose normal" has been coined (Food Empowerment Project, n.d.), as a high percentage of the human population is lactose intolerant, particularly people of color (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2016, as cited in Food

Empowerment Project, n.d.).

Food movements toward alternatives can be analogized to fossil fuel alternatives, as there are predictions of steep increases in animal agriculture in the coming decades, perhaps as much as 3.5 times today's levels (Frederich, 2023). An inclusive approach can respect the rights of all animals to live and thrive, and is also just to farmers, and is within "ecological" limits; this must be done in a manner that is practical, as whole-foods plant-based diets are ideal in many ways, but processed foods are a major role in food systems. Risks can also be distributed in a more equitable manner (Broad, 2023).

There is considerable discussion surrounding the role and effectiveness of science in the animal welfare movement. For example, there are theories that legislation is not based on the best available science; for example, the Five Freedoms were coined by veterinarians in the UK, while the three "Rs" were coined by a zoologist, but they are very vague, and they may still allow mutilation of pigs if done by "trained personnel" (Di Concetto, 2023).

"Animal welfare science" is a relatively recent phenomenon, and in the 1960s and 1970s, it condoned animal exploitation and offered that farmed animals adapt to their environments (basically "industry science"), while later, more scientists have taken different positions; Bruno Latour stated that science is "political"; "comitology" can include ethics (Di Concetto, 2023). Meanwhile, Wise (2001) argues that most philosophers and scientists no longer believe that animals were put on this planet to be used by humans, but that the law has not caught up to this. Thus, nonprofits and NGOs must navigate a society that is divided in many ways on these and similar questions.

2.4. An overview of activist tactics in the movement

In this section, I explore existing research about animal protection activism from the perspective of nonprofits. Many sources in this section are cited by nonprofits, and are generally authored by animal protection nonprofit researchers and activists. Research studies cited in this section examine existing activist tactics, and their findings pave the way for possible refinement of existing tactics and development of new tactics. Some tactics focus mainly on individual outreach, while others focus mainly on outreach to pressure corporations to change their animal welfare policies and/or outreach to encourage legal change. This reflects differences in strategies of various nonprofits and NGOs, and these differences in strategy pave the way for discussion of nonprofits' ideologies that I

discuss in Chapter 3. Interestingly, several of the sources I cite are surveys, which suggests that nonprofits are more inclined to conduct surveys.

Subsection 2.4.1 focuses on the use of media in animal rights movements and other social justice movements. This subsection focuses on media tactics (e.g., documentaries, social media posts, articles, etc.), and examines research on which media tactics are most effective and/or have lower risks of backfiring. Subsection 2.4.2 explores the issue of consumer education more broadly, and explores the extent to which consumers change their habits (e.g., when consumers decrease their consumption of meat and/or other animal products, or demonstrate preferences for animal products with "humane" labels) when they know more about farming practices. This subsection also explores the notion of "humane washing" in marketing, and other psychological elements in people's ideologies surrounding non-human animals and consumption of animal products. Subsection 2.4.3 explores one specific tactic, leafleting, more in depth. This subsection cites studies on how consumers responded when given leaflets about animal farming practices and/or veganism/vegetarianism, and discusses various approximations of how many animals are saved per leaflet based on the content of each leaflet. Subsection 2.4.4 discusses the content of the underlying messages in individual advocacy tactics. Specifically, this section examines the relative effectiveness of imparting information about animal welfare vs. animal rights vs. environmentalism.

Many tactics explored in this chapter and later chapters are largely dependent on contexts, including temporal context, location, and cultural context. Indeed, a common concept in sociology is that what many take for granted, or consider "common sense," is actually "socially constructed" (e.g., created via cultural and social norms), and that a certain "reality" is only in our imaginations (Wrenn, 2019). In fact, Corey Wrenn (2013) discusses the general notion that what many people attribute to individual actions, or "bad luck," may actually be group processes or results of larger systems. Wrenn further states that individualistic schools of thought may obscure social contexts in which human behavior takes place, and contends that a greater awareness of social aspects can be beneficial in activism, etc. Another point is that, within a cultural "hegemony," those in power can assert their perspective as a "universal" perspective. Thus, it is important to examine the findings in context, and to note that if similar research were done in different contexts, the results may change.

Some of the research papers cited in this section are meta-analyses, which raises a significant question: When is it best to include or exclude research studies in a meta analysis; or in other words, how flexible should inclusion criteria be? For example, researchers may exclude studies that only tracked participants who signed up for a program to go vegan or reduce consumption, because these

participants were already among a more motivated cohort of people, and without a control group, bias may be too high. Researchers may also exclude studies that only examine people's plans to reduce consumption but do not actually track consumer choices in days following the surveys (Mathur et. al., 2021). This speaks to the overarching challenge of advocacy when there is, for example, no single "best" food system (see, e.g., de Boer and Aiking, 2022).

2.4.1. The roles of media

The use of media as an educational tactic has a history in social justice movements, including in the anti-slavery movement (Wrenn, 2013). Media outlets are a major part of communication, and communication is a major part of activism; indeed, "conversation" is said to be important for "meaning-making across groups" (Wrenn, 2019). Media-based communication can entail social media, television, radio, webinars, presentations, and movies. Indeed, communication may be all-encompassing; "Larry Rosenfield … commented that … rhetorical phenomena 'includes everything but tidal waves,' Richard McKeon quipped, 'Why not tidal waves?' (quoted in Bitzer 1997, 20)"; this is analogous to the all-encompassing nature of animal law, as a field that encompasses any type of law that includes animals (Kivinen, 2023). This is analogous to the all-encompassing nature of both communication and the animal protection movements, and is thus analogous to the breadth of communication within the movement.

The use of media has been historically debated in social justice movements. For example, in the anti-slavery movement, distribution of literature was often condemned on the premise that it may lead to an uprising of enslaved persons. Post offices sometimes sided with such concerns, and sometimes sided with abolitionists. In the non-human animal rights movement, modern technology, such as the internet, is used (Wrenn, 2013). Many nonprofits and NGOs use media and other educational tools to educate the public about animal rights and welfare issues. This section explores many of these examples in greater depth, because many estimates have been made regarding certain tactics. For example, activists and researchers from The Humane League, Vegan Outreach, and Animal Charity Evaluators have made estimates regarding the effectiveness of leafleting (explored in greater depth in Section 2.4.3). Thus, this section explores how media and other educational tools are used in the animal rights and welfare movements, especially by animal protection nonprofits, and research that has found varying levels of success with media-related tactics. This research informs nonprofits, and can help them decide how much to focus on various media-related tactics.

In an article on effectiveness of advocacy tactics, Polanco et. al. (2022) discusses two studies in the United States that examined the effectiveness of various tactics in the animal protection movement.[9] One key finding in Polanco et. al.'s research was that news articles and social media posts reduced meat consumption in those who already "avoided" meat ("meat-reducers," etc.), but not in other meat-eaters. Specifically, "meat-avoiders" (including pescetarians, "reducetarians," and vegetarians") reported between 1.3 and 2.3 fewer "servings" of animal products per week after seeing news articles and social media posts, while "full meat-eaters" did not report any change as a result of these articles or posts (pg. 7; more detailed graph of results on pg. 49); the survey found that 59 percent of respondents had "experienced animal advocacy" via news articles, and 51 percent had experienced it via a "social media or blog post" (pg. 16).[10]

Documentaries are used in advancing various perspectives in the animal rights and welfare movements and interconnected movements. In some cases, documentaries are useful in creating sub-movements. For example, the documentary, "The Smell of Money" (2022), follows a legal case in which people from a North Carolina community sued an animal agricultural corporation for air pollution, etc., stemming from the operations of this corporation, especially the health effects that these community members experienced from this pollution. The community members won the lawsuit, and when the corporation appealed, the appellate court affirmed the trial court's decision, and the community members won again. Because of the outcome of the lawsuit, the corporation was made to pay a sum of money. However, this did not compel them to stop polluting. Thus, the effectiveness of this lawsuit is debatable. The documentary, however, has been screened in many locations, and has involved thoughtful discussion. As another example, the documentary, "Vegucated" (2011) follows three people who decided to go vegan for six weeks. After this six-week period, one stayed vegan, one stayed vegetarian, and one stayed mostly vegan. As a final example, the documentary, "Cowspiracy," highlights the environmental impacts of animal agriculture, and how this issue has often been minimally covered in environmental advocacy contexts, including certain environmental nonprofits. "Cowspiracy"'s website has a plethora of studies to back up its claims. The producer of "Cowspiracy" later made a documentary on health benefits of plant-based diets, called "What the Health?" (2017), and another documentary on pro-animal stances of religious leaders, called "Christspiracy" (2014). This series of documentaries has the potential to respond to some potential pushback that the public

[9] More detailed information on how the research was conducted is found on pgs. 89-111.
[10] Note: The description states that the "final sample size" was 4,155, of whom 2,156 "complet[ed] the questions about their responses to an animal advocacy experience" (Polanco et. al., 2022, pg. 14); participants were all 18 years or older, lived in the U.S., and did not identify as vegan (pg. 108).

may have against plant-based diets (namely, that they believe vegan diets are not the most sustainable, that they are concerned about health risks of vegan diets, and that they believe there are religious justifications to exploit animals). However, it is important to note that documentaries often carry agendas, and that their arguments may lack nuance. Polanco et. al.'s (2022) research suggests that documentaries have been shown to potentially change people's intentions, but not habits. On the one hand, if this tactic does not actually change consumption habits, then efforts may be wasted; on the other hand, if documentaries change people's intentions, then intention may be a step towards changing habits. In addition, documentaries have anecdotally been cited as reasons to go vegetarian or vegan (see, e.g., Ofei, 2023). With mixed evidence on intention vs. habits, Polanco et. al. (2022) focus on tactics that change habits, but encourages openness to tactics that change intentions, because changes in intentions can precede changes in habits.

One question is how to balance benefits and risks, especially when deciding between "safe" tactics that seem to have no high risks but are likely less effective, versus tactics that have higher risks but are more effective. The ideal goal is to maximize tactical effectiveness while minimizing drawbacks. For example, Polanco et. al. (2022) recommended the use of news articles and social media posts, because these tactics were effective in persuading meat-reducers to reduce meat consumption, and did not seem to backfire with any audience. Specifically, Polanco et. al. found that 23 and 20 percent of the United States population had reduced their consumption based on news articles and social media posts, respectively (pg. 35). Polanco et. al. also noted that some tactics may be more or less effective among participants, but that this may not be reflected in the percentages of people who have changed their habits as a result of these tactics, because these tactics may be used more or less frequently (pgs. 34-35). Thus, it is also important to examine the effectiveness of these tactics on those who have been exposed to them, not just the general population. For example, another effective tactic was "classroom education," which reportedly influenced 58 percent of participants to reduce consumption of animal products. However, only five percent of the surveyed general population reported reducing consumption because of this tactic (pg. 35). Meat-free "challenges" were also effective, prompting 63 percent of participants to decrease animal product consumption; 23 percent of respondents had experienced this tactic. Of the most impactful tactics listed at the bottom of the paragraph above, some of these were also found to have the lowest risks in certain ways. Namely, consumers were surveyed about this same list of tactics, and were asked whether these tactics made them feel "anger towards activists." Of these, "educational" information about labels appeared the second least likely to have this effect, as 8 percent of consumers reported feeling "anger towards

activists" as a result of this tactic (the least likely was vegan or plant-based labels, at 7%) (pg. 32).

2.4.2. The role of consumer education

In the article about knowledge and behavior, Adam Feltz, Jacob N. Caton, and Zac Cogley (2022) discuss correlations between knowledge (specifically "Knowledge of Animals Used as Food") and actions. The study overall found that when people knew more about factory farming, they were likely to consume animal products at lower levels, and were more likely to approve of "political actions aimed at factory farming." There were some nuances; for example, when people knew of "Animals Used as Food," they were likely to consume animal products at lower rates, while if people had "Knowledge of Factory Farming," they were more likely to support "political" actions for animals on factory farms. The authors build on previous research that predicted that if people considered eating animals to be "normal," "necessary," and "nice," they were more likely to consume animals at higher levels. They also build on prior research on how people can integrate new knowledge into their value systems, and accordingly change their behaviors to match this new knowledge and how it informs their values. They reason, then, that if people value a reduction in "suffering," and know that consumption of animal products contributes to "suffering," then they are more likely to reduce their consumption of animal products. They reason that there is no uniform measure of "factory farming," though they define it synonymously with the United States Environmental Protection Agency's definition of "concentrated animal feeding operation," which is "any operation that over a 12-month period has or will confine animals for a total of 45 days and for which vegetation required for natural feeding is not sustainable" (in 2019, there were over 20,000 reported concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) in the United States). The authors' focus on CAFOs is largely informed by common practices on CAFOs that adversely affect the animals' welfare. For example, to make animals "harvestable," farms often trim chickens' beaks; while this is sometimes practiced on smaller farms, this is nearly always practiced on CAFOs and "on a much larger scale and scope than on smaller farms." Thus, the authors define "factory farming" to mean CAFOs and standard practices on CAFOs.

The results above largely complement other data. For example, a study found that grandparents were more open to "higher-welfare" products than mothers or university students were, because grandparents were part of a generation that had more interaction with farmed animals (Channin, 2023). This seems to complement the finding that people who know more about factory farming are more likely to support political action for farmed animals, because it suggests that people who know more

about farmed animals are more likely to support welfare measures.

Polanco et. al. (2022) found that teaching meat-eaters and meat-avoiders the meanings behind animal welfare labels did not alter their "intentions" to purchase products with or without these labels. This result potentially conflicts with other research, because in other research, consumers have been found to be willing to pay higher prices for animal products with welfare labels. For example, in a study on willingness to pay premiums for chicken welfare standards in Kenya, David Jakinda Otieno and Sylvester Ochieng' Ogutu (2019) found that "Relative to the current price of chicken meat, consumers were willing to pay a premium of 30% for use of certified transport, 72% for animal welfare labeling, 135% for humane slaughter, 236% for nonuse of growth hormones and 40% less for chicken reared in confined systems." And after Germany voted to ban cages for egg-laying hens (the ban was to take effect sooner than the European Union ban on battery cages), United Poultry Concerns (2001) found that "German consumer affairs minister Renate Kunast says that over 90% of German customers are opposed to battery farming and are willing to pay more for eggs from cage-free hens."[11] Some studies have been mixed on the subject; for example, in a study on willingness to pay higher prices for dairy products with "humane" labels, L. Elbakidze and R.M. Nayga Jr. (2012) found that consumers in Pullman, Washington, USA and Moscow, Idaho, USA were willing to pay higher prices for a scoop of "humane animal care-labeled" ice cream than for "conventional" ice cream, but they found no such difference in willingness to pay for "humane animal care-labeled" cheese. Other research has found 65 percent of consumers willing to pay more for beef products with labels that suggest more humane conditions (Howell, 2024). On the flip side, a *YouGov* (2018) study found that 63 percent of people in the United States said that if they learned that a company had a "bad reputation for animal welfare," they would be "less likely to buy meat processed by" this company (Lowrey, 2024). It is possible that cultural contexts influenced the disparities in results from these studies, as these studies were conducted in the United States, Kenya, and Germany. Interestingly, Polanco et. al. did find that consumers were more likely to pay attention to animal welfare labels after seeing certain types of animal activism. Of these types of activism, books, classroom education, documentary, meat-free challenge, and "educational" information about these labels were found to be the most impactful; respectively, 82%, 74%, 72%, 70%, and 64% of consumers reported "moderately," "very much," or "extremely" increased attention to animal welfare labels after these types of activism (pg. 23).

[11] It should be noted, however, that more humane conditions do not necessarily increase prices. For example, intensive confinement can increase the incidence of bird flu, and if farmers are required to kill their birds due to bird flu, this can affect the "food supply chain" and lead to higher egg prices (Bolotnikova and Torrella, 2024).

The idea of “happy meat” also relates to the common phenomenon of “greenwashing” in environmental discourse (Joy, 2016). “Greenwashing” means making something sound environmentally friendly in a “false” or “misleading” manner (Lindwall, 2023).[12] The equivalent in animal welfare discourse is “humane washing,” as it may make animal products appear to be more humane than they actually are (Joy, 2016). “Humane washing” labels may include “cage-free,” “humanely raised,” “certified humane,” and “pasture raised” (Howell, 2024). Anytime consumers are led to believe their meat, dairy or eggs come from animals who lived happy lives, such as when food corporations emphasize welfare standards but downplay welfare problems, or when animal products' packaging contains pictures of animals who consumers perceive to be happy, there is a risk of humane washing.[13] This creates certain potential legal issues, such as misleading consumers, as it can be considered “fraud” (depending on the laws of the particular jurisdiction), particularly when consumers have been paying more for products for “altruistic” reasons (i.e., because these consumers believe they are supporting something more humane) (Howell, 2024). The dairy industry has attempted to preclude plant-based milk companies from calling their products "milk" (Kirwan, 2023). This also somewhat relates to Joy's point, that "happy meat" ideas are signals that anti-carnism is working; this is analogous, because if dairy companies want to prevent plant-based milk companies from calling their products "milk," this likely signals that anti-dairy activism is working. Indeed, if consumers are not properly educated, this creates an easier opportunity for the meat industry to spread misinformation about supposed health risks of plant-based products (Cantrell, 2024). Similar fear-mongering tactics can even be used by political actors; for example in 2019, Sebastian Gorka said Democrats “want to take away your hamburgers” (BBC, 2019).

With all of this information on trends in discourse, Joy (2018) uses much of this information to discuss effective tactics, to increase the likelihood that others will be receptive to our message. Joy acknowledges that it is often not enough to simply have concrete facts and evidence that support our position, and in fact, advocates against “over-informing.” Indeed, much research and inquiry has been done to examine why many people are not persuaded by facts (Fradera, 2016). Joy states that instead,

---

[12] Interestingly, the European Union has enacted legislation that will make it illegal (starting in 2026) to label something as “climate neutral,” “climate positive,” or another “greenwashing” term if there is no evidence to support this claim (Greenfield, 2024).

[13] There have been developments where animal agriculture producers have been sued for environmental reasons, including greenwashing. For example, the Danish Crown is not allowed to use certain environmentally friendly-sounding terminology to describe a pig; the New Zealand Supreme Court ruled that animal agriculture defendants were not different from fossil fuel defendants; three cities in the Netherlands have banned meat and dairy advertising; and the Swedish consumer protection agency has done work of this type (to avoid misleading consumers) as well (Bray, 2024). Thus, there may be potential to sue for humane washing too.

the goal is to “plant seeds” while giving people autonomy, and that people must feel safe departing from embedded ways of life, and taking social risks. This is an important issue. Information is not always readily available to many. In addition, data and individual stories can be shared together.

Joy gives tips on effective communication, and how to do so in a way that is fulfilling. Indeed, Joy (2023) advises to walk away from a situation in which one is not being respected. Watts and Garces (2023) both advise to be “comfortable being uncomfortable.” Joy recommends focusing on the communicative “process” instead of “content,” and advocates for a goal of mutual understanding, instead of a goal of convincing the other person. Joy also advocates against arguments that take the “moral high ground,” as this can lead to “shame” (seeing others as “less than”) in human relationships and can thus backfire, and states that a person who has not been a victim of violence may be seen as “moralistic” (as an analogy, a student who speaks out against war violence, as opposed to a war veteran). Indeed, the communication process is to understand one another, and people who have small differences may fight; a goal to help the other person “understand me” and make them an ally, instead of to convert them, can help the process (Joy, 2023) and make the other person more receptive (Freston, 2023). Thus, Joy recommends that one share one’s own stories (and what one has learned), as people cannot make one’s own stories “wrong,” and that one strive to understand others’ perspectives.

Some journal articles also discuss the habits of self-identified vegans or vegetarians. Vinnari et. al. (2009) discuss the habits of self-identified vegans or vegetarians in Finland. The study found that, among self-identified vegetarians, 80 percent did not follow a vegetarian diet according to the “operationalized” definition, but they did consume “fewer meat products.” Juan et. al. (2015) discuss the habits of self-identified vegans or vegetarians in the United States. The study found that self-identified vegetarians, on average, consumed healthier diets, fewer calories, less meat, less poultry and seafood, less “added sugars,” and more fruits, vegetables, “whole grains,” and “total grains” per calorie than non-vegetarians consumed. This calls into question societal definitions of “vegan” and “vegetarian,” because consuming animal-based products is not vegan in a traditional sense, and consuming meat is not vegetarian in a traditional sense. However, it also provides useful evidence on how people regard veganism and vegetarianism, because it provides insight into the eating habits of self-identified vegans and vegetarians. In addition, research has found that 41 percent of people eat plant-based at least once a week (Cantrell, 2024); thus, general trends toward plant-based eating, even among people who are not vegan or vegetarian in a traditional sense, may be promising.

This research can inform the animal protection movement, in that it can help nonprofits and NGOs decide how much emphasis to put on education-related tactics. Knowledge is often valued, and

there is some evidence of interconnectedness between knowledge and other aspects of the movement. For example, there is evidence that in countries with more progressive animal welfare laws (e.g., Germany), there is also greater public awareness of animal protection issues (Coman-Hidey, 2023). In addition, knowledge is sometimes linked with the phenomenon of "control," in the sense of control of knowledge, and thereby control of how we act (Wrenn, 2019).

2.4.3. Leafleting

One tactic that has been studied in some depth in the animal protection movement is leafleting. Leafleting has been estimated to save approximately one animal for every two leaflets (Broughton, 2015), convince one person to go vegan or vegetarian for every 75 leaflets handed out (C., 2018), or (as detailed below) lead people to consume more meat rather than less. These are, understandably, vastly diverse estimates. Thus, Animal Charity Evaluators (ACE) is not confident that leafleting has an overall significant benefit (see, e.g., Greig, 2017). Greig evaluated this tactic in the category of "individual" outreach (pg. 3). Greig's evaluation is based on reported "best" advocacy tactics used, and does not consider effectiveness of leafleting when tailored to a more specific topic such as reducing dairy or chicken consumption (pg. 4).

ACE's research on leafleting was largely built on prior research on the subject. For example, Nick Cooney (2014) reported on research conducted by Humane League Labs on the effectiveness of leafleting in changing young people's dietary habits (pg. 1). In this study, leaflets were handed out on university campuses and at concerts, and study participants included a group who had received leaflets and a group who had not received leaflets (pg. 1); 60 percent of survey participants were university campuses in the Boston, Philadelphia, and Dallas areas, and 40 percent were at the Warped Tour (a concert tour). Survey participants filled out surveys upon receiving the leaflets, and follow-up surveys after being contacted by email three months later. Three primary measures of effectiveness were examined, with the following results: leaflets that focused on animal cruelty were more effective than leaflets that focused on health benefits of vegetarian diets, saving an average of 3.27 versus 2.94 animals per booklet; leaflets that focused on all farmed animals were significantly more effective than leaflets that focused on chickens, saving an average of 4.41 versus 1.79 animals per booklet; and leaflets that focused on how to become vegetarian were more effective than leaflets that focused on why one would go vegetarian, saving an average of 3.75 versus 2.45 animals per leaflet (pg. 2). Cooney acknowledges limitations in reliability due to the somewhat small sample size, as 45 to 95

participants per booklet filled out the three-month follow-up survey. However, in examining the results, the most successful leaflet was one that focused on how to go vegetarian, focused on all animals, and focused on animal cruelty; this leaflet saved an average of 6.44 animals. The second most effective leaflet was one that focused on why one would go vegetarian, focused on all animals, and focused on health benefits; this leaflet saved an average of 5.95 animals. The least effective leaflet focused on why one would go vegetarian, focused only on chickens, and focused on animal cruelty; this leaflet spared an average of -1.13 animals, meaning it (on average) *increased* participants' likelihood to consume a diet that killed more animals. The second least effective leaflet focused on why one would go vegetarian, focused only on chickens, and focused on health; this leaflet spared an average of 1.24 animals (pg. 3). Thus, the three primary examined factors clearly interacted with each other in important ways; for example, as demonstrated above, leaflets that focused on animal cruelty were usually more effective, but this focus on animal cruelty backfired when it was combined with a sole focus on chickens and a focus on why one would go vegetarian (though, as demonstrated above, these latter two focus points were overall less effective).

Overall, from Cooney's research, it is clear that it was most effective to focus on all animals and on how to go vegetarian, and thus, it seems best to hand out these leaflets (if activists decide to leaflet), though perhaps there are certain contexts in which "less effective" focus points would be more effective; for example, perhaps advocating for health benefits in a more health-focused context or setting would be effective, as one may have an audience that cares more about health benefits. Indeed, this was observed in individuals 18 to 22 years old, as for this demographic, a focus on health was more effective than a focus on cruelty, at 1.1 and 0.77 animals saved, respectively. Additionally, for this demographic, it seemed certain focus points actually backfired to a greater extent, as leaflets that focused on why one would go vegetarian saved an average of -0.59 animals, and leaflets that focused on chickens saved an average of -0.89 animals. Even where leaflets made a positive difference in this demographic, it seems leaflets were less effective than in the general surveyed population, as leaflets that focused on how to go vegetarian saved an average of 1.95 animals, and leaflets that focused on all animals saved 2.25 animals. Again, however, Cooney cautions about the small sample size (pg. 3). Interestingly, persons aged 13 to 17 years reported a greater intent to modify dietary habits after receiving leaflets, as well as greater actual dietary modification at the three-month follow-up; each leaflet handed to this age group saved an estimated 4.78 animals, compared to 1.92 animals saved per leaflet handed to an 18 to 22 year old. Cooney cautions, however, about both the small sample size and the fact that a higher percentage of participants in this age group received a second leaflet later in the

day after receiving the first one (pg. 4).

In the end, Cooney found that the leaflets that inspired the greatest intent to modify one's diet (as measured the day the participant received the leaflet) also tended to inspire the greatest reported dietary modification (as measured at the three-month follow-up). Specifically, of the four most effective leaflets in inspiring intent to change, three of these were among the four most effective in inspiring actual reported change; and of the four least effective leaflets in inspiring intent, three of these were among the four least effective in inspiring actual reported change. On the other hand, when taken individually, each of the three primary measured factors fared quite differently in terms of intent to change versus actual reported change. Specifically, those who received leaflets on only chickens reported an equal intent to change as those who received leaflets on all farmed animals, but the latter group saved more than twice as many animals with dietary modifications. Those who received leaflets on health benefits and animal cruelty reported an equal intent to change, but those who received leaflets on animal cruelty would have saved 3.5 times more animals than the other group with reported dietary modifications. Also interestingly, those who received leaflets on why one would go vegetarian reported greater intent to change than those who received leaflets on how to go vegetarian, but those who received leaflets on how to go vegetarian ended up saving 50 percent more animals with reported dietary modifications than the other group (pg. 5). These findings have numerous potential implications. For example, perhaps leaflets that focused on chickens versus all animals had compelling information on why one would want to stop eating meat, but perhaps participants found it more difficult to find substitutes for chicken than for other types of meat. For health benefits vs. animal cruelty, perhaps both types of leaflets gave compelling arguments, but perhaps participants later thought that they could receive the same health benefits without going vegetarian, but that it was impossible to completely stop supporting animal cruelty while still eating meat. And for why vs. how, perhaps the reasons given to go vegetarian were compelling and inspirational, but implementation was far more difficult without actual tools and strategies to make the dietary shifts.

Even more strikingly, in the three-month follow-up, those who did not receive a leaflet (the "control" group) reported a greater meat reduction than did those who received a leaflet.[14] However, Cooney largely attributed this to a small sample size, as only 45 members of the control group completed the three-month follow-up survey (pg. 5). This seems like a plausible explanation, as those who are more likely to fill out the survey are likely more interested in relevant topics, and are thus

[14] Cooney stated that the control group reported a greater reduction than "those who received any of the other booklets." It is not entirely clear why Cooney used the word "other" in this phrase, if the control group received no booklet at all, so perhaps that word was an error.

probably more likely to make corresponding dietary modifications. Cooney also suspected that, because survey participants often sat next to one another and knew each other, members of the control group still looked at the leaflets taken by the other group, as when participants got the leaflets, they could keep them (pg. 5). Thus, this does not seem like a reliable indicator of whether those who got leaflets or the control group actually made greater dietary modifications. A study in which participants are spaced out from each other, both physically and temporally, would likely be necessary, in order to reliably answer this question.

A somewhat more in-depth look at the leaflet reported to be most effective, that spared an estimated 6.44 animals each, also provides more insight. On its front cover was a picture of smiling people with a plate of food, with a headline that included the words "something better." The next page stated that meat consumption had been decreasing, specifically 10 percent the previous year in the United States. This page also mentioned specifically that chicken, pork, and beef consumption were falling, and included quotations from people who had stopped eating meat or similar. Later pages of this leaflet included information on cruelty to animals, including pictures of animals (a pig and a chicken) in cages on factory farms, tips on recipes or brands or alternatives to buy, and tips (including from a doctor who specializes in the benefits of plant-based eating) on how to get important nutrients on a plant-based diet. Thus, it is important to note that the three primary measured factors are not necessarily mutually exclusive; for example, this most effective leaflet focused on how to go vegetarian, but also included reasons to do so.

In a more recent study, on how leafleting effects consumption of animal products (looking at 200,000 meals), Menbere Haile et. al. (2021) found that leafleting resulted in a 2.4-percent reduction in fish and poultry consumption in men, and a 1.6-percent reuction in beef consumption in women within the "semester of the intervention," but that these effects "disappear" after two months. In addition, while Haile et. al. consider the 2.4- and 1.6-percent reductions to be "statistically significant," they found no overall "statistially significant long-term aggregate effects" of the leaflets on consumption over two academic years. This, similar to ACE's (or Greig's) research above, does not suggest a clear significant benefit. On the other hand, if it reduces meat consumption in a "statistically significant" manner within two months, this alone may save at least some animals. Thus, it may be effective, but not the most effective use of nonprofit resources.

On the other hand, some nonprofits combine leafleting with other tactics; for example, Vegan Outreach employees hand out leaflets, and when passersby take the leaflets, the Vegan Outreach employees may then present a plant-based jerky, and when passersby take the jerky, the employees

may tell the passersby about their "10 Weeks to Vegan" program.[15] As discussed above, "meat-free" challenges have shown to have relatively high efficacy; thus, if leafleting is combined with meat-free challenges, perhaps it will have greater efficacy.

Some research suggests that leafleting and related activist tactics influence consumers' intentions but do not influence consumers' actual habits. For example, from Polanco et. al.'s (2022) research, showing videos and leafleting have been shown to influence meat-eaters' intention, in that people are more likely to intend to reduce their consumption of animal products, but they have not been shown to actually change people's consumption habits. In addition, perhaps these tactics can be refined in such a way that they are more effective; for example, as evidenced above, the content of a leaflet may influence its effectiveness. In fact, advocacy tactics that are more "engaging" and "clear" have been found to be more effective (Polanco et. al., 2022), and leaflets have the potential to be more "engaging" and "clear." Finally, this research should be interpreted with caution, because social contexts and other outside factors may have influenced people's dietary habits and changes, including how people responded to leafleting and similar activist tactics.

2.4.4. Effectiveness of animal rights vs. animal welfare vs. environmental messaging in influencing consumer choices

In examining the most effective tactics, one important question is whether it is most effective to promote animal rights and anti-speciesist messages; animal welfare and anti-cruelty messages; and/or environmental and ecocentric messages. As used in this subsection, these different types of "messaging" refer to the content of the messages, regardless of the form of activism. For example, one could arrange a protest, arrange a litigation campaign, make a documentary, and write a newspaper article with the same message, even though these are four separate forms of activism.

In a study on messaging, Janosch Linkersdörfer and Jacob R. Peacock (2020) examine whether, in encouraging people to alter their consumption of animal products, it is more effective to focus on animal cruelty, animal rights and "moral consistency," or environmental implications of animal agriculture (pg. 1). In this study, survey participants were shown information either about animal cruelty on farms, animal rights, or environmental implications. The participants were then asked about their future planned consumption of certain types of animal products, including red meat, poultry, fish, eggs, and dairy; participants were asked to rate their planned consumption on a six-point scale, with

[15] See program here: https://veganoutreach.org/10-weeks-to-vegan/

options including that they would eat more, the same, less, or stop eating said product, or that they already abstained from said product. They were also asked whether they wanted a vegetarian recipe book, and asked about their dietary identities ("vegan," "meat reducer," "omnivore," etc.) (pg. 2). It was estimated that there were about 1,200 participants total, most in the United States and Canada (pg. 3).

In interpreting survey results, researchers estimated much participants would change their consumption; namely, "eat more, +20%; eat the same, 0%; eat a little less, –10%; eat a lot less, –35%; stop eating entirely, –100%; already do not eat, 0%" (Linkersdörfer and Peacock, 2020, pg. 3). Then, researchers estimated how many days of "suffering" would be spared, assigning a number of days to each animal product; this number was based on estimates of how much of each animal product consumers would typically eat in the United States; notably, fish and chicken had the highest estimates, at 1500 and 1220 days of suffering, respectively[16] (pg. 3). This is a noteworthy finding, because it suggests that a stronger focus on fish and chicken can alleviate a greater amount of suffering. There appears to be a lot of work to be done in this arena; because chicken consumption has undergone recent increases, and is projected to increase in the coming years; for example, in the United States, people eat more pounds of chicken than any other type of meat (Shahbandeh, 2024). People also seem more likely to sign a petition about overall farmed animal welfare (52%) than about fish welfare (45%) (Polanco, 2022), which suggests that people consider fish welfare less important than other types of animal welfare. This general bias against sea animals may translate into law and policy; for example, EU Secondary law requires animals to be stunned before they are killed, but boiling lobsters alive or cooling live lobsters on ice has still been practiced, even though there is evidence that invertebrates feel pain, though these practices have been banned by certain jurisdictions; for example, Italy banned cooling lobsters on ice (Livni, 2018), and Switzerland has banned boiling lobsters alive (Street, 2018).

Overall, from Linkersdörfer and Peacock's (2020) study, talking about animal cruelty or environmental impacts appears to be more effective than talking about animal rights. In some cases (often with planned egg consumption reduction), it appears more effective to talk about animal cruelty than environmental impacts, while in some, there appears to be no significant difference between the two. Also, on average, participants were more likely to report plans to significantly cut beef and pork consumption than other animal products. However, there are caveats in the study. For example, in this

[16] I do not fully understand this part; it seems like it means how many days of suffering are spared per consumer within a certain timeframe, but I am unsure what this timeframe is.

study, some flyers directly asked participants to reduce their consumption of animal products, while others only spoke of the impacts of cutting out animal products; and the animal cruelty flyer only talked about pigs and chickens, while other flyers spoke of more species. In addition, self-reported dietary habits may not always accurately reflect actual dietary habits, and self-reported dietary plans may have a "social desirability bias" that may make participants more likely to report plans to reduce consumption of animal products. Without clear controls for these variables, it is recommended that the results be interpreted with caution. However, The Humane League Labs states that it is committed to "transparency" and "open science" practices.

In their study, on messaging tactics Maya B. Mathur et. al. (2021) discuss the effectiveness of various interventions to inspire consumers to reduce their meat consumption. They reference many other studies that estimate how many animals are killed per person consuming a typical diet that consists of animal products, how animal products contribute to pandemics and antibiotic resistance, about "nudge" interventions like making vegetarian options the default, etc. However, their focus is on "animal welfare" interventions. The vast majority of included studies looked at participants' consumption of meat or animal products, while others looked at purchasing. Some looked at the percentage of purchased meals that contained meat. To examine research results, researchers examined whether flyers used in surveys included text; whether they asked participants to go vegan, vegetarian, reduce consumption, etc., or did not have any specific ask; whether results were measured over seven or more days after the survey; and the ages of participants (Mathur et. al., 2021).

Mathur et. al. discuss a few types of interventions. "Social norm" interventions make cutting out meat sound more mainstream. Other types of interventions describe animal welfare conditions on farms. Still others list plant-based options as meal options. Most interventions included text, most included pictures, but fewer included "social norms" or mentioned companion animals. In many "developed" nations, most people are concerned about animal well-being on factory farms; however, it appears that this does not translate to a reduction in consumption of animal products as much as one may believe, and researchers have a few plausible explanations for this. First, consumers in these countries typically do not raise animals for meat themselves, which allows them to separate the meat from the animals; interventions to reduce this cognitive dissonance may include putting pictures of animals next to animal products. Second, many people are not well-informed about these issues; indeed, some actively avoid learning about it, and some admit this to researchers. Some interventions include describing or showing footage of conditions on factory farms, which can be effective. Results, though, may be mixed when showing graphic footage; graphic footage is likely effective in some

cases, but may be counterproductive in other cases. For example, the effectiveness of this type of intervention may vary by context and the manner in which it is presented. The Humane League (2017) has taught that it is more effective to show graphic footage if it is paired with a "call to action"; this seems potentially similar to Mathur et. al.'s findings (more details below) that it is more effective to ask people to go vegan (though it is unclear whether going vegan is the "call to action" that The Humane League was referring to – as opposed to, for example, signing a petition for a welfare campaign; in fact, Wrenn (2013) states that groups that use graphic imagery and the like are reformist or welfarist groups, and that abolitionist groups tend to downplay this and instead use more "rational" arguments). This may conflict with certain other results; for example, the organization, Pax Fauna, did a study that showed that graphic imagery was less effective, but survey participants were very uncomfortable with the idea that animals had to be slaughtered, and the participants were very "articulate" about this (Hamer, 2023). In addition, there has been evidence that "social norm" interventions have been successful when institutional defaults are plant-based; indeed, when it is the default, 65.5 percent of people have stuck with it, while when it was the opposite (i.e. one would opt into a plant-based meal), only 18.6 percent of people opted into it; other research has found that, when two-thirds "meat entrees" are shifted to two-thirds vegetarian entrees, "selection of veg entrees" increases by more than 50 percent (Cantrell, 2024). Social norm interventions fit with a "theory of change" (Cantrell, 2024).

On average, Mathur et. al.'s studied interventions made people 22 percent more likely to report, "intend," or "behaviorally demonstrate" eating less instead of more meat. In addition, interventions that said "go vegan" were significantly more effective than those with no recommendation, and it seemed that those with a more powerful message were more effective (e.g., "go vegan" vs. "reduce meat consumption"). Overall, 83% of interventions had an overall positive, rather than counterproductive, effect. However, tactics that are overall effective may still be counterproductive with certain people, and tactics that are overall counterproductive may still be effective with certain people. For example, occupations, cultural backgrounds, and socioeconomic backgrounds of research participants and consumers[17] may affect their responses to various activism tactics. In my interviews and in Chapter 6, I explore this somewhat more in-depth, because there are many aspects to this. For

[17] I list "research participants" and "consumers" separately in this paragraph, because the psychological impact of viewing oneself as a research participant, and the psychological impact of viewing oneself as a consumer, may be significantly different, and may affect a person's behavior. Indeed, practitioners of, for example, Nonviolent Communication have stated that people can respond differently when they sense that one is using a tactic or technique on them (e.g., Auerbacher, 2019), so this is a point worthy of further exploration.

example, in some countries, meat consumption rates are far lower than in most of the "Western" world, yet the ability to consume meat is viewed as a symbol of "wealth" and "status" (see, e.g., Williams, 2007).

Some nonprofits and NGOs may use a multidisciplinary approach, while others may use a more focused approach. In an article in favor of "comprehensive" approaches in advocacy, Corey Wrenn and Rob Johnson (2013) critique the common tactic, among animal rights groups, to do species-specific or single-issue campaigns, and instead advocate for a more "holistic abolitionist" approach that addresses the more fundamental issue of speciesism. Issue-specific advocacy may include campaigns to abolish a certain type of animal use, including vivisection, cages on factory farms, fur, or horse-drawn carriages. This type of activism is often employed because it can be advantageous for fundraising and appeal to the public's "emotion." However, Wrenn and Johnson argue that this type of advocacy cannot achieve the end goal of animal rights, and that the correct path of advocacy is a vegan, anti-speciesist movement that addresses the fundamental problem. Wrenn and Johnson add that this will require the same appeal to "emotion," as well as addressing barriers against introducing veganism to sectors of the general public. This complements earlier discussion on another potential pitfall of single-issue advocacy: that opponents of the single-issue goal may give into said goal "on their terms." Wrenn and Johnson also discuss the use of single-issue advocacy by various factions of the animal protection movement; these factions (similarly to what I discuss in Section 2.2) include "traditional welfarists," who believe that animal use is permissible if the animals are not subjected to cruel conditions; and abolitionists, who believe that ending animal use should be the goal. There is some debate as to what constitutes "abolitionist" activism; for example, some campaigns seek to ban certain types of cages for animals on farms, or seek to ban leghold traps, and some say these can be "incremental" abolitionism, while others say these are not abolitionist unless they do not leave animals in an exploitative situation, as banning e.g. leghold traps may still allow other forms of trapping (Wrenn and Johnson, 2013). Arguments for the approach that Wrenn and Johnson advocate for include: it is important to be intersectional, and this can only be done if we examine the underlying issues (Wrenn and Johnson, 2013) (also, see my discussion on intersectionality and inclusivity in Chapter 3 onward); and that it is not enough to simply abolish the worst forms of animal cruelty if animals are still kept on factory farms and killed. Other arguments for different approaches include: the idea that it is easier to be intersectional if our movement is narrower and we can focus more in-depth on an issue; and potential evidence that it is more effective to talk about animal cruelty on factory farms, rather than to talk about speciesism.

2.4.5. Psychological phenomena

There is evidence that some do not ascribe as much "sentience" to farmed animals; while there is extensive scientific evidence (or consensus) that non-human animals are sentient, consumption of animal products may reduce how much people think of farmed animals in this manner (Mathur et. al., 2022). This is similar to a phenomenon discussed by the psychologist, Melanie Joy (2018), in which many people have been found to consider a turkey to be "something" rather than "someone"; this type of thinking can be used to promote carnism, a philosophy discussed further below. People are especially hesitant to ascribe sentience to fish, even though there is scientific evidence that fish are sentient (Millstein, 2024).

Interventions to counteract this cognitive dissonance may include asking people to imagine or describe emotions, etc. of animals, and appealing to people's acknowledgment of the sentience of companion animals, in noting that many typical farming practices would be illegal if done to companion animals. As another example, Steven Wise (2001) begins an article with a story about Jerome, who died ten days before his fourteenth birthday, having been infected with three HIV strains at 30 months, four years, and five years of age. The story continues to detail conditions in which Jerome was kept, and in the middle of this description, it adds that this was a chimpanzee research facility. Stories such as this allow readers and listeners to relate to non-human animals from a different perspective; rather than thinking of the animals as "animals" or even "things," readers and listeners of these stories may view the animals as individuals with names (e.g. Jerome), birthdays, and other characteristics commonly ascribed to humans (and to companion animals to an extent). Stories can also invoke both "physical disgust" and "moral disgust." "Physical disgust" and "moral disgust" can influence and amplify each other; for example, if one is told about an investigation into a farm that reveals dead animals among living, and other disgusting conditions to which animals are subjected, this can invoke both moral and physical disgust (Mathur et. al., 2021).

In a presentation on communication between vegans and non-vegans, Melanie Joy (2016) discusses ideologies that promote consumption of animal products. Joy is a psychologist who has studied the animal rights movement, particularly schools of thought that influence people to consume meat and other animal products, including the concept of "carnism," which Joy defines as "the invisible ideology that conditions people to eat certain animals," and largely considers it a "sub-ideology" of speciesism. Joy discusses the ways in which this is embedded into systems and

institutions in the world, and how it is "internalized," and leads people to look at the world through this lens. For example, Joy speaks of tension between the desire to speak out about "atrocities," and the desire to avoid engaging with information about these atrocities. For the desire to avoid engaging with this information, Joy discusses "defense mechanisms" that lead people to strengthen the "carnism" ideology, by considering carnism "normal," "natural," and "necessary," and weakening counterarguments to carnism. For example, some people consider a turkey to be "something" instead of "someone," and more generally, to consider farmed animals as monoliths instead of individuals. There is significant scientific research behind this phenomenon: "a single death is a tragedy, a million deaths are a statistic"; that is, people pay more attention to a story of one death than a story about a million deaths (Tirman, 2011). This phenomenon, combined with the sheer numbers of farmed animals, may make people less likely to consider farmed animals sentient. This is also somewhat related to a phenomenon discussed by Wrenn and Johnson (2013), that single-species advocacy (instead of comprehensive animal rights advocacy) may be used to appeal to people's emotions. This may be similar to the "one death vs. a million" phenomenon, in that a story of one species may evoke more care than a story of many species.

Another aspect is social acceptability of veganism. As stated in Section 2.4.2, Melanie Joy states that it is important for people to feel comfortable taking social risks in departing from embedded ways of life. The aspect of taking social risks has been studied, and there are mixed scientific findings. In a study, Faunalytics found that people were more likely to stick with vegan diets if they had more interactions with other vegans and related more "strongly" to being vegan, and less likely to stick with vegan diets if they had fewer interactions with vegans or went vegan for health reasons (Markowski, 2022).

Joy states that some may also consider vegans to be biased, while failing to acknowledge biases in carnistic ideologies. Some may also "attack the messenger," to thereby justify disregarding the message. In addition, some "carnistic defenses" may view vegans and carnists in a dualistic manner. Joy argues that this is largely due to the embeddedness of carnism in our system, and arguments about "happy meat," which Joy argues exists because the anti-carnism movement is successful. This dualism relates to other concepts of "animality" in Western culture, which fit with culturally-imposed dichotomies of "humanity" vs. "animality," and "nature" vs. "society," discussed by Kay Anderson (2017).

Joy also states that there are certain situations in which it is best not to advocate. Joy states that it is best not to advocate to "psychopaths," as they are not capable of feeling empathy. Joy states that

99 percent of people are able to feel empathy, and that humans have the "seeds" for "love" and "empathy," and we have to "water" these seeds. I am critical of this language, because the term, "psychopath," is used to perpetuate ableist stigmas against mentally ill and neurodivergent or neurodistinct[18] people, while in reality, the majority of people with psychosis are not violent, and mentally ill folks are actually more likely to be victims of violence (Uwujaren, 2012). In addition, the idea of "empathy" can be subjective and arbitrary, and can be ableist. This is especially important in the animal rights movement, because many people who work in CAFOs and slaughterhouses have gone through immense trauma. Many experience physical and mental trauma working in these jobs. Many of these people are undocumented immigrants, who have experienced oppression (Winders and Abrell, 2021), and cannot speak out against working conditions without risking deportation. As Leah Garcés, of Mercy for Animals (2023), states, many choices are influenced by external circumstances; Garces states that if she grew up in rural North Carolina, she may have made similar decisions. Garces found, in working with Craig Watts, that Watts and many others "wanted out" of their situations. Watts (2023) was involved in advocacy in labeling of food products; Watts participated in an expose soon after there was a ruling that certain products could not be labeled "humanely raised." Watts is now a mushroom farmer (Garcés, 2023); this is a reminder that we need to "build up" people who work on farms in addition to "resisting against" the system, and to remember Martin Luther King, Jr.'s words that the three evils this country was built upon were racism, classism, and militarism, and so it is important to fight against militarism (Masri, 2023).

On the other hand, Joy's mental health work touches on another important connection that is rarely discussed: the connection between animal abuse and the stigma against mental health. In the book *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows* (2020), Joy discusses humane washing, in that people consider domesticated animals to have better lives than wild animals have, and gives an example comparison between a wild zebra and a domesticated cow. Joy discusses a line of thinking that people likely employ, which considers that the zebra spends a lot of time looking for (and not always finding) food, worrying about predators, etc., while the cow has vaccines, food, and many other physical needs provided. Joy also states that, in reality, most cows live in conditions that would be considered unconscionable if cats and dogs lived in these conditions, and that even if a farmed animal's physical needs are met, the animal's emotional needs are likely not met. This strongly relates to the mainstream phenomenon that disregards mental health, and fails to give mental health the same

[18] Note: I use the terms "neurodivergent" and "neurodistinct" interchangeably, because they are sometimes preferred by people who are not considered "neurotypical."

importance that physical health is given, and also fails to acknowledge that mental health and physical health are strongly related. Joy states that animals' emotional needs date back to their ancestors thousands of years ago; for example, puppies love to play, because wolves, their ancestors, needed to cooperate to thrive in the wild. Joy also likens this to contemporary humans and our ancestors.

Joy (2018) also states that it may be better not to advocate if we, or the other person, are "triggered" or similar. This is a useful concept to explore, because while some people advocate against having conversations while angry or triggered, others advocate for the use of anger and similar emotions as a compass to guide us towards our needs, and may advocate for expressing anger nonviolently. Joy also states that it is best not to advocate to people "invested" in carnism, such as someone who has hunted their entire life. This may be related to other ideologies and identities; for example, hunting, eating meat, etc. are often associated with masculinity (Broad, 2023; Carol Adams,). Joy also stresses the importance of not internalizing messages from the "dominant culture," and links this to past social justice activists, including activists against slavery, in that human rights activists have also faced criticism that may have included "they're too sensitive," "nothing is good enough for them," etc. Joy similarly cautions against perfectionism, and advocates for "nonviolence" towards ourselves. For example, Joy states that it is valid for activists to say "I don't know," and not buy into the idea that they must be "experts" on "everything." Indeed, Joy speaks of this perfectionist ideal that vegans are often expected to live up to (2023),

Another psychological phenomenon that Joy discusses is Secondary Traumatic Stress Disorder, or STS/D. This occurs when someone witnesses violence. For activists, Joy advocates for recognition of STS/D within ourselves, such as if we feel "depressed" and/or are losing "faith." Indeed, a witness can be a victim; recognition of STS/D can be helpful to avoid being "triggered" (Joy, 2023).

2.5. Relationships between sub-movements within the animal rights movement, and between the animals rights movement and other social justice movements

2.5.1. Infighting and division within the animal rights movement

In the book, *Piecemeal Protest: Animal Rights in the Age of Nonprofits*, Corey Lee Wrenn (2019) examines animal rights movements, and tension between animal rights "ideologies" and bureaucracies of nonprofit groups. This is an important topic in the nonprofit and NGO sectors,

because as discussed in later chapters (e.g., in my interview with Claire Howe in Section 4.2), professionalization and institutionalization of the animal protection movement have implications for the goals of the movement and how the movement is perceived. Indeed, Francione has critiqued "professionalized groups that had become bound to organizational maintenance and were largely hesitant to present any meaningful challenge to exploitative industries" (Wrenn, 2013, pg. 178). There is evidence of professionalization; indeed, ten organizations control about half of the budget in the movement" (Webermann, 2023).

As discussed in Section 2.2, some sections of the animal protection movement are liberationist in goal, yet reformist in tactic or practice. Wrenn (2019) states that this "dualism" is due, at least in part, to "neoliberalism" of the mid-1900s. Wrenn also notes that much of the movement is "institutionalized," and that while there is an understandable focus on growth and momentum of the movement, it is important not to assume that "bigger" always means "better." This ties in with the tension between effective altruism and inclusivity, because from a standpoint of effective altruism or utilitarianism, it is (all else being equal) better to have a larger movement, because a larger movement has a potential for a larger-scale impact. However, from a standpoint of inclusivity, it is important to note that larger movements may be more likely to stick with (or even perpetuate) the status quo, because in order to have many people join a movement, it may be necessary to cater to the status quo. This can detract from the purpose of an inclusive movement, because the status quo is not necessarily fair or inclusive. Indeed, with "power" differences, not all "voices" are treated equally (Wrenn, 2019); these "power" differences can even appear within animal protection movements, particularly within nonprofits, because nonprofits can become corporatized. Indeed, in an article on the development of social movements in organizations ("movement organizations," or "MOs"), Zald and Ash (1966) discuss potentially concerning corporatization of MOs.

Melanie Joy also talks about "infighting" within the movement, and the potential costs of infighting. In particular, Joy discusses the costs of infighting to the movement, and how this does not help animals. One potential solution is to not "engage" in this infighting, and instead to acknowledge the value of those who are willing to engage in effective tactics that differ from one's own. (This is somewhat similar to Joy's precautions against perfectionism, as discussed in Section 2.4.2.) This speaks to a large issue in the movement, when animal rights activists may have "debates" that do not have a true meaning for the movement; this can also narrow the vision of activists, instead of leading to "shared" goals (Coman-Hidey, 2023).

Another potential solution is to not be too tied to "identities" with certain tactics (Coman-Hidey, 2023). For example, if an activist identifies as an abolitionist, this activist may be resistant to advocating for animal welfare campaigns, even if said animal welfare campaigns show great promise in helping many animals. Conversely, if an activist identifies as a welfarist, the activist may be resistant to tactics that advocate for veganism, even if said tactics who great promise in helping many animals.

On the other hand, some argue that infighting is not always a bad thing. For example, in the book, *Piecemeal Protest: Animal Rights in the Age of Nonprofits*, Corey Lee Wrenn (2019) states that "infighting," disagreement, etc. are "predictable" in group contexts, and that this is "nothing personal." Indeed, few (if any) social movements have had total cohesion where all activists are completely in "lock step" (Coman-Hidey, 2023). Divides within the movement can even be beneficial at times. Thus, while some consider factionalism a waste of "resources" in the movement, factionalism can also be important when "mainstream" movements are not as effective (Wrenn, 2019). For example, Wrenn (2019) further states that while "factionalism" may be frustrating, it is not necessarily "contrary" to the movement, and that factionalism has forced groups to look into animal homelessness, anti-vivisection, vegetarianism, veganism, inclusivity from a feminist standpoint, etc. Wrenn also states that many "long-standing" and "influential" groups have stemmed from factionalism, including the Humane Society of the United States, Cruelty Free International, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and that were it not for factionalism, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals may still be okay with hunting. Wrenn predicts that factionalism will continue to have similar benefits, and that it will push the movement in a more abolitionist direction. Thus, infighting is not necessarily something it is possible to eradicate, but rather, something to "manage" (Coman-Hidey).

Wrenn (2019) takes this a step further, and states that factionalism is important for "longevity" of "collective action." Indeed, there is evidence that more "radical factions" of movements can play an important role in said movements, and can set goals that are once considered too radical (for example, goals that "moderates" of said movements may initially consider too radical) but are later considered reasonable (Goodman and Sanders, 2011). For example, some large organizations focus on "low hanging fruit," and focus on reforms that have little consequence to industries (such as "enriching" cages) and/or focus on practices thought unneeded in the industry (such as employees kicking or beating animals), or seek to "improve" the industry and frame these issues as worker safety or company image issues (Wrenn, 2019); as discussed in other sections, there are arguments for and

against these types of tactics. As another example, there is debate on animal sanctuaries that purchase animals from farms, because on one hand, these sanctuaries are likely giving the animals far better qualities of life than the animals would have experienced on farms, while on the other hand, these sanctuaries are giving money to the very farms that exploit animals. Thus, there is considerable room for discussion in tactics such as this. To allow for discussion such as this, it is valuable to distinguish between healthy and productive debate or discussion, and unhealthy and counterproductive infighting.

2.5.2. Comparison between animal and human rights movements in tactics in modern and historical contexts

Both animal rights and human rights movements share potentially parallel features, as well as bridging points between movements at large and individual organizations. In an article on tactics in human rights and nonhuman animal rights movements, Corey Lee Wrenn (2013) takes the position that the human anti-slavery and Civil Rights movements, and the nonhuman animal rights movements, are part of the same movement in a sense, and have lots of connections. In particular, Wrenn discusses parallels in terms of property status and "oppressive ideologies." These parallels go back to ancient history; indeed, under a law from about 4000 years ago, humans could own enslaved humans or non-human animals, and many contemporary laws are still based on outdated norms. One central question here is whether we have the right to subjugate others simply because they are not "us" (Wise, 2001). Indeed, racialising and similar concepts relate to the broader concepts of "othering" and colonial powers, including the notion of "externalising" (Anderson, 2017). Wrenn (2013) also argues that the Civil Rights movement influenced the animal rights movement to look at animals used for food, testing, companionship, and entertainment.

Francione considers it important to "address the property status of nonhuman animals," (Wrenn, 2013, pg. 178); Wrenn likens Francione's position to that of anti-slavery movements, and states that animal rights movements gain validation from anti-slavery movements, and that property status has played a major role in justifying the treatment of enslaved humans and nonhuman animals. Francione's "abolitionist" approach also strives for a "recognition of the personhood of other animals and the equal consideration of their interests based on their self-awareness and capacity to suffer" (pg. 178).

One noteworthy sentence is this: "Welfare reform has become standard protocol and organizations that had initially formed for the advancement of other animals now find themselves

pushing for regulations that, according to their own economic reports (PETA 2007), promise to improve efficiency and productivity for exploitative industries (Francione and Garner 2010)" (Wrenn, 2013). This highlights one of the most pervasive debates within animal protection movements (similar to the welfare vs. abolitionist debates described in some other sources). The PETA (2007) article, which Wrenn cites in the quotation above, discusses economic benefits of controlled-atmosphere killing, including lower rates of bruising and lower rates of broken bones, as in certain other slaughter methods, the shackling and stunning process often results in bruises and broken bones, and bruised meat and similar issues are considered to make the meat less attractive to consumers, and thus lead to economic loss. Thus, controlled-atmosphere killing may benefit the meat industry as well. From a standpoint of vegan advocacy, this is a potential downside, because a vegan advocacy goal is generally to reduce support of the meat industry, and in this way, controlled-atmosphere killing may defeat that goal. However, PETA also discusses animal welfare benefits of controlled-atmosphere killing. PETA also discusses benefits to the slaughterhouse workers, who are often people in desperate situations who are exploited for their labor, even though most animal rights activists likely despise the very idea of this profession. In addition, from a practical standpoint, in order to achieve animal welfare goals, it may help to appeal to those in power, and those in power (especially from an economic standpoint) are often the profit-driven agricultural corporations. Further, if less meat must be wasted, this may mean fewer animals are killed, because if companies want to keep up with consumer demand while discarding bruised meat, they likely must kill more animals in order to do so.

Animal rights movements got "moral suasion" from anti-slavery movements. Parallel tactics have included advocacy to expand the "circle of concern" to "all species," and to combat "domination". Francione says there are no differences in "sentience" of humans vs. nonhuman animals that would "justify" how we treat nonhuman animals. Wrenn also states that abolition of slavery was first about anti-property status, later against "oppressive ideologies," and was divided regarding the use of violence, "moral suasion," etc. (Wrenn, 2013).

Wrenn also discusses "moral suasion," in terms of altering public opinion as a means to enact social change. Wrenn states that this tactic was used in the slavery abolitionist movement, when many believed that social change would arise from shifts in public opinion. In their article about leafleting, Menbere Haile et. al. (2021) discuss the use of "moral suasion" in the contemporary animal protection movement, as well as past social justice movements, such as with the book *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in the anti-slavery movement, and Martin Luther King Jr.'s activism during the civil rights movement. Haile et. al. also liken leafleting in animal protection movements to dissemination of literature in past social

movements, including Martin Luther's *95 Theses*,[19] and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s *Letter from a Birmingham Jail*. Wrenn discusses similar tactics in the non-human animal rights movement, where people believe humanity is "fundamentally interested in progress." However, Wrenn also notes that there has been pushback against this in both the anti-slavery movement and the animal rights movement. In the anti-slavery movement, many were frustrated that these tactics did not yield the results many hoped they would. Some also questioned, for example, whether they could change the church's perpetuation of pro-slavery rhetoric; while some spoke out against churches for racist ideologies, some contended that pro-slavery ideologies were too embedded into churches, and that activism against this would not work. Similarly, in the nonhuman animal rights movement, many are not optimistic that these tactics work, and may instead use violent tactics, legal reform, etc. Franconian schools of thought often use moral suasion, yet some say it should be more "rational," instead of allowing "compassion," spirituality, and other "subjective" approaches to replace rationality (Wrenn, 2013).

Consumer pressure has also been used in both movements. It was used in the anti-slavery movement, for example, when consumers and merchants boycotted sugar that was harvested using slave labor. However, this had limited popularity; for example, many people in Britain considered sugar such a necessity that they were unwilling to boycott it (from this passage, it is not entirely clear how difficult it was to find sugar that was not cultivated with slave labor, though the passage does note that sugar grown from free labor in India increased, and I thus wonder how much less unethical it was, if it was from free labor). The non-human animal rights movement uses boycotts as well, such as veganism, abstention from events that use animals as entertainment, and abstention from products that are tested on animals. Wrenn notes similarities and differences in the use of this tactic, between the anti-slavery and non-human animal rights movement. On the one hand, it is similar, in that both movements involve consumers boycotting certain products that play a role in oppression. On the other hand, they are different, in that animal-based products are often much more directly involved in exploitation, because while sugar and similar products were produced using slave labor, the reason for the boycott has nothing to do with the nature of sugar itself, whereas the existence of animal products themselves is much more directly due to animal exploitation. Some are critical of certain "cruelty-free" foods, such as tomatoes and sugar. Given that many people eat substantial quantities of animal-based foods, while most people did not own slaves, Wrenn argues that people are much more directly involved in non-human animal exploitation, and that abstention as a moral baseline makes more sense

[19] Note: I understand that many of Martin Luther's practices had strongly anti-semitic effects (Gritsch, 2012).

(Wrenn, 2013).

"Transnational" efforts were common in the anti-slavery movement, and are common in the non-human animal protection movement. In the former, abolitionists from the United States and Britain worked together. In the non-human animal rights movement, activists are geographically diverse. Nonprofits are sometimes international. There may be tension, given that many mainstream international movements are Western-focused in terms of culture (Wrenn, 2013); this can cause problems, and is a worthy point for nonprofits and NGOs to explore, in terms of being more inclusive of activists from a variety of cultural backgrounds.

Wrenn notes that the human rights movement has achieved its goal of abolishing slavery (though as I note elsewhere, the 13th Amendment has exceptions), but that racist ideologies and systemic racism have persisted in many ways, earlier in terms of, e.g., a "sharecroppoing," a lack of voting rights and a ban on interracial marriage, and later in terms of, e.g., the prison system. The non-human animal rights movement, however, has failed to significantly improve the "status" of animals, in that animals are still considered property, and billions are killed annually for human consumption (Wrenn, 2013).

One large takeaway from this is that social movements are necessarily multifaceted. Indeed, it has been said that "personal transformation," institutional change (including political change), and alternatives are all necessary for a movement (Coman-Hidey, 2023). However, some movements indeed have arguments against each other; for example, some animal rights activists argue that welfare reforms are actually harmful, because they reduce resistance to farming, but research generally shows this is not true, as Austria and Sweden have the best welfare and most sympathetic to movement goals (Hamer, 2023). On the flip side, some argue that "extreme activism" gives the movement a bad reputation, and is then harmful. Instead of asking if the tactic is good, it may be helpful to ask if this is the best time to use the tactic; for example, when people "fetishize" not making others uncomfortable, this is actually just another tactic that is sometimes effective (Coman-Hidey, 2023).

In using sources that compare social movements, I contrast this perspective with others that caution against comparing animal rights and human rights movements. On the one hand, as this source and some others demonstrate, there are potentially useful comparisons to be made, and potential lessons that movements can learn from each other. Indeed, it serves as a useful reminder that at many points in history, there were people who challenged unjust social norms. It also posits animal rights movements as social justice movements in the same way that human rights movements are regarded. This gives hope for future change, because many injustices have been corrected, while these same

injustices were once commonplace. It also serves as important reminders that different approaches can simultaneously exist and work in harmony; for example, prison abolitionists would generally not oppose, e.g., having better food in prisons, so it seems logical that abolitionist anti-speciesists can refrain from working on welfare campaigns (if they so choose) without opposing these welfare campaigns (Webermann, 2023). This may even foster collaboration between movements; if animal rights activists are willing to help human rights activists, this can help both causes (Perry, 2023). This also sets "precedent" for banning things (Bray, 2024).

On the other hand, comparisons can be problematic, for a variety of reasons. For example, comparing certain human groups to nonhuman animals has historically been a tactic of oppression; this can still be seen in insulting expressions such as "acting like an animal." This type of oppressive reasoning has been used at various points in history; for example, John Quincy Adams presented a petition from enslaved people, which another politician likened to sending a petition from non-human animals (Wise, 2001). Thus, to members of any oppressed group, any comparisons between their oppression and that of nonhuman animals can conjure up trauma relating to such oppressive comparisons. Indeed, if a White person compares slavery to animal exploitation, this can be triggering to those affected by the legacy of slavery (Perry, 2023). This is especially true if we make arguments such as "We respect all humans' rights, so we should respect all non-human animals' rights," because in reality, there are many human rights abuses throughout the world. Indeed, such comparisons may not appreciate the depth of nuances behind human rights violations. For example, while slavery was abolished in the nineteenth century, this abolition may not have been as complete as is often thought; for example, the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolished slavery and indentured servitude, except as "punishment for a crime" for which one was "duly convicted" (Milestone Documents, n.d.). Even without slavery, there is much evidence of systemic racism, sexism, classism, ableism, anti-LGBTQ+ discrimination, etc. in contemporary society. Thus, to say "we solved racism/sexism/classism/ableism, so now we can solve speciesism" has similarly problematic implications, because there is much evidence that these human rights problems have not been solved and are still prevalent.

One specific example of a potentially problematic analogy appears in Wise's (2001) article. (Trigger warning: this article contains an extremely ableist term, and this paragraph references this term.) Wise states that if "dignity-rights" required "advanced mental abilities such as a moral sense or a sense of justice," then "hundreds of millions of humans would be ineligible." This makes a good point, as it stresses that everyone is entitled to rights, regardless of how one may think or feel about a

particular person; however, this statement also seems problematic, because it assumes a hierarchy of "mental abilities," and seems to assume many people do not have a sense of "justice." It is unclear how one would arrive at such conclusions; however, in society, neurodivergent folks are often falsely thought to have no sense of justice or other "higher" mental abilities. The article also uses language that is extremely problematic; it refers to mentally "retarded" human beings. This word is extremely ableist and oppressive, and should not be used (Law and Varela Medrano, 2023). The article also uses this word to make the point that mentally disabled humans are given rights that mentally "complex" non-human animals are not given, and while this is a valid point, it fails to acknowledge the oppressive realities of living with a mental disability in a society that does, indeed, legally subjugate mentally disabled folks in many cases. Given this, it is important to be mindful of how comparisons such as this are made.

One other danger in making analogies is that many analogies may simply be less accurate than they may appear. For example, Wrenn (2013) compares the use of "nonviolent direct action" in the anti-slavery movement to its use in the animal rights movement. Wrenn discusses how, in the anti-slavery movement, this often consisted of enslaved people escaping, and in the nonhuman animal rights movement, it often consists of open rescue, in which rescuers take animals from a laboratory or farm. While both of these examples may indeed be "nonviolent direct action," it may be problematic to compare (on the one hand) people escaping to save their own lives to (on the other hand) people rescuing others. As another example, Wise (2001) references scenarios in which a human being is in a comatose state, in which courts have basically asserted that this individual has fundamental rights, without giving any philosophical arguments to support this position. This is clearly debatable, but it is important to be careful about declaring that one could not possibly attain certain qualities; after all, some people come out of comas, and it is impossible to know for sure whether someone is conscious during a coma.

Chapter 3: Data and Methods

My methodology consists of two main data sets: nonprofits' mission statements, and interviews. Both of these components serve important roles in my thesis development, as I explain below.

3.1. How I Define the Approaches

Data gathering is done primarily by comparing mission statements, campaigns, and answers to interview questions. Each nonprofit/NGO is placed into one of four boxes, based on my research questions in Section 1.4. In Section 1.4, my research questions focus on three aspects of nonprofits/NGOs: animal rights vs. welfare, utilitarianism vs. inclusivity, and grassroots vs. corporate. Accordingly, each nonprofit/NGO is placed into a box, based on whether its approach is based primarily on animal rights or welfare, and utilitarianism or inclusivity; the grassroots vs. corporate distinction is discussed, but is not included in this table. It is important to note that the focus point of each nonprofit/NGO is not necessarily exclusively rights or welfare, utilitarianism or inclusivity, or grassroots or corporate, as all nonprofits and NGOs have nuances in their approaches; and (as discussed in Section 2.2.3) many of them incorporate both rights and welfarist approaches in their work, are informed by both utilitarianism and inclusivity, and have both grassroots and corporate-based campaigns or approaches. In addition, the approaches of any particular nonprofit/NGO are not necessarily constant, as many groups modify their approaches as the groups themselves evolve and as society evolves. For example, some groups have vegan (animal rights) ideals and also focus on campaigns to end extreme confinement of animals in factory farms (campaigns that typically lend themselves to more welfarist approaches). Some groups may also start out more grassroots, and then evolve into more corporate structures. Thus, in addition to my four data boxes, I discuss nuances of each group's approach.

3.2. Examples of Nonprofits/NGOs Collaborating to Effect Law and Policy Change

In the arena of law and policy research, I examine a few law and policy campaigns that nonprofits and NGOs were involved in, such as Proposition 2 (2008), Assembly Bill No. 1437 (2010), and Proposition 12 (2018) in California, that banned intensive confinement of animals on factory farms. In particular, many NGOs teamed together to promote Proposition 12, which represents cooperation between animal protection groups, which is a major topic in my thesis. In the arena of evaluation research, I examine the goals of various NGOs(e.g., in Sections 3.5 and 3.7), and the ways in which their progress is measured (e.g., in Sections 2.4 and 3.7). For example, I examine perspectives on the effectiveness of NGOs in improving animal protection laws and related anti-factory farming laws, as well as convincing corporations and the public to improve their choices. Proposition 12 is especially notable for a few reasons. First, it bans the sale of eggs, pork and veal in California from animals raised in prohibited forms of confinement — even if the farms are outside California. This is significant, because much of the meat sold in California actually comes from farms outside California; for example, a lot of hogs (almost a third of hogs in the United States) are raised in Iowa (Schulz, Hayes, and Hayes, n.d.), and their meat can then be sold as pork in California and other states. Thus, Prop 2 did not initially affect legal welfare standards for farms outside California, even if their meat or eggs were sold in California, but Prop 12 means California businesses cannot sell animal products from animals raised with prohibited forms of confinement (even if these forms of confinement are legal in the jurisdictions in which the animals were raised), so it puts pressure on businesses outside California to raise their welfare standards (though, Assembly Bill 1437 banned the sale of eggs in California, if the chickens were treated in conditions contrary to Proposition 2 (Harvard Law School, 2023, pg. 9)). This is also significant because California is a large economy; if California were a country, it would be the fifth largest economy in the world (Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, 2024). Third, Prop 12 recently survived a constitutional challenge in the Supreme Court of the United States (*National Pork Producers Council et al. v. Ross, Secretary of the California Department of Food and Agriculture, et al.*, 2023). This is significant for several reasons; namely, Prop 12 survived despite the pushback from the economically powerful animal agricultural industries, and even some conservative Supreme Court justices ruled that Prop 12 was constitutional. Fourth, following Prop 12, some other states have passed cage-free sale laws, including some more traditionally conservative states, such as Arizona, Nevada, and Utah (Brindle, 2023).

3.3. Interviews

I interviewed employees of animal protection nonprofits, including employees for newer nonprofits and employees for more established groups. Interviewees include current and former employees for nonprofits that have been rated Top Animal Charities (i.e. The Humane League and Mercy for Animals), as well as nonprofits that focus on interconnectedness between animal exploitation and related forms of oppression (i.e. The Raven Corps and the Charity Doings Foundation). In preparing for these interviews, I made pre-prepared questions to ask; however, during the interviews, I also strove to give the interviewees time to talk about subjects that are most interesting to them, as this helps the conversation flow more naturally. Thus, I avoided having a list of questions that would have been too long to allow free flow of conversation. At the same time, I wanted to have questions prepared, in case the interviewees were unsure what direction to take the conversation and/or would like a bit more prompting or guidance. I also tailored my questions to ensure that they relate to my overall aim of my thesis. Thus, in my pre-prepared questions, I gave priority to questions that directly relate to my research questions and overall thesis aims. I planned to ask my "back-up questions" if time permitted; however, this did not typically happen during the interviews.

My research question, "How do animal rights/welfare activists, researchers, nonprofits and NGOs evaluate how (and how much) animal welfare campaigns reduce animal suffering in factory farming?" is largely addressed by my interview question, "How do you and your nonprofit implement evaluation methods to determine which tactics, campaigns, etc. are best?" and by discussion with my interviewees about types of campaigns, such as legal campaigns, corporate outreach, and public outreach. This research question and interview question focus mainly on actors' perspectives, such as the criteria that nonprofits and NGOs use to evaluate and define what is most effective. These questions also explore the tools these groups use to work toward their goals, and identify chains of goals and steps. Common goals include closing factory farms, changing society's mind about these issues, and convincing corporations to change their policies. For example, in addition to interviewing people who have worked for NGOs that do legal campaigns or campaigns that pressure food corporations to change their policies, I have collect examples on how successfully these measures have been implemented (see my discussion of Props 2 and 12 in Sections 3.2 and 4.1.4).

The research question, “How does a shift in language or focus, from animal welfare to animal rights, influence the strategies of movements against factory farming?” is addressed by the interview question, “What is your opinion on the animal welfare/rights dichotomy? How does your group deal with this?” This research question is also addressed by examining how nonprofits have conducted their activism in the past few years or decades.

The research question, “How do anti-factory farming NGOs effectively focus on interconnectedness between factory farming, speciesism, and related forms of oppression?” is addressed by the interview question, “What is your opinion on interaction between speciesism, ableism, racism, sexism, classism, anti-LGBTQ discrimination, ageism, etc.? How does your group deal with this?” To an extent, this research question is also addressed by the interview question, “How big a role do you think cultural contexts play in the movement? Have you or your group had experiences in which cultural context played a major role?”

During my interviews, priority questions are as follows:

i. How do you and your nonprofit implement evaluation methods to determine which tactics, campaigns, etc. are best?
ii. What experiences do you and your nonprofits have being evaluated by groups like Animal Charity Evaluators? What are your thoughts, opinions, etc. on the evaluation process?
iii. How do you and your nonprofits address the dichotomy between effective altruism (doing the most good) and intersectionality/inclusivity — or do you think this dichotomy exists? And how do you think we can best promote the greatest good in an intersectional and inclusive manner (for example, having everyone do work in ways that work best for them)?
iv. What is your opinion on the animal welfare/rights dichotomy? How does your group deal with this?
v. What is your opinion on interaction between speciesism, ableism, racism, sexism, classism, anti-LGBTQ discrimination, ageism, etc.? How does your group deal with this?
vi. How big a role do you think cultural contexts play in the movement? Have you or your group had experiences in which cultural context played a major role?
vii. Do you think it is more helpful or harmful to compare animal rights and human rights movements to each other? What positions does your group take on this?

Potential questions that are more personal in nature, that I kept as questions I could ask if time permitted (these questions may build a more friendly atmosphere), such as:

viii. What inspired you to work or volunteer in the movement?

ix. What inspired you to get involved with this group? How did you get involved?

x. What inspired you to work in the field of law/policy/academia/statistics [or insert other field here, depending upon the interviewee's main career/volunteer focus]?

xi. What is your opinion on animal charity evaluation methods?

xii. What do you like most about working or volunteering in the movement / for your group?

xiii. What is the biggest challenge in working in the movement / for your group?

xiv. How much "infighting" within the movement have you observed (e.g., animal protection groups fighting with each other over certain campaigns, tactics, etc.)–do you perceive it to be a major problem?

xv. If there were one thing the movement needs right now, what would it be?

3.4. Mission statements of nonprofits/NGO

Table 1 below lists nonprofits and brief summaries of their mission statements. These mission statements are explored in greater depth in this section and following sections.

Table 1

Nonprofit name	Mission statement summary	My methodology for this nonprofit
The Humane League (THL)	To end "abuse of animals raised for food" through laws, company policies, and consumer actions.	Mission statement analysis and interview
Mercy for Animals (MFA)	Reduce animal suffering and "exploitation" in the food system and create a fair and "sustainable" food system by ending "industrial animal agriculture."	Mission statement analysis and interview

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA)	To end speciesism and focus on ending animal abuse in four large areas.	Mission statement analysis
Humane Society of the United States (HSUS)	To help “all animals” in ending animal abuse in a wide variety of contexts.	Mission statement analysis
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)	To give “effective” strategies to prevent animal cruelty.	Mission statement analysis
The Raven Corps (TRC)	To help animals and take an “anti-oppression lens” in a youth-led manner.	Mission statement analysis and interview
Food Empowerment Project (FEP)	To improve the food system in terms of animal rights and food justice via consumer choices and food access.	Mission statement analysis
Charity Doings Foundation (CDF)	To create an “equitable and sustainable future for all.”	Mission statement analysis and interview
Vegan Outreach (VO)	To end “violence” against animals and reach people who are “motivated” to make change.	Mission statement analysis
Greener By Default (GBD)	To encourage consumers to choose plant-based options, and to encourage institutions to make plant-based the default.	Mission statement analysis

The Humane League’s mission statement

The Humane League’s mission statement is given under the heading, “Our Mission,” and states: “We exist to end the abuse of animals raised for food. But we can’t do it without you.” On its main page, The Humane League (THL) has a statement, “We exist to end the abuse of animals raised for food by influencing the policies of the world’s biggest companies, demanding legislation, and empowering others to take action and leave animals off their plates.”

Mercy for Animals’s mission statement

Mercy for Animals (MFA) states, under “Our Mission,” “Mercy For Animals’ mission is to construct a compassionate food system by reducing suffering and ending exploitation of animals for food.” MFA also states (on its website), under the heading “Inspiring Compassion. Ending Cruelty,” “Our mission is to end industrial animal agriculture by constructing a just and sustainable food system.”

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals’s mission statement

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) has three paragraphs under the heading, “Our Mission Statement.” The first paragraph is “People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) is the largest animal rights organization in the world, and PETA entities have more than 9 million members and supporters globally.” The second paragraph is “PETA opposes speciesism, a human-supremacist worldview, and focuses its attention on the four areas in which the largest numbers of animals suffer the most intensely for the longest periods of time: in laboratories, in the food industry, in the clothing trade, and in the entertainment business. We also work on a variety of other issues, including the cruel killing of rodents, birds, and other animals who are often considered ‘pests’ as well as cruelty to domesticated animals.” The third paragraph is “PETA works through public education, investigative newsgathering and reporting, research, animal rescue, legislation, special events, celebrity involvement, and protest campaigns.”

HSUS’s mission statement

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) has a page titled “Our mission.” The first subheading is “We fight the big fights to end suffering for all animals.” This (“all animals”) suggests a comprehensive end goal, and “end suffering” suggests a utilitarian leaning. The paragraph under this subheading is “Together with millions of supporters, the Humane Society of the United States takes on puppy mills, factory farms, the fur trade, trophy hunting, animal cosmetics testing and other cruel industries. Through our rescue, response and sanctuary work, as well as other hands-on animal care services, we help thousands of animals every year. We fight all forms of animal cruelty to achieve the vision behind our name: a humane society.” Below this paragraph is a hyperlink attached to the words, “Our values.” Below this is another subheading, “We work to:” with three bullet points. The first bullet point is “End the cruelest practices toward all animals,” the second bullet point is “Care for animals in crisis,” and the third bullet point is “Build a stronger animal protection movement.”

ASPCA's mission statement

The ASPCA's mission statement, found under the heading "Mission" on the ASPCA's website, is "to provide effective means for the prevention of cruelty to animals throughout the United States" (ASPCA, 2024). Notably, the ASPCA's website states that this mission statement was "by Henry Bergh in 1866." ASPCA's statement is considerably more brief than those of most other nonprofits discussed here.

The Raven Corps's mission statement

The Raven Corps (TRC) has a page on its website titled "Our Mission." This page's first paragraph states, "The Raven Corps is a youth-centered movement of activists devoted to building a just and sustainable future for ALL animals and our natural world. We take action through a consistent anti-oppression lens and trust that we can achieve liberation for ALL if we join forces and strike at the roots of oppression." The second paragraph of TRC's page states, "We're an expanding online community with roots in Portland, OR. We organize 'Operations' that best serve the collective need for justice, compassion, and sustainability. Through it all, we support each other—growing as leaders, organizers, and change-makers in welcoming, open-minded spaces. And we don't forget to have fun." The Raven Corps's page has another section below, after "Our Mission," titled "Values." This section has eight subsections (or "values"): "Youth-led," "Sustainable," "Anti-oppression," "Future Driven," "Compassionate," "Community-Minded," "Creative," and "Fun." The terms, "anti-oppression" and "community-minded" further suggest an emphasis on intersectionality and inclusivity. I am not including TRC's description of each "value," but under "Youth-led," their description begins, "We do ***not*** organize from the top down" (bold and italics from their page).

Food Empowerment Project's mission statement

The Food Empowerment Project (FEP) has a page on its website titled "Mission and Values." The first subheading here is "Mission"; the first paragraph under "Mission" states, "**Food Empowerment Project seeks to create a more just and sustainable world by recognizing the power of one's food choices.** We encourage healthy food choices that reflect a more compassionate society by spotlighting the abuse of animals on farms, the depletion of natural resources, unfair working conditions for produce workers, and the unavailability of healthy foods in low-income areas." (Boldfaced text is from the page itself.) The second paragraph states, "By making informed choices, we can prevent injustices against animals, people, and the environment. We also work to discourage

negligent corporations from pushing unhealthy foods into low-income areas and empower people to make healthier choices by growing their own fruits and vegetables. In all of our work, Food Empowerment Project seeks specifically to empower those with the fewest resources."

The third paragraph of FEP's "Mission and Values" states, "Food Empowerment Project is a vegan food justice organization and a registered nonprofit 501(c)(3) and was founded in 2007 by lauren Ornelas. Learn more about the organization's leadership team." (Hyperlinks are from the website itself.) Under the "Values" subheading, the first paragraph states, "In addition to the values inherent to our work, which include stances against animal exploitation, worker exploitation, slavery, and food apartheid, Food Empowerment Project acknowledges that many other social injustices exist. Our values and ethics include a strong stance against ableism, ageism, antisemitism, body shaming, casteism, classism, colonialism, homophobia, Islamophobia, racism, sexism, transphobia, and xenophobia. We are a vegan organization founded and operated by a woman of color and our staff and board also hold these values." The second paragraph under "Values" states, "These values also include supporting a number of causes, such as boycotts called by farm workers and other impacted community members, as well as supporting and amplifying the voices of communities of color, women affected by sexism or harassment and bullying in the animal movement, and those who speak out against violence to human or non-human animals. We also commit our solidarity to Indigenous peoples facing ongoing displacement and lend our voice to support long-overdue reparations for impacted tribal nations."

Greener By Default (GBD)

GBD has a page titled "About Us"; this page has the subheadings "Our Mission," "Our Vision," and "Our Strategy." Under "Our Mission," the statement is "**Greener by Default consults with institutions to apply behavioral science to food policy, nudging diners towards sustainable plant-based food while preserving freedom of choice.**" Under "Our Vision," the statement is "Greener by Default envisions a world in which plant-based foods are the default across all foodservice, shifting demand to create a sustainable food system that allows communities and ecosystems to thrive." Under "Our Strategy," the statement has two paragraphs. The first paragraph is "Plant-forward diets are critical for ensuring the wellbeing of people and the planet, but transforming the way we eat is a big lift. Choice architecture - organizing the decision-making environment to lower the barriers to making sustainable choices - is one of the most effective ways to create a widespread shift in diner behavior." The second paragraph is "Making plant-based foods the easiest and most appealing option for *all* diners, not just

vegetarians, drives down demand for industrial meat production and normalizes plant-based eating, while offering options to meet everyone's needs."

Charity Doings Foundation's mission statement

Charity Doings Foundation (CDF) has a page on its website titled "About Us"; this page includes headings "Our Vision" and "Our Mission." Under "Our Vision," the statement is "*Create a more equitable and sustainable future for all.*" (Italics are from the website.) Under "Our Mission," CDF's statement is "*Charity Doings Foundation is committed to providing aid and support to those in need, promoting social welfare through the provision of food, shelter, healthcare, and other basic necessities.*" While these statements are shorter than those of most other groups, this "About Us" page on CDF's website contains significantly more than what is under those two headings, as it discusses its projects in greater depth, includes pictures, and lists its "Team" (staff or volunteers).

Vegan Outreach's mission statement

I cannot find a "mission statement" that is titled as such on Vegan Outreach's website. However, Vegan Outreach has a page titled "About Vegan Outreach." The first paragraph under this heading is two sentences: "Vegan Outreach is a 501c3 nonprofit organization working to end violence towards animals. We seek a future when sentient animals are no longer exploited as commodities." The second paragraph is one sentence: "We focus on reaching the people who are motivated enough to make changes now—there are always many in our target audience who just need some guidance." The third paragraph is two sentences: "Founded in 1993, we've been most known for our massive outreach program of leafleting on college campuses. At its peak, we were handing booklets to over 1 million students at 1,000 schools per semester." The fourth paragraph is one sentence: "By steadily increasing the number of vegans, we're laying the groundwork to reach a tipping point in which sweeping public policy changes for animals will become realistic."

How I selected nonprofits for my research

I selected nonprofits based on the following: I chose PETA, HSUS, and ASPCA, because they are well-known nonprofits; this is important to me, because I wanted to examine nonprofits that have gained a large amount of public recognition, so that I could better understand what types of missions and tactics seem to "catch on" in terms of gaining public attention. This exercise, in comparing

mission statements and tactics from more well-known vs. less well-known nonprofits, gives valuable information, in terms of whether there are significant overall differences in mission statements and tactics between more and less well-known nonprofits. I chose THL and MFA, because they have been designated as “Top” or “Recommended” charities by Animal Charity Evaluators; this is important to my research, because it fits with my research questions that focus on effectiveness. I chose TRC, FEP, and CDF, because they each focus on interconnectedness between animal protection and other interconnected issues; this is important to my research, because it fits with research questions that focus on inclusivity and interconnectedness between issues. I chose GBD and Vegan Outreach, because they focus on promoting consumer choices but do so from different angles; this is important, because much of my thesis focuses on effectiveness, and a major component of this relates to how activists relate to consumers, because as discussed in Section 2.4, consumer choices can make significant differences. In addition, consumers come from various walks of life, and thus, activist-consumer relationships are important for inclusivity.

3.5. Interviewees

I interviewed Claire Howe, founder and director of The Raven Corps. Howe also used to work for Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers (HEART).

My second interview was with Altamush Saeed, who founded Charity Doings Foundation (CDF), a nonprofit and NGO that was founded in Pakistan and expanded to the United States. During the interview, Saeed mentioned that he is also an ambassador to the Benji Project for Animal Welfare and Rescue. However, the interview focuses on CDF’s work.

My third interview was with Miranda Harrington, who has worked for The Humane League and currently works for Mercy For Animals.

Chapter 4: Analysis & Findings

4.1. Analysis & Findings From Mission Statements and Tactics

This section discusses mission statements of selected nonprofits, and how these mission statements relate to my numbered research questions in Section 1.4. Subsection 4.1.1 addresses my first research question, 4.1.2 addresses my second research question, 4.1.3 addresses my third research question, and 4.1.4 addresses my fourth research question.

In Table 2 below, I classify nonprofits based on their mission statements. Data boxes below signify mission statements that focus on animal rights vs. welfare, and utilitarianism vs. inclusivity. I reference this table in 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3.

Table 2

	Animal rights:	Animal Welfare:
Utilitarianism	PETA, THL, VO	HSUS, ASPCA, GBD
Inclusivity	TRC, FEP	CDF, MFA

Note: In some cases, the mission statements are quite ambiguous; thus, while I classified each nonprofit in Table 2 above, my descriptions below often speak of ambiguities. In addition, while this is not included in the above table, here is my overall assessment of grassroots vs. corporate based on mission statements (to be discussed in 4.1.1): TRC, FEP, VO, and CDF have mission statements that seem more grassroots. THL and GBD have mission statements that seem more corporate. PETA, ASPCA, HSUS, and MFA have mission statements that seem more ambiguous in this regard.

4.1.1. Correlations between nonprofits that focus on utilitarianism vs. inclusivity, rights vs. welfare, and grassroots vs. corporate

Table 2 addresses this research question, because it demonstrates correlations or lack thereof. In certain cases, when I compare specific tactics and goals of certain nonprofits, I notice correlations

that are not captured by Table 2, because Table 2 above only reflects overall leanings based on mission statements. Here is my analysis:

Mission statements suggest that THL, PETA, HSUS, and ASPCA have more utilitarian focuses, but are mixed in terms of their animal rights vs. welfare leanings. The first paragraph of PETA's mission statement includes "People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) is the largest animal rights organization in the world, and PETA entities have more than 9 million members and supporters globally." This suggests that PETA values scale and power in numbers, which suggests utilitarianism. The second paragraph of PETA's mission statement demonstrates that PETA wishes to address fundamentally unjust ideologies ("speciesism" and "human supremacist" ideologies); this suggests an animal rights view, because ending human supremacy suggests a goal to consider non-human animals equal in status to humans (note: this does not automatically mean non-human animals have the same rights, but rather that they are not automatically inferior by virtue of being non-human). PETA's mission statement also suggests that it wishes to help the greatest numbers of animals, because it mentions four areas in which "in which the largest numbers of animals suffer the most intensely for the longest periods of time." Perhaps PETA's work in a variety of issues is part of their effort to keep a large support network, which relates to its reference that it has over 9 million "members and supporters." THL's statement, that it targets the world's "biggest companies," suggests that it focuses on utilitarianism. Its statement is more ambiguous regarding rights vs. welfare; "end the abuse" is rights-based if it means end use of animals, but welfare-based if "abuse" only means certain types of treatment of animals on farms.

HSUS's and ASPCA's mission statements suggest that HSUS and ASPCA focus on utilitarianism and animal welfare. In ASPCA's mission statement, the word "effective" suggests a utilitarian leaning, and the phrase "prevention of cruelty" suggests an animal welfare leaning (more detail about this in 4.1.2). HSUS's mission statement suggests that it values scale; specifically, the statement about "millions of supporters," similar to PETA's statement, suggests that HSUS prides itself on scalability, which suggests a utilitarian focus. HSUS's bullet points under "Our Values" suggest this as well. The first bullet point (about the "cruelest" practices) suggests a focus on the largest problems. This is somewhat similar to PETA's statement about areas in which the highest numbers of animals "suffer immensely." However, there are some differences, as PETA's statement speaks of "suffering," which suggests a more utilitarian standpoint, while HSUS's statement leaves the meaning of "cruel" somewhat more open-ended and up to interpretation. Both metrics are somewhat up to implementation, as suffering can be difficult to quantify, and there may be different types of suffering.

However, the metric of "suffering" is somewhat easier to define and clearly interpret. The information under HSUS's second bullet point may suggest a few different interpretations. "Crisis" may mean a humanitarian crisis, such as a war, pandemic, famine, or natural disaster. It may also mean a crisis at a more individual, family, or small community level, such as if an owner, family, household, sanctuary, or business is struggling financially and is thus unable to properly care for their animals. It may also mean something broader, such as any problem that affects animals. The third bullet point sounds more like a focus on effectiveness, as "stronger" suggests effectiveness. This, too, may suggest a utilitarian leaning.

However, TRC's and FEP's mission statements suggest a focus on inclusivity and animal rights (more about the "rights" aspect in 4.1.2). In TRC's mission statement, the phrases, "anti-oppression lens," "liberation for ALL" and "strike at the roots of oppression" suggest a greater emphasis on intersectionality, inclusivity, and interconnected issues. This is somewhat different from the mission statements of most of the other nonprofits discussed in this chapter, because most of the other nonprofits (except, perhaps, CDF) focus mainly, if not exclusively, on animal protection. Similarly, the phrases, "sustainable future" and "our natural world" suggest a focus on environmentalism, which also suggests a focus on interconnected issues to animal protection. This mission statement is consistent, however, in that it advocates for "ALL animals"; this is similar to the mission statement of HSUS, and is somewhat similar to that of PETA, as HSUS's statement contains the phrase "all animals," and PETA's statement suggests a broad focus. The second paragraph of TRC's page also suggests a greater emphasis on the inclusivity, as it states, "we support each other" and "we don't forget to have fun." This also suggests an emphasis on the activists' needs, which suggests greater emphasis on inclusivity. It can also relate to effectiveness, because it relates to self-care of activists to avoid burnout, and activists are likely more effective when they are not burnt out. This second paragraph is also somewhat more conversational than many of the other nonprofits' mission statements, as it includes contractions ("we're" and "don't"); this may suggest a somewhat less formal attitude, which may lend itself to grassroots rather than corporate. Indeed, TRC's statement, "We do ***not*** organize from the top down," suggests (or states explicitly) that TRC takes a grassroots approach.

Similar to TRC's statement, FEP's statement also suggests a focus on inclusivity, intersectionality and interconnectedness with related issues, as discussed in more detail in 4.1.3. FEP's second paragraph suggests a focus on interconnected issues as well; it also suggests a grassroots approach, in speaking of "choices" and "we can…"; it depends whether "we" refers to consumers, the general public, FEP itself, or anyone else, but I generally interpret it to refer to consumers or the

general public. The third paragraph also suggests a focus on interconnected issues, when it identifies as a "food justice organization." It also states explicitly that it promotes intersectionality, inclusivity, and recognition of interconnected issues, when it states that it stands against ableism, transphobia, and several other forms of oppression. The first paragraph suggests a focus on animal rights or welfare, in the phrase "abuse of animals on farms." However, FEP's third paragraph suggests a focus on animal rights rather than animal welfare, because it identifies as a "vegan … organization."

CDF's statement under "Our Vision" suggests a focus on inclusivity, particularly in its statement "equitable and sustainable future for all," because "equitable" and "for all" suggest inclusivity. It is somewhat similar to The Raven Corps and FEP in its use of the phrase "sustainable future," as it is similar to those groups' acknowledgment of sustainability or environmental issues, and is similar to The Raven Corps's value of being "Future Driven." CDF's statement under "Our Mission," uniquely from the other groups' statements, does not explicitly mention animal rights, animal welfare, or animal protection.

While only TRC and FEP have mission statements that strongly suggest grassroots approaches, some other nonprofits have mission statements that suggest a grassroots or corporate leaning. In CDF's mission statement, the phrase, "providing aid and support to those in need," suggests a more grassroots approach, because it suggests direct aid rather than policy change. VO's mission statement appears grassroots for a similar reason to CDF's, because VO focuses on "focus[es] on reaching … people," though CDF's and VO's tactical focus points ("providing aid" vs. leafleting) seem substantially different. PETA's mission statement suggests both grassroots and business-oriented approaches. On one hand, PETA's statement speaks of "public education" and "animal rescue," which both lend themselves to more grassroots approaches. On the other hand, it also speaks of research and legal change, which suggests a more business-oriented approach, because these tactics are more removed from the general public. HSUS's mission statement is fairly ambiguous in this regard, but it states that it "takes on" various industries, which may suggest a more business-oriented approach. ASPCA's mission statement is completely silent on this matter. THL's statement seems somewhat more business-oriented, because it states that it "influenc[es]" companies to improve their policies, and works on legislative campaigns. However, it also says "we can't do it without you," and states that it "empower[s]" consumers to make changes; these statements seem more grassroots. In terms of campaigns, THL appears to have a somewhat corporate leaning, because two out of the three main areas it lists (business policies and law) lean this way, while one (consumer empowerment) leans grassroots. MFA's statement is also ambiguous in this regard; when it states that it seeks to create a

"just and sustainable food system," it depends what tactics it uses to work toward this, as it may work toward it in a grassroots or business-oriented manner. In terms of tactics, GBD appears more corporate, because it works with businesses. However, its goals seem somewhat more grassroots, because it seeks to empower consumers to make choices.

Overall, it appears that smaller rights-based nonprofits (TRC and FEP) are more likely to focus on inclusivity and grassroots approaches, while larger nonprofits (ASPCA, HSUS, and PETA) are more likely to focus on utilitarianism.

4.1.2. Analysis of how animal welfare and animal rights language influence strategies and tactics

As demonstrated in Table 2, some mission statements suggest stronger focuses on animal rights, while others suggest stronger focuses on animal welfare. For example, overall, when mission statements speak of "cruelty" or "cruel" practices, this suggests a welfare leaning, because it is concerned with how animals are treated, rather than whether animals are used instrumentally at all. ASPCA's mission statement includes the phrase, "prevention of cruelty," which suggests a welfare focus. HSUS's mission statement speaks of "cruelest practices," which suggests a potentially welfare leaning. PETA's mission statement identifies PETA as the world's "largest animal rights organization," which suggests (or states explicitly) that it focuses on animal rights, because it identifies as an animal "rights" group. PETA's mission statement also speaks of "suffering," which could lend itself to either rights or welfare. Similarly, "cruel" or "cruelty" language could potentially lend itself to rights as well, because animal rights groups may argue that any practices that use animals instrumentally are indeed cruel practices. However, overall, "cruel" or "cruelty" language lends itself more to welfare, because it does not describe animal use as a fundamentally exploitative practice. Indeed, "animal cruelty" laws do not necessarily ban animal use, nor do such laws necessarily give animals rights (especially if "rights" are defined in terms of personhood).

In some cases, mission statements are more ambiguous in this regard. For example, MFA's statement includes "reducing suffering and ending exploitation." "Ending exploitation" sounds more like an animal rights philosophy, because it is more likely to lean toward discontinuation of animal use. "Reducing suffering" is more ambiguous, though "reducing" sounds less radical than "eliminating," and some may argue that this leans toward welfare. "End industrial animal agriculture" leans toward welfare; it would likely be rights-based if it said to end all animal agriculture, but it does not say this. Therefore, I classify MFA's statement as welfarist in my chart. In TRC's statement, "just and

sustainable future for ALL animals" does not explicitly lean toward rights or welfare; however, "just and sustainable future" may lean toward rights, because this language suggests more than simply ending cruel practices, and this type of terminology can be used when discussing futures for human societies. Therefore, I classify TRC's statement as rights-based in my chart. I classify GBD's statement as welfarist, because it aims to reduce animal product consumption, but not necessarily to eliminate it or to abolish animal agricultural industries.

From mission statements, it is often difficult to assess whether animal rights vs. animal welfare language makes a difference in terms of a particular nonprofit's tactics. For example, the third paragraph of PETA's mission statement demonstrates openness to a wide variety of tactics. The later clauses of HSUS's mission statement, under "Our Values," suggest an emphasis on diversity of issues and tactics as well, because it makes broad statements. "Cruelest practices" is sufficiently general that it allows for a focus on a variety of issues. However, because PETA and HSUS are both large nonprofits, it seems that larger nonprofits use a wider variety of tactics.

Overall, it seems that groups with welfarist mission statements are more likely to work with businesses, and are thus more corporate in their approaches.

4.1.3. Interconnectedness between various forms of oppression, and how mission statements put more or less focus on this

TRC's and FEP's mission statements suggest a focus on interconnectedness between issues. As discussed in Section 4.1.1, in TRC's mission statement, the phrases, "anti-oppression lens," "liberation for ALL" and "strike at the roots of oppression" suggest a greater emphasis on intersectionality, inclusivity, and interconnected issues. Similarly, as discussed in 4.1.1, the phrases, "sustainable future" and "our natural world," suggest a focus on environmentalism, which also suggests a focus on interconnected issues to animal protection. FEP's statement also suggests a focus on intersectionality and interconnectedness with related issues, particularly (as discussed in 4.1.1) in the phrases, "more just and sustainable world," "healthy food choices," "compassionate society," and "depletion of natural resources, unfair working conditions for produce workers, and the unavailability of healthy foods in low-income areas." It again suggests a focus on interconnected issues, when it identifies as a "food justice organization." It also states explicitly that it promotes intersectionality, inclusivity, and recognition of interconnected issues, when it states that it stands against ableism, transphobia, and several other forms of oppression. FEP exemplifies its points about interconnected issues, when it

discusses support for people of color, with women who have endured "bullying," with Indigenous peoples, and with those who speak out against "violence." As discussed in 4.1.1, CDF's statement under "Our Vision" suggests an openness toward interconnected issues. It is somewhat similar to TRC and FEP in its use of the phrase "sustainable future," as it is similar to those groups' acknowledgment of sustainability or environmental issues, and is similar to TRC's value of being "Future Driven."

Some mission statements are somewhat more vague on this matter. For example, as discussed in Section 4.1.1, HSUS's use of the word "crisis" is up to interpretation, and "crisis" may mean humanitarian crises, such as wars, pandemics, famines, or natural disasters. It may also refer to crisis at a more individual, family, or small community level, such as if an owner, family, household, sanctuary, or business is struggling financially and is thus unable to properly care for their animals. This can thus relate to interconnected issues, because these issues affect both humans and non-human animals. Similarly, MFA's goal to create a "just" and "sustainable" food system can relate to interconnected issues, because sustainability and animal protection can work together, but they can be separate issues.

4.1.4. Best ways to assess effectiveness and inclusivity of tactics

Overall, from mission statements, it is difficult to tell how nonprofits evaluate the effectiveness and inclusivity of their tactics. In some mission statements, goals include to create a "just" and "sustainable" food system (or similar); in this case, nonprofits may evaluate their success via results of their campaigns, in terms of whether these campaigns lead to measurably more justice and/or sustainability. As another example, VO can track data on its leafleting and "10 weeks to vegan" program, to see the choices of leaflet recipients and program participants.

In addition to mission statements themselves, various nonprofits' and NGOs' projects reflect their mission statements and goals; some of these projects have involved collaborations on campaigns that have had substantial impacts, and thus complement mission statements that focus on effectiveness. For example, several groups worked together to support the passage of Prop 2 and Prop 12; this collaboration represents mission statements of groups involved in various ways. For example, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) (Ballotpedia, 2008) and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) (ASPCA, 2008) supported Prop 2, and The Humane League (THL) and Mercy for Animals (MFA) (among other groups) were majorly involved in advocating for the passage of Prop 12; these nonprofits have mission statements that are in alignment with these campaigns (the mission statements are also discussed in detail in Section 3.4). HSUS's

mission statement includes a statement that HSUS "fight[s] the big fights." Given the millions (potentially billions) of animals affected by Prop 2, it makes sense that HSUS would consider it a "big fight." HSUS also states that it strives to help "all animals"; thus, it makes sense that it would be involved in campaigns that help large numbers of animals. ASPCA's mission statement is similarly broad, as it states that it seeks to prevent "cruelty" to "all animals." Thus, it makes sense that ASPCA would also target campaigns that help large numbers of animals. THL's mission statement includes a goal to end "abuse of animals raised for food," through various means, including laws. MFA's mission statement includes goals to reduce animal suffering and "exploitation"; this mission statement is somewhat more abstractly related to Prop 12, but it still relates to Prop 12, because Prop 12 seeks to ban certain types of abuse of animals raised for food.

4.2. Analysis of Information from Interviews

I divide the interviewees' commentary into the following sections, based on my research questions in Section 1.4: correlations between groups with different focus points, rights vs. welfare approaches, interconnectedness between movements, and evaluation of tactics and strategies.

4.2.1. Insight on correlations between groups that focus on rights vs. welfare, utilitarianism vs. inclusivity, and grassroots vs. corporate

From my interview with Claire Howe, TRC appears to be grassroots; this is similar to the impression TRC's mission statement gives. TRC strives to establish a "relationship" with each youth member, to know who they are as an individual. This ties in with their goal of community building, so that each member feels like they are part of something. Howe stated that it is beneficial when smaller organizations are formed, as people feel "cared for" with the supportive communities smaller organizations build. For example, TRC examines how they can assist if a youth member has "fallen off" or is less "engaged." The Raven Corps also focuses on "community building," rather than just on what they can do as an organization. Howe stated that it is a major problem when professional advocacy organizations focus solely on what their organizations can do, and that instead, it is important for people to know how they can get involved and make contributions to the movement. Notably, Howe stated that 97 percent of donations in the farmed animal protection and vegan

movements go to “professional advocacy” organizations; grassroots groups get less money. Howe also contended that we cannot simply “outsource” issues to nonprofits and expect them to solve problems, and that there must instead be power with the people, and we must address the “roots” of oppression.

Howe stated that TRC has challenging conversations within their community, and focuses on “learning” and “unlearning” simultaneously. Howe further stated that TRC emphasizes the importance of the “human experience” which can be “activist” at the same time. TRC also strives to foster a “safe” and “welcoming” space where people can ask challenging questions, explore diverse perspectives, “live” in that “discomfort,” and be willing to “challenge” ourselves. Howe added that we are all “individuals,” and can focus on what we can agree on. Howe would like to see people in the animal rights movement “come together” and develop an “overarching” strategy to the movement.

Howe cited a few other issues that relate back to inclusivity, which suggest an approach on inclusivity rather than utilitarianism. Howe mentioned that many things relate back to culture, that culture does not “homogenize,” and that people have differing “approaches.” Howe emphasized that those who experience “oppression” are in the best positions to “lead” movements related to these issues; as well as how culture influences how people think, “ethics,” and how people wish to “approach” “problem-solving.” As an example, Howe discussed that food culture in the United States is “whitewashed”; for example, dairy milk was only introduced in the 1600s, and such, it is “deeply offensive” to refer to dairy milk as “real milk,” and all of these interconnected issues highlight that the “standard American diet” is a “social justice” issue in addition to an animal rights issue.

Harrington stated that THL has always undergone evaluations by Animal Charity Evaluators, but that MFA has not always undergone this evaluation process. THL has been designated a Top Animal Charity since it applied for rankings; MFA has sometimes been ranked a Top Animal Charity, but not always. Harrington further stated that ACE’s evaluation process seems fairly “intensive,” and that ACE likely uses “quantitative” data in assessments. Harrington stated that Effective Altruism (EA) has a “troubling influence” on the animal protection movement. Harrington said that THL and MFA have both often received funding from the EA movement, so Harrington was unsure whether there were efforts to “openly criticize” the EA philosophy, but noted that there was “acknowledgment” that it had changed the animal protection movement, in some ways for the “better” and in some ways not. Harrington further contended that it is important to “invest” in things EA does not fund as much, as these things are less “quantifiable.” In terms of intersectionality and inclusivity, Harrington contended that the “idea” and “sentiment” is present, but there are no “cohesive” plans that lead to the “work” and “space” being more intersectional.

4.2.2. Insight on how animal welfare and animal rights language influence strategies and tactics

TRC's ultimate goal is oriented toward animal rights rather than animal welfare. Howe stated that the goal is "abolitionist" in nature, in that technological developments with food production cannot create an ethic to make society care more about non-human animals. In other words, Howe stated that it is important to take a "staunch collective liberation approach," and not just talk about how much space an egg-laying hen has. At the same time, Howe understands the importance of a welfarist approach in today's society, but worries that some people may stop at welfare goals. Thus, Howe emphasized that it is important to be "extremely thoughtful" of our goals and how we achieve them, and that animal welfare goals alone will not achieve the more fundamental goals of collective liberation and anti-oppression. For example, Howe acknowledged that it is difficult to motivate people to alter what they eat based on "ethics," but added that it is important to ask what the long-term "goal" is at a fundamental level.

Harrington stated that activists grapple with this "dichotomy" between "creating a movement" vs. incremental changes that lead to where animal liberationists want us to get to. Harrington further noted that the animal agriculture industry "pushed back" against welfare reforms, and that too much has been invested in incremental change, and it does not appear to lead to "cultural shift" or "mobilize" a lot at the grassroots level, even though Harrington noted that incremental and welfare reforms are important.

Saeed believes in animal rights and that there should not be any animal exploitation, as we would not want that for humans, but that welfare is the "first step" to rights, and we cannot simply "jump" to end exploitation. For example, many people do not meet poor farmers, who are overlooked by both Congress and animal welfare activists. Saeed also acknowledged that in some countries, there is a significant lack of access to vegan food. Saeed also noted that some cultures and religions have been "misinterpreted"; for example, Saeed stated that factory farming is prohibited in Islam. Saeed also discussed how animals are slaughtered for religious purposes, and how animal rights activists advocate for prohibitions on these practices. Saeed discussed how religious slaughter bans can be problematic, because they may be enacted without an understanding of the people impacted, but this may not be discussed in activist spheres. Animal rights and welfare people need to come together as rights people think "holier."

Harrington stated that she did not believe there was as much of an animal rights vs. welfare "divide" as there used to be or people think. Harrington noted that, in some cases, other organizations are more "abolitionist," but that groups she would not have thought would not work together are "showing up" for one another, and that this demonstrates that it is possible to "align" where possible rather than fighting these "battles." As an example, Harrington noted that activists from a certain group may say "you have the campaign, we'll bring the people"; in other words, one group may put together the campaign, and the other group may recruit activists to join the cause. Harrington also discussed another issue, which is that nonprofits receive money from donors, and certain donors expect specific types of work. For example, if donors want their money to be used for certain specific campaigns, it can be difficult for the nonprofit to find time and resources to work on other projects. Harrington noted that groups are already putting a lot of effort into animal welfare work, so it can be difficult to find time to work on other issues.

4.2.3. Insight on interconnectedness between various forms of oppression, and how nonprofits put more or less focus on this

Howe stated that HEART took a "multi-dimensional" (term created by Aph Ko) approach, and did not use the terms "holistic" or "intersectional." In this approach, HEART focused on environmental, social justice, and animal rights causes. Howe stated that it is problematic that activists feel that they must "compartmentalize" and "silo," which can lead to "infighting" rather than "collective liberation," and can detract from anti-oppression work. The Raven Corps focuses on anti-racism, including anti-racism within the vegan movement. Howe emphasized that it is important to consult "stakeholders" who "are being oppressed."

As stated in Section 4.2.1, TRC strives to establish a "relationship" with each youth member, to know who they are as an individual, and they have a goal of community building, so each member feels like they are part of something. Howe stated that it is beneficial when smaller organizations are formed, as people feel "cared for" with the supportive communities smaller organizations build. For example, TRC examines how they can assist if a youth member has "fallen off" or is less "engaged."

Saeed spoke more about strategies to work with the public, in terms of meeting the public's needs while also making progress for animal protection. For example, many people do not have enough food for their families, 70 percent of farming is one or two cattles for farmers' families and crops; however, the "vertical" system shortchanges them for "bigger" players, even in crop agriculture.

Saeed also noted that if there is not enough food for children, it is difficult or impossible to focus on animals. CDF's water projects are intended to benefit both humans and non-human animals, but CDF staff may not explicitly tell others that animals are important, because they would like people to learn it by "internalizing" it. For example, people may view animals as "livestock" and a "resource," but Saeed hopes they realize that animals have the same needs. One of CDF's large goals is to be respectful. For example, in 2022 there were floods, so CDF began with "humanitarian" relief by building houses, medical camps, kitchens, and similar resources, and Saeed decided to fundraise for these types of resources for non-human animals too. CDF hired veterinary assistance, who gave vaccines for more effective disease prevention, and rescued 8,000 animals. They had similar plans for 2023, got a grant from Humane Society International, and hoped for a larger veterinary assistance and food for 20,000 or more farmed animals. Saeed researches Pakistan's "disease system" for animals, in "non-disaster" time, to check whether the animals are vaccinated, because if the animals are vaccinated this reduces the chance of disease and suffering in disaster times. Other nonprofits in Pakistan manage local shelters; for example, there is one in Karachi, another in the north of Pakistan, and others around Lahore; this movement is fairly new but is gaining traction. Saeed states that the "tone" of one's question is important, because it recognises a "lack" and need to "bridge" it. Saeed recognises a tendency to put oneself first, and that this is anthropocentric, so Saeed envisions a world in which all communities are equal; this could be anthropocentric, but in theory it would not be. Saeed recognises a lack of inclusivity within the animal protection movement; for example, people of color are often not given "space" to be part of movement. Saeed disagrees with "counter-movements" to anthropocentrism, and believes this type of movement should end, but believes that these movements are "understandable," because science says that veganism is beneficial, and 80 billion animals and "immunocompromised" people are better off with veganism. Saeed believes this is only possible if people acknowledge both animal and human interests, and that the goal is not to bring non-human animals "up" or humans "down" but rather to create equality, and to have animal and human "communities" be equal. Saeed also emphasized that we are "connected," there is biodiversity loss in natural disasters, and environmental costs affect everyone. Saeed also mentioned that animal survival is necessary for human survival, and that this argument is "unfortunate" but can be used. Saeed believes that it is important for movements to work together as "equals," that no one is "superior" or "inferior," and gave examples of natural disaster "spaces," and disaster management systems that protect both humans and non-human animals. Saeed also spoke about religious perspectives on animal rights and welfare. Saeed stated that religion prescribes duties from humans to animals.

Saeed also discussed the importance of the "messenger," in addition to the importance of the message. For example, Saeed discussed how white people have sometimes believed they knew the experiences of people of color, and that this means we have the "wrong messenger," as only those who endure racism are qualified to talk about racism. As a specific example, Saeed stated that, when schools disallow plant-based milk, nonprofits say this is "dietary racism"; Saeed elaborated that these nonprofits have a good message, but that these nonprofits are the wrong "messengers." Saeed likened this to various phenomena; for example, we lack an effective "system" to understand disabled people, and thus may be faced with situations in which we have the "right message" but "wrong messenger." In addition, many practices have been in existence for hundreds of years but have only recently been understood to be racist in certain contexts.

Saeed stated that the "collective" problem is "suffering" so movements should "intersect," and should be "equitable," "diverse," "inclusive," and understanding of the needs of humans and non-human animals. Saeed considers himself fortunate, because he was already doing "humanitarian" work but was "rescued" in 2018 by a cat, when he "rescued" her from streets, as she taught him "about the world." Saeed began doing protest work, because there was dog killing and similar phenomena in Pakistan. Saeed went on to launch a water project, then COVID hit, bringing a new set of challenges. Recently, CDF has been working to establish a new school, at which all food served will be vegan all five days of the week. Saeed contended that many of these projects are welfare, but form a "gateway to rights"; Saeed further contended that it is important to view humans the same ways in which animal rights folks see non-human animals. The Benji Project for Animal Welfare and Rescue set up ambulances in six locations in Pakistan for veterinary care for animals on the streets. The Benji Project is also trying to do trap-neuter-vaccinate-release (TNVR) for cat and dog populations instead of shooting.

Harrington noted that it is necessary to be "intersectional," and not only for vegans. As an example, it is not the best to simply be "opportunistic" and say, e.g., "let's help, because farmworkers are having problems." Harrington further stated that she believes the movement must align with the "left," and that being "politically neutral" does not benefit the movement. THL and MFA are attempting to do "cross-movement" collaboration, and they recognize the need for it. Sometimes this is challenging, as it is difficult to create campaigns that "appeal" to a variety of issues. Harrington further noted that people at THL and MFA would likely say speciesism, racism, and similar issues are all interconnected, and that it is impossible to "liberate" one area without addressing other areas. Thus, the question is how to "address" this and work on two or more issues at once. As stated earlier, Harrington

contended that the “idea” and “sentiment” are present, but that there are not “cohesive” plans that lead to the “work” and “space” being more “intersectional.”

Another area is when activists from diverse cultural backgrounds and geographical areas collaborate. Harrington noted that THL had branches in the USA, the UK, Mexico, and Japan, but that they may just be in the USA and the UK now. MFA has branches in the US/Canada, Latin America, Brazil, and India; Harrington interacts with organizing “counterparts” in those regions; for example, the “organizing manager” with the Mexico team shared resources with her that are quite different from what Harrington would share with volunteers. Harrington said that Brazil has the most “successful” organizing in MFA. Harrington also contended that there are varying “cultures” in organizing; for example, in Mexico, protests are common, while in Japan, one could not simply use the same strategies that the US team would use, because it must be more “culturally relevant” in making animal welfare policy.

Harrington contended that it is possible to learn “lessons” from other movements, such as “critical mass,” instead of “recreating the wheel” and attempting things “randomly.” In terms of classifying groups as multiple types of social justice movements, Harrington has seen other orgs do it. She said she believed saying animal agriculture affects humans and non-human animals is truthful, but that if we compare the “plight” of non-human animals to the “plight” of humans, this can be problematic, because those statements often miss a lot of “context,” and are often quite “offensive” and will not benefit us in creating a “movement of movements.”

Howe further mentioned that many things relate back to culture, that culture does not “homogenize,” and that people have differing “approaches.” Howe re-emphasized that those who experience “oppression” are in the best positions to “lead” movements related to these issues; as well as how culture influences how people think, “ethics,” and how people wish to “approach” “problem-solving.” As an example, Howe discussed that food culture in the United States is “whitewashed”; for example, dairy milk was only introduced in the 1600s, and such, it is “deeply offensive” to refer to dairy milk as “real milk,” and all of these interconnected issues highlight that the “standard American diet” is a “social justice” issue in addition to an animal rights issue. However, Howe wishes people would not make analogies between Civil Rights or anti-slavery movements and animal rights, especially when White people make comparisons, because Howe sees little benefit to such comparisons, and reasons that if we “harm” communities by making these comparisons, this is simply not helping anyone, human or non-human.

4.2.4. Insight on best ways to assess effectiveness and inclusivity of tactics

Howe stated that The Raven Corps (TRC) "compartmentalizes" its goal; for example, goals include plant-based milk access, raising awareness of the "horrors" of the dairy industry, and supporting the bill for access to plant-based milk in schools. To measure their success, they may look at how the bill progresses. They also send tool kits to people, to help them take action. Howe's interview also gives insight on assessing inclusivity: one can "check in" with activists, in the manner in which Howe discusses.

Saeed stated that, in deciding which campaigns and tactics to focus on, economics is an important factor for Charity Doings Foundation (CDF), because financial resources are often limited in Pakistan. Thus, funding for projects is often sparse, so Saeed and other members examine how much certain campaigns would cost, and often choose projects that can be accomplished at a low cost. For example, CDF conducts water projects that include filtration plants, solar panels, etc. which may cost four to five lakhs, which is the approximate equivalent of 1,500 U.S. dollars. CDF also has project sites that focus on one aspect or another; for example, some of its solar facilities do not have filtration plants. CDF also sometimes utilizes implementation strategies that can be significantly less expensive; for example, if water is taken out manually, the cost is far lower, at around 150 U.S. dollars. These water plants supply water to both humans and non-human animals. In addition, CDF uses project "samples" to elicit donations from "big" donors.

In Pakistan, there is no "evaluating" organization for nonprofits (e.g., no equivalent of 80,000 Hours); in particular, there is no evaluating organization for animal welfare groups (e.g., no equivalent of Animal Charity Evaluators), as Pakistan has only four or five animal welfare nonprofits. Saeed said that CDF's mission is to "make the world a better place for all life," including humans, nonhuman animals, and the environment. Saeed further stated that everyone has rights, including trees. Saeed stated that in communities in Pakistan, economics are a significant factor in people's lifestyles; for example, if someone is the son of a farmer, or a member of a Christian community, this can significantly influence that person's trajectory. Saeed stated that animal welfare cases are rare, but that there are a few cases. In addition, most animal welfare nonprofits in Pakistan focus on welfare of "companion" animals, so Saeed wishes to focus on the welfare of farmed animals. For example, as restaurants closed for COVID, and there were many stray dogs throughout Pakistan, "Empathy for the Voiceless" was founded, and promoted compassion for companion animals. Saeed stated that this was a major step in Pakistan, and that this was largely because many people in Pakistan hold religious

beliefs that dog saliva is “unclean,” and that “angels” will not enter a house if dogs are in that house, so people shoot dogs. However, people often do not say that it is necessary to keep inside houses, but rather that it is simply important to give them a reasonable quality of life. If it is impossible to help, Saeed advocates against shooting dogs or giving them poisoned meat; in fact, Saeed stated that it is actually against religion to kill in that manner. They feed 100 dogs and 50 to 100 cats each week as well. CDF has at least 1,000 water projects across Pakistan, making it the only animal protection nonprofit to have that many water projects.

Saeed also stated that he will not wait for someone to “give him expertise” on certain subjects, because in certain cases, there is a lack of access to “experts” on relevant subjects. For example, in animal rescues, particularly in Pakistan, there is sometimes a lack of access to animal rescue experts, but there is nonetheless a crisis, and so the rescuers must do the best they can with their knowledge. Thus, Saeed seeks to work with people who understand the fundamental concepts of animal rights and human rights, so they can collaborate on certain ideas.

Harrington stated that at THL, THL Labs was part of THL, but that they have since been “reintegrated” into “Rethink Priorities”; Harrington contended that at THL, THL Labs is supposed to be “separate” from the “organization,” so it does not really exist to “inform” THL’s “tactics,” but rather to contribute to research. Now, at MFA, due to a recent “restructure,” the research team is committed to informing MFA’s “tactics,” “strategies,” “campaigns,” etc. Harrington contended that this is useful, as scientists can examine trends in other social movements; for example, there is an “expert” on communication in social issues, as the animal protection movement often relies on “limited” data, particularly in the welfare arena, in terms of figuring out what tactics do or do not increase the probability that companies will adopt welfare policies. Thus, it is useful to gather information from other movements that have been around for a longer time, and have received more public support and experienced more “wins” and “losses” than the animal protection movement has experienced.

Harrington said she believes there is certainly a “dichotomy,” in terms of what an “organizer” and “organizing team” are evaluating, because it is impossible to “quantify” everything, and it is important to shift the “political culture” and “space” in which we “exist” via “people” and “relationships.” Harrington contended that it is possible to “quantify” it by examining past movements, but that it is impossible to determine, for example, how many “active” volunteers would create a movement.

My interview with Miranda Harrington gives rise to questions of collaboration between activists and researchers, because Harrington noted the connectedness and separation between THL

and THL Labs at various points in time. Indeed, the term, “scholactivism” has been coined, to combine scholarship and activism, to encapsulate the “persona” of the “scholar” and the “activist,” and perhaps ask whether there are any boundaries to where the scholar can go that do not exist for the activist, or any boundaries to where the activist can go that do not exist for the scholar; boundaries may be made by “opponents” of animal law or protection, as a way to disregard scientific opinion (Kivinen, 2023). It can even be argued that everything is “political” (Kivinen).

4.3. How Interviews and Mission Statements Complement Each Other and Enhance Perspectives in the Movement

The interviews give more nuanced perspectives on my interpretations of nonprofits’ mission statements. My interview with Claire Howe reaffirms many points from TRC’s mission statement. Specifically, TRC’s mission statement strongly suggests a grassroots approach, and Howe specifically spoke of a lack of funding to grassroots groups. Similarly, Howe spoke of problems with “professional” organizations, which suggests a preference for grassroots movements. Howe also spoke of a need for “community building”; TRC’s mission statement specifically states that it is “Community-Driven.” Howe’s points, on community-building, speak to an issue of avoiding burnout among activists. Joy (2018) also states that if activists think “not again, do I now need to advocate again?” it may be better to give themselves breaks, to avoid burnout and increase sustainability as advocates. This is important, as sustainability of the movement is important. Particularly in the area of nonprofits and NGOs, burnout is a phenomenon that has been increasingly discussed within the animal protection movement in recent years. My interview with Altamush Saeed also reaffirms some points from CDF’s mission statement. CDF’s mission statement includes a commitment to provide “aid and support to those in need.” Saeed discussed many of CDF’s projects that related to that, such as disaster relief and water projects.

Howe’s points touch on many larger points in the animal rights and welfare movements, especially in the nonprofit and NGO sectors. For example, some see a divide between “professional” and “grassroots” activism. Some self-identified “grassroots” activists will “reluctantly” be paid; grassroots activists are sometimes characterized by a desire to see a different “world,” and to use moral appeal, while professional activists are sometimes characterized by a more welfarist approach, but this parallel is not always true (Hamer, 2023). The “grassroots” approach has many advantages; for

example, they ask, “What motivates activists?” (Coman-Hidey, 2023). This is important, and perhaps more holistic than effective altruism’s focus on big donors. Coman-Hidey also states that grassroots activists make large individual sacrifices, and value “citizenship” over “consumerism.” Coman-Hidey further argues that the grassroots provides “worthy critiques,” as counterpoints to the more “moderate groups,” and that this is an important part of any social movement. The professional movement has strengths as well. For example, it can develop “power” in large organizations; it can influence institutions; it can assess effectiveness, and may need to do this in order to secure donations; and can offer its own “worthy critique” (Hamer, 2023). However, Hamer acknowledges that if something is measurable, that does not mean it is best.

Another relevant point to Howe’s interview is that professionalization may lead groups to be “beholden” to donors; Harrington discussed this in her interview as well. Hamer considers this, too, to be a tactic, because in some cases, large professional “infrastructure” is necessary to address certain problems, such as large-scale issues (e.g. federal political threats).

A fundamental aspect of Howe’s analysis comes in the idea of how transformations occur, and whether they can occur in a manner focused on business, capitalism, etc., as true inclusivity requires fair and equitable opportunities to participate and have everyone’s interest taken into account in a fair and equitable manner. Indeed, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (2013) defines “environmental justice” to mean “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.” Howe's work specifically highlights many issues of justice; for example, in many schools, plant-based milk is only available if a student has a doctor's note that states that this student has a relevant disability, and Howe and TRC have importantly noted the dietary racism inherent in this.

Various points can be taken from Saeed’s interview as well. The importance of the “messenger” is key in many cases, especially when members of human rights movements are resistant to expanding their inclusivity to nonhuman animals. This resistance may be due to the messenger, because in some cases, messengers may not be sufficiently well-versed in said human rights causes, or how veganism and other changes would apply in the contexts of underserved communities.

Some groups in my analysis identify as “vegan” groups, which speaks to the definition of “Veganism.” Some define veganism as a philosophy, while some define it as a lifestyle. “Afro-Veganism” is said to relate to the experience of being a person of African descent living and interacting in the world as a vegan.” Indeed, it is argued that Black history is actually plant-based

(Calloway, 2023). This is often lost in stereotypes about "soul food." Even the medical community often lacks awareness. Indeed, Black Americans have shorter life expectancies. Colonialism "often leaves its traits behind in a culture that it dominated"; veganism then must be "re-taught" (Calloway). Fossils from millions of years ago suggest that humans' diets were largely plant-based (NSF, 2013). There is also little knowledge of "culturally relevant and appropriate approaches" for Asian countries (Nishibu, 2023). It is also argued that the movement is already "diverse," but we need to be "more inclusive and equitable to represent marginalized voices" (Nishibu). Roadblocks to advocacy can include political, societal, technological, language, amongst others (Nishibu).

Another area is my data-gathering from Table 2. As noted in Section 4.1, my classifications in Table 2 are based on nonprofits' mission statements. It is clear that my classifications in Table 2 do not always match up perfectly. For example, I classified the Charity Doings Foundation as focused on animal "welfare," but Saeed's view takes an animal rights ideal, and is thus not in line with "traditional welfarists" who, as described in Section 2.2.2, believe animal use is permissible as long as the animals are not subjected to any cruel conditions.

All of my interviews discuss interconnectedness between animal protection movements and other social justice movements. This is also important in terms of legally prosecuting animal cruelty cases. For example, many animal protection groups strive to strengthen anti-cruelty laws, which may include stronger penalties for animal cruelty violations. In the context of farms, this often includes prosecuting workers on farms; for example, if a worker kicks an animal to move the animal, this is unlikely to be considered a "normal" practice, and can thus be prosecuted (Lowrey, 2024). However, this raises ethical issues, because as discussed in Section 1.2, workers themselves are subjected to dangerous conditions. Thus, it can be more intersectional and inclusive to charge the corporations, because the corporations create policies that encourage animal cruelty, and thus have more power over the situation. In addition, it can be more effective, because if workers are convicted, the corporations can simply fire these workers and hire new workers without changing their corporate policies, and the cycle is then repeated. The nonprofit, Legal Impact for Chickens, seeks to sue corporations for animal cruelty on farms. Even if there has been no past prosecution for a particular act of cruelty, this does not necessarily mean it is impossible to secure a conviction for that particular act. However, judges are often reluctant to set precedents (Gold, 2024). Thus, it can be useful to establish that a certain practice is not customary (Evans, 2024).

Chapter 5: Conclusions

As demonstrated in the chart at the start of Section 4.1, in terms of overall leanings, there does not seem to be a strong correlation between this and whether said nonprofits' mission statements are more likely to focus on utilitarianism or inclusivity. From this chart, among nonprofits that focus on utilitarianism, there are an equal number of nonprofits that focus on rights vs. welfare; the same is true of nonprofits that focus on inclusivity.

However, when looking at specific campaigns and goals, it seems that an animal rights leaning correlates with a focus on inclusivity and grassroots, while an animal welfare leaning correlates with a focus on utilitarianism or effectiveness. For example, FEP has an animal rights goal (identifying as a "vegan" group), and its campaigns focus on empowering communities, which suggests a focus on inclusivity. TRC, similarly, has a grassroots focus, and its mission statement seems to lean in the direction of "rights."

A focus on animal rights also seems to correlate with a grassroots focus, and a focus on animal welfare seems to correlate with a corporate focus. For example, FEP's community empowerment goals suggest a grassroots focus. As another example, TRC's mission statement explicitly goes against top-down structures, and TRC's statement leans more toward rights. Finally, VO's statement focuses on consumers.

There are certain limitations in my research. It is unlikely that the findings can perfectly inform future activism, as context (geographical, cultural, etc.) is important. My interviews were with people who are already involved in NGO activism. While these perspectives are extremely valuable, it would also be valuable to gain perspectives from people who are not involved in this type of work. In addition, in future research, I would ideally make my own evaluation of the most effective tactics in the movement. This provides a basis for potential future research, as discussed in Chapter 6.

Chapter 6: Potential for Further Research

6.1. Exploring Tactics in Diverse Social and Cultural Contexts

Some tactics may be more or less effective in different cultural contexts. For example, perhaps in cultures with individualistic vs. collectivist ideals, individual vs. corporate vs. legal outreach would have varying levels of effectiveness. I can look at both shorter and longer time periods, as the most effective activism today compared to ten years ago compared to ten years in the future may be different. For example, perceptions of the word “vegan” may alter the likelihood that consumers will choose vegan options, and this perception may quickly evolve as society evolves. This complements research in my literature review, which found that a request to go vegan to be more effective than either a request to reduce meat consumption or an absence of a specific request. Thus, in future projects, I can look more in-depth at the terminology nonprofits use in their outreach, and ask for data on results of outreach.

Another area worthy of exploration is how cultural relationships with animals and nature can inform the movement. In the book, *Nature unbound: conservation, capitalism and the future of protected areas*, Dan Brockington, Rosaleen Duffy, and Jim Igoe (2008) discuss the process of designating protected areas, and acknowledge power dynamics at play in this designation process itself, and uneven impacts of conservation in various walks of society. The authors argue that “conservation and capitalism are allying mutually to reshape the world” (p. 4). This book serves as a useful source in my thesis, because it relates well to the dichotomies discussed in Section 2.4.5 with regard to Anderson's article. For example, the idea of designated areas is arguably based on the dichotomy between nature and society. In many indigenous cultures, however, the concepts of nature and society are not this dichotomous, and rather, are thought to exist in harmony with one another.

6.2. How Effective Altruism Can Be More Inclusive

In Chapter 2, I explore various perspectives that can inform nonprofit and NGO activism. In this section, I discuss how these perspectives can help make nonprofit and NGO activism more effective and more inclusive.

Animal Charity Evaluators has a clear goal to do the most good possible in terms of helping animals. Thus, it is reassuring to know that "effectiveness" in the judgment of Animal Charity Evaluators is defined in terms of helping animals. In addition, not everyone in the animal protection movement agrees with Animal Charity Evaluators's approach and evaluation methods. Animal Charity Evaluators's approach is generally utilitarian, and is largely related to the "effective altruism" philosophy/movement. The effective altruism philosophy/movement is often critiqued for lack of inclusivity and lack of intersectionality. Newer nonprofits may be especially disadvantaged by Animal Charity Evaluators's approach, because Animal Charity Evaluators relies on data, and newer nonprofits may not have had a chance to establish themselves for a long enough time to accumulate enough data to be considered Top Animal Charities. Animal Charity Evaluators does give honorable mentions to organizations that they do not designate Top Animal Charities. For example, their website includes Standout Charities. Thus, it is possible to gain recognition, even if not as a Top Animal Charity. However, it can still be difficult to gain recognition before having a chance to "prove" oneself. This is especially true, because in the early stages of a nonprofit, the nonprofit will likely have to expend more resources on administrative matters. Thus, newer nonprofits that have a lot of potential may miss out on Animal Charity Evaluators's recognitions.

6.3. Potential of Legal Campaigns

As discussed in Section 2.4.1, the documentary, "The Smell of Money," follows the impacts of an agricultural facility on the surrounding community, and a lawsuit that followed. As discussed in 2.4.1, the success of the lawsuit is debatable, because while the agricultural corporation had to pay, it did not have to stop polluting. This is an issue worth exploring in greater depth, because there are potential nuances in the legal issues involved. For example, as discussed, a community member contracted pancreatic cancer, and the risk of pancreatic cancer is increased by exposure to certain pollutants (Bogumil et. al., 2021). Thus, in this case, there is a chance that this community member contracted pancreatic cancer as a result of exposure to pollution from the agricultural facility. If causation cannot be confirmed, the "loss of chance" doctrine from tort law may potentially give rise to

successful lawsuits for this type of case, as pancreatic cancer indeed became more likely after this community member was exposed to this pollution. The standard of proof for most tort cases in the United States is a preponderance of the evidence (i.e., the greater weight of the evidence, meaning it is "more likely than not" that each element for a successful lawsuit is satisfied) (Dobbs et. al., 2017). In various cases, courts have ruled that statistics are not sufficient to satisfy the preponderance of the evidence standard, because statistics are not based on the individual situation at hand (Dobbs et. al., 2017). Thus, in this case, if the plaintiff submits a statistic for an increased risk of pancreatic cancer after exposure to air pollution, this may not be sufficient to satisfy this standard of proof. However, a loss of chance doctrine may bridge that gap. This basically means that if the chance of harm increased as a result of the defendant's conduct, the plaintiff may bring a successful lawsuit (Dobbs et. al., 2017). The amount of money awarded may be proportional to the amount of loss of chance. Similar legal frameworks exist to potentially sue corporations for creating dangerous work environments; indeed, some U.S. states have laws that establish employer duties to create safe work environments for employers, and this duty is breached upon creation of dangerous conditions, even if actual harm does not result; however, there are still challenges, as it can be more difficult to do "impact" litigation, and courts have stated that companies are not required to provide the safest conditions as long as they create e.g. "reasonably" safe environments (Muraskin, 2024). This can inform potential effective nonprofit and NGO legal activism.

As discussed in Subsection 2.4.2, "humane washing" can be a problem, and creates potential legal issues. This can be effective; however, companies will rarely respond to such lawsuits by committing to treat their animals better. In addition, it can be challenging to argue that plaintiffs have standing. It has even been argued that, even if humane washing lies appear on the front of a food package, this is permissible if there is certain truthful information (e.g. disclaimers) on the back of the package or via a QR code. However, there is some success; for example, after the case, *Bohr v. Tillamook* (Multnomah County Circuit Court, 2019), the company removed humane-related advertising, and in *Claybaugh v. Trader Joes's Co.* (Super. Ct. Alameda, 2018), the company took away pictures of chickens from their "cage-free" labels. In addition, the label of "plant-based" has been used for products that are not actually vegan, because companies have gotten the impression that consumers respond more positively to the term "plant-based" than to the term "vegan," but "plant-based" can be used to mean something other than "vegan" (Howell, 2024). This suggests that it may be useful for activists to move away from the term "vegan." However, as discussed in Section 2.4.4, Linkersdörfer and Peacock's study found it to be more effective to ask consumers to go vegan.

“The Smell of Money” serves as another reminder; as Misri states, it is important to come into communities and hear what affects them, rather than leading with animal issues. On the other hand, Mercy for Animals put out an ask if farmers wanted to help end industrial animal agriculture; 200 farmers responded, and no farmers have said “this is awesome” without their contractors standing nearby; this makes sense, as this system takes economic power, etc. away from them as well (Garcés, 2023).

Now, the EATS Act seeks to invalidate Prop 12, protection of animals used for research, laws on puppy mills, and laws that regulate public health including hazardous chemicals; in total, it could invalidate over 1,000 state and local laws. If it passes, the EATS Act would “force a lowest-common-denominator approach” (Brindle, 2023). The bill states, . The EATS Act is considered a stronger threat than the King Amendment (defeated in 2014 and 2018), as Rep. Steve King was considered “polarizing,” while Ashley Hinson and Roger Marshall are considered more “mainstream” (Brindle). It affects cats and dogs

In this article, Wise (2001) highlights the conservative nature of law. Here, it may be useful to compare common law vs. civil law countries, because both common law and civil law are conservative by nature, as they are based on some sort of law or precedent. On the one hand, common law may be more flexible, because it may allow judges to adapt their rulings to present-day society; on the other hand, binding precedent is, by nature, conservative. Civil law may be less flexible in terms of autonomy given to judges to interpret it, yet more flexible in that judges are not bound by past decisions. The NhRP relies on common law, in terms of creating legal precedent for certain rights, etc.; it may be interesting to examine how well similar tactics would work in jurisdictions without common law (e.g., perhaps civil law jurisdictions).

On the flip side, there is momentum to promote subsidies on plant-based products; in some cases, this may complement meat taxes, as New Zealand, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden are considering taxes of this type (Bray, 2024). This fits with the model of “just transitions,” and can help prevent the notion of shifting consumption toward foods that actually cause more animal suffering (Bray, 2024) or the notion of making meat a “luxury good” for the “privileged” (Sebo, 2024).

Consumer-oriented tactics have potential in the legal arena as well. For example, in some jurisdictions, there are laws and/or court rulings that protect veganism as a human right, on the basis of freedom of religion or protection of sincerely held beliefs (see, e.g., McKeown and Dunn, 2021). This relates to consumer protection law, which can also include labels on food products. In addition, as discussed in Section 2.4.3, leafleting can be combined with other tactics.

One common problem, in the realm of law and policy, is access to courts and access to the legal processes. For example, for NGOs, access to the European Court of Justice is very limited (Christiaenssen, 2023). In many cases, one must pay fees to have access to the legal process. This is commonly in the form of fees charged by lawyers, and court fees. For example, one plaintiff contracted pancreatic cancer, which is linked to air pollution.

With the advent in animal welfare policies, a “global ban” on factory farming has been discussed (Sebo, 2024). This can relate to legal campaigns that may benefit many animals. As discussed earlier, the Nonhuman Rights Project has conducted campaigns that advocate for legal rights of nonhuman animals. On the one hand, as discussed earlier, this gives a higher level of protection than welfare campaigns typically do, because welfare campaigns allow animals to still be used on factory farms, etc, and do not give animals legal rights as such. On the other hand, as discussed earlier, this often focuses on one animal at a time, which may mean they cannot help as many animals at once as animal welfare groups can. I may interview professors, students, scholars, and/or nonprofit founders, and ask if they believe the "rights" framework can be effective on a larger scale (e.g., via class action lawsuits, as one group, Legal Impact for Chickens, may take this route), as I actually wrote a paper that explored this issue in another course. If this leads to a worldwide ban on a harmful practice as common as factory farming, this would likely be worthwhile. If more incrementalist campaigns lead to a similar result, this is also noteworthy; however, if rights-based and incrementalist campaigns are equally effective, then rights-based campaigns are likely more worthwhile, because they advocate for a higher standard.

6.4. Examining Research on Effectiveness of Messaging Tactics

As discussed in Section 2.4.4, various studies have been done on the relative effectiveness of animal rights vs. animal welfare vs. environmental messaging in activist tactics. One of the main studies discussed in Section 2.4.4 is Linkersdörfer and Peacock’s study on consumption habits of consumers after being exposed to various types of messaging. In use of studies such as this one, it is useful to take an analytical and somewhat critical perspective on the methodologies used in these studies. For example, in this study, it may be useful to examine the decision to estimate "more," "a little less," and "a lot less" to mean 20 percent more, 15 percent less, and 35 percent less, respectively. It may also be useful to examine the decision to estimate "stop eating entirely" as 100 percent less,

because while "stop eating" does mean 100 percent less if taken literally, it is possible (perhaps likely) that some consumers would say they "stopped" when they actually mean they reduced a significant amount. Indeed, there are studies (e.g., Vinnari et. al., 2009). that suggest that some self-identified "vegans" and "vegetarians" may not be completely vegan or vegetarian; such research will be explored later in this chapter. In addition, the effectiveness of talking about environmental versus animal cruelty aspects may depend on the survey participant's background, as some may be more swayed by one or the other depending on their background. It is also possible, for example, that people are more likely to go vegan for animal cruelty reasons, but more likely to become "flexitarian" for environmental reasons. Indeed, the researchers here noted differences between different types of animal products, in terms of the stronger motivating factors to reduce or stop eating said product. Flexitarianism has been shown to be more common in Europe (Sentient Media, 2023). Even in the United States, however, 60 percent of households have plant-based products, and 80 percent of people who try plant-based products will buy them again, while there has been a 45 percent growth in the plant-based food industry (Dreskin, 2023).

In addition to animal rights vs. environmental vs. animal welfare approaches, it may be useful to compare this to economic messaging. For example, a school district saved 10,000 US dollars by forgoing eggs and dairy in baked goods (Cantrell, 2024).

6.5. Integrating Anti-Ableist and Other Social Justice Inclusivity Into Mission Statements and Goals

As stated in Subsection 2.4.5, Melanie Joy refers to the concept of “psychopaths.” However, as I noted in that subsection, this concept is problematic. Indeed, as Kai Cheng Thom (2016) states in the article, "Sociopaths, Borderlines, and Psychotics: 3 Mental Illnesses We Must Stop Hating On," discourse surrounding “psychopathy” tends to portray mentally ill folks as “wrong” and “untreatable.” It treats mental health disorders as “disgusting,” “freaky,” and “monstrous,” and avoids “empathizing” with folks with these conditions. Such discourse stigmatizes people with legitimate struggles, and as Thom further notes, this discourse is prevalent even in social circles in which people consider themselves “progressive” on the topic of mental health. Thom also notes that such discourse is sometimes condoned by mental health professionals and psychology textbooks, and can be used as a way to express dislike for a person. Thus, it is problematic to label a person a “psychopath,” “sociopath,” “narcissist,” etc. This does not mean that, e.g., narcissistic personality disorder and

similar conditions cannot be legitimate diagnoses, but it is problematic to arbitrarily refer to someone this way in order to express disgust with them. It is also problematic to assume someone is "unreachable" because of such a condition; this is another problem with this language in animal rights movements and related movements, especially the way in which Joy uses this term to denote people who may be unreachable. This relates to various questions of which types of sources are best to use (nonprofit literature, journal articles, etc.), because on the one hand mental health professionals, educational institutions, and psychology textbooks (similar to peer-reviewed journals) are likely "vetted" more than other individuals and sources are in terms of their trustworthiness on the subject of mental health; while on the other hand, mental health professionals, educational institutions, psychology textbooks, and diagnostic manuals are still parts of systems of oppression. Indeed, educational institutions, psychology textbooks, and diagnostic manuals are not necessarily written by people with these types of neurological conditions.

In addition, the concept of "empathy" can be arbitrary, subjective, and ableist. First, as Devon Price (2020) discusses in an article on this subject, a lack of capacity for empathy does not mean that one will perpetuate harm, and a lack of empathy does not mean that one has no moral compass. One may lack empathy for someone who is hurting in a particular way, but this lack of empathy does not mean one will hurt someone in that way, because one can still intellectually know it is wrong, even if one does not have said "empathy." Second, while neurodivergent people (e.g., autistic people) are stereotyped to lack empathy, this is quite often not true; in fact, in some cases, some autistic people and other neurodivergent people may experience "hyper-empathy," and experience more empathy than most people would (Price, 2020). Third, on the flip side of this, Price also argues that empathy has been used in harmful ways. This is another area in which the animal protection movement could perhaps be more inclusive.

Notably, both Thom's and Price's articles refer to "empathy," but from different angles. Thom's article states that various ableist discourses avoid "empathizing" with people with certain mental health conditions, while Price's article advocates against putting undue emphasis on empathy. These points complement each other in the context of vegan and animal protection advocacy. As stated earlier, Joy speaks against advocacy to "psychopaths," and as Thom states, this type of discourse is used to avoid "empathizing" with people with certain mental health conditions. Joy's use of the term "psychopath" is further evidence of this, because Joy speaks as if activists should not engage in advocacy with people whom Joy considers to be "psychopaths." It seems that Joy would recommend that activists distance themselves from people who Joy would consider to be "psychopaths." However,

if one were to truly try to understand these people, one may find that they are actually not bad people at their core. This raises two of Price's points. It relates to Price's precaution against over-emphasizing empathy, because if activists place too much importance on empathy, they may miss out on opportunities to reach people who may not (or may not appear to) empathize in the same ways these activists do. It also raises Price's point that some people are stereotyped to lack empathy, even if they actually experience as much or more empathy than others.

This relates to nonprofit and NGO activism, for two reasons. First, it is useful to have tactics that work with a variety of audiences, and this includes people who are more inclined toward logic and those who are more inclined toward emotion. Second, it is important for groups to be inclusive in engaging with neurodiverse audiences. Mission statements could also benefit from some provisions about this, in terms of being inclusive with how the nonprofits and NGOs engage inclusively. TRC already has strong suggestions of being grassroots- and community-oriented, which may give it some headway in talking about inclusivity in this way. HSUS and ASPCA, with broad and comprehensive mission statements, have strong bases to work this in as well.

As discussed in Section 2.5.2, veganism has been critiqued for being "elitist" or not "accessible" enough (Wrenn, 2013). This is an important point to explore, as it poses an opportunity for animal rights movements to be more inclusive. Indeed, there are inequities that make it easier for some people to go vegan than others, such as proximity to stores that have good options. In addition, there are concerns with calling foods "cruelty-free" simply because they are vegan, because of potential ethical issues, such as, perhaps, labor; for example, as FEP discusses, produce farmers can still be subjected to unsafe and unjust working conditions. It is also important to acknowledge that, while the anti-slavery movement is often discussed in the context of the 1800s, the use of forced labor is not over. Indeed, child labor and other exploitative forms of labor have been documented in slaughterhouses and in fields (Yang, 2023). Boycotts similar to ones that happened during the anti-slavery movement may still happen to a certain extent.

6.6. Potential for More In-Depth Interviews

My interviews also give rise to potential future exploration. For example, as discussed in Chapter 5, I only interviewed people who have worked for or founded nonprofits, and if I interview people who are not involved in this type of work, I can form ideas on what is preventing some people

from getting involved in activism. Ideally, in my research, I would also be able to translate this into data on how successfully these measures have been implemented. I can also examine cases in which agricultural corporations, retailers, or employees of agricultural corporations have been held civilly or criminally liable for violations of laws passed by the legal campaigns that I explore, and explore general data on the numbers of animals killed on factory farms over the years, as well as the percentage of animals on farms raised in cage-free facilities.

In addition, I may interview people who work in the field of animal law or policy. Questions may include:

1. To what extent do you think the law and public opinion influence each other?

2. What is your opinion on interaction between speciesism, ableism, racism, sexism, classism, anti-LGBTQ discrimination, ageism, etc.? Do you think jurisdictions with better legal human rights laws are more likely to have better animal welfare laws, and/or vice versa?

3. How effective do you think lawsuits are in animal protection?

4. How effective do you think criminal laws are in animal protection?

5. Do you face challenges in navigating the legal system?

6. Do you face challenges in deciding what is most equitable–for example, in prosecuting people for animal cruelty laws, are there challenges in trying not to contribute to injustices in the legal system?

7. Do you think inter-species democracy could work?

8. What do you think of laws or legal cases that may indirectly speak to animal welfare/abuse, such as suing farms for pollution and human health consequences, and protecting people's legal rights to observe ethical vegan practices?

9. Do you think laws, regulations, or court cases are more effective? How much does this depend on the legal or social context (e.g., common law vs. civil law vs other legal context)?

If I interview youth activists for TRC, I may ask other questions, in addition to those I asked Claire Howe. These include:

1. What challenges do you face as a youth animal activist?
2. What do you find most effective in educational contexts, such as schools, libraries, etc.?

I may also conduct interviews that are focused on people who work for newer animal protection groups. In this case, priority questions (in addition to those asked in my thesis) may also be as follows:

1. What challenges do you face gaining recognition as a newer group?
2. Is it difficult to secure funding as a newer group without as much data of success, or without as long a track record?

Certain questions may also be somewhat personal, even though they can provide useful insights. Thus, to ask these, it would be important to establish a reasonable rapport with the interviewee:

1. Is your income comfortable for you? (Or if they are not paid "Do you think it would be helpful to you if you were paid?")
2. Do you think the group you work for stays in touch with its animal protection goals (as opposed to, for example, corporate interests)?
3. Do you ever have to choose between representing your own views and representing the nonprofit/NGO you work/volunteer for?

As a follow-up to my interview questions about interconnectedness between issues or movements, I can do more in-depth interviews about this subject. Effective interviewees include employees for nonprofits and NGOs that advocate for animal rights and interconnected human rights issues. For example, the Food Empowerment Project (FEP) is a nonprofit that focuses on interconnected issues of food justice, including animal rights, worker safety, and access to healthy food. For example, FEP certifies chocolate that is both vegan and not produced using enslaved labor or child labor. It also advocates against dietary racism; for example, it advocates for plant-based milk options in schools, and advocates for the term "lactose normal" instead of "lactose intolerant," because the majority of the human population is lactose intolerant / lactose normal, especially most people of color. It is also involved in other movements and campaigns related to working conditions, and inequitable access to fresh produce due to a lack of supermarkets in many areas (especially low-income areas). The FEP founder, lauren Ornelas (2022) also cautions about White people going into Black communities to talk about veganism. Thus, an FEP employee would be a beneficial interview candidate for my thesis, because FEP focuses on these interconnected issues, as well as on how to make the animal rights and vegan movements as intersectional as possible. I can also focus on interconnectedness between bird flu spread (which could potentially spread between humans,

especially in communities with a “high density” of farms) and egg prices and extinction of species of birds. In activism, there is tension, because many activists would argue that it is a good thing if egg prices rise. However, it is a largely “inelastic” good (Crawford, 2023). On the other hand, taxing beef and milk, increasing prices by 20 percent, has been found to have an impact on climate, though there is also research that shows the public may “tolerate” taxes (Gambert, 2023). There are also pushes to label food products to demonstrate environmental impacts (Poore, 2018). On the other hand, this has been found more effective if combined with “graphic” “emotional” appeal, and it may be more effective if the products also included warnings about animal exploitation and working conditions (Gambert, 2023).

6.7. Future Horizons

As is demonstrated throughout this chapter, and throughout this thesis, there has been a long, evolving history of the animal protection movement. As society evolves, and the nonprofit and NGO frameworks evolve, future developments in the movement are sure to come.

Works Cited

"A Future for All." N.d. Mercy For Animals. https://mercyforanimals.org/vision/

"A Grassy Trend in Human Ancestors' Diets." 2013. U.S. National Science Foundation. https://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=128106

"About Mercy For Animals." N.d. Mercy For Animals. https://mercyforanimals.org/about/

"About Us." N.d. Charity Doings Foundation. https://charitydoings.org/about-us

"About Us: what we do, and how can we help?" 2024. 80,000 Hours. https://80000hours.org/about/#what-do-we-do.

"About Vegan Outreach." 2024. Vegan Outreach. https://veganoutreach.org/about/

Adams, C.J. *The Sexual Politics of Meat*.

Alexander, L.; Moore, M. 2020. "Deontological Ethics." Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological

Anderson, K. 2014. "Cowspiracy." [Documentary.]

Anderson, K. 2017. "'The Beast within': Race, Humanity, and Animality." *Sage Journals*, Vol. 18, Issue 3. https://doi-org.ezproxy.uef.fi:2443/10.1068/d229

Anderson, K. 2017. "What the Health?" [Documentary.]

"Animal Bill of Rights." N.d. Animal Legal Defense Fund. https://aldf.org/article/animal-bill-of-rights/.

Animal Charity Evaluators. 2022. "How We Prioritize Causes." https://animalcharityevaluators.org/charity-reviews/causes-we-consider/#farmed-animals

"ASPCA Supports California Proposition 2." 2008. ASPCA.

Atrooz, F.; Alkadhi, K.A.; Salim, S. 2021. "Understanding stress: Insights from rodent models." *Curr. Res. Neurobiol*, Vol. 2. doi: 10.1016/j.crneur.2021.100013

"AWA Standards." N.d. A Greener World. https://agreenerworld.org/certifications/animal-welfare-approved/standards/.

Ball, M. N.d. "A Meaningful Life: Making a Real Difference in Today's World." Mercy For Animals. https://mercyforanimals.org/essays-a-meaningful-life/

BBC. 2019. "Do Democrats want to take away Americans' hamburgers?" https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-47394484

Berger, J. 2022. "The Smell of Money." [Documentary.]

Bishop, T. 2021. "Detailed Discussion of Cross-Reporting Laws for Child Abuse and Animal Abuse." Michigan State University College of Law.

https://www.animallaw.info/article/detailed-discussion-cross-reporting-laws

Bolotnikova, M. 2023. “You’re more likely to go to prison for exposing animal cruelty than for committing it.” Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/23952627/wayne-hsiung-conviction-direct-action-everywhere-dxe-rescue-sonoma-county-chickens

Bolotnikova, M; Torrella, K. 2024. “9 charts that show US factory farming is even bigger than you realize.” Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/24079424/factory-farming-facts-meat-usda-agriculture-census

Branham, A. 2005. “Philosophy and Animals.” Animal Legal & Historical Center. https://www.animallaw.info/intro/philosophy-and-animals

Bray, D. 2024. “Policy Approaches to the Climate Problem of Animal Agriculture.” [Presentation.] Thinking Outside the Box: Large and Small Scale Solutions [Panel at Environmental Law Symposium at Lewis & Clark Law School].

Breakey, H. 2014. “Who’s Afraid of Property Rights? Rights as Core Concepts, Coherent, Prima Facie, Situated and Specified.” *Law and Philosophy*, Vol. 33: pgs. 573-603. Doi: 10.1007/s10982-013-9190-5.

Brindle, K. 2023. “How Prop 12 Won in the Courts.” [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Broad, G. 2023. “Alt Protein’s Role in Inclusive Food System Transformation.” [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Brockington, D.; Duffy, R.; Igoe, J. 2008. *Nature Unbound: Conservation, Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas.* Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.

Broughton, B. 2015. [Interview.]

Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. “Non-Governmental Organizations in the United States.” U.S. Department of State. https://www.state.gov/non-governmental-organizations-ngos-in-the-united-states/

Bureau of Human Rights, Democracy, and Labor. “Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in the United States.” U.S. Department of State. https://www.state.gov/non-governmental-organizations-ngos-in-the-united-states/

C., B. 2017 [Interview.]

“California Proposition 2, Farm Animal Confinement Initiative (2008).” Ballotpedia.

https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_2,_Farm_Animal_Confinement_Initiative_(2008)

"California Remains the World's 5th Largest Economy." 2024. Office of Governor Gavin Newsom. https://www.gov.ca.gov/2024/04/16/california-remains-the-worlds-5th-largest-economy/

Calloway, V. 2023. "Diversifying the Global Animal Justice Movement." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Cantrell, K. 2024. "Nudging a New Food Future: Behavioral Science and Institutional Procurement." [Presentation.] Thinking Outside the Box: Large and Small Scale Solutions [Panel at Environmental Law Symposium at Lewis & Clark Law School].

"Center for Animal Law Studies." N.d. Center for Animal Law Studies. https://law.lclark.edu/live/files/33956-cals-overview.

Channin, J. 2023. "How Do We Value What Can't Be Easily Quantified?" [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Christiaenssen, P. 2023. "Err on the Side of Sentience: The European Precautionary Principle, Art. 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Invertebrates." [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Collins, P.H.; Bilge, S. 2020. *Intersectionality*. John Wiley & Sons.

Coman-Hidey, D. 2023. "Bridging the Divide Between Welfarism and Abolitionism." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

"Contribute to Improve the Lives of Farm Animals." 2024. Certified Humane. https://certifiedhumane.org/

"Controlled-atmosphere killing vs. electric immobilization: A comparative analysis of poultry-slaughter systems from animal welfare, worker safety, and economic perspectives." 2007. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals.

Cooke, C. 2016. "North Carolina's Factory Farms Produce 15,000 Olympic Pools Worth of Waste Each Year." Civil Eats. https://civileats.com/2016/06/28/north-carolinas-cafos-produce-15000-olympic-size-pools-worth-of-waste/?_ga=2.227383069.1454692709.1715809218-334607018.1715487555

Cooney, N. 2014. "What elements make a vegetarian leaflet more effective?" The Humane League Labs. https://osf.io/nwcgf

Cornell Law School. N.d. "non-profit organizations." Legal Information Institute.

https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/non-profit_organizations

Crawford, K. 2023. “Why the price of eggs, a food staple for breakfast and baked goods, has risen so sharply.” Harvest Public Media. https://www.kcur.org/2023-01-17/why-the-price-of-eggs-a-food-staple-for-breakfast-and-baked-goods-has-risen-so-sharply

D'Olimpio, L. 2016. “The trolley dilemma: would you kill one person to save five?” The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/the-trolley-dilemma-would-you-kill-one-person-to-save-five-57111

de Boer, J; Aiking, H. 2022. “Considering how farm animal welfare concerns may contribute to more sustainable diets.” *Appetite*, Vol. 168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2021.105786

DeLuca, C. 2013. “Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Educational Inclusivity.” *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 36, No. 1. https://www.jstor.org/stable/canajeducrevucan.36.1.305

Di Concetto, A. 2023. “Does ‘Science-Based’ Animal Welfare Legislation Benefit Animals?” [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Dobbs, D.; Hayden, P.; Bublick, E. 2017. *Torts and Compensation: Personal Accountability and Social Responsibility for Injury*. West Academic Publishing.

Bogumil, B.; Wu, A.H.; Stram, D.; Yang, J.; Tseng, C.C.; Le Marchand, L. 2021. “The association between ambient air pollutants and pancreatic cancer in the Multiethnic Cohort Study.” *Environ. Res.* doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2021.111608

Driver, J. 2014. “The History of Utilitarianism.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/utilitarianism-history/

“Educational Outreach.” 2023. New Roots Institute. https://www.newrootsinstitute.org/educational-outreach

Eisen, J. 2023. “Animals and Constitutions.” [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Elbakidze, L.; Nayga Jr., R.M. 2012. “The effects of information on willingness to pay for animal welfare in dairy production: Application of nonhypothetical valuation mechanisms.” Journal of Dairy Science 95, issue 3: pgs. 1099-1107. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2011-4730

Elwood, R.W.; Adams, L. 2015. “Electric shock causes physiological stress responses in shore crabs, consistent with prediction of pain.” *Biol Lett.*, Vol. 11 (11). doi:

10.1098/rsbl.2015.0800

"Environmental Justice‐Related Terms As Defined Across the PSC Agencies." 2013. United States Environmental Protection Agency. https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-02/documents/team-ej-lexicon.pdf

Epstein, Y.; Kantinkoski, S. 2020. "Non-governmental Enforcement of EU Environmental Law: A Stakeholder Action for Wolf Protection in Finland." *Sec. Conservation and Restoration Ecology*, Vol. 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2020.00101

Evans, K. 2024. "Litigating for Farmed Animals: Creative Strategies." [Presentation.] Animal Law Review Symposium, Lewis & Clark Law School.

"Exempt Purposes - Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3)." N.d. IRS. https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/exempt-purposes-internal-revenue-code-section-501c3

"Exemption Requirements - 501(c)(3) Organizations." N.d. IRS. https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/exemption-requirements-501c3-organizations

Favre, D.; Tsang, V. 1993. "The Development of Anti-Cruelty Laws During the 1800s." *Detroit College Law Review*, Issue 1, pgs. 1-35. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/y9hc-fw88

Feltz, A.; Canton, J.N.; Cogley, Z. 2022. "Developing an objective measure of knowledge of factory farming." Faunalytics. https://faunalytics.org/the-link-between-knowledge-and-ethical-behaviors/

Finnis, J. 2011. *Natural Law and Natural Rights*, Second edition. Oxford University Press.

Fradera, A. 2016. "Why is it so hard to persuade people with facts?" The British Psychological Society. https://www.bps.org.uk/research-digest/why-it-so-hard-persuade-people-facts

Francione, G.; Garner, R. 2010. *The animal rights debate: Abolition or regulation?*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Frasch, P.D.; Wahlberg, B. 2023. "Animal Law Beyond the Imagination: Rethinking the Framework." [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Frederich, B. 2023. "Alt Protein's Role in Inclusive Food System Transformation." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Freston, K. 2023. "Vegan Communication: Improving Communication and Relationships with Nonvegans and Other Vegans." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Gambert, I. 2023. "Should the Great Food Transformation be fake-meat free? Considering

strategies for a future of food that is kinder to people, animals, and the planet." [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Garcés, L. 2023. "The Power of Unlikely Alliances." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

"Germany Moves Independently to Ban Battery Cages for Hens." 2001. United Poultry Concerns. https://www.upc-online.org/winter2001/germany_ban.html

Gold, S. 2024. "Litigating for Farmed Animals: Creative Strategies." [Presentation.] Animal Law Review Symposium, Lewis & Clark Law School.

Gonyou, H.W. 1993. "Animal welfare: definitions and assessment." Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics 6.

Goodman, J.R.; Sanders, C.R. 2011. "In Favor of Tipping the Balance: Animal Rights in Defense of Residential Picketing." Society & animals, 2011, Vol.19 (2), pgs. 137-155.

Greenfield, P. 2024. "EU bans 'misleading' environmental claims that rely on offsetting." The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2024/jan/17/eu-bans-misleading-environmental-claims-that-rely-on-offsetting

Greig, K. 2017. "Leafleting Intervention Report." Animal Charity Evaluators. https://animalcharityevaluators.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/leafleting-intervention-report.pdf

Gritsch, E.W. 2012. *Martin Luther's Anti-Semitism: Against His Better Judgment.* Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Hamer, E. 2023. "Bridging the Divide Between Welfarism and Abolitionism." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Harrington, M. 2024. Interview

Hewson, C.J. 2003. "What is animal welfare? Common definitions and their practical consequences." The Canadian Veterinary Journal 44 (6): pgs. 496-499.

"How disasters impact animals." 2023. IFAW. https://www.ifaw.org/journal/how-disasters-impact-animals

Howe, C. 2023. Interview.

Howell, A. 2024. "Consumer Protection Laws: Strategic Impact Litigation for Animals." [Presentation.] Animal Law Review Symposium, Lewis & Clark Law School.

Jaleel, H. 2023. "Global Developments in Animal Personhood Jurisprudence." [Presentation.]

Animal Law Conference.

Joy, M. 2011. *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows: An Introduction to Carnism*. Red Wheel. https://books.google.fi/books?hl=en&lr=&id=bL-tDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=melanie+joy&ots=2WftsiOGSX&sig=6wJKLtwDparjchwhh010Px91DZ4&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=melanie%20joy&f=false

Joy, M. 2016. "Understanding carnism for effective vegan advocacy." [Presentation.] International Animal Rights Conference. https://youtu.be/bu3z74jBPDk?si=e61Zxc7B04_dvfs5

Joy, M. 2018. "Vegan Communication: How to either Damage or Empower the Vegan Movement." [Presentation.] International Animal Rights Conference. https://youtu.be/Yo7b_ULdF38?si=ExgxAyGzIyfVX-W_

Joy, M. 2023. "Vegan Communication: Improving Communication and Relationships with Nonvegans and Other Vegans." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Juan, W.; Yamini, S.; Britten, P. 2015. "Food Intake Patterns of Self-identified Vegetarians Among the U.S. Population, 2007-2010." *Procedia Food Science*, Volume 4: pgs. 86-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profoo.2015.06.013

Kirwan, H. 2023. "Dairy groups call new federal guidance for labeling plant-based milk alternatives a 'double-edged sword.'" Wisconsin Public Radio. https://www.wpr.org/agriculture/dairy-groups-new-federal-guidance-plant-based-milk-alternatives-fda

Kivinen, T. 2023. "Si omnia, nulla? Animal law and the criteria of involvement." [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Kladis, C. 2023. "Global Developments in Animal Personhood Jurisprudence." [Presentation.] Animal Law Conference.

Kumar, S. 2021. "Veganism, Hinduism, and Jainism in India: A geo-cultural inquiry." In Wright, L. 2021. *The Routledge Handbook of Vegan Studies*. Routledge.

"Lactose Intolerance." N.d. Food Empowerment Project. https://foodispower.org/access-health/lactose-intolerance/

Lanza, R.; Berman, B. 2009. *Biocentrism: How Life and Consciousness Are the Keys to Understanding the True Nature of the Universe*. BenBella Books.

Law, M.; Varela Medrano, D. 2023. "It's time to end the use of a hate-filled slur." The Lowell.

https://thelowell.org/12234/opinions/its-time-to-end-the-use-of-a-hate-filled-slur/

"LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS OF S.2019 / H.R.4417: The 'Ending Agricultural Trade Suppression Act.'" 2023. Animal Law & Policy Program: Harvard Law School. https://animal.law.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/Harvard-ALPP-EATS-Act-Report.pdf

Lercier, M. 2023. [Doctoral research paper and presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Letizia, V. 2023. "Urgent Call for International Standards in Animal Welfare: The Link between Pandemic Prevention, Animal Protection, and Environmental Health." [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Lindwall, C. 2023. "What is Greenwashing?" NRDC. https://www.nrdc.org/stories/what-greenwashing

Lingel, G. 2019. "Animal Welfare and Animal Rights: Can They Co-Exist and How." Sentient Policy. https://sentientmedia.org/animal-welfare/.

Linkersdörfer, J., Peacock, J.R. 2020. "Is Animal Cruelty or Abolitionist Messaging More Effective: A Reanalysis." The Humane League Labs. https://thehumaneleague.org/article/animal-cruelty-abolitionist-messaging-reanalysis

"Livestock's Long Shadow: environmental issues and options." 2006. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. https://www.fao.org/4/a0701e/a0701e00.htm

Livni, E. 2018. "The new science of animal cognition is forcing countries to overhaul their laws." Quartz. https://qz.com/1181881/proof-of-animal-cognition-is-recognized-by-new-laws-in-europe

Lowrey, W. 2024. "Disrupting Industrial Animal Agriculture through the Criminal Justice System." [Presentation.] Animal Law Review Symposium, Lewis & Clark Law School.

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992). U.S. Supreme Court. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/504/555/

MacAskill, W. "The Definition of Effective Altruism." In Greaves, H., Pummer, T., eds. 2019. *Effective Altruism: Philosophical Issues.* Oxford University Press.

Markowski, K. 2022. "Identity processes and food choice: predictors of dietary lapses among ethical and health vegan." *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 163, Issue 3. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2022.2105194

Martin, A.K. 2022. "Animal Research that Respects Animal Rights: Extending Requirements for Research with Humans to Animals." Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics (2022), 31: 1, pgs. 59–72. doi:10.1017/S0963180121000499.

Masri, R. “The Power of Unlikely Alliances.” [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Mathur, M.B., et. al. 2021. “Interventions to reduce meat consumption by appealing to animal welfare: Meta-analysis and evidence-based recommendations.” The Humane League Labs. https://thehumaneleague.org/article/E014R01-reducing-meat-consumption-appealing-aniMal-welfare-meta-analysis-protocol

McKeown, P.; Dunn, R.A. 2021. “A ‘Life-Style Choice’ or a Philosophical Belief?: The Argument for Veganism and Vegetarianism to be a Protected Philosophical Belief and the Position in England and Wales.” *Liverpool Law Review*, Vol. 42: pgs. 207-241.

Milestone Documents. N.d. “13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Abolition of Slavery (1865).” National Archive. https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/13th-amendment

Millstein, S. 2024. “Fish Feel Pain, Science Shows–But Humans Are Reluctant to Believe It.” Sentient Science. https://sentientmedia.org/do-fish-feel-pain/

“Mission.” 2024. ASPCA. https://www.aspca.org/about-us/aspca-policy-and-position-statements/mission

“Mission and Values.” 2024. Food Empowerment Project. https://foodispower.org/mission-and-values/

Morris, S. 2000. “Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Some Lessons from History.” *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 11, No. 1. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008950915555

Muraskin, D. 2024. “Fighting for an Equitable Workplace for Slaughterhouse Workers through Litigation.” [Presentation.] Animal Law Review Symposium, Lewis & Clark Law School.

National Pork Producers Council et al. v. Ross, Secretary of the California Department of Food and Agriculture, et al. 2023. Supreme Court of the United States. https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/22pdf/21-468_5if6.pdf

New Roots Staff. 2022. “When Did Factory Farming Start and Why Does It Still Exist?” New Roots Institute. https://www.newrootsinstitute.org/articles/when-did-factory-farming-start-and-why-does-it-still-exist

“NGO vs. Nonprofit: What’s the Difference?” 2024. University of the People.

https://www.uopeople.edu/blog/ngo-vs-nonprofit/

Niell, A.S. 1996. *Freedom–Not License.* https://trisquel.info/files/a_s_neill--freedom--not-license_1.pdf

Nishibu, K. 2023. "Diversifying the Global Animal Justice Movement." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Ofei, M. 2023. "The Film That Turned Us Vegan Overnight." The Minimalist Vegan. https://theminimalistvegan.com/overnight-vegan/

"Open Wing Alliance: A Global Coalition Against Cages." N.d. Open Wing Alliance. https://openwingalliance.org/

"Operations." 2020. The Raven Corps. https://www.theravencorps.org/were-just-getting-started/

Otieno, D.K., Ogutu, S.O. 2020. Consumer willingness to pay for chicken welfare attributes in Kenya. Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing, Vol. 32, issue 4, pgs. 379-402. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08974438.2019.1673275.

"Our History." 2022. Animal Charity Evaluators. https://animalcharityevaluators.org/about/background/our-history/

"Our Mission." N.d. The Humane League. https://thehumaneleague.org/our-mission

"Our Mission." 2020. The Raven Corps. https://www.theravencorps.org/our-mission/

"Our Standards." 2024. American Humane. https://www.americanhumane.org/humane-heartland/our-standards/.

Özden, J. 2023. "How Do We Value What Can't Be Easily Quantified?" [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Perry, J. 2023. "The Current State of Social Justice & Our Movement." [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Plaza, D. 2023. "Global Development in Animal Personhood Jurisprudence." [Presentation.] Animal Law Conference.

Polanco, A., Parry, J., Anderson, J. 2022. "Planting Seeds: The Impact Of Diet & Different Animal Advocacy Tactics." https://faunalytics.org/relative-effectiveness/

Poore, J. 2018. "We label fridges to show their environmental impact – why not food?" The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/10/we-label-fridges-to-show-their-environmental-impact-why-not-food

Powell, A. 2023. "COVID-19 came from animals. Why aren't we working to prevent new

scourge?" The Harvard Gazette. https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2023/07/covid-19-came-from-animals-why-arent-we-working-to-prevent-new-scourge/

Price, D. 2020. "Empathy Is Overrated: Our actions matter more than how we feel." Human Parts: Medium. https://humanparts.medium.com/empathy-is-overrated-6cf4090c601e

Runkle, N.; Stone, G. 2017. *Mercy for Animals: One Man's Quest to Inspire Compassion and Improve the Lives of Farm Animals.* New York: Penguin Random House.

Saeed, A. 2023. Interview.

Schulz, L.; Hayes, C.; Hayes, D. N.d. "United States Pork Production." Center for Agricultural and Rural Development: Iowa State University. https://www.card.iastate.edu/products/presentations/files/hayes_us_pork_production.pdf

Sebo, J. 2024. "Towards a Global Ban on Factory Farming by 2050." [Presentation.] Thinking Outside the Box: Large and Small Scale Solutions [Panel at Environmental Law Symposium at Lewis & Clark Law School].

Shahbandeh, M. 2024. "Per capita meat consumption in the United States in 2022 and 2033, by type (in pounds)." Statistica. https://www.statista.com/statistics/189222/average-meat-consumption-in-the-us-by-sort/

Shanker, A. 2023. "Instrumental Animal Protection and Its Implications for the Status of Animals." [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

Street, F. 2018. "Switzerland bans boiling lobsters alive." CNN. https://www.cnn.com/travel/article/switzerland-lobster-boiling-banned/index.html

Tirman, J. 2011. "10 Counting: A Single Death Is a Tragedy, a Million Deaths Are a Statistic." In Tirman, J. *The Deaths of Others: The Fate of Civilians in America's Wars*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780195381214.001.0001

Todorović, Z. 2023. "Recognition of Animal Rights: Membership Rights vs Welfare Rights." [Presentation.] Helsinki Animal Law Conference.

"Until Every Animal is Free." 2024. Direct Action Everywhere. https://www.directactioneverywhere.com/

"Urging the EPA to Regulate Factory Farms' Air Pollution." N.d. Animal Legal Defense Fund. https://aldf.org/case/urging-the-environmental-protection-agency-to-stop-giving-factory-farms-a-free-pass-on-air-pollution/

Uwujaren, J. 2012. “Mental Illness: How the Media Contributes To Its Stigma.” Everyday Feminism. https://everydayfeminism.com/2012/12/mental-illness-stigma/

“Vegucated.” 2011. [Documentary.]

Vinnari, M.; Montonen, J.; Härkänen, T.; Männistö, S. 2009. “Identifying vegetarians and their food consumption according to self-identification and operationalized definition in Finland.” *Public Health Nutr.*, Vol. 12 (4), pgs. 481-488. DOI: 10.1017/S1368980008002486.

Wahlberg, B. 2023. Interview.

Wahlberg, B. 2023.

Walters, K.; Portmess, L. 1999. *Ethical Vegetarianism: From Pythagoras to Peter Singer*. State University of New York Press.

“We believe humane education should be part of every child's learning experience.” 2024. Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers. https://teachheart.org/

Webermann, M. 2023. “Bridging the Divide Between Welfarism and Abolitionism.” [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Webermann, M. 2023. “How Do We Value What Can’t Be Easily Quantified?” [Presentation.] Animal & Vegan Advocacy Summit.

Williams, J. 2007. “Meat is a Luxury.” The Earthbound Report. https://earthbound.report/2007/04/23/meat-is-a-luxury/

Winders, D. 2021. Lecture in Industrial Animal Agriculture Law.

Winders, D.; Abrell, E. 2021. “Slaughterhouse Workers, Animals, and the Environment.” *Health and Human Rights*, Vol. 23 (2): 21-33. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8694297/

Wise, S. 2010. Legal personhood and the nonhuman rights project. 17 *Animal Law* 1. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/anim17&div=4&id=&page=

Wrenn, C.L. 2013. “Abolition Then and Now: Tactical Comparisons Between the Human Rights Movement and the Modern Nonhuman Animal Rights Movement in the United States.” *J Agric Environ Ethics*, 27:177-200. DOI: 0.1007/s10806-013-9458-7.

Wrenn, C.L. 2019. *Piecemeal Protest : Animal Rights in the Age of Nonprofits.* University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.

Wrenn, C.L.; Johnson, R. 2013. “A Critique of Single-issue Campaigning and the Importance of

Comprehensive Abolitionist Vegan Advocacy." *Food, culture, & society*, Vol. 16 (4), pgs. 651-668. https://doi-org.ezproxy.uef.fi:2443/10.2752/175174413X13758634982092

Yang, M. 2023. "Over 100 children illegally employed by US slaughterhouse cleaning firm." The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/law/2023/feb/17/underage-child-labor-working-slaughterhouse-investigation

Yong, E. 2023. "Keynote Presentation." [Presentation.] Animal Law Conference.

Zald, M.N.; Ash, R. 1966. "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change." *Social Forces*, Vol. 44 (3), pgs. 327-41.

Zuckert, M.P. 1997. "Do natural rights derive from natural law?" *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*, Vol. 20, Issue 3. https://web-p-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.uef.fi:2443/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=8a1e0e34-ae44-42f4-ba98-1eebdb448b7b%40redis&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=491149&db=bsh