

Meat, Media, and Morals:
Furrowing in on Effective Food Activism in the Animal Protection Movement

Beau Broughton
Lewis & Clark College
Portland, Oregon

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts
Environmental Studies Program
Concentration: "Animal Ethics in Agricultural Commodity Chains."

May 2014

Abstract

I employ a multifaceted methodology situated in American food activism discourse to investigate the segment of the animal protection movement focused on farmed animals. Animal advocates use undercover investigative media in farms and slaughterhouses to inspire individual change by decreasing the visual distance between morally-contested sites of production and consumption. I focus on the 10 Billion Lives Tour, which utilizes video media, an ethical narrative, and a receptive demographic to encourage a reduction in consumption of animal products as a response to perceived systemic cruelty within animal agriculture. I assisted in collecting follow-up surveys, which demonstrate the campaign's relatively high success rates: nearly 60% of viewers reported consuming less meat, dairy, and eggs one year after watching the campaign's informative video. I also argue that the rise of popular media texts addressing food—coupled with legislative victories and institutional changes regarding production practices—supplements the role of grassroots advocates. I draw on specific examples to better illustrate the post-modern literary food landscape. Fundamentally, my research serves both to inform animal protection advocates concerned with campaign efficacy, as well as to draw outside scholars and social activists into the realm of grassroots outreach for farmed animals. By discussing the barriers and shortcomings of the broader animal protection movement in the United States, I aim to build on existing research and critical advocacy work to foster a social movement that must discontinue exclusive tactics to become more inclusive, cohesive, intersectional, and, therefore, more effective.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I. Situating Food Studies and Animal Advocacy

I

An Influx of food-Related Media

4

The Politics of Sight

8

Furrowing In on Food Discourses

9

Looking at (More of) the Literature

12

Advocacy for Animals: Which Side of the Aisle?

15

II. Narrowing In: The Application of the 10 Billion Lives Tour in a Time of Change

17

The Times Are Changing: Legislative and Institutional Advances

18

The Tour: Background

21

Contextualizing the Campaign

23

The Importance of Incentives

26

Methodology and Motivations

28

Gauging Impacts: Survey Results

29

"We All Oppose Animal Abuse": Analyzing the Video

31

Ethics Over the Environment?
32

The Role of (Ir)Rationality in Reducing Demand
35

III. Branching Out—Fostering Fruitful Relationships and Self-Reflection
38

Confidence and Caveats
38

Larger Trends
39

Feeding Into the Propaganda Machine
41

Resistance, Repression, and Regrouping
43

More Than Just Morals: Barrier to Greater Inclusion
45

On Gender & Gastronomy
48

Is Food a Fad?
49

Looking Forward
50

-

Works Cited
51

Appendix A: Viewer Survey
57

Appendix B: Control Survey
59

Appendix C:
Raw Survey Data
60

Acknowledgments

First, I owe an immense amount of gratitude to my parents, whose support in so many ways has made this academic adventure possible.

I would, of course, like to thank Professor Liz Safran, for all of her hard work reading over and providing feedback on my work, inspirational discussions during office hours, and general moral support and unconditional support throughout this journey. Your ideas, coupled with assistance from the Environmental Studies department, have meant so much during my time on Palatine Hill. Within this incredibly diverse department, Professors Bruce Podobnik and Bob Goldman have been particularly influential in molding and enriching my academic career. Thank you.

My heartfelt thanks go out to my indescribably incredible friends, roommates, classmates, and colleagues. Your kind words of encouragement, as well as your generosity in providing me with otherwise ignored opportunities to eat, breathe, and laugh mean more than I can convey.

Nonetheless, this thesis and my motivations to pursue this topic would literally not be possible without animal advocates. I cannot understate how the work of these inspirational scholars and activists has shaped much more than just my research. Specifically, I would like to thank Alex Felsing and others at Farm Animal Rights Movement (FARM) for providing me with data, support, insight, and the opportunity to work, live, and thrive with the phenomenal crew aboard the 10 Billion Lives Tour. None of this work would be possible, though, without the undercover investigators who continue to sacrifice so much so that we can simply see. To the animals continuing to languish at the hands of humans, we thank you for your patience, your trust, and, most of all, your forgiveness. We see you. We're trying.

I. Situating Food Studies and Animal Advocacy

As I write, the *New York Times* is putting the final touches on an article titled “Is That Sausage Worth This?”¹ With a thumbnail photograph of a cute, pink piglet, the piece describes reasons to reconsider those ribs. In fact, the *Times* is breaking the Humane Society of the United States’ newest undercover investigation into a factory farming operation in Kentucky, one of many farms providing various pork products to the people of America. On the morning after the *Times*’ initial post, the story has not only been syndicated across news sites—with an NPR headline mentioning an ominous “piglet smoothie”²— but has also been splattered across social media, and the actual footage itself has been made available to those daring enough to watch.³ The year 2014 has seen numerous investigations revealing cruel practices at various animal agriculture operations, the latest featuring none other than cannibalistic pigs at Iron Maiden farm, with mother sows forced to feed on “a purée” of their own young in an attempt to soften the spread of a lethal diarrhea virus that has already killed millions of pigs, causing a nightmare for the industry.

But what, really, is so bothersome about this latest investigation into animal agriculture? After all, the industry ensures that “feeding the piglet intestines to sows is legal and safe.”⁴ For some, the unavoidable ability to empathize with these animals motivates a moral response to a seemingly sadistic set of practices. For others, the unshakeable thought that, perhaps, this is not a safe or sanitary practice will lead to concerns for personal and public health. And, perhaps for most, simply reading the above paragraph was enough to ruin your lunch, disgusted simply by the description.

While such information—transmitted via computers, phones, newspapers, and word-of-mouth—certainly sparks conversation and reaction, does it inspire consumers to change their consumption patterns? Will the Iron Maiden operation in Kentucky suffer as shoppers pressure retailers to cut ties with the farm? Will pork purchases fall across the board? For how long will

¹ Kristof, Nicholas. “Is That Sausage Worth This?” *The New York Times*, February 19, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/20/opinion/kristof-is-that-sausage-worth-this.html>.

² Barclay, Eliza. “‘Piglet Smoothie’ Fed To Sows To Prevent Disease; Activists Outraged.” *NPR.org*. Accessed February 24, 2014. <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2014/02/20/280183550/piglet-smoothie-fed-to-sows-to-prevent-disease-activists-outraged>.

³ *Pigs Suffer at IRON MAIDEN*, 2014. Accessed March 21, 2014. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sj1YjhAJckM&feature=youtube_gdata_player.

⁴ Kristof, Nicholas. “Is That Sausage Worth This?”

recollections of cannibal sows follow shoppers into the grocery store? Will the Humane Society and other similar organizations see a spike in donations to assist their efforts?

The power of such media efforts—specifically undercover investigations into sites of production such as the Iron Maiden pig factory farm—can expand exponentially when distributed on a mass scale. In fact, I am motivated to examine this topic because media coverage of these issues does have proven effects on altering food choice. A Kansas State University study found that, “as a whole, media attention to animal welfare has significant, negative effects on U.S. meat demand.”⁵ Furthermore, this effect can last for some while: “Media articles influence meat demand for both the quarter they are released and the subsequent quarter following the article’s publication.”⁵ Creating indices based on individual animals (beef, pork, and poultry), the researchers mined American newspapers and magazines for mentions of instances such as the infamous 2008 Westland/Hallmark slaughterhouse scandal⁶ and found that “increasing media attention to animal welfare issues triggers consumers to purchase less meat rather than reallocate expenditures across competing meats.”⁷

In addition to mainstream media coverage, these undercover investigations have real, lasting impact when disseminated through grassroots activism. Passionate groups and individuals on the ground understand and appreciate the power of this type of disturbing information and aim to craft creative ways to increase viewership and incite dietary change. The undercover investigation described above is simply one element of a broad movement that exists along the intersection of food, transparency, agency, and justice. This “movement,” a term used cautiously here, is extremely broad in its range. From fair trade chocolate to Meatless Mondays, agents of social change—non-profit organizations, advocacy coalitions, individual activists, and others—vary widely both in their goals as well as their tactics. Consumers in the United States have been inarguably bombarded with food-related doctrines for years, leading to newly-labeled products on the shelves, local products receiving new limelight (even if they have always been

⁵ Tonsor, Glynn T., and Nicole J. Olynk. “Impacts of Animal Well-Being and Welfare Media on Meat Demand.” *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 62, no. 1 (2011): 59–72. doi:10.1111/j.1477-9552.2010.00266.x.

While this may seem like a relatively short period, the fact that this research combines media coverage and meat consumption, specifically, is an important stepping-stone to conduct and interpret future research. These undercover investigations have risen prominence as a rather recent tool for the animal protection movement addressing farmed animal issues, and this article, while perhaps not making huge claims, is a vital foot-in-the-door for future research.

⁶ “Rampant Animal Cruelty at California Slaughter Plant: The Humane Society of the United States.” Accessed February 24, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/news/2008/01/undercover_investigation_013008.html.

⁷ Tonsor, Glynn T., and Nicole J. Olynk. “Impacts of Animal Well-Being and Welfare Media on Meat Demand.”

locally grown or processed), new lexicons illustrative of these changes, and general levels of awareness perhaps unseen in this country for decades. These changes need no scholarly citations—they are simply omnipresent, perhaps taken for granted, or, even seen as a nuisance, a hindrance to the pursuit of happiness and a barrier to enjoying the simple things in life once more. Many of these food-related messages stem from grassroots activists working to target specific demographics on the ground. The animal protection movement exists as a branch of this broader movement and fundamentally questions the conditions and commodification of farmed animals by working to alter the ways and extent to which they are used for human consumption. This paper focuses primarily on the segment of this movement aiming to reduce the number of farmed animals killed for food in the United States, which has reached nearly 10 billion per year.⁸

I argue that food activism—specifically in the realm of the animal protection movement—can and has benefitted from the use of three things: Integration of enticing media, targeting desirable demographics (notably youth), and employing an ethical narrative to inspire lasting behavioral change. I focus in particular on the 10 Billion Lives Tour, a non-profit grassroots campaign that embodies all three of these aspects to enact actual change for farmed animals.

This narrative is strongly entrenched in existing food transparency discourse. Thus, I must first introduce prominent critical food literature to better paint our current foodscape. Both popular and scholarly food-centric sources add vertical and horizontal breadth to a snowballing conversation that ultimately raises awareness, assisting targeted grassroots outreach efforts. Since farmed animal advocates must work to combat entrenched social norms and influential agricultural industries, efficiency is crucial. Thus, it is imperative to first examine existing work that monitors campaign efficacy. Fundamentally, farmed animal advocates strive to bring to light otherwise hidden production practices, operating in a politics of sight, a scholarly framework I borrow to contextualize the advocates' use of undercover investigative videos. After examining legislative victories and survey results from the 10 Billion Lives Tour, I will address broader issues in the animal protection movement, and strive to remedy them by looking forward to a more informed, critical social movement.

⁸ “Farm Animal Statistics: Slaughter Totals : The Humane Society of the United States.” Accessed February 24, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/resources/research/stats_slaughter_totals.html.

An Influx of Food-Related Media

French philosopher Pierre Bourdieu has noted that, “taste is what brings together things and people that go together.”⁹ Speaking broadly about affinity towards specific cultural items and phenomena, Bourdieu’s work is acclaimed for its discussion of the creation and pretension of senses of taste as “a classification system” contextualized by socioeconomic conditions.¹⁰

To bring Bourdieu’s work on taste into the realm of food, it is clear that a sense of literal, sensual taste is developed and continually molded by people, their ideas, and the conditions that we encounter in our everyday lives. These interactions occur, it should be noted, between persons in both physical and virtual spaces, and often both simultaneously. The production of goods and tastes are intimately interwoven, and as demand via preferences change—or become inevitably altered—supplied goods will shift as well. Expanding on the rationales of supply and demand, Bourdieu argues that, “every change in tastes resulting from a transformation of the conditions of existence and of the corresponding dispositions will tend to induce, directly or indirectly, a transformation in the field of production.”¹¹ Thus, as realities and procedural motivations are reviewed and altered, greater changes are inevitably induced. But how do these mind-shifting changes come about? In looking at ourselves, most of us can presumably conjure up external motivations for most of our lifestyle changes. We have been influenced by others and their messages and we work to live in ways we find appropriate and attractive. Rather than recognizing the need to shift practices on our own, many of our procedural decisions are influenced by incoming messages—through media. In the realm of food and dietary habitation, our consumption practices are informed by a multitude of targeted messages via media. In opposition to, or perhaps diverging from advertisements, a flux of critical food media has flooded the social sphere to facilitate a vibrant dialogue surrounding food production and consumption. What I will term media texts refers to communicative and creative pieces across mediums, including books, articles, films, and a wide array of visual materials.

⁹ Pierre Bourdieu. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1984: 241.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 231

¹¹ *Ibid.*

From the *Omnivore's Dilemma* to *Fast Food Nation* to *Food Inc.*, there has been a remarkable rise in popular media surrounding food in the 21st century. However, this is not a new phenomenon. Upton Sinclair scrutinized Chicago stockyards for their horrific labor conditions and abuses of power more than 100 years ago in *The Jungle*.¹² Edward Murrow shocked the 1960s by broadcasting on television the multitude of issues facing migrant workers with *Harvest of Shame*.¹³ These classics shocked the public at the time, and remain as powerful predecessors to a modern group of food-related media. This new millennial wave of food-related media texts has taken more aimed assaults at the conventional food system, focusing on problematic facets related directly to the comestible product itself while making it clear that consumers are complicit in the issue through their consumptive behaviors.

Motivated as a teen by media texts such as Eric Schlosser's foray into the grotesque fast food commodity chains in *Fast Food Nation*, I am invested in the study of media, social change, and food because I am aware of its immense effects on at least one individual—myself. As the process of un- and re-learning progresses with age and education, it appears that we become more suspicious and fascinated not only by attempts to maintain secrecy, but also the infinitely complex relationships required to sustain our bodies with food. For a teenager learning for the first time about notions of power, control, exploitation, and, significantly, animal cruelty, reading *Fast Food Nation* sparked my interest in learning more about the complexities in the American food system and, as a result, changing my lifestyle to avoid all animal-derived products.

Fast Food Nation was first published more than 10 years ago, in 2001. It was later released as a film in 2006. *Food, Inc.* was released in 2008 and was accompanied by a 2009 follow-up book. The power of these two media texts has been immense, as demonstrated by their ability to span media genres and build upon one another. Other, perhaps less influential, critical food-related media include *Super Size Me* (2004), *The Future of Food* (2004), *Earthlings* (2005), *King Corn* (2005), *The Omnivore's Dilemma* (2006), *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle* (2007), *Fresh* (2009), *The Harvest/La Cosecha* (2011), *Forks Over Knives* (2011), and *Farmageddon* (2011). All of these media texts utilize, to some degree, moral campaigning to illustrate their respective issues. They are united by their attempt to examine the pitfalls of the current dominant food

¹² Upton Sinclair. *The Jungle*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2004.

¹³ Edward R Murrow, Dan Rather, CBS News, Docurama (Firm), and New Video Group. *Harvest of Shame*. New York: Docurama, 2005.

system rather than a desire to appreciate production processes in the realm of culture. (There is a vibrant segment of the documentary world dedicated to this field, including *Jiro Dreams of Sushi*, *A Matter of Taste: Serving Up Paul Liebrandt*, *Kings of Pastry*, and *El Bulli: Cooking in Progress*.) Eric Schlosser and Michael Pollan are part and parcel of this first wave of modern popular critical food texts. While there does seem to have been a slowing of the tide, this is not necessarily demonstrative of the end of this wave of media. These media texts—books, documentaries, and the like—have immensely impacted the popular discourse surrounding food in the 21st century. They have disseminated messages surrounding areas of concern to the public, laying the way for more applied courses of action through grassroots advocacy work. These books and documentaries have also often provided viewers and readers with relatively clear courses of action, taking prescriptive approaches to encourage behavior change.

Pollan is known for his elastic mantra, “Eat Food. Not too much. Mostly plants.”¹⁴ While clearly advocating for moderated, wholesome, plant-based eating, Pollan’s proclamation also allows readers to mold the message to mesh with their lifestyle. What does “mostly plants” truly mean? More than 50% of a meal? More than 75%? Does there even need to be such a clear definition? One could argue that this is what has made Pollan such a revered figure in popular critical food discourse, as his works and associated messages are accessible and flexible.

The point here is not necessarily to dissect Pollan’s messages (which, to be clear, has been done¹⁵), but, more significantly, to point out and contemplate the popularity of these critical food texts. If viewers of *Food Inc.* are deeply distraught by the conventional agricultural practices depicted in the documentary, they just may be motivated to alter their eating patterns and steer clear of the drive-through window. One can see the power and allure of providing a clear but simple fix to concerned readers and customers.

Other critical food texts take different approaches, including a turn towards the academic. Authors such as Julie Guthman—whose work focuses on organic agriculture in California—seem to have adopted a practice of critically examining and responding to this first wave of 21st century critical food media. Guthman, though, serves a vital role in the public narrative surrounding food issues by fostering more critical thought. While Schlosser, Pollan,

¹⁴ Michael Pollan. The New York Times, January 28, and 2007. “Unhappy Meals.” Accessed February 24, 2014. <http://michaelpollan.com/articles-archive/unhappy-meals/>.

¹⁵ Julie Guthman. “The Food Police.” *Utne*. Accessed February 24, 2014. <http://www.utne.com/politics/the-food-police.aspx>.

and others played an integral part in spreading concern far and wide (with the help of Netflix, book clubs, and social media), scholars such as Guthman add a vertical dimension to the conversation, providing an element of depth to complement the previously mentioned popular media texts. While *Food, Inc.* worked to persuade viewers of the promise of local and organic—which have all but slumped to the status of buzzwords in recent years in hyper-aware circles—critical scholars take a hammer—in Guthman’s case a sledgehammer—to this popular portrayal, demonstrating, for example, the moral and environmental bankruptcy that plagues organic agriculture’s flawed standards.¹⁶ In scaling out her studies, Guthman has also explored notions of lifestyle and, as a result, gentrification and other issues that are important to chew on while discussing food politics. Situated in the San Francisco Bay Area, Guthman historicizes the alternative food movement, including the famed offspring of Alice Waters, Chez Panisse, and urges the reader to perhaps not quite reconsider, but to certainly reexamine such a culture and its yuppie under-, and often blatant, overtones.¹⁷ This academic approach complements the first wave of popular critical food texts by institutionalizing the discourse. Although Guthman may have not yet successfully built a bridge between the ivory tower and the laypeople, she has assisted in the construction of a legitimate field of critical food studies to investigate the meta-discourse surrounding critiques of the conventional food system, as well as importantly incorporating issues of gender, race and class into the moral narrative.

Guthman works alongside many other scholars exploring everything from modern foodie culture¹⁸, to the politics of labels¹⁹, historicized notions of purity²⁰, and much more in seeking to deconstruct our food landscape—the foodscape, if you will. I have focused on Guthman here due to her ability to address and critique facets of the post-modern food(ie) movement. She offers fresh insight to an often and increasingly stale conversation, and despite

¹⁶ Julie Guthman. *Agrarian Dreams: The Paradox of Organic Farming in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

¹⁷ Guthman, Julie. “Fast Food/Organic Food: Reflexive Tastes and the Making of ‘Yuppie Chow’.” *Social & Cultural Geography* 4, no. 1 (2003): 45–58.

Here Guthman also explores the manifestations of this movement through the fat/thin dichotomy, utilizing the image of the body and class associations in her analysis.

¹⁸ Josée Johnston. *Foodies: Democracy and Distinction in the Gourmet Foodscape*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

¹⁹ Jaffee, Daniel. “Weak Coffee: Certification and Co-Optation in the Fair Trade Movement.” *Social Problems* 59, no. 1 (February 1, 2012): 94–116. doi:10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.94.

²⁰ E. DuPuis (Erna Melanie). *Nature’s Perfect Food: How Milk Became America’s Drink*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.

her shortcomings²¹, serves to check the perspectives and actions of many food activists. While Guthman does not target specific campaigns nor gauge the efficacy of organizations, her role in the greater food movement is necessary to foster healthy debate and conversation amongst and beyond the academic community.

The Politics of Sight

I am motivated to pursue this realm of research by the idea of the politics of sight. As noted above, my inducement for discussing these issues stems from my process of being exposed to previously hidden systems of production in slaughterhouses and processing facilities. Motivations for altering my personal consumption habits have evolved from instances, including reading *Fast Food Nation*, in which barriers to sight have been briefly broken down, making the unseen visible. I was eventually driven to exclude animal-derived foods from my diet entirely after viewing undercover footage showing conditions on a dairy farm. Coupled with a fundamental commitment to recognize and address social injustices, this first tear in the divide between production and consumption inspired my path towards further investigating the unseen.

Scholar Timothy Pachirat discusses the politics of sight in detail in *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*.²² The theory involves the power of vision, experience, and interaction, and the importance of altering or restricting these factors to gain or ease control. Through the lens of an ethnographic killer, Pachirat masterfully utilizes his experiences at Nebraska slaughterhouses to situate the power of sight and secrecy at the intersection of violence and food justice. Pachirat's ethnographic approach allows readers to empathize with those who make a living from killing, as well as with the killed themselves. This approach also encourages readers to better understand and appreciate the current politics of advocates involved in reducing the current distance between the fork and factory farm:

²¹ 2012, 19 April. "Weighing In: Obesity, Food Justice, and the Limits of Capitalism." *Times Higher Education*. Accessed May 5, 2014. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/books/weighing-in-obesity-food-justice-and-the-limits-of-capitalism/419649.article>.

Here Geof Rayner notes that only "two and a half pages of this book are allotted to Guthman's own alternative," making it so that "I simply don't get it." Rayner rightfully points out that Guthman's lack of faith in individual action ignores "the enormous power of the status quo."

²² Timothy Pachirat. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.

The answer to distance and concealment as mechanisms of domination, however, is not more distance and concealment. In a world characterized by the operation of physical, social, linguistic, and methodological distance and concealment as techniques of power, movements that seek to subvert or shorten this distance through a politics of sight are necessary and important.²³

Pachirat goes on to praise the efforts of various advocacy groups, from the Humane Society of the United States to WikiLeaks, for their efforts “that aim at the metaphorical equivalent of a world in which slaughterhouses are enclosed by walls of glass.”²⁴ This work of closing the gap between the viewer and the (un)seen, especially within the context of animal welfare, requires dedicated activists to make visible what has for so long been kept from sight.

Pachirat effectively acts as a bridge between scholarly communities and those in the popular realm. His work is embedded in ethnographic tradition and draws on critical sociology to support his observations, yet his project is situated in an actual site of food production and successfully portrays these phenomena in an extremely accessible manner. This combination serves to prop up an already powerful work, making Pachirat’s work available and attractive to a variety of readers.

Furrowing in on Food Discourses

I aim to build on the work of Pachirat and others to foster a more effective movement situated within the operating realm of the politics of sight. Recognizing the vital nature of this expository work in raising awareness about farmed animal issues, I intend here to highlight work that dismantles the distance within which the worst abuses occur.

The animal protection movement, although centuries old, continues to enlist only a miniscule number of followers and often fails to garner credibility by slipping into stereotype, cliché, and perceived extremism. Pachirat’s research actively expands on the basic animal protection narrative by providing an intersection with broader, late-capitalist structural tendencies operating within a fundamental system of distance. Additionally, his work combines theory with praxis and serves an advocacy role not only in providing a detailed account of the myriad instances of exploitation within animal agriculture, but also by encouraging a more thoughtful response to these problematic practices.

²³ Ibid., 252

²⁴ Ibid.

I certainly encourage readers to access the abundant archive of resources discussing perceived problems with the use and abuse of non-human animals in the agricultural complex.²⁵

²⁶ In order to better understand what drives animal protection advocates, it is worth providing a very brief discussion of motivating factors to those outside of the movement.

The agricultural sector constitutes the largest arena of animal use and has thus become a focus for many individual advocates as well as regional and national groups. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, nearly 10 billion land animals are currently raised and slaughtered each year within the country. This value does not include fish and other aquatic animals.²⁷ The vast majority of these animals are raised in intensive conditions. For example, hens in egg production facilities approved by the United Egg Producers are allotted an average of only 67 square inches of space.²⁸ The paper you are currently holding is 93.5 square inches.

Chickens, pigs, cattle, and other commonly used animals are routinely subjected to industry-standard practices that are cringe-worthy even when mentioned briefly. These practices—from tail-docking to dehorning to castration without the use of anesthetics—are frequently referenced and depicted in undercover investigations, hoping to appeal to consumers' sense of empathy by demonstrating the gap between their moral beliefs and the industry practices they buy into. The video shown through the 10 Billion Lives Tour depicts all of these practices, as captured by undercover investigators, to demonstrate the intensity of the abuses animals in agriculture suffer.

The tour demonstrates the powerful role of targeted media campaigns in eliciting a moral concern for animals and, thus, a motivation to actually shift consumption patterns away from meat, dairy, and eggs. While there is certainly an existing literature on advocacy efficacy, which will be discussed below, some of it fails to either situate its claims entirely, or does not provide a level of detail that the reader may desire.

Again, I argue here that agents of social change need to design and implement campaigns utilizing interactive media components that advocate specific issues based on streamlined

²⁵ Peter Singer. *Animal Liberation*. 1st Ecco pbk. ed.. New York: Ecco, 2002.

²⁶ Gail A. Eisnitz. *Slaughterhouse: The Shocking Story of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane Treatment Inside the U.S. Meat Industry*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1997.

²⁷ "Farm Animal Statistics: Slaughter Totals: The Humane Society of the United States." Accessed February 24, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/resources/research/stats_slaughter_totals.html.

²⁸ "Table Egg Production and Hen Welfare: Agreement and Legislative Proposals." *Agricultural Legislation*, July 17, 2013. <http://agriculture-legislation.blogspot.com/2013/07/table-egg-production-and-hen-welfare.html>.

emotional appeal and factual reasoning. These efforts will mesh with the works of scholarly and popular food writers to engage more segments of the public with critical food issues.

My research concerning the efficacy of the animal protection movement incorporates discursive, cultural, and, perhaps demographic components of being situated. By focusing on the narratives utilized specifically by the animal rights movement, I employ a critical approach to evaluate the broader animal protection movement. Discussing the efficacy of the cleverly-designed, targeted 10 Billion Lives Tour, I will explore the importance of intelligently targeting specific portions of the American public to maximize effectiveness, leading to larger rates of change in consumption patterns.

In addition to the impacts of this first wave of popular critical food texts discussed above, I am interested in examining the 10 Billion Lives Tour juxtaposed with legislative and institutional progress for farmed animals. I argue that these popular food texts and institutional and legislative victories are interwoven with grassroots campaigns, and they build upon one another to bring about tangible change for farmed animals. The 10 Billion Lives Tour takes to the (literal) streets to build upon other instances of social progress in an effort to reach and inspire individuals to decrease their demand for products seen to be morally problematic.

Spanning geographical boundaries to address a national commodification apparatus, grassroots animal advocates traverse a “glocal” system by inspiring change on the individual level while others in the movement address legal and institutional facets of the system.²⁹ This will be discussed below in more detail.

While I certainly argue for a more effective and intelligent social movement surrounding farmed animal issues, I do realize that there is by no means whatsoever a consensus concerning these issues within the broader food movement. While many readers may (hopefully!) consider themselves involved or interested in some way in this type of work, others may be removed from food transparency narratives for a variety of reasons and thus be mostly or entirely disengaged from this conversation. The animal protection community is particularly notorious for being inaccessible to those systematically disadvantaged due to their race, class, or even gender identity. An essential component in analyzing activism efficacy, these issues will be addressed further later.

²⁹ *Jim Proctor, Professor of Environmental Studies at Lewis & Clark often advocates that his students “think glocally, act glocally,” refuting and effectively expropriating the overused mantra to problematize the false division between the local and global.*

I hope to traverse this gap, though, not necessarily by providing detailed information as to why animal protection and food justice issues are of concern, but more by demonstrating that these movements are becoming more established as well as self-conscious with each day and continue their efforts more mindfully of their efficacy. In other words, I explore the topic of animal protection advocacy through an empirical lens, moving past the evaluative to the instrumental to examine and increase the efficacy of various tactics.

Looking at (More of) the Literature

There is, in fact, a relatively small but significant literature situated at the intersection I wish to examine. Bruce Friedrich, a long-time animal advocate, penned the *Animal Activist's Handbook*, a popular resource within the animal protection community. Various scholars have commented specifically on the effectiveness of animal advocacy efforts in the United States and abroad^{30,31,32}, the Humane Research Council works with organizations to assess their efficacy³³, and an Effective Animal Activism Facebook group³⁴ allows virtually anybody to weigh in on these issues, as well as link to and comment on new findings. Of great interest and relevance here, though, is Nick Cooney's *Change of Heart: What Psychology Can Teach Us About Social Change*.³⁵ A sort of *Tipping Point*³⁶ specialized for the social justice activist, *Change of Heart* provides readers with a healthy dose of accessible pop psychology to provide a refreshing and accessible account of existing research, contextualized with examples of activist efforts.

³⁰ "Beyond Morality: Developing a New Rhetorical Strategy for the Animal Rights Movement." *Maxim Fetissenko*. Accessed February 5, 2014. <http://fetissenko.com/research/beyond-morality/>.

³¹ Cherry, Elizabeth. "Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement." *Sociological Forum* 25, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 450–475.

³² Bob Torres. *Making a Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights*. Oakland, CA ; Edinburgh, Scotland: AK Press, 2007.

³³ "HumaneSpot.org | Your Animal Advocacy Resource Center." Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://spot.humaneresearch.org/node>.

The Humane Research Council has published a variety of vital studies in the field of animal advocacy. Their report on readability, funded in part by Farm Animal Rights Movement (FARM), proves the need to simplify outreach materials and messages. The HRC "recommends developing vegan outreach materials at a 7th or 8th grade reading level in order to ensure comprehensibility for a large proportion of the target audience." While animal advocacy groups commonly come under attack for simplifying human-animal uses and relationships, the HRC demonstrates the need for the movement to maintain simplicity as the fundamental operating system for the movement

³⁴ Facebook. "Effective Animal Activism—Discussion Group." Accessed March 21, 2014. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/EffectiveAnimalActivism/>

³⁵ Nick Cooney. *Change of Heart: What Psychology Can Teach Us About Spreading Social Change*. New York: Lantern Books, 2011.

³⁶ Malcolm Gladwell. *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make A Big Difference*. 1st ed.. Boston: Little, Brown, 2000.

Cooney rounds up a much-appreciated variety of statistics, all of which relate in some manner to social change, whether in the environmental, human rights, or animal advocacy realm. From the contribution ethic³⁷, to the foot in the door approach³⁸, to the stability hypothesis³⁹, *Change of Heart* not only utilizes existing psychological studies to situate them for agents of social change, it also proves that there is a literal and (semi-) academic market for this topic. Unsatisfied with current tactics or frustrated with stereotypes involved in social change work, dedicated scholars and activists can rely on Cooney's work for a brief (and admittedly often basic) but relevant tome of popular psychology.

Cooney has also initiated further research of his own in the arena of animal advocacy through his organization, The Humane League. With offices across the country, The Humane League is extremely invested in maximizing efficacy and minimizing costs to reduce the greatest amount of suffering for non-human animals. Humane League staff and volunteers have used many of the same venues as FARM to test the appeal of various leaflets outlining reasons to reduce meat consumption.⁴⁰

Of the literature addressing effective activist efforts, the work of Tonsor and Wolf zooms in on perspective and rhetoric within the realm of dairy consumption. Their article, "Effect of Video Information on Consumers: Milk Production Attributes,"⁴¹ situates critical food narratives in three YouTube campaign videos from the California Milk Advisory Board, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), and the Center for Food Integrity. Tonsor and Wolf assessed participants' perceptions prior to viewing the videos, asking the participants whether and how much of the conventional milk supply comes from "(a) cows provided growth hormones, (b) cows treated with antibiotics, (c) cows provided organic feed, (d) cows provided regular access to the outdoors and pastures, (e) farms with less than fifty cows, and (f) farms

³⁷ Cooney, *Change of Heart*, 50.

The contribution ethic: "I've done my part on issue A, so it's okay for me to ignore issues B, C, and D."

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 93.

The foot in the door approach: "Make a small initial request to which a person is likely to say 'yes'" to later "make a second, larger request" to make them "more likely to say 'yes' to the larger request."

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 180.

The stability hypothesis: "The social environment will determine how most people live their lives, and that on any particular issue people will generally adopt the default position."

⁴⁰ "The Humane League." *TheHumaneLeague.com*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://www.TheHumaneLeague.com>.

⁴¹ Tonsor, Glynn T., and Christopher A. Wolf. "Effect of Video Information on Consumers: Milk Production Attributes." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 94, no. 2 (January 1, 2012): 503–508.

providing appropriate overall care for the well-being of their dairy cows.”⁴² These factors are significant in that they signify elements of production practices deemed desirable to many discerning consumers. Additionally, most of them have a moral element, with many consumers demonstrating concern for the treatment of cows used for dairy production, emphasizing a desire for smaller operations that do not utilize hormones, antibiotics, or other elements perceived to be “unnatural.”

The hypothesis—that the participants’ perceptions would not be significantly altered after viewing the videos—was shattered. Participants viewing the infamous “Happy Cows” video from the California Milk Advisory Board surfaced with more confidence that the conventional milk commodity chain utilized one or more of the idealized practices listed above. PETA’S “Unhappy Cows” video “triggered largely opposite responses to those of the Happy Cows video,”⁴³ as consumers were made aware of morally questionable farming practices, highlighting the fact that “California’s dairy cows live on lots without even a blade of grass, forced to produce unnatural amounts of milk, and often routinely neglected.”⁴⁴ Surprisingly, though, the Center for Food Integrity’s “Farmers Feed Us” video, which claimed that, “we treat our cows like princesses,” and focused on an individual, multi-generation farm in Michigan had the strongest effect. This video swayed participant perception towards belief that conventional milk includes more of the desirable practices listed above.

Furthermore, Tonsor and Wolf investigated consumer willingness to pay (WTP), incorporating a much-needed economic analysis, ultimately finding that there were no “significant changes in stated WTP for milk attributes following video.”⁴⁵ In other words, although consumers expressed interest in these desirable milk attributes, they were not significantly swayed in their willingness to pay for such attributes after watching one of the videos. Despite the videos’ pandering, consumers were not driven to change their actual behaviors, even when stated hypothetically. Even though the participants did not end up purchasing different products, their altered perceptions signal a rupture in socially constructed estimations of dairy production practices. While Tonsor and Wolf’s results may ultimately be disappointing to animal protection advocates, it does demonstrate a significant preliminary step

⁴² Ibid., 503.

⁴³ Ibid., 506.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 508

in recognizing the ideological changes motivated by the ingestion of critical media pieces. Nonetheless, it is important that animal advocates continue to exercise an ethical narrative to convey the urgency of taking action on behalf of farmed animals.

Advocacy for Animals: Which Side of the Aisle?

The animal protection movement is deeply divided. I have avoided the use of terms such as "rights" and "liberation" here due mainly to their loaded meanings and contested nature. The "farmed animal protection movement," for these purposes, incorporates advocates on both sides of the hypothetical aisle. Whereas welfarists continue to work to improve conditions, ban the most egregious agricultural practices, and do so primarily through legislative and corporate avenues, abolitionists question the fundamental human use of animals and strive to dismantle their status as property. Domestic animals are, fundamentally, our property in the legal realm.⁵⁸ Aside from meager and ill-enforced anti-cruelty statutes, we can do with our dogs, cats, chickens, and pigs what we wish.⁵⁹ Whereas welfare-oriented advocates aim to reduce suffering by outlawing particularly cruel practices, some do not question the systematic commodification of animal bodies. Those who take the abolitionist stance, however, strike at the roots of animal suffering by questioning the socially constructed notion of animals as ours to use and abuse in the first place.⁶⁰ In spite of these disagreements, I argue that these ideologies inform one another, as informed individuals encourage institutional change, and vice versa. This diversity of positions manifests itself both as healthy, tactical debate, as well as crippling in-fighting.

The 10 Billion Lives Tour was constructed on an abolitionist framework, as an outreach model that rejects the inherently cruel commodification and use of animals for food. However, it is important to note that the video describes these industry-standard practices and uses

⁵⁸ Pamela D. Frasch. *Animal Law in a Nutshell*. St. Paul, MN: Thomson/West, 2011.

⁵⁹ Bob Torres. *Making a Killing : the Political Economy of Animal Rights*. Oakland, CA ; Edinburgh, Scotland: AK Press, 2007. 58.

To illustrate the moral nuances with the property status of animals, Torres notes that, "We are so accustomed to thinking of animals as our property that rarely think of the impacts of this legal and social status for animals. For example, were I a fickle pet wonder and I were to tire of living with the dog who is sleeping at my feet as I write this, I could sell her for whatever I felt was a fair price... Similarly, I could take her to the vet right now and have her euthanized if I wished. In either case, because she is my property, I am more or less free to dispose of her as I wish."

⁶⁰ Francione, Gary L., and Robert Garner. *Animal Rights Debate : Abolition or Regulation?* New York, NY, USA: Columbia University Press, 2010. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10433227>.

disturbing undercover footage to plant seeds of compassion in viewers to reflect on the manifestations of a social and economic system that allows animals to be commodified at all.

Instead of adding my voice to an already robust choir criticizing various tactics or campaigns, I have consciously opted to discuss how I believe the 10 Billion Lives Tour has come to be so successful, measured here by self-reported surveys noting dietary change. Since I advocate staunchly for the continued use of follow-up surveys and other involved methods to gauge the effectiveness of various farmed animal protection efforts, I believe it is important here to demonstrate what I see as a model for successful outreach rather than criticize other efforts. Those who do not show concern for the efficiency of their campaigns are almost certainly doomed to fail as they utilize whatever means they see fit to passionately yet un-tactfully spit their message into today's ever-complex, media-dominated culture. I attempt in the following pages to avoid the often dangerous downward spiral of negative critique by instead bringing forth what I find to be an exemplary model of effective, long-lasting educational outreach to reduce the number of animals killed for food in the United States.

II. Narrowing In: The Application of the 10 Billion Lives Tour in a Time of Change

The 10 Billion Lives Tour is effective due to its clever utilization of media, coupled with masterful situating in demographically-targeted locations to maximize receptiveness. Additionally, the focus on ethical narratives works to not only explain the motivations for, but actually encourage dietary change as a direct response to industry practices perceived to be morally problematic. The campaign has been designed and operated to implement findings from Nick Cooney in *Change of Heart* and other studies, and continues to gather data to increase efficacy. FARM staff continues to collaborate on an informal basis with Cooney to ensure maximum effectiveness within the tour.

The tour's interactive video media model builds on perhaps the most utilized tactic in the farmed animal advocacy realm, leafleting. As the process of distributing print booklets to passerby at busy locations, virtually any able-bodied animal advocate can easily leaflet. While it certainly requires fewer resources than the 10 Billion Lives Tour's video tactic, leafleting does not ultimately prove to be as successful, with between 1%-6% of Vegan Outreach leaflet recipients reducing their consumption of red meat, poultry and fish. The changes are even smaller for dairy and eggs.⁶¹

The 10 Billion Lives Tour works to enact change for animals by empowering individuals. It does so alongside other animal advocates working diligently to inspire legislative and greater institutional change. These processes work simultaneously to advance the status of animals and encourage Americans to reconsider and expand their circle of moral concern. In other words, the boundaries of our moral community are increasingly being expanded to include non-human animals. While companion animals such as dogs and cats—"honorary humans"⁶²—have benefitted from expanding social privilege and legislative victories for quite some time, farmed animals are beginning to gain only some of the most basic legal protections in the United States. Before diving into the details of the 10 Billion Lives Tour, I find it necessary to note major large-

⁶¹ "Leafleting Outreach Study Analysis (Fall 2013) | Animal Charity Evaluators." Accessed May 5, 2014. <http://www.animalcharityevaluators.org/research/interventions/leafleting/leafleting-outreach-study-fall-2013/leafleting-outreach-study-analysis-fall-2013/#main>.

⁶² Cherry, Elizabeth. "Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement." *Sociological Forum* 25, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 454.

scale advances for the greater animal protection movement, which serve to mutually benefit grassroots efforts.

The Times Are Changing: Legislative and Institutional Advances

In early 2008 it was impossible to turn on the news or open a newspaper without reading about the Hallmark/Westland Meat Packing Company. What was once a thriving California cattle processing plant was ultimately shuttered due to the investigatory efforts of an animal protection group. After horrific abuses to cattle were documented on the premises, Hallmark eventually recalled 143 million pounds of beef—the largest meat recall in the nation’s history—and subsequently closed its doors due to bankruptcy.⁶³

It is worth mentioning the specifics of the case here to demonstrate how ethical and public health concerns coalesced to lead to massive institutional change. The “downed” cows—those unable to walk to slaughter—were, while struggling even to stay alive after being transported to the plant, “kicked, shocked and shoved with forklifts.”⁶⁴ An undercover investigator documented employees openly engaging in these abuses on the property. Concerned about the ability of these injured animals to spread mad cow disease and other pathogens, public health was at risk. This became especially crucial as it was soon after discovered that millions of pounds of Hallmark beef were used in school lunches and other federal programs.⁶⁵ In short, the USDA was widely criticized for allowing the downed cows to be slaughtered, the company went bankrupt, and millions of American consumers were exposed to problematic practices in their trusted commodity chains. Ultimately the investigation inspired the USDA to alter their practices to improve both animal welfare and public health after the Humane Society of the United States sued the institution.^{66, 67}

Significantly, this investigation exposed more than just severe health violations that spread nationwide from one slaughterhouse. It also brought to the attention of millions of

⁶³ Martin, Andrew. “Largest Recall of Ground Beef Is Ordered.” *The New York Times*, February 18, 2008, sec. Business. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/18/business/18recall.html>.

⁶⁴ The Associated Press. “California: Deal Reached in Suit Over Animal Abuse.” *The New York Times*, November 27, 2013, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/28/us/california-deal-reached-in-suit-over-animal-abuse.html>.

⁶⁵ Hu, Winnie. “New Jersey Schools Told to Discard Suspect Beef.” *The New York Times*, February 26, 2008, sec. New York Region. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/26/nyregion/26recall.html>.

⁶⁶ Martin, Andrew. “Agriculture Dept. Vows to Improve Animal Welfare.” *The New York Times*, February 29, 2008, sec. Business. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/29/business/29food.html>.

⁶⁷ Martin, Andrew. “Humane Society Sues U.S. in Cattle Case.” *The New York Times*, February 28, 2008, sec. Business. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/28/business/28beef.html>.

Americans the atrocious cruelty involved in animal processing for perhaps the first time. The fact that school lunchmeat was sourced from heinously abused cattle was shocking to those who turned on the morning news. By pointing out the ethical issues in animal agriculture, this 2008 investigation paved the way for a slough of further investigations and undoubtedly helped fuel the passage of California's Proposition 2.

Although only a California ballot initiative, news about Proposition 2 swept the nation leading up to the 2008 election. Effectively banning specific confinement practices in the egg, pork, and veal industries, the legislation passed by a sizable majority of voters and utilized a handful of ethical tropes to encourage voters to favor its implementation to alleviate the suffering of millions of farmed animals.⁶⁸ A video by Humane California called "Uncaged" encouraged voters to support the initiative, utilizing an anthropomorphized cartoon pig dancing through various agricultural facilities. Distressed animals begged viewers to free them from their tightly caged conditions.⁶⁹ While the initiative proved victorious to much fanfare from the animal protection community, Proposition 2 was not the first of its kind, as similar efforts actually passed in Florida and Arizona in 2002 and 2006, respectively⁷⁰ (See Table 1). Proposition 2 was incredibly important, though, in that it demonstrated a shifting public opinion towards concern for farmed animals in the country's most significant agricultural state.

Data show that large segments of the population approve of these changes across the country. Specifically, 91% of Connecticut voters demonstrated their support for legislation that would ban specific crating practices in the state in 2013. Additionally, "the survey also found that nearly 80 percent of voters say they are more likely to cast their ballot for a lawmaker who supports legislation to prohibit gestation crates."⁷¹ This indicates the importance of lawmakers' pro-animal platform in soliciting voter support and signals the need for politicians to align their values with those of their constituents. If an overwhelming majority of voters

⁶⁸ Lovvorn, Jonathan R., and Nancy V. Perry. "California Proposition 2: A Watershed Moment for Animal Law." *Animal Law* 15 (2009 2008).

⁶⁹ *Uncaged-YES on Prop 2*, 2008. Accessed March 21, 2014.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oqPJsfjyyZU&feature=youtube_gdata_player.

⁷⁰ Lovvorn, Jonathan R., and Nancy V. Perry. "California Proposition 2: A Watershed Moment for Animal Law." *Animal Law* 15 (2009 2008): 154.

⁷¹ "New Poll Shows 91 Percent of Connecticut Voters Support Legislation to Protect Farm Animals: The Humane Society of the United States." Accessed March 21, 2014.
http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2013/05/hb6317-conn-gestation-crate-poll-052913.html.

support placing a moratorium on morally problematic agricultural practices, lawmakers clearly need to highlight their commitment to these issues to maintain public support.

Year	State	Legislation	Voter Approval
2002	Florida	Amendment 10 —“bans the caging of pigs in gestation crates” ⁷²	54.75%
2006	Arizona	Amendment 204 —“bans the intensive confinement of breeding pigs and veal calves” ⁷³	62%
2008	California	Proposition 2 —reforms confinement of pigs, hens, and veal calves, requiring the ability to “lie down, stand up, fully extend their limbs and turn around freely” ⁷⁴	63.5%

Table 1: Major successful state legislation reforming confinement practices for farmed animals

Just as this type of support for animal welfare legislation is not exclusive to a specific state or region of the country, it is also not exclusive to agricultural reforms. In fact, entire industries can be outlawed when politicians and public opinion coincide to create tangible change. As of July 1, 2012, the state of California banned the production and sale of foie gras, the artificially fattened livers of ducks and geese. Pitting chefs against animal advocates against producers against lawmakers, the legislation was passed on the premise that foie gras was a comestible delicacy out of touch with public opinion.⁷⁵ Foie gras has long been a culturally- and morally-contested product both in Europe and the United States. Animal advocates target foie gras, specifically, for its particularly problematic production process, which involves a practice called *gavage* in which birds are force-fed through funnels to fatten their livers. Some academics, siding with producers, continue to argue that *gavage* is not an inherently painful

⁷² “Crammed into Gestation Crates: The Humane Society of the United States.” Accessed May 7, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/confinement_farm/facts/gestation_crates.html#.U2msHVMpd4Y.

⁷³ “Animals Win Big at Ballot Box : The Humane Society of the United States.” Accessed May 4, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2006/11/arizona_michigan_ballot_110706.html#.U2RqHVMpd4Y.

⁷⁴ “Poultry Cage Laws Create Scrambled Eggs.” Accessed May 7, 2014. <http://farmfutures.com/blogs-poultry-cage-laws-create-scrambled-eggs-8147>.

⁷⁵ Leibowitz, Ed. “The Last Days of Foie Gras.” *Atlantic Monthly* (10727825) 310, no. 1 (August 7, 2012): 37–38.

technique and have denounced the demonization of foie gras.⁷⁶ Nonetheless, California residents have since made do without the French delicacy while animal advocates and foie gras fans continue their battle across the country.⁷⁷

The foie gras ban in California is critical here because it not only completely outlawed an entire industry, but managed to do so using moral rhetoric. John Burton, chair of the California Democratic Party, and principal backer of the bill, claimed that, “The bottom line is, you shouldn’t be torturing Goosey Gander and Donald Duck.”⁷⁸ Public opinion was cited as a motivator for spearheading the legislation.⁷⁹

Reforms continue to pass in board meetings and legislative sessions, and seem only to increase in scale. Smithfield foods asked its suppliers in early 2014 to phase out gestation crates by 2022. These crates confine breeder sows, prohibiting them from turning around or even lying down and standing up. The giant pork producer claimed that the suggested reform “will help maintain the farms' value for years to come, while at the same time supporting our company wide commitment to animal care.”⁸⁰ Following this, Canada banned gestation crates in pork production across the board, effectively outlawing one of the most brutal sources of discomfort for sows.⁸¹ These legislative and institutional changes continue to reform the farmed animal commodity system while grassroots campaigns simultaneously encourage consumers to reflect on their support for these industries. These efforts mutually aid and abet one another and work to appeal to emotional and ethical rationales to incite change.

The Tour: Background

The 10 Billion Lives Tour is a program of Farm Animal Rights Movement (FARM), a national non-profit animal protection group that has addressed animal use in the agricultural

⁷⁶ Heath, Deborah, and Anne Meneley. “The Naturecultures of Foie Gras.” *Food, Culture & Society* 13, no. 3 (September 2010): 421–452.

⁷⁷ Caro, Mark. *The Foie Gras Wars: How a 5,000-Year-Old Delicacy Inspired the World’s Fiercest Food Fight*. Simon and Schuster, 2009.

⁷⁸ Leibowitz, Ed. “The Last Days of Foie Gras”: 38.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 37

You go out in the street and ask 25 people 'What do you think about fattened duck liver?' and they'll say 'Oh, I don't like that.' You don't have to take a poll,” claimed Josiah Citrin, a chef at a restaurant serving foie gras.

⁸⁰ “Smithfield Urges Farmers to End Use of Gestation Crates.” Accessed March 10, 2014. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/01/07/hog-crates-ban/4362353/>.

⁸¹ Randy Shore. “New Code Restricts Painful Practices, Confinement in Pig Rearing | Vancouver Sun.” Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://blogs.vancouversun.com/2014/03/10/new-code-restricts-painful-practices-confinement-in-pig-rearing/>.

sector since their official formation in 1981. FARM was founded in 1976—by a Polish Holocaust survivor—out of the first major animal rights conference held in the United States, and has maintained a steady level of activity since those initial years. The organization continues to employ less than 15 full-time employees, boasting low overhead costs coupled with a sizable network of grassroots volunteers across the country that assists in planning local events. FARM advocates the adoption of a vegan diet as the most thorough response to the ethical issues inherent in animal agriculture. FARM operates out of their primary office in Bethesda, Maryland. Despite their proximity to the nation’s capitol, the organization “sh[ies] away from legislative initiatives, as they are very costly, unlikely to reduce the number of animals used for food, and vulnerable to unintended consequences.”⁸² Thus, the organization works from the bottom up to influence and inspire individual consumers to change their consumptive behaviors to shift demand away from animal-based foods. This model contrasts with lobbying efforts of other groups such as the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and the American Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), but it is important to note that FARM acts in tandem with these other important efforts to produce a multi-faceted animal protection movement utilizing an impressive array of tactics. FARM’s longstanding commitment to the power of grassroots activism has made the implementation of the 10 Billion Lives Tour possible.

My motivation to focus on the 10 Billion Lives Tour stems from my participation during the summer months of both 2012 and 2013. During these two summers as an intern and tour operator, respectively, I was able to witness firsthand the process of utilizing media in the form of an informational video, coupled with a follow-up conversation (and, later, email blasts) in raising awareness regarding the conditions and use of animals in the agricultural sector. However, these firsthand encounters are not enough to measure the long-term effects on viewers concerning actual dietary change. By utilizing data from in-person surveys and online forms, I will discuss the impact of the tour on self-reported dietary change. The data demonstrate a higher level of efficacy than anticipated just from my mere involvement with the tour during the span of two summers. I will explore the quantitative data that FARM has collected from viewers and complement it by providing brief qualitative supplements from intimate personal experience working (and living) on the tour.

⁸² Farm Animal Rights Movement. “About.” Accessed March 2, 2014. <http://www.farmusa.org/about.htm>

The Humane Research Council has published some of these data in October 2013.⁸³ The data are published as a downloadable spreadsheet as well as a brief, two-page conclusion of the findings and motivations for conducting the surveys, authored by two FARM employees.

However, findings published through the Humane Research Council can escape the attention of academics for a variety of reasons. The Council requires interested readers to apply for approval to view research articles in their entirety. This process seems to be more of a formality than an intention to keep their findings insular, and is used to solicit information about readers to better serve their interests. Additionally, these findings tend to be ingested only by scholars and advocates interested specifically in animal protection issues. Thus, I hope to bring this niche-specific work out of the animal rights community to demonstrate its importance to those involved in other social movements or critical food studies as well. Even for those not involved in the animal advocacy community, these data provide a context-specific example of the utility of demographically-targeted campaigns and their implementation of media elements to shift consumer perceptions and ignite behavior change.

Contextualizing the Campaign

The 10 Billion Lives Tour provides a \$1 incentive to view a 4-minute video depicting industry-standard practices and general slaughterhouse footage with moral contextualization. The video is supplemented with an insightful follow-up conversation with a staff member of the tour to debrief viewers. This aims to provide viewers with the moral motivation and practical resources to, hopefully, make changes to their eating habits. The tour staff and interns, comprised of young animal advocates, ask viewers about their general thoughts on the video, inquire about pledges to change dietary habits, and field questions from viewers who are motivated to shift their diets but lack the resources to do so.

Using two vehicles in its campaign across the country, the tour seeks out young people—perceived to be more open-minded than other segments of the population—to engage in educational outreach.

⁸³ Felsinger, Alex; Weberman, Michael “A Year Later: The Effectiveness of FARM’s 10 Billion Lives on Warped Tour.” Accessed March 10, 2014. <http://spot.humaneresearch.org/content/year-later-effectiveness-farms-10-billion-lives-warped-tour>.

The original, main segment of the tour—which will be the focus of this research—operates out of a large, retrofitted step van with eight touch-controlled screens, each with four sets of headphones, on the exterior of the vehicle (see Figure 1). The screens are protected by hinged flaps that close at the end of events to protect the technology while traveling.

The vehicle shows a same 4-minute mini-documentary, also called *10 Billion Lives*, which was compiled by FARM staff with the help of an outside agency. The video outlines standard industry practices in various animal agriculture operations as captured by undercover investigators.⁸⁴ Prior to beginning the video, viewers must enter their email address. This is used to follow up with viewers to provide them with educational and online resources (such as recipes and tips on transitioning away from meat) as well as surveys to help FARM assess the impacts of the video on actual, yet self-reported, dietary change.

After the video, viewers must answer a question that asks, “How many days a week can you pledge to eat animal-free meals?” The screen offers categorical responses ranging from 0 to 7 days a week. Here participants end their viewing experience and find an intern to receive their \$1 and engage in further dialogue about the content of the video.



Figure 1. The *10 Billion Lives* van conducting outreach at a college campus

The vehicle houses between two to five paid FARM employees and interns, including a tour operator, tour assistant, and driver. These staffers work with local volunteers at college campuses, street fairs, and music festivals such as Warped Tour to maximize outreach opportunities while minimizing costs.

⁸⁴ *A 4-minute Glimpse into the Story of 10 Billion Lives*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://10billionlives.com/>.

While FARM campaigns to solicit online views, my research focuses on the vehicle-based outreach model. I worked and lived on tour for a total of four months in June and July of 2012 and 2013. As the vehicle took a detour from college campuses and street fairs, it traveled with Warped Tour, a mobile music festival spanning the country from coast to coast each summer. In 2014, Warped Tour will feature more than 100 artists at 42 cities across North America between June and August.⁸⁵

Warped Tour serves as a prime operating grounds for the 10 Billion Lives Tour, and for many non-profit organizations in general. Celebrating its 20th anniversary in 2014, Warped Tour has brought together an increasingly diverse array of musicians, although the tour's original intent in 1994 was to showcase punk rock bands. The tour caravans across the country, featuring a massive stage set-up, catering, and administrative crew in addition to the musicians, vendors, and non-profit organizations. Mobile stages are erected at various outdoor venues, and, coupled with non-profit organizations, companies, retail and food vendors, and bands selling records and merchandise, make for a mobile city that is unpacked and torn down each day throughout the summer. Approved non-profit organizations and their touring staff are granted free entry at all tour dates, but must cover their own traveling costs between venues, making Warped Tour an attractive prospect for organizations with sufficient funding, willing staff, and a creative campaign to target and interact with the festival-goers. In addition to a handful of animal protection organizations, groups such as Invisible Children, the Keep-A-Breast Foundation, and Feed Our Children Now regularly partner with Warped Tour to increase awareness about their respective campaigns and increase donations to their organizations.⁸⁶

In general, Warped Tour is a hotbed for progressive advocacy groups because it brings in a group of young, social media-savvy consumers, many of whom have already been exposed to social issues online or in recent high school classes. Ten years into the tour, in 2004, 80% of attendees were between the ages of 12-19.⁸⁷ As of 2012, Warped Tour continued to draw in a young crowd: 70% of festival-goers were between 13-19 years of age.⁸⁸ Additionally, many

⁸⁵ Vans Warped Tour. "2014 Dates." Accessed 21 March 2014. <http://vanswarpedtour.com/dates>

⁸⁶ Vans Warped Tour. "Warped 101." Accessed 21 March 2014. <http://vanswarpedtour.com/101>

⁸⁷ Billboard. Nielsen Business Media Inc. . *Billboard*. "Warped Tour Celebrates 10 Years." Nielsen Business Media, Inc., 2004. 31.

⁸⁸ "Revitalized Vans Warped Tour Regains Popularity." *TribLIVE.com*. Accessed May 6, 2014. <http://triblive.com/aande/2164661-74/tour-warped-lyman-fans-says-bands-kevin-burgettstown-niagara-pavilion>.

express an interest in anti-establishment (“punk”) politics and alternative culture, and actively exercise and express this identity by attending Warped Tour. By interacting with their favorite musicians and fashion lines, and being willing to engage with progressive issues, including human rights, queer issues, and pro-vegetarian campaigns, Warped Tour attendees are a desirable demographic for many non-profit organizations. Many bands playing at Warped Tour have openly vegetarian and vegan members, who directly and indirectly assist the efforts of animal advocacy organizations at the festival since many attendees actively idolize these musicians and are extremely swayed by their messages. In addition to targeting youth immersed in alternative music and culture at Warped Tour, the 10 Billion Lives Tour also recognizes the importance of incentives to encourage viewership.

The Importance of Incentives

The incentivizing process adds an integral element to the tour. Termed “pay-per-view,” the 10 Billion Lives Tour’s outreach model incentivizes prospective viewers with \$1 in cash to watch the video. This method works to bring passerby into the viewing area, many fascinated with the prospect of a group giving out free money to watch a nondescript 4-minute video. By reversing the trend typically associated with non-profit organizations, FARM has capitalized on the opportunity to provide a meager but promising monetary incentive to solicit viewers. Coupled with the vague branding of the tour, the \$1 incentive beckons passerby to ponder the content of the video as well as the motivations for the tour. Since the tour materials, including the van exterior and the signs, provide virtually no hints as to the content of the video, willing passerby initiate the viewing process with very limited knowledge of the tour’s message. This works, generally, to the advantage of the tour staff, who rely on this relative lack of knowledge to encourage viewership and entertain queuing passerby if all of the screens are full. While they are certainly willing to answer questions about the contents of the video, the tour staff maintain a veil of as much confidentiality as possible, commenting perhaps that the video is “about food” or “about animals” or, courting the possibility of giving too much away, that “the video is about animals in our food system.” Anticipating the repelling effect of disgust concerning the prospect of watching four minutes of animal use and abuse, the tour staff attempt to intrigue viewers enough to consent to watch the video while being circumspect about its actual contents.

While some passerby learn about content of the video from other concert-goers or caught a glimpse of the footage over the shoulders of other viewers, the vast majority are legitimately intrigued by the campaign, unsure whether the vehicle and video are the project of some corporate outreach attempt, a non-profit organization, or even an attempt from anti-abortion activists or religious evangelicals tapping into the youth-oriented venue to spread the word.

As tour operator, I instructed staffers to go so far as to explain to skeptics that, “We are a non-profit looking to raise awareness about issues in our food system.” In this relatively neutral and certainly ambiguous manner, hesitant concert-goers were enticed to learn more about our video and organization in general, even if they suspected that the video would contain distressing facts and footage. Many passerby did ask staffers if the video was “sad” or even “fucked up,” along the lines of the documentaries *Food, Inc.* or *Earthlings*, which contain graphic footage. Some even asked, “Is this video going to make me cry?” While staffers employed a plethora of responses to these potential viewers, we did inform those concerned about their sensitivity that the video did contain graphic, disturbing footage, reminding them that the decision to participate lay ultimately with them, and that the tour attempted simply to inform consumers of standard agricultural practices.

After finishing the video and pledge process, viewers are prompted by on-screen instructions to find a FARM staffer to receive their \$1 incentive. Tucked into a tri-fold leaflet,



Figure 2. A FARM staffer debriefs viewers at Warped Tour in 2013.

viewers leave with follow-up statistics, frequently asked questions, a simple vegan recipe, and a coupon for a plant-based meat product. FARM staffers provide these to viewers after debriefing them, asking about their thoughts regarding the video, and offering to answer any clarifying questions. While some viewers had a very positive or negative emotional response to the video, most took advantage of the opportunity to

rationally engage in conversation, asking questions regarding the sources of the footage to the best way to avoid meat in school lunches to resources on how to best shop for vegan foods (See Figure 2).

Methodology and Motivations

After being dissatisfied with the results from attempts to administer online follow-up surveys via email, the staff at FARM decided to implement an in-person survey procedure during Warped Tour 2013. The less-than-successful online surveys, sent automatically to all viewers between one to two months after they had initially viewed the video (either at Warped Tour or another venue), aimed to gain insight into the longevity of pledged dietary changes. Respondents were incentivized with a randomized chance of winning movie tickets. While there was only a 4.6% response rate, 64.3% of respondents continued to report a decrease in the amount of animal products they consumed. Significantly, 82% claimed that they had discussed the issues presented in the video with family or friends. This is notable in that this could have led to more views online, more requested informational resources from FARM, and more meals made without meat or other animal products. In short, the fact that more than four in five respondents shared this information with others has immeasurable effects, but certainly provides free, targeted advertising to the 10 Billion Lives Tour.

However, at under 5%, this relatively low response rate, coupled with other reasons to be skeptical of these opt-in online responses, led FARM to initiate a new strategy for administering surveys to monitor the lasting effects (or lack thereof) of the video.

Thus, I assisted in collecting survey results from Warped Tour dates in June and July of 2013. These surveys targeted repeat concert-goers who had previously interacted with the 10 Billion Lives Tour. The surveys, created by FARM'S Executive Director and Director of Outreach Programs, were designed to solicit specific dietary data. The survey, one two-sided piece of paper in length, asked viewers about their estimated eating habits before viewing the video in 2012 compared to the present (summer 2013). The survey also asked whether viewers had utilized the various email and online resources. The survey asked about estimated consumption of specific animal products to gauge whether the video impacted consumption levels of some products more than others.

Members of the 10 Billion Lives staff conducted the surveys on the mornings of each Warped Tour date that had also been visited in 2012 so as to target festival-goers who had possibly seen the video the previous year. These staff members identified as various genders and were between the ages of 18-25, which mirrors the general Warped Tour demographics. Staffers were compensated for their participation in conducting the surveys.

Staffers walked the entry gate lines prior to the opening of the festival each morning. Without any descriptive clothing items, we attempted to remain as objective as possible while asking those in line whether they had attended Warped Tour last year. If they had, we would present them with a photo of the 10 Billion Lives vehicle, which was taped to the back of the survey clipboard, asking “Did you watch this video?” If the answer was yes again, we asked, “Would you mind filling out this survey for a chance to win \$100?” For those willing to participate, we distributed the print survey, often to many individuals in a group, standing at a safe distance and averting our gaze so as to ensure as confidential a process as possible for the participant. The surveys are included in Appendices A and B.

This distance was very important considering the content of the first question. Designed to weed out participants who had not actually watched the video, the first question simply asked about the video’s contents. Surveys containing the wrong answer to this first question were later marked as null and were not considered in the final statistical analysis.

Additionally, we included a control group in the survey process. Those who claimed to have attended Warped Tour the previous summer but had not previously viewed the 10 Billion Lives video were provided this control survey. This survey inquired only about dietary patterns, attempting to monitor whether concert-goers had increased or decreased their consumption of meat and other animal products without viewing the 10 Billion Lives video.

Gauging Impacts: Survey Results

In total, 345 festival-goers at Warped Tour completed our surveys. 242 previous viewers participated in the survey process and 103 non-viewers participated in the control group. 45% of survey respondents were males and 55% were females in both the viewers and non-viewer (control) groups. These percentages were more the result of pure chance than any reflection of a desired balance of genders in respondents.

Viewers of both genders claimed the largest dietary drop in red meat consumption, 26.81%, compared to other animal-based products. Dairy consumption proved to be the least affected, with an average decrease rate of 17.75% between 2012 and 2013 (See Figure 3). Additionally, more females self-reported a decline in their red meat consumption than males, at 28.20% and 25.38%, respectively. Younger viewers (ages 13-14) were most likely to report a drop in red meat consumption, at 55%. Older viewers also demonstrated a large percentage of red meat reduction, at 34.62%. Younger viewers were also extremely likely to report a remarkable decline in fish consumption, at 46.15%. This is particularly surprising given the fact that the 4-minute video does not explicitly address the use and abuse of fish, and the 10 billion figure of animals killed for food excludes marine animals.

Overall, 57.9% of previous viewers ate fewer animal products, whereas only 16.5% of non-viewers reported eating fewer animals. One year later, this compares rather favorably to the 80% of viewers who pledge to reduce their consumption of animal products instantly after watching the video. Significantly, those in the non-viewer control group actually reported eating *more* animal products, on average. While these respondents were not expected to have reduced their consumption due to the 10 Billion Lives video, it is notable that they reported eating more meat, dairy, and eggs in 2013 than in 2012. FARM has calculated that these viewers ate, on average, 3.6 more animals than they claimed eating the previous year. While there is no clear explanation for these results, it is somewhat a testament to the relative failure of other campaigns and animal advocacy campaigns to push American youth to consume fewer animal products. Nonetheless, those who watched the video in 2012 were 251% more likely to reduce the amount of animal products in their diet than those who had not seen the video.

These results demonstrate the power of a media-savvy campaign that encourages young people to empathize with the plight of farmed animals and, thus, make actual changes to their diets.

Animal Product	Reduced Consumption Rate
Viewers	
Dairy	17.75%
Eggs	20.69%
Fish	18.66%
Poultry	23.66%
Red Meat	26.81%
Non-Viewers	
Dairy	-10.91%
Eggs	-5.51%
Fish	-6.06%
Poultry	-2.06%
Red Meat	-3.24%

Figure 3: 10 Billion Lives Tour survey results, depicting consumption change by food type

“We All Oppose Animal Abuse”: Analyzing the Video

The 10 Billion Lives video employs an ethical narrative to present industry-standard practices perceived to be at odds with the moral sentiments of most Americans. With data showing that “96% of Americans saying that animals deserve at least some protection from harm and exploitation,”⁸⁹ the video aims to build upon Americans’ innate concern for animals.

“We all oppose animal abuse.” Here, the 4-minute video begins with a brief montage of everyday human-animal bonds, describing the intrinsic care that we all have for our companion dogs and cats. Rescued farmed animals are then shown romping around on peaceful sanctuaries. “Each of these animals is an intelligent, unique being,” says the male narrator, who notes with an accredited tone the “exceptional” mothering qualities of cows, the curious nature of pigs, and the social systems within chicken and turkey communities. Slowly transitioning into a more somber tone, the narrator describes that, “for every one dog or cat with a home, 60 farmed animals lead miserable lives and face cruel deaths year after year.” By beginning with an attempt to find common ground with the viewer, the video evokes an immediate moral tone and works

⁸⁹ David W. Moore. “Public Lukewarm on Animal Rights,” accessed May 7, 2014. Gallup News Service. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/8461/public-lukewarm-animal-rights.aspx>

to elicit a sense of empathy while providing contrast to the horrific abuses outlined in the remainder of the video. By exposing the significant gap between Americans' beliefs regarding companion animals versus farmed animals, the video intends for viewers to contemplate the moral inconsistencies in how they regard various groups of non-humans. Specifically, the video portrays practices at facilities that produce various types of meat, dairy, and eggs. Wince-worthy scenes—including beak-searing, chick-sexing, tail-docking, branding, de-horning, castration, and throat-slitting—show standard practices defended by these industries, rebutting those skeptics clinging to the notion that the footage is somehow sourced from only the worst facilities.⁹⁰ For your reading pleasure, I will again spare you a detailed description of these practices.

Finally, the video transitions out of these grisly depictions to conclude by empowering viewers to use their purchasing power to demonstrate their discontent—or disgust—with these practices. Presenting appealing shots of vegan foods, viewers are informed that “millions” have made the choice to eschew animal products. Finally, they are asked to pledge on the next screen to eat fewer animal products to turn awareness into action.

Thus, the video presents viewers with a stark contrast. Showcasing animals as individuals, and harping on their sentience and unique personalities, encourages viewers to reflect on and embrace their innate sense of compassion. Subsequently, the depictions of shocking, run-of-the-mill practices otherwise hidden from sight actively alert viewers to some of the moral inconsistencies we harbor by claiming to “oppose animal abuse” while providing a demand for these products.

Ethics Over the Environment?

“It’s a good thing you’re focusing on the animals, because you know these kids don’t give a shit about the environment.” One woman who watched the 10 Billion Lives video made this remark to me during the 2013 leg of the tour. A self-described Warped Tour veteran, the woman, in her mid-30s, gestured at the much younger crowd banging their heads to a

⁹⁰ “Video Shows Live Chicks Dumped in Grinder.” *Msnbc.com*. Accessed May 6, 2014.

http://www.nbcnews.com/id/32647389/ns/business-us_business/t/video-shows-live-chicks-dumped-grinder/.

The practice of sexing chicks destined for egg-laying facilities involves discarding male chicks, which are useless to the industry. Male chicks are routinely tossed into plastic bags to suffocate, or are thrown into grinders. Defending the practice, a spokesman for the United Egg Producers claimed that, “If someone has a need for 200 million male chicks, we’re happy to provide them to anyone who wants them. But we can find no market, no need.”

metalcore band just beyond the 10 Billion Lives vehicle. Moved by the video's description of ethical reasons to move away from meat, the woman noted in her comment the importance of such rhetoric in actually engaging young people in food transparency issues.

Despite the shaky validity regarding a perceived indifference towards “the environment,” the woman did successfully motion towards a much larger discussion in her comment supporting the video's ethical message. Assuming a failed ability to be concerned with environmental issues (however defined), she noted that Warped Tour attendees were much more likely to empathize with animals rather than more distant ecological concerns. The survey data confirms this notion. My experience debriefing thousands of viewers over two summers also reinforces this idea. The 10 Billion Lives video's ability to use emotional leverage to inspire consumptive change in viewers simply seems to work—nearly 60% of viewers reported eating fewer animal products one year after watching the video. Since the video encourages viewers to empathize with and be morally concerned with abused animals, and since the data suggest long-term dietary change resulting in part from viewing the video, it is evident that an ethical narrative can be effective in altering the habits of Warped Tour attendees.

But is the reliance on ethical narratives ideal for progressive social movements? Probably not, according to Maxim Fetissenko. Arguing that few, if any, massive social changes have occurred due solely to morality-based arguments, Fetissenko claims in “Beyond Morality: Developing A New Rhetorical Strategy for the Animal Rights Movement”⁹¹ that animal advocates must additionally utilize health and environmental arguments to better appeal to the masses who are literally addicted to the use and abuse of animals to consume their bodies (and secretions). Drawing on modern philosophers Singer and Francione, Fetissenko claims that touting morality-based motivations for behavioral and systemic change is less promising than we may like to believe, and that shifting towards encompassing health and environmental messaging would be beneficial. I am weary, though, to follow his advice at this point in time. While the animal protection movement, specifically, has been rooted in compassionate concern, this moralizing can reinforce stereotypes. Many Americans can conjure up images of angry activists, armed with red-paint, bolt cutters, and a head of lettuce proselytizing about the suffering of

⁹¹ Maxim Fetissenko. “Beyond Morality: Developing a New Rhetorical Strategy for the Animal Rights Movement.” *Maxim Fetissenko*. Accessed February 5, 2014. <http://fetissenko.com/research/beyond-morality/>.

animals.⁹² These stereotypes may stem in part from reality, but what is important to note is the new wave of media-centric, youth-oriented advocacy efforts that reach targeted demographics where they are at rather than tossing blood and spitting on their Hot Topic leather jackets. Thus, I continue to advocate unapologetically here for the power of moral rhetoric, as it has proven to be effective in the 10 Billion Lives Tour. The power of the 4-minute video that brings in viewers unsure about the content works to instill concern for animals in a nouveau manner. Since Warped Tour attendees are presumed to be more susceptible to change as well as more able and willing to alter their lifestyles when moved to do so, the 10 Billion Lives Tour has found success in reaching out to a demographic already near their tipping point.

In a broader sense, many food transparency advocates work on moral grounds. By providing faces to a rumor, for instance, fair trade advocates unveil the child labor involved in cocoa production. Through video narratives and motion pictures, filmmakers depict the toll of corporate control and genetic modification on farmers and their families.⁹³ Through documentary filmmaking, media mavens introduce viewers firsthand to the people that pick our food.⁹⁴ And, by showcasing individual chickens and depicting their cramped conditions, animal advocates shed light on the plight of factory-farmed hens in egg production. There are numerous examples to demonstrate how agents of social change situate their message to pull at the heartstrings of Americans, inciting an emotional response designed to change habits, or, at least, initiate a conversation.

While it may be hard to imagine those concerned with child labor or corporate control to shift their campaigns to focus on, say, environmental issues involved with cocoa production, it is possible for those advocating on behalf of animals to utilize other messages to convince consumers to decrease their meat consumption. In fact, major animal welfare organizations have been shifting focus in recent years, not away from the ethical impetus that drives their efforts, but to encompass other persuasive narratives to entice and engage consumers. The Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) devotes a significant portion of its

⁹² Thomas, Mat. "AnimalRighter: Leaked NRA Pamphlet Targets 'Animal Rights Terrorists'." *AnimalRighter*, January 15, 2007. <http://animalrighter.blogspot.com/2007/01/leaked-nra-pamphlet-targets-animal.html>.

⁹³ Anusha Rizvi, Aamir Khan, Kiran Rao, Omkar Das Manikpuri, Raghuvir Yadav, Shalini Vatsa, Farukh Jaffer, et al. *Peep! Live*. Marine del Rey, CA: UTV Communications LLC, 2010.

⁹⁴ U Romano, Eva Longoria, Rory O'Connor, Nick Clark, Wendy Blackstone, Shine Global (Firm), Globalvision (Firm), Romano Film & Photography, Unbelievable Productions, and Cinema Libre Studio. *The Harvest/La Cosecha*. Canoga Park, Calif: Cinema Libre Studio, 2011.

plant-based school lunch campaign to discuss health issues in our food system.⁹⁵ People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) has been known to endorse nearly any tactic to raise awareness about animal issues, from dumping truckloads of manure to demonstrate the ecological toll of factory farming to renting billboards attempting to link meat-heavy diets to unhealthy body types.⁹⁶ Thus, while some groups may have mastered the multi-faceted appeal, it is difficult to imagine a movement so historically dependent on ethical narratives as the American animal rights movement to begin shifting away from this powerful mode of messaging.

Ultimately, the 10 Billion Lives Tour is faced with a near-impossible task: to craft and package a message, and inform and empower an array of individuals. All in a very brief, enticing manner, to boot. With the intention of reaching as many people as fiscally possible, the 4-minute video must do more than educate. It must inspire action on behalf of farmed animals. The tour is forced to move beyond acknowledging complexity in order to craft a narrative that will impact viewers beyond the video screen and into the grocery store, hopefully empowered to make choices reflective of a new or renewed discontentment with animal agriculture.

The Role of (Ir)rationality in Reducing Demand

I point towards Fetissenko's work to acknowledge the limitations of moral persuasion. Although I praise the 10 Billion Lives Tour for its use of moral messaging, I certainly recognize the inherent nuances here.

Given the video's short length—an requirement to entice passerby—viewers are not explicitly exposed to the myriad human health and ecological benefits of consuming fewer animal products. However, it is important to emphasize the power of the debriefing conversations to address these additional motivating factors for dietary change, as well as an opportunity for viewers to reflect on their inner contradictions.

One can employ a philosophical approach here to note select phenomena that act as barriers between concern and calculated action. Examples from everyday life demonstrate that humans act irrationally. We know we should study for an exam, but we end up watching *Game of Thrones* instead. We need to do the dishes eventually, but ordering take-out is just a phone

⁹⁵ Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. Accessed 23 February 2014. [Pcrm.org](http://pcrm.org)

⁹⁶ Examiner, Gail Gedan SpencerWeight Loss. "PETA 'Save the Whales' Campaign." *Examiner.com*, August 18, 2009. <http://www.examiner.com/article/peta-save-the-whales-campaign>.

This campaign rightfully came under scrutiny for its fat-shaming shock tactics, and was later discontinued and removed by PETA.

call away. We feel an ecological obligation to take the bus, but often wind up driving to the mall more often than not. Examples are unlimited. Thus, the theory of Rational Ignorance rings a bell here: We opt for ignorance over information after analyzing associated costs.⁹⁷ It is easier for one to continue to shop at H&M than to research the clothing company's labor practices. Similarly, why ruin your tasty turkey sandwich by learning about slaughterhouse practices?

Specific to human-animal interactions, prominent abolitionist scholar Gary Francione diagnoses Americans with a "moral schizophrenia" in our relationships with animals. Simply put, we are happy to grant some animals rights while maintaining the property status of billions of farmed animals.⁹⁸ Chloe Waterman argues that "meat evades morality."⁹⁹ Perceptions of meat and other animal products are muddled by attachments to "personal choice," distance between the consumers and the consumed, and a tendency to explain rather than justify meat consumption.¹⁰⁰ Waterman uses an array of interviews with study participants of various dietary preferences to illuminate a complex web of irrationality. Ultimately, Waterman surfaces to restate her faith and dedication to enacting institutional change to best benefit farmed animals.

As discussed above, the schism in the animal protection movement is inherently situated in this institutional vs. individual/welfare vs. abolition discussion. While I would like to again assert the importance of institutional change, I do so acknowledging it as part and parcel of a larger movement addressing supply and demand in relation to farmed animals and their commodified bodies. Improvements in production practices and incremental legislative victories not only tangibly reduce the degree of animal suffering, but they also assist grassroots efforts by raising fundamental awareness about the plight of farmed animals. These gradual macro-level progressions, however, unfortunately do not tend to decrease the number of animals killed for human consumption in the United States. For most animal advocates—and certainly those involved in the 10 Billion Lives Tour—the goal lies ultimately in reducing suffering by liberating animals from their relegated status as property.¹⁰¹ Thus, an informed public, inspired by

⁹⁷ Huerner, Michael. "Why People are Irrational About Politics.." Accessed May 6, 2014. <http://spot.colorado.edu/~huemer/irrationality.htm>

⁹⁸ Gary L. Francione (Gary Lawrence). *Introduction to Animal Rights : Your Child or the Dog?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.

⁹⁹ Waterman, Chloe. "Getting to the Meat of Moral Discourse." Accessed May 6, 2014. <https://sge.lclark.edu/2012/05/02/a-medium-rare-steak-in-celebration-of-a-well-done-thesis>

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ *A 4-minute Glimpse into the Story of 10 Billion Lives*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://10billionlives.com/>.

interactions with the 10 Billion Lives Tour, serves as the foundation for dismantling industrial animal agriculture by reducing overall demand for animal flesh and secretions.

The video mentions free-range and cage-free practices as misleading and morally inadequate, noting that the most effective course of action is not to switch to other animal products, but rather to reduce the consumption of meat, dairy, and eggs overall.

III. Branching Out—Fostering Fruitful Relationships and Self-Reflection

The use of media, intelligent demographic situating, and an ethical narrative successfully inspires lasting behavioral change in the realm of grassroots farmed animal advocacy work. The 10 Billion Lives tour embodies all three of these aspects and serves as an example of a well-designed campaign that is enacting actual change for animals.

The data from the 10 Billion Lives Tour's surveys support this claim and demonstrate its efficacy in bringing about dietary change. While the tour continues to find success throughout the country, it is important to consider the broader implications, pitfalls, and barriers to moving forward in understanding and promoting effective advocacy work. Thus, I find it necessary to reflect qualitatively on major areas of concern for animal advocates after first discussing how the results from the 10 Billion Lives survey inform broader trends.

In arguing for the power of intelligently-designed and crafted media to initiate and assist social change, it is important to demonstrate the fact that more than food justice and animal protection advocates have realized the impressive ability of media-centric campaigns. In fact, the very industries targeted by activists have undeniably felt the power of these exposés in their profits, and, perhaps more significantly in their suffering public image. By undermining the corporate rhetoric of control, efficiency, and the fundamental merits of the neoliberal market, whistleblowers have illustrated the growing gap between production practices and consumer sentiment. With the help of campaigns such as the 10 Billion Lives Tour, these efforts are masterfully broadcasted to targeted demographics to maximize the ethical issues and emotional effect to encourage actual dietary change.

Confidence and Caveats

Approximately four out of five viewers pledge on site to reduce their consumption of animal-derived products. Nearly three out of five viewers (58%) maintain this pledge, consuming fewer meat, dairy, and eggs at least one year after initially watching the 10 Billion Lives video. As of April 2014, the 10 Billion Lives campaign has solicited more than 200,000 viewers.¹⁰² Following the results of this surveying technique, we can conclude that more than 20,000 young Americans are now consuming fewer animal products.

¹⁰² Farm Animal Rights Movement. "10 Billion Lives North American Tour." Accessed April 21, 2014. <http://10billiontour.org/>

This number includes both in-person and online views since the tour's inception in May 2012.

As self-reporting surveys, there are clearly inherent issues when interpreting this data. While the staffers who administered the surveys wore completely non-descript clothing, were instructed not to mention their association whatsoever with the tour, and did not express interest in interpreting the participants' responses on the spot, it is still difficult to entirely trust the responses. The survey responses are not statistically significant.

Additionally, there were issues in the actual survey design. Multiple staffers reported respondents claiming to be confused about the specific wording. When asked in Question 3, "How often did you eat these foods * before * watching the video?" some respondents interpreted this question too literally, assuming that they were being asked about the amount of animal products that they had consumed for breakfast before coming to the festival. Respondents repeatedly asked for clarification here from the staffer administering the survey. Ideally, the wording of this specific question would have been altered to solicit more accurate responses, but we did not want to sacrifice the consistency of the content of the administered surveys throughout the tour.

While these caveats do serve as a significant barrier to incorporating and implementing the data into scholarly work, they stimulate discussion of the pros—and cons—associated with utilizing an ethical narrative to target a very specific demographic through the utilization of media.

Larger Trends

Just as we can see the longer-term effects of the recently initiated 10 Billion Lives Tour, we also know from Tonsor and Olynk that there is an initially-proven correlation between increased media coverage of animal welfare issues and decreased meat consumption.¹⁰³ But what about overall meat consumption? That, too, is declining.

In the last days of 2011, *Daily Livestock Report* predicted that the ongoing decline in meat consumption would continue in 2012 and beyond. Describing the 12.2% decline in per capita consumption of meat and poultry from 2007-2012 in the United States, the *Report* speculated three reasons for the decline. The United States at that point had been 1) ramping up exports; 2) fostering a burgeoning ethanol market, resulting in higher feed costs, and, finally; 3) the

¹⁰³ Tonsor, Glynn T., and Nicole J. Olynk. "Impacts of Animal Well-Being and Welfare Media on Meat Demand." *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 62, no. 1 (2011): 59–72. doi:10.1111/j.1477-9552.2010.00266.x.

Report claimed that “the feds have indeed waged war on meat protein consumption.”¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, “the efforts of a large number of non-governmental agencies that oppose meat consumption for reasons ranging from the environment to animal rights to social justice” were so significant that “one could conclude that it was amazing that consumption held up as long as it did.”¹⁰⁵ *Daily Livestock Report* is, expectedly, an industry trade magazine. In a response to the article confirming the declining consumption statistics, popular *New York Times* food writer Mark Bittman brazenly argued, “The flaw in the report is that it treats American consumers as passive actors who are victims of diminishing supplies, rising costs and government bias against the meat industry. Nowhere does it mention that we’re eating less meat because we *want* to eat less meat” [emphasis original].¹⁰⁶ Bittman’s commentary on food culture and industry trends strikes a chord here as he lends agency to American consumers. Greater macroeconomic and historical market forces have, of course, certainly crafted and continue to mold our agricultural system, but it is important to not understate the role of on-the-ground organizing and targeted media campaigns in encouraging Americans as individuals to increasingly eschew meat.

Historian Maureen Ogle, author of *In Meat We Trust: An Unexpected History of Carnivore America* examines the roots of the factory farming system.¹⁰⁷ Ogle argues that the rise of the industrialized animal agriculture infrastructure stems from America’s urbanization and that the resulting system is an attempt to provide efficient animal products to American urbanites: “You’re not going to satisfy demand with small farmers.”¹⁰⁸ Demand drives supply, and the current immense demand for meat, dairy, and eggs fuels America’s factory farming system. On meat, Ogle claims, “We want it; we want it cheaply; we want it made in a place where we don’t have to deal with the sights and sounds of slaughtering animals; and we don’t want it to come from factory farms. Something...has to give.”¹⁰⁹ Echoing notions of Pachirat’s politics of sight, Ogle reflects on the increasingly conflicted relationship between Americans’ moral sentiments

¹⁰⁴ Meyer, Steve, and Steiner, Len. “Daily Livestock Report. December 20, 2011. <http://www.dailylivestockreport.com/documents/dlr%2012-20-2011.pdf>

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ “We’re Eating Less Meat. Why?” *Opinionator*, n.d. <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/01/10/were-eating-less-meat-why/>.

¹⁰⁷ Ogle, Maureen. *In Meat We Trust: An Unexpected History of Carnivore America*, 2013.

¹⁰⁸ Bernfeld, Jeremy. “‘In Meat We Trust’ Argues We Got The Meat Industry We Asked For.” *NPR.org*, n.d. <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2013/12/06/249352711/in-meat-we-trust-argues-we-got-the-meat-industry-we-asked-for>.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

and the meat we eat. As the visual, linguistic, cultural, and physical barriers between the consumer and the consumed slowly deteriorate—due in large part to the efforts of animal advocates, authors, and academics such as Pachirat—the production processes that turn an animal into a meal come under fire, further encouraging critical discourse situated between farm, factory, and fork. Animal advocates working to reform and, more importantly, abolish this exploitative system need to assist in continuing this conversation while remaining engaged in actions that advance the status of animals in the most efficient way possible.

Feeding Into the Propaganda Machine

It is not hard to imagine a scenario in which a group advocating for local produce consumption is met with praise and positive reception from passerby when tabling at a summertime farmers' market. It is also rather easy to envision a group outlining reasons to eat more vegetarian foods encountering significant pushback when leafleting outside of a barbeque competition. Is this messaging propaganda? According to the barbeque crowd, the animal advocates would likely be seen as passing out propaganda or engaging in propagandist acts to further their agenda. Yet, those folks at the farmers market are unlikely to accuse the local advocacy group of forcing their beliefs onto others in an attempt to brainwash vulnerable members of the population.

So, why is one group guilty of engaging in acts of propaganda while one is not? The answer, of course, depends on one's beliefs, and is thus extremely subjective and context-sensitive. Assuming that words can, in some instances, be used in a more or less objective manner, the word *propaganda* fails to fall into this category, as it has been utilized so heavily throughout history to refer to so many disparate scenarios, although rather consistently in a negative manner. Visions of Nazi Germany, Mao's China, and American wartime posters are common examples of campaigns widely considered to be propaganda.

Faced with many—often seemingly directly oppositional—definitions of propaganda, what, then, are we to make of the word? Drawing on historical examples of the word's usage, Randal Marlin claims that, following the word's Latin root, *propagare* (to propagate), "it is clear

that one feature, common to all [definitions], should be present in any definition of propaganda: it is an organized and deliberate attempt to influence many people, directly or indirectly.”¹¹⁰

I am driven to address and explore this extremely subjective question because it appears that as media is utilized as a tool to trigger alternative thinking, or, conversely, to fall in line with a dominant mode of thought, the stakes are raised. *Beef Daily*, an industry press outlet, published an article titled “Animal Rights Group Pays People to Watch Propaganda” in response to the 10 Billion Lives Tour, arguing that “this pay-per-view tactic is just another way for animal rights activists to line their pocketbooks to help achieve their ultimate goals of promoting a vegan society and eliminating animal agriculture.”¹¹¹ It is important to briefly note the absurdity in this recent industry tactic to portray animal protection non-profits as money-hungry powerhouses. Whereas the most recent data notes that the collective marketing budget for animal organizations rests at \$195 million, animal agriculture industries spend more than \$6 billion.¹¹² While this rhetoric is not surprising from an industry whose existence is being questioned and threatened by this campaign, the use of the word “propaganda” appears to fall in line with the traditionally negative connotation of the word, as a means to denounce the efforts of those pushing the so-called propaganda. What is of interest, though, is that aside from the title, the actual article itself never uses the word propaganda, instead describing, “grisly, dramatic footage of how [the activists] see animal agriculture.”¹¹³ Never actually questioning the honesty or validity of the video, *Beef Daily* capitalizes on the campaign’s abolitionist stance to dismiss the tour as another instance of animal rights extremist agenda-pushing. Thus, it is important to (re-)consider the usage of terms such as “propaganda” and contemplate the context in which they are used to discern between advocacy work and truly troublesome affronts to individual agency and freedom of speech.

¹¹⁰ Randal Marlin. *Propaganda and the ethics of persuasion*. Peterborough, Ont; Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press, 2002: 22.

¹¹¹ “Animal Rights Group Pays People to Watch Propaganda.” <http://beefmagazine.com/blog/animal-rights-group-pays-people-watch-propaganda>

¹¹² Harish Sethu. “Meat Industry Advertising,” last modified May 7, 2012. Countil Animals. <http://www.countinganimals.com/meat-industry-advertising/>

¹¹³ Ibid.

Resistance, Repression, and Regrouping

Ag-gag laws, etymologically hailing from the combination of “agriculture” and legislative “gag” efforts¹¹⁴, came to major journalists’ attention in 2013. Ag-gag laws are pieces of legislation designed specifically as a response to the efforts of undercover animal advocates to film and disseminate footage of the plight of animals exploited in agriculture. They have swept the nation with varying success in recent years and aim to crack down on efforts to record abuses within agricultural operations by criminalizing the investigators themselves. Ag-gag legislation has been successfully passed in six states. Additionally, 11 states introduced similar legislation in 2013, yet all failed to come to fruition.¹¹⁵

The legislation, aimed very specifically at animal protection organizations, appears to come from threatened industries. The Animal Agriculture Alliance has claimed, “We don’t need activists to police us. We can do it ourselves.”¹¹⁶ If it has not been made clear already, these industries certainly need policing. Investigative videos into pig¹¹⁷, chicken¹¹⁸, and cattle operations¹¹⁹ regularly rack up YouTube views in the millions, indicative of a public eager to catch a glimpse into these otherwise sealed facilities. Furthermore, undercover investigations consistently result in cruelty charges, dropped contracts, and even company closures.¹²⁰

There is also evidence that the American model for ag-gag legislation is spreading internationally¹²¹, as industries increasingly realize the power of whistle-blowing investigations coupled with mass dissemination through social media to alter public opinion, and, potentially, shift patterns of consumption away from these products.

⁸¹ Bittman, Mark. “Who Protects the Animals?” *Opinionator*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/04/26/who-protects-the-animals/>.

New York Times food columnist Mark Bittman popularized the term “ag-gag” in this 2011 article.

¹¹⁵ Cindy Galli “Turn Off That Camera! Idaho Gov Signs Tough ‘Ag-Gag’ Into Law.” *ABC News*, February 28, 2014. <http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/turn-off-camera-idaho-gov-signs-tough-ag/story?id=22726424>.

¹¹⁶ “Beat Your Meat: Factory Farmers Want to Choke Their Chickens in Private | VICE United States.” *VICE*. Accessed May 4, 2014. <http://www.vice.com/read/meat-the-press>.

¹¹⁷ *Undercover at Smithfield Foods (2012 Webby Award Winner)*, 2010. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L_vqIGTKuQE&feature=youtube_gdata_player.

¹¹⁸ *Undercover Investigation at Hy-Line Hatchery*, 2009. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JJ--faib7to&feature=youtube_gdata_player.

¹¹⁹ *Slaughterhouse Investigation: Cruel and Unhealthy Practices*, 2008. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zhlhSQ5z4V4&feature=youtube_gdata_player.

¹²⁰ Jr, Richard A. Oppel. “Taping of Farm Cruelty Is Becoming the Crime.” *The New York Times*, April 6, 2013, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/07/us/taping-of-farm-cruelty-is-becoming-the-crime.html>.

¹²¹ Potter, Will. Attack On Factory Farm Whistleblowers Goes Global.” *The Dodo*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <https://www.thedodo.com/community/WillPotter/attack-on-factory-farm-whistle-432264681.html>.

Could these ag-gag laws actually be helping animal advocates though? Many who otherwise express little or no interest in watching or discussing undercover investigations into specific industries are starting to discuss the far-reaching effects of criminalizing whistleblowers. No matter what one's degree of interest in animal advocacy issues, protecting the rights of corporations to act in total secrecy should be of concern. In fact, many organizations have grouped together with animal protection organizations after realizing the frightening reach of these ag-gag laws. Several animal protection organizations, journalists, whistleblowers, as well as academics and other concerned organizations have filed a lawsuit to challenge Utah's ag-gag legislation.¹²² The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) recently filed a lawsuit against the state of Idaho's recently passed ag-gag legislation, arguing that the statute violates not only freedom of the press, but free speech in general.¹²³ This is significant because the ACLU does not in any way advocate specifically for animal protection issues, yet the scope of these ag-gag laws are clearly a threat to groups concerning with civil liberties more broadly.

By attempting to silence whistleblowers and, thus, maintain the veil under which many of these corporations have operated under for decades, these companies have, in turn, proven that they have something to hide from consumers. As activists lift this veil by disseminating undercover investigations, harping on the industry's moral bankruptcy, these corporations simply reify their position as increasingly out of tune with progressing public opinion. As these advocacy campaigns depend on the ability of the public to empathize with those oppressed by the industrial agricultural system, pushing for consumers to be morally motivated to change their consumption habits, corporations seemingly, yet unintentionally, reinforce this rhetoric, actually abetting the activists' efforts.

¹²² Animal Legal Defense Fund. "Advocates Stand Up for Animals in Landmark 'Ag Gag' Lawsuit." *Animal Legal Defense Fund*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://aldf.org/press-room/press-releases/advocates-stand-up-for-animals-in-landmark-ag-gag-lawsuit/>.

¹²³ "ACLU Challenges Idaho 'Ag Gag' Law, Saying It Violates Free Speech And Freedom Of The Press." *Huffington Post*, March 17, 2014. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/03/17/aclu-challenges-idaho-ag-gag-law_n_4983203.html.

More Than Just Morals: Barriers to Greater Inclusion

A popular online news source recently published an important article titled “Disturbing Fast Food Truth Not Exactly a Game-Changer for Impoverished Single Mom of 3.”¹²⁴ Describing “the release of a new documentary exposing the disturbing practices and adverse health effects associated with the fast food industry,” the article features an “impoverished single mother of three, Karen Ford, [who] told reporters Thursday that the revelations in the shocking new film haven’t exactly ‘flipped [her] world upside down.’”

This false piece of news was published by *The Onion*, a satirical newspaper, and attempts to add humor at the intersection between expository food-related media and working class Americans struggling to make ends meet. While some readers may appreciate the levity in the fictional Ford saying, “I can’t say these hard new truths about fast food have really been a deal-breaker for my family’s dietary habits,” others may wince at the all-too-real nature of the issue.

The Onion certainly stuck a chord in its commentary here, calling out the inherent privilege involved in certain types of consumer behavior. While some consumers fret over the decision to buy kale or collard greens at Whole Foods, many others must contemplate whether to provide a fulfilling dinner or pay their rent on time. The very discussion concerning food advocacy and ethical narratives is precisely one of those privilege-based conversations that remains insular to those with the social and economic capital to even consider them in the first place.

In fact, a significant (yet immeasurable) amount of viewers at Warped Tour cited the perceived higher costs of items like fruits, vegetables, and meat- and milk-alternatives as a barrier to their adoption of a more plant-based diet. Although many expressed a moral concern with animal agriculture, they claimed to be unable to forego meat altogether due to parental control over their diet and grocery budgets unable to stray from the most affordable, and often easiest to prepare ingredients. These viewers lacked the fiscal resources to transition away from supporting what they understood to be morally problematic practices, demonstrating the importance of addressing fundamental barriers to adequate food access and preparation knowledge.

¹²⁴ “Disturbing Fast Food Truth Not Exactly A Game-Changer For Impoverished Single Mom Of 3,” February 27, 2014. <http://www.theonion.com/articles/disturbing-fast-food-truth-not-exactly-a-gamechang,35388/>.

Discussions surrounding campaign efficacy, while very important to those within the movements at hand, can remain extremely repugnant to those who are removed or excluded from the conversation. Thus, in addition to continuing such conversations around effective outreach models, advocates need to make a more conscious effort to consider the wider social ramifications and limitations of their endeavors. The animal rights community has, specifically, been repeatedly called out for its reputation as a white, middle-class community that continually exploits the plight of marginalized groups such as overweight and obese women.¹²⁵ Whereas many advocacy efforts utilize narratives of disgust to discourage meat consumption, it is important to isolate this tactic on the side of production rather than consumption to maintain its utility¹²⁶.

Inspired by the work of Sarah Jaquette Ray in her seminal book *The Ecological Other: Environmental Exclusion in American Culture*, I advocate tirelessly for the greater inclusion of various voices in any social movement. The animal protection movement is no exception to this, and, as mentioned above, deserves much of the criticism for its inability to work cohesively with other progressive movements. While I do not seek to provide a list of the ways in which the animal protection movement has excluded various groups, I encourage interested readers to dive into the robust literature surrounding these shortcomings. Ray encourages readers to ask, “How do othered perspectives revise mainstream environmentalism entirely and challenge assumptions of what ‘environmental’ means?”¹²⁷ Along this vein, animal activists perhaps need to revise their definition of “animal rights,” “animal liberation,” or popular slogans such as “liberation for all” or “animal liberation / human liberation” if they are not actually actively collaborating with groups they claim to defend. Advocates of any cause need to have their assumptions constantly challenged to foster a culture of critique, improvement, and, hopefully, tactical revision to increase efficacy. Animal protection advocates need to consider not if, but

¹²⁵ Shire, Emily. “PETA Is Now Fat-shaming Women into Vegan Diets.” *The Week*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://theweek.com/article/index/253574/peta-is-now-fat-shaming-women-into-vegan-diets>.

¹²⁶ Heather. “Fat Girl Posing: Vegans.. I Need to Talk to You..” *Fat Girl Posing*, May 11, 2011. <http://fatgirlposing.blogspot.com/2011/05/vegans-i-need-to-talk-to-you.html>.

Here one blogger rightfully points out that, “if 64% of the US is supposedly “overweight” or “obese” then you’re alienating the majority of people and, very likely, keeping them far, far away from veganism or vegetarianism [with fat-shaming tactics]. “More so, the hypocrisy is obvious and ridiculous in a community that’s supposed to be about compassion and understanding.”

¹²⁷ Ray, Sarah Jaquette. *The Ecological Other: Environmental Exclusion in American Culture*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013, 180.

how their actions are actively producing othered communities in the process of obtaining liberation for one group.

If the animal protection movement is to continue to use a primarily moral and emotional appeal to encourage consumers to eschew meat, we need to actively engage ourselves with other social justice movements. Rather than lashing out at those that do not share our views—“Real Environmentalists Don’t Eat Meat”¹²⁸—animal protection advocates need to expand their horizons. Rather than asking why others are not advocating for animals, we need to ask why we ourselves are not advocating for *all* animals.

However, while some specific organizations—namely People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA)—have garnered extremely bad press for animal protection advocates as a whole, an impressive response has emerged in the form of multi-issue discussions. Scholars and grassroots advocates aware of and deeply concerned about the intersections of oppression are emerging to tackle layers of injustice. In other words, people interested in both animal protection and other issues based on an innate commitment to transparency, equality, and justice are cohabitating a new niche for intersectional studies. A. Breeze Harper released *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society* in 2010.¹²⁹ Carol Addams’ classic *Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* recently celebrated its 20th anniversary.¹³⁰ A grassroots food justice and animal rights organization recently conducted a survey of low-income and non-white communities’ desires for non-meat foods in California.¹³¹ These examples—few of many—depict rampant issues within the broader advocacy movements and need to be further discussed so advocates can move forward in a more conscientious manner.

Other literature dives deep into the multiplicity of issues relating to identity, dietary habits, and privilege. In *The Queer Vegetarian: Understanding Alimentary Activism*, Hall provides a plethora of scenarios depicting the overlapping of identifying simultaneously as queer and a

¹²⁸ “Real Environmentalists Don’t Eat Meat (Women’s Light Green).” *In Defense of Animals - Shop*. Accessed May 7, 2014. <http://www.idausa.org/shop/?product=real-environmentalist-womens-light-green-3>

¹²⁹ A Harper. *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*. New York: Lantern Books, 2010.

¹³⁰ Adams, Carol J. *Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory (20th Edition)*. New York, NY, USA: Continuum International Publishing, 2010. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10422448>.

¹³¹ Food Empowerment Project. “Food Empowerment Project | Because Your Food Choices Can Change the World.” Accessed 21 March 2014. <http://www.foodispower.org/>

vegetarian or vegan, including how both are repeatedly associated in problematic ways in popular media texts.¹³² Many others have commented specifically on notions of masculinity and meat consumption.^{133 134 135}

On Gender and Gastronomy

Gender is vital in any discussion surrounding food discourse and discerning taste. Aside from the obvious associations between the female body, domesticity, and food production labor, gender certainly enters the discussion here at the intersection between social performance and advocacy efforts. From Camas Davis of the Portland Meat Collective—an alternative approach to industrial meat production and preparation—to the Discerning Brute—a lifestyle website for men eschewing meat for ethical reasons—a plethora of self-described activists attempt to subvert gender norms through praxis and publicity.¹³⁶

While these limited examples demonstrate a growing movement to challenge traditional notions of food and gender performance, public opinion continues to reinforce a gendered divide in ideology and practice. Gallup poll data ground these ideas concerning social identities. A 2010 poll investigating moral issues showed that, “majorities of men, but less than half of women, consider the use of animal fur for clothing, and medical testing on animals to be morally acceptable. Also, there is a 24-point gap between men and women in their belief that cloning animals is acceptable.”¹³⁷ While not involving the use of animals for food specifically, the poll demonstrates the gendered thinking regarding our use of animals. According to Gallup’s findings, it appears that men are more likely than women to condone or self-identify as being morally unconcerned with the use of animals in a broad range of topics. This component of gender is often overlooked, but is a vital part of the discussion surrounding food advocacy,

¹³² Hall, Lauren Rae. “The Queer Vegetarian: Understanding Alimentary Activism.” *International Perspectives in Feminist Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2013.

¹³³ Buerkle, C. Wesley. “Metrosexuality Can Stuff It: Beef Consumption as (Heteromascuine) Fortification.” *Text & Performance Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (January 2009): 77–93. doi:10.1080/10462930802514370.

¹³⁴ Rothgerber, Hank 2012 Real Men Don’t Eat (Vegetable) Quiche: Masculinity and the Justification of Meat Consumption. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* (Advance online publication):1-13

¹³⁵ Rogers, Richard A. “Beasts, Burgers, and Hummers: Meat and the Crisis of Masculinity in Contemporary Television Advertisements.” *Environmental Communication* 2, no. 3 (November 2008): 281–301. doi:10.1080/17524030802390250.

¹³⁶ Broughton, Beau. 2013, “Brutes, Blowjobs, and Butchers: An Exploration of Meat and Masculinity” Lewis & Clark College.

¹³⁷ Saad, Lydia. “Four Moral Issues Sharply Divide Americans.” Gallup. Accessed 14 March 2014. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/137357/four-moral-issues-sharply-divide-americans.aspx>

animal protection issues, and social justice in general. The longer American men find themselves chained to the expectations of dominant heterosexual masculinity, the longer empty and exploitative social norms will remain.

In short, animal advocates need not be unapologetic in their activism, per se, but rather passionately empathetic as they struggle to promote the well-being of farmed animals in a society scarred by an array of intersecting oppressions facing both human and non-human animals.

Is Food a Fad?

In her latest book, *Weighing In: Obesity, Food Justice, and the Limits of Capitalism*, Julie Guthman strikes at the intersection between alternative food politics and body-shaming in a material, late-capitalist culture. While she remains critical of capitalism throughout, what Guthman seems to be truly tired of are progressive food politics. Guthman remains skeptical of individual action and activist attempts to incite personal-level progress, especially since, she argues, it tends to trample on marginalized identities and enforce class-, and race-based dichotomies.

Is food just a fad? Have activists confused the public with conflicting messages, produced jaded academics, and generally tired out the topic? As discussed earlier, there seems to have been a slowing of the tide of popular food books and documentaries. Major market chains have shelves stocked with alternative products. Walmart carries almond milk and organic kale. This is progress. But, one must inquire, are we really beginning to win?

I encourage those interested in this topic to reflect on your own path with critical food studies and advocacy, and to take note of the ways in which the current discussion aids or detracts from the movement. If scholars and advocates have indeed successfully inspired institutional and individual change—which, to be clear, we have—but have done so at the expense of others, it is high time for deep introspection. As scholars make forays into other fields at the intersection of environmental and social justice issues, including, notably, gentrification, transportation equity, and carceral justice, animal protection and food advocates must evaluate our longevity.

Looking Forward

Food activism—specifically in the realm of animal protection advocacy—can benefit from the use of three things: Integration of (interactive) media, targeting desirable demographics, and employing an ethical narrative to inspire lasting behavioral change. The 10 Billion Lives Tour embodies all three of these aspects and serves as an example of a well-designed campaign that is enacting actual change for animals.

The distance between consumer and producer in the United States is in many cases appalling, and attempts to shine light on production processes that are perceived to be problematic should be executed in the most effective, insightful way possible. Considering the financial resources and majority opinion that give power to agricultural corporations, animal advocates need to utilize social psychology and theory, as well as empirical evidence, to craft campaigns that contribute to tangible change rather than ineffective cliché. Not only do we need more research gauging the efficacy of these campaigns, but we also need to make sure that it is accessible to those on the ground, serving to inform laypeople and agents of social change in addition to the academic community.

The 10 Billion Lives Tour is a single manifestation of one group's passion for transparency, accountability, and justice in the food system. In a multi-faceted movement addressing a plethora of issues related to animals and beyond, it is important to turn the mirror on ourselves, critically examine our work, and remember to peek our heads out of the furrows.

Works Cited:

- A 4-minute Glimpse into the Story of 10 Billion Lives*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://10billionlives.com/>.
- A Harper. *Sistah Vegan : Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society* : New York: Lantern Books, 2010.
- “A Medium-Rare Steak in Celebration of a Well-Done Thesis | Situating the Global Environment.” Accessed May 6, 2014. <https://sge.lclark.edu/2012/05/02/a-medium-rare-steak-in-celebration-of-a-well-done-thesis/>.
- “A Year Later: The Effectiveness of FARM’s 10 Billion Lives on Warped Tour.” Accessed March 10, 2014. <http://spot.humaneresearch.org/content/year-later-effectiveness-farms-10-billion-lives-warped-tour>.
- “ACLU Challenges Idaho ‘Ag Gag’ Law, Saying It Violates Free Speech And Freedom Of The Press.” *Huffington Post*, March 17, 2014. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/03/17/aclu-challenges-idaho-ag-gag-law_n_4983203.html.
- Adams, Carol J. *Sexual Politics of Meat : A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory (20th Edition)*. New York, NY, USA: Continuum International Publishing, 2010. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10422448>.
- “Advocates Stand Up for Animals in Landmark ‘Ag Gag’ Lawsuit.” *Animal Legal Defense Fund*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://aldf.org/press-room/press-releases/advocates-stand-up-for-animals-in-landmark-ag-gag-lawsuit/>.
- “Animals Win Big at Ballot Box : The Humane Society of the United States.” Accessed May 4, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2006/11/arizona_michigan_ballot_110706.html#.U2RqHVMpd4Y.
- Anusha Rizvi, Aamir Khan, Kiran Rao, Omkar Das Manikpuri, Raghuvir Yadav, Shalini Vatsa, Farukh Jaffer, et al. *Peepli live*. Marine del Ray, CA: UTV Communications LLC, 2010.
- “Attack On Factory Farm Whistleblowers Goes Global.” *The Dodo*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <https://www.thedodo.com/community/WillPotter/attack-on-factory-farm-whistle-432264681.html>.
- Barclay, Eliza. “‘Piglet Smoothie’ Fed To Sows To Prevent Disease; Activists Outraged.” *NPR.org*. Accessed February 24, 2014. <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2014/02/20/280183550/piglet-smoothie-fed-to-sows-to-prevent-disease-activists-outraged>.
- “Beat Your Meat: Factory Farmers Want to Choke Their Chickens in Private | VICE United States.” *VICE*. Accessed May 4, 2014. <http://www.vice.com/read/meat-the-press>.
- Bernfeld, Jeremy. “‘In Meat We Trust’ Argues We Got The Meat Industry We Asked For.” *NPR.org*. Accessed April 20, 2014. <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2013/12/06/249352711/in-meat-we-trust-argues-we-got-the-meat-industry-we-asked-for>.
- “Beyond Morality: Developing a New Rhetorical Strategy for the Animal Rights Movement.” *Maxim Fetissenko*. Accessed February 5, 2014. <http://fetissenko.com/research/beyond-morality/>.
- Björklund, Fredrik, Jonathan Haidt, and Scott Murphy. “Moral Dumbfounding: When Intuition Finds No Reason.” *Lund Psychological Reports*, 2000. <http://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/o.o.i.s?id=12683&postid=1024827>.
- Bob Torres. *Making a Killing : the Political Economy of Animal Rights*. Oakland, CA ; Edinburgh, Scotland: AK Press, 2007.

- Buerkle, C. Wesley. "Metrosexuality Can Stuff It: Beef Consumption as (Heteromascu)line Fortification." *Text & Performance Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (January 2009): 77–93. doi:10.1080/10462930802514370.
- Burnett, Kim. "Trouble in the Fields: Fair Trade and Food Sovereignty Responses to Governance Opportunities After the Food Crisis." *Geopolitics* 0, no. 0 (n.d.): 1–26. Accessed February 19, 2014. doi:10.1080/14650045.2012.752356.
- Caro, Mark. *The Foie Gras Wars: How a 5,000-Year-Old Delicacy Inspired the World's Fiercest Food Fight*. Simon and Schuster, 2009.
- Charles, Dan. "Is Tyson Foods' Chicken Empire A 'Meat Racket'?" *NPR.org*. Accessed February 20, 2014. <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thesalt/2014/02/19/276981085/is-tyson-foods-chicken-empire-a-meat-racket>.
- Cherry, Elizabeth. "Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement." *Sociological Forum* 25, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 450–75.
- Counihan, Carole, and Penny Van Esterik. *Food and Culture : A Reader*. 3rd ed. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2012.
- "Crammed into Gestation Crates : The Humane Society of the United States." Accessed May 7, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/confinement_farm/facts/gestation_crates.html#.U2msHV Mpd4Y.
- "Disturbing Fast Food Truth Not Exactly A Game-Changer For Impoverished Single Mom Of 3," February 27, 2014. <http://www.theonion.com/articles/disturbing-fast-food-truth-not-exactly-a-gamechang,35388/>.
- Doran, Caroline Josephine. "The Role of Personal Values in Fair Trade Consumption." *Journal of Business Ethics* 84, no. 4 (February 1, 2009): 549–63. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9724-1.
- E. DuPuis (Erna Melanie). *Nature's Perfect Food : How Milk Became America's Drink*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.
- Edward R Murrow, Dan Rather, CBS News, Docurama (Firm), and New Video Group. *Harvest of Shame*. New York: Docurama, 2005.
- Examiner, Gail Gedan SpencerWeight Loss. "PETA 'Save the Whales' Campaign." *Examiner.com*, August 18, 2009. <http://www.examiner.com/article/peta-save-the-whales-campaign>.
- "Farm Animal Statistics: Slaughter Totals : The Humane Society of the United States." Accessed February 24, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/resources/research/stats_slaughter_totals.html.
- Francione, Gary L., and Robert Garner. *Animal Rights Debate : Abolition or Regulation?* New York, NY, USA: Columbia University Press, 2010. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10433227>.
- Frank, Joshua. "Meat as a Bad Habit: A Case for Positive Feedback in Consumption Preferences Leading to Lock-in." *Review of Social Economy* 65, no. 3 (September 1, 2007): 319–48.
- Fredric Jameson. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Gail A. Eisnitz. *Slaughterhouse : the Shocking Story of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane Treatment Inside the U.S. Meat Industry*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1997.
- Gary L. Francione (Gary Lawrence). *Introduction to Animal Rights : Your Child or the Dog?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
- Goodman, Michael K. "Reading Fair Trade: Political Ecological Imaginary and the Moral Economy of Fair Trade Foods." *Political Geography* 23, no. 7 (September 2004): 891–915. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2004.05.013.

- Greta Claire Gaard editor of compilation, Simon C. Estok editor of compilation, and Serpil Oppermann editor of compilation. *International Perspectives in Feminist Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2013.
- Guthman, Julie. "Fast Food/organic Food: Reflexive Tastes and the Making of 'Yuppie Chow'." *Social & Cultural Geography* 4, no. 1 (2003): 45–58.
- Heath, Deborah, and Anne Meneley. "The Naturecultures of Foie Gras." *Food, Culture & Society* 13, no. 3 (September 2010): 421–52.
- Heather. "Fat Girl Posing: Vegans.. I Need to Talk to You.." *Fat Girl Posing*, May 11, 2011. <http://fatgirlposing.blogspot.com/2011/05/vegans-i-need-to-talk-to-you.html>.
- Henderson, Julie, Paul Ward, John Coveney, and Samantha Meyer. "Trust in the Australian Food Supply: Innocent Until Proven Guilty." *Health, Risk & Society* 14, no. 3 (May 2012): 257–72. doi:10.1080/13698575.2012.662948.
- Hu, Winnie. "New Jersey Schools Told to Discard Suspect Beef." *The New York Times*, February 26, 2008, sec. New York Region. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/26/nyregion/26recall.html>.
- "HumaneSpot.org | Your Animal Advocacy Resource Center." Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://spot.humaneresearch.org/node>.
- Inc, Nielsen Business Media. *Billboard*. Nielsen Business Media, Inc., 2004.
- Jaffee, Daniel. "Weak Coffee: Certification and Co-Optation in the Fair Trade Movement." *Social Problems* 59, no. 1 (February 1, 2012): 94–116. doi:10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.94.
- Josée Johnston. *Foodies : Democracy and Distinction in the Gourmet Foodscape*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Jr, Richard A. Opper. "Taping of Farm Cruelty Is Becoming the Crime." *The New York Times*, April 6, 2013, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/07/us/taping-of-farm-cruelty-is-becoming-the-crime.html>.
- js, CINDY GALLI Cindy Galli More from Cindy » Investigative Producer !function{var, and fjs=d.getElementsByTagName;if}{js=d.createElement;js.id=id;js.src="//platform.twitter.com/widgets.js";fjs.parentNode.insertBefore;}}; "Turn Off That Camera! Idaho Gov Signs Tough 'Ag-Gag' Into Law." *ABC News*, February 28, 2014. <http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/turn-off-camera-idaho-gov-signs-tough-ag/story?id=22726424>.
- Julie Guthman. *Agrarian Dreams : the Paradox of Organic Farming in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Kahan, Dan M., Ellen Peters, Erica Cantrell Dawson, and Paul Slovic. *Motivated Numeracy and Enlightened Self-Government*. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, September 3, 2013. <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2319992>.
- Kristof, Nicholas. "Is That Sausage Worth This?" *The New York Times*, February 19, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/20/opinion/kristof-is-that-sausage-worth-this.html>.
- Leibowitz, Ed. "The Last Days of Foie Gras." *Atlantic Monthly (10727825)* 310, no. 1 (August 7, 2012): 37–38.
- Lovvorn, Jonathan R., and Nancy V. Perry. "California Proposition 2: A Watershed Moment for Animal Law." *Animal Law* 15 (2009 2008): 149.
- Magazine, Michael PollanThe New York Times, January 28, and 2007. "Unhappy Meals." Accessed February 24, 2014. <http://michaelpollan.com/articles-archive/unhappy-meals/>.
- Malcolm Gladwell. *The Tipping Point : How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. 1st ed.. Boston: Little, Brown, 2000.
- Martin, Andrew. "Agriculture Dept. Vows to Improve Animal Welfare." *The New York Times*, February 29, 2008, sec. Business. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/29/business/29food.html>.

- — —. “Humane Society Sues U.S. in Cattle Case.” *The New York Times*, February 28, 2008, sec. Business. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/28/business/28beef.html>.
- — —. “Largest Recall of Ground Beef Is Ordered.” *The New York Times*, February 18, 2008, sec. Business. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/18/business/18recall.html>.
- “NEW POLL SHOWS 91 PERCENT OF CONNECTICUT VOTERS SUPPORT LEGISLATION TO PROTECT FARM ANIMALS.” *States News Service*, May 29, 2013. Academic OneFile. http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA331694442&v=2.1&u=lacc_main&it=r&p=AO NE&sw=w&asid=69625b5a28d23abd5c9d78aa858b31cc.
- “New Poll Shows 91 Percent of Connecticut Voters Support Legislation to Protect Farm Animals : The Humane Society of the United States.” Accessed March 21, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2013/05/hb6317-conn-gestation-crate-poll-052913.html.
- Nicholls, Alex, and Nick Lee. “Purchase Decision-making in Fair Trade and the Ethical Purchase ‘gap’: ‘is There a Fair Trade Twix?’” *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 14, no. 4 (2006): 369–86. doi:10.1080/09652540600956384.
- Nick Cooney. *Change of Heart : What Psychology Can Teach Us About Spreading Social Change*. New York: Lantern Books, 2011.
- Ogle, Maureen. *In Meat We Trust: An Unexpected History of Carnivore America*, 2013.
- Olynk, N. J. “Assessing Changing Consumer Preferences for Livestock Production Processes.” *Animal Frontiers* 2, no. 3 (July 1, 2012): 32–38. doi:10.2527/af.2012-0046.
- Page, Louise, and Berta Friend. “The Changing United States Diet.” *BioScience* 28, no. 3 (March 1, 1978): 192–97. doi:10.2307/1307348.
- Pamela D. Frasch. *Animal Law in a Nutshell*. StPaul, MN: Thomson/West, 2011.
- Peter Singer. *Animal Liberation*. 1st Ecco pbk. ed.. New York: Ecco, 2002.
- Pierre Bourdieu. *Distinction : a Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Pigs Suffer at IRON MAIDEN*, 2014. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sj1YjhAJckM&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
- “Poultry Cage Laws Create Scrambled Eggs.” Accessed May 7, 2014. <http://farmfutures.com/blogs-poultry-cage-laws-create-scrambled-eggs-8147>.
- “Rampant Animal Cruelty at California Slaughter Plant : The Humane Society of the United States.” Accessed February 24, 2014. http://www.humanesociety.org/news/news/2008/01/undercover_investigation_013008.html.
- Randal Marlin. *Propaganda and the Ethics of Persuasion*. Peterborough, Ont; Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press, 2002.
- Randy Shore. “New Code Restricts Painful Practices, Confinement in Pig Rearing | Vancouver Sun.” Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://blogs.vancouversun.com/2014/03/10/new-code-restricts-painful-practices-confinement-in-pig-rearing/>.
- Ray, Sarah Jaquette. *The Ecological Other: Environmental Exclusion in American Culture*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013.
- “Real Environmentalists Don’t Eat Meat (women’s Light Green).” *In Defense of Animals - Shop*. Accessed May 7, 2014. <http://www.idausa.org/shop/?product=real-environmentalist-womens-light-green-3>.
- “Revitalized Vans Warped Tour Regains Popularity.” *TribLIVE.com*. Accessed May 6, 2014. <http://triblive.com/aande/2164661-74/tour-warped-lyman-fans-says-bands-kevin-burgettstown-niagara-pavilion>.

- Shire, Emily. "PETA Is Now Fat-shaming Women into Vegan Diets." *The Week*. Accessed March 21, 2014. <http://theweek.com/article/index/253574/peta-is-now-fat-shaming-women-into-vegan-diets>.
- Slaughterhouse Investigation: Cruel and Unhealthy Practices*, 2008.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zhlhSQ5z4V4&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
- "Smithfield Urges Farmers to End Use of Gestation Crates." Accessed March 10, 2014.
<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/01/07/hog-crates-ban/4362353/>.
- "Smithfield Urges Farmers to End Use of Gestation Crates." Accessed March 21, 2014.
<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/01/07/hog-crates-ban/4362353/>.
- "STOP FACTORY FARMS = STOP BIRD FLU." *Avian Flu Talk*. Accessed May 7, 2014.
http://www.avianflutalk.com/stop-factory-farms-stop-bird-flu_topic15325_page20.html.
- "Table Egg Production and Hen Welfare: Agreement and Legislative Proposals." *Agricultural Legislation*, July 17, 2013. <http://agriculture-legislation.blogspot.com/2013/07/table-egg-production-and-hen-welfare.html>.
- The Associated Press. "California: Deal Reached in Suit Over Animal Abuse." *The New York Times*, November 27, 2013, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/28/us/california-deal-reached-in-suit-over-animal-abuse.html>.
- "The Humane League." *TheHumaneLeague.com*. Accessed March 21, 2014.
<http://www.TheHumaneLeague.com>.
- Thomas, Mat. "AnimalRighter: Leaked NRA Pamphlet Targets 'Animal Rights Terrorists'." *AnimalRighter*, January 15, 2007. <http://animalrighter.blogspot.com/2007/01/leaked-nra-pamphlet-targets-animal.html>.
- Timothy Pachirat. *Every Twelve Seconds : Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Tonsor, Glynn T., and Nicole J. Olynk. "Impacts of Animal Well-Being and Welfare Media on Meat Demand." *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 62, no. 1 (2011): 59–72. doi:10.1111/j.1477-9552.2010.00266.x.
- Tonsor, Glynn T., and Christopher A. Wolf. "Effect of Video Information on Consumers: Milk Production Attributes." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 94, no. 2 (January 1, 2012): 503–8.
- U Romano, Eva Longoria, Rory O'Connor, Nick Clark, Wendy Blackstone, Shine Global (Firm), Globalvision (Firm), Romano Film & Photography, Unbelievable Productions, and Cinema Libre Studio. *The Harvest La Cosecha*. Canoga Park, Calif: Cinema Libre Studio, 2011.
- Uncaged-YES on Prop 2*, 2008.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oqPJsfjyZU&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
- Undercover at Smithfield Foods (2012 Webby Award Winner)*, 2010.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L_vqIGTKuQE&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
- Undercover Investigation at Hy-Line Hatchery*, 2009. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JJ--faib7to&feature=youtube_gdata_player.
- Upton Sinclair. *The Jungle*. Boston: Bedford/StMartins, 2004.
- "Video Shows Live Chicks Dumped in Grinder." *Msnbc.com*. Accessed May 6, 2014.
http://www.nbcnews.com/id/32647389/ns/business-us_business/t/video-shows-live-chicks-dumped-grinder/.
- "We're Eating Less Meat. Why?" *Opinionator*. Accessed April 21, 2014.
<http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/01/10/were-eating-less-meat-why/>.

“Who Protects the Animals?” *Opinionator*. Accessed March 21, 2014.
<http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/04/26/who-protects-the-animals/>.

Appendix A: Viewer Survey

Survey for 2012 Warped Tour attendees

1. What was the 4-minute video about?

- A music video from a Warped Tour band
- The reasons not to smoke cigarettes
- The treatment of animals on farms
- Kony 2012

2. Please provide the following information:

First Name: _____
 Phone Number (will call if you win!): _____
 Age: ____ Gender: _____

2. Did you watch the full 4-minute video & receive \$1?

- Yes
- No

**3. How often did you eat these foods *before* watching the video?
 (check one per row)**

	Very Often	Somewhat Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Dairy Products (milk, cheese, ice cream, etc)					
Egg products (including baked goods)					
Fish and sea mollusks					
Poultry (chicken, turkey, duck, etc)					
Red meat (beef, pork, lamb, etc)					

PLEASE CONTINUE ON BACK >>>
ONLY COMPLETED SURVEYS ARE ENTERED INTO THE RAFFLE

Appendix A (continued): Viewer Survey

How often do you eat these foods currently? (check one per row)

	Very Often	Somewhat Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Dairy Products (milk, cheese, ice cream, etc)					
Egg products (including baked goods)					
Fish and sea mollusks					
Poultry (chicken, turkey, duck, etc)					
Red meat (beef, pork, lamb, etc)					

4. Have you been receiving weekly Meatout Mondays emails?

Yes, I'm still subscribed. Yes, but I've unsubscribed No

6b. Have you made any dishes from the emailed recipes?

Yes, and found them tasty/helpful Yes, but wasn't impressed No

6c. Have you found the emails otherwise helpful?

Yes, very much so Yes, somewhat No

5. If you made a pledge onsite to eat vegan at least 1 day/week, you have also received a supportive email once every few months, detailing the positive impact you've made. Did these emails...

Increase your commitment to move towards a vegan diet?

Help you maintain your commitment?

Have no effect on/decrease your commitment?

Do not recall receiving these emails.

6. Did you make use of the Gardein coupon on your brochure?

Yes, and liked it! Yes, but wasn't impressed. No

7. If you shared or discussed the video with friends or family, did any of them change their diet? Yes No

Appendix B: Control Survey

Survey for 2012 Warped Tour attendees

First Name: _____

Phone Number (will call if you win!): _____

Age: ____ Gender: _____

How often did you eat these foods *before* Warped 2012?
(check one per row)

	Very Often	Somewhat Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Dairy Products (milk, cheese, ice cream, etc)					
Egg products (including baked goods)					
Fish and sea mollusks					
Poultry (chicken, turkey, duck, etc)					
Red meat (beef, pork, lamb, etc)					

How often do you eat these foods currently? (check one per row)

	Very Often	Somewhat Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Dairy Products (milk, cheese, ice cream, etc)					
Egg products (including baked goods)					
Fish and sea mollusks					
Poultry (chicken, turkey, duck, etc)					
Red meat (beef, pork, lamb, etc)					

Appendix C:
Raw Survey Data
Source: FARM

Group	Sample Size	Av. Age	Animals Spared	Improved Diet	No Change or Worsened Diet	Watched Full Video
Viewers						
Males (raw)	108	18.6	17.9	60	48	103
Males (percent)	44.63%	18.6		55.56%	44.44%	95.37%
Females (raw)	134	17.7	14.3	80	54	127
Females (percent)	55.37%	17.7		59.70%	40.30%	94.78%
All (raw)	242	18.1	16	140	102	230
All (percent)	100.00%	18.1		57.85%	42.15%	95.04%
Non-Viewers						
Males (raw)	46	19.3	-4.1	6	40	
Males (percent)	44.66%	19.3		13.04%	86.96%	
Females (raw)	57	17.4	-3.2	11	46	
Females (percent)	55.34%	17.4		19.30%	80.70%	
All (raw)	103	18.2	-3.6	17	86	
All (percent)	100.00%	18.2		16.50%	83.50%	

Group**Viewers** Sample Size**13-14****(raw)** 6**13-14**
(percent) 2.48%**15-16****(raw)** 64**15-16**
(percent) 26.45%**17-18****(raw)** 95**17-18**
(percent) 39.26%**19-20****(raw)** 50**19-20**
(percent) 20.66%**21+****(raw)** 26**21+**
(percent) 10.74%**Non-****Viewers** Sample Size**13-14****(raw)** 5**13-14**
(percent) 4.85%**15-16****(raw)** 21**15-16**
(percent) 20.39%**17-18****(raw)** 37**17-18**
(percent) 35.92%**19-20****(raw)** 27**19-20**
(percent) 26.21%**21+****(raw)** 13**21+**
(percent) 12.62%

Animal Product Viewers	All	Female	Male	Ages 13-14
Dairy	17.75%	16.96%	18.81%	33.33%
Eggs	20.69%	19.43%	22.26%	16.67%
Fish	18.66%	14.55%	23.28%	46.15%
Poultry	23.66%	24.80%	22.36%	45.00%
Red Meat	26.81%	28.20%	25.38%	55.00%
Non-Viewers				
Dairy	-10.91%	-11.11%	-10.69%	0.00%
Eggs	-5.51%	-7.19%	-3.48%	-6.67%
Fish	-6.06%	-7.58%	-4.55%	3.33%
Poultry	-2.06%	1.95%	-6.57%	-2.22%
Red Meat	-3.24%	0.00%	-6.23%	1.11%

Animal Product Viewers	Ages 15-16	Ages 17-18	Ages 19-20	Ages 21+
Dairy	18.22%	17.06%	14.63%	19.75%
Eggs	21.76%	21.12%	20.86%	17.11%
Fish	11.46%	18.90%	23.46%	14.89%
Poultry	25.95%	22.13%	21.71%	20.51%
Red Meat	26.30%	24.07%	23.18%	34.62%
Non-Viewers				
Dairy	-5.09%	-1.14%	-18.18%	
Eggs	-5.77%	-2.02%	-12.50%	
Fish	-7.14%	-4.08%	-8.33%	
Poultry	-1.72%	-8.41%	-10.39%	
Red Meat	0.00%	0.00%	-4.05%	