

WellBeing International

WBI Studies Repository

1993

Animal Well-Being: key Philosophical, Ethical, Political, and Public Issues Affecting Food Animal Agriculture

Andrew N. Rowan
Wellbeing International

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.wellbeingintludiesrepository.org/aw_farm_gen

Recommended Citation

Rowan, A.N. 1993. Animal well-being: Key philosophical, ethical, political and public issues affecting food animal agriculture. In Proceedings of a Conference on Food Animal Well-Being, pp 23-35. Purdue University, Office of Agricultural Research Programs, West Lafayette, Indiana.

This material is brought to you for free and open access by WellBeing International. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of the WBI Studies Repository. For more information, please contact wbisr-info@wellbeingintl.org.



ANIMAL WELL-BEING: KEY PHILOSOPHICAL, ETHICAL, POLITICAL, AND PUBLIC ISSUES AFFECTING FOOD ANIMAL AGRICULTURE

Andrew N. Rowan

Director, Center for Animals and Public Policy

Tufts University

Introduction

Concern about the way farm animals are raised and treated in the food production process has developed slowly in the North American animal protection movement and is still largely absent as an issue for the general public. Nonetheless, anybody involved in the animal production business who is also interested in strategic planning would be foolish to overlook the question of animal protection and animal rights.

The farmer or agribusiness executive interested in learning more about these issues should first understand the terminology as it is used and as it should be used. It is common to see distinctions being drawn between animal welfare and animal rights as if the descriptors are mutually exclusive. Thus, animal welfare types are frequently characterized by farm and animal research organizations as appropriately concerned with fighting animal cruelty, while animal rights types are characterized as promoting the radical (and inappropriate) notion that we should release all our animals back to the wild and revert to a diet of grains, nuts, and fruits. The problem with such simplistic divisions is that many animal welfare organizations are unhappy with modern systems of animal agriculture and argue that they cause (sometimes considerable) animal distress. Furthermore, 80% of the public believe that animals have rights (*Parents Magazine*, October, 1989). However, 85% of this same sample agree that humans could kill animals and eat animal products. As far as can be determined, the general public notion of animal “rights” is that humans have obligations that require them to concerned about human treatment of animals.

At another level, the use of “rights” terminology is a fundamental feature of U.S. political discourse and is commonly used to establish a claim for disenfranchised groups. It is, therefore, natural that the animal movement should have appropriated “rights” language in its campaign for a changed moral status for animals. An animal “welfare” proponent may well use animal “rights” terminology in a political campaign because it strikes a responsive chord with the general public. The establishment, however, has been waging a campaign that

seeks to establish the marginality of animal rights claims and identifies animal rights activists as belonging to a lunatic and perhaps dangerous fringe.

From a philosophical perspective, “rights” language carries very specific meaning, and moral arguments framed in rights are often identified as the opposite of moral arguments framed in utilitarian or consequentialist terms (actions are judged as moral based on producing consequences that maximize benefit over harm, for example). As a philosopher, one could develop an animal rights argument to justify the animal welfare position on animal suffering and cruelty or the abolitionist position that argues against almost all human uses of vertebrate animals.

Therefore, when people talk about the animal rights movement, it is not clear whether they are referring to animal rights as understood by the public, animal rights as a political movement, or animal rights as a philosophical position. These distinctions are not trivial, and I now argue that indiscriminate and careless use of animal rights terminology tends to confuse rather than clarify issues.

A more useful way of distinguishing between different categories of animal activists would identify those groups that have been unwilling to depart from traditional animal sheltering and cruelty investigations; those that have broadened their concerns to include farm animals, research animals, and the like but who tend to try to work within the system; and those who have resorted to high-profile activist campaigns to confront and challenge the establishment and call for a radical change in the way we exploit animals. But even this modified linear scale is too simplistic. A two-dimensional matrix would be a more accurate way of distinguishing between different groups campaigning on behalf of animals. One axis of the matrix would separate groups on the basis of their philosophy on animal treatment and human use of animals, while the other would separate them on their political approach (from dialogue to illegal activities).

There is also some confusion about the term “cruelty.” Animal cruelty laws cover a wide variety of actions, from cases in which a perpetrator not only causes pain or distress to an animal but also gains some personal satisfaction from doing so, to animal abuse and neglect where the individual responsible is causing animal distress because of ignorance, economic gain, or some other reason. Animal use that is sanctioned by society may also cause animal distress, but it is usually justified in terms of the actual or potential counterbalancing benefits to humans and other animals. Under the above definitions, animal cruelty is more narrowly defined and refers to actions that are hopefully relatively rare and that should be of great concern to all society. Animal abuse and neglect should still be of concern, but human intent in such cases is very different. As with “rights” language, if these terms are not carefully defined and used, it is easy to see how two groups of well-meaning protagonists can so rapidly be at each others’ throats. A better understanding of the above concepts should help to promote a constructive debate on farm animal well-being issues.

Brief History of the Issue

The first laws protecting farm animals in the United States were passed as long ago as 1873 (the “24-Hour” law), and the early humane movement in the United States concentrated almost exclusively on horses and farm animals. The abuse of livestock in transport and slaughter was a major focus for the American Humane Association (AHA) during its first 50 years (founded in 1877). Eventually, the United States, after much prodding and lobbying by AHA and other animal groups, passed a humane slaughter law in 1958.

However, the modern protest over farm animal treatment (particularly intensive husbandry systems) began in the 1960’s in Britain. In 1964, Ruth Harrison’s book, *Animal Machines*, was published. In it she called attention to the new animal housing systems that restricted the natural behaviors of animals compared to the former extensive pastoral methods. The book quickly led to the establishment of the Brambell Commission by the British government to examine the situation. Brambell enunciated the famous “five freedoms” to stand up, turn around, lie down, stretch, and groom as the basic needs of animals in any farming system.

The Brambell Commission’s (1965) report led to the establishment of codes of practice for animal agriculture in the United Kingdom. In other parts of Europe, the early 1970’s saw the passage of several animal protection laws that also addressed farm animal practices. For instance, in Sweden, new animal housing systems had to be evaluated by the veterinary service for their likely impact on the animals before they could be put into general use. In 1972, the first stirring of concern about modern farming systems in North America was raised in a paper in the *Canadian Veterinary Journal*, authored by Dr. Franklin Loew, then at the University of Saskatchewan.

In the United States, Dr. Michael Fox began to raise questions about animal agriculture when he joined the Humane Society of the U.S. in 1976, and by 1980, when *Animal Factories* by Jim Mason and Peter Singer appeared, it seemed as though the farm animal issue was about to catch fire in the North American animal protection movement. However, while farm animal welfare became a major issue in Europe in the early 1980’s, it is only now becoming an issue in North America. For example, the EEC has been deeply involved in examining the science of farm animal well-being and in legislative initiatives to promote such well-being (Guither and Curtis, 1983), but, with the exception of the CAST report in 1981, serious debate on farm animal well-being is just beginning in the United States.

In the last 40 years, the animal protection movement in North America has developed from a fringe movement that was charged with enforcing anti-cruelty statutes and organizing “Be Kind to Animals” weeks to a social movement with significant political clout. More than 30 new animal groups with a national focus have been established, as well as smaller organizations of activists in almost every major urban center. Of the new national groups in the United States, 13

have a significant interest in the farm animal issue (Table 1). These groups range from those who try to work within the establishment (Animal Welfare Institute, Farm Animal Concerns Trust) to those who have chosen dramatic confrontation with the establishment (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). Most of them have ongoing farm animal programs. The Humane Society of the U.S. is known for its work on sustainable agriculture. Animal Right International has been spearheading a campaign against kosher slaughter (that has persuaded several slaughter plants to install the slaughter system developed by Temple Grandin) and another against Perdue Chicken. The Humane Farming Association has been campaigning against veal production with some success, according to their own reports, while Farm Sanctuary has been distributing dramatic video footage of animal abuse in stockyards taken by a Minnesota activist.

All the groups in Table 1 have grown significantly since they were founded, some quite spectacularly (Rowan, 1989). The Humane Society of the U.S. has increased its membership by more than tenfold since 1978 and now counts almost a million and a half “constituents.” People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals has expanded from 20 members in 1980 to over 300,000 constituents and a \$9 million annual budget in 1991. What would explain this growth? Have the groups been very skillful at manipulating public opinion and the media, or have they merely taken advantage of underlying public concerns about the place of animals in society?

Table 1.

Founding Dates of Animal Groups with an Interest in Farm Animal Issues.	
Year Founded	Group Name
1951	Animal Welfare Institute
1954	Humane Society of the U.S.
1976	Animal Rights International
1978	Animal Legal Defense Fund
1979	Animal Rights Network–Agenda Magazine People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
1980	Action for Life Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights Farm Animal Reform Movement
1982	Farm Animal Concerns Trust
1984	Humane Farming Association
1985	Physicians Committee for Reform of Medicine
1986	Farm Sanctuary

Reasons for the Growth of the Animal Protection Movement

Victorian Era

Keith Thomas (1983) described the development of heightened concern for nature and animals in Britain from 1500 to 1800. Nonetheless, this change in attitude towards animals did not lead to any organized animal movement until 1824, when the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (later the Royal SPCA) was formed in the United Kingdom. The early 19th-century efforts at preventing animal abuse tended to be concentrated on the treatment of horses and animals used in spectacles and entertainment. Later in the century, the English animal movement became a potent political force with its campaign against the use of animals in research, a practice that has always touched a particularly raw nerve. A variety of reasons have been put forward as to why animal protection and antivivisection should have risen to prominence at the end of the Victorian era (French, 1975; Stevenson, 1956; Turner, 1980), and some of them are relevant to the growth of the modern movement.

Theory of Evolution

The publication of the theory of evolution and Darwin's arguments about the evolution of human beings weakened (and in some cases totally undermined) the widespread assumption that humans and animals were radically different in kind. People began to investigate animal behavior and discuss animal intelligence. Their willingness to even think in these terms led to challenges to existing attitudes to animals and a growth in concern for the way animals were treated. Nonetheless, when Henry Salt, a confidant of George Bernard Shaw, suggested in 1892 that animals should have rights, his arguments were too much for society, and his plea was not taken seriously.

Religion

Some of the Protestant religions (e.g., Methodism) held that animals had souls. These teachings raised questions about how animals should be treated and supported the growth in the 19th-century concern for animals (Stevenson, 1956). By contrast, Roman Catholicism did not believe that animals had any claims on human beings. Today, organized religion is more likely to reinforce the status quo than to support challenges to human exploitation of animals.

Utilitarian Philosophy

The development of British Utilitarian philosophy in the late 1700's laid the groundwork for Victorian concerns about suffering and promoted admiration for those who showed they were "men of feeling" (Bentham, 1962). Bentham specifically promoted concern for animal suffering in his writings and provided intellectual support for the movement. The women's movement was also politically important at this time and may have increased attention to and support for caring for exploited groups, be they black-skinned slaves, children, or animals.

Modern Era

After the first world war, animal protection and antivivisection in both Europe and North America lost influence, and one does not observe any signs of a renaissance in the movement until the 1950's, when new organizations began appearing at an increasing rate. Some of the elements underlying the explosive growth of the animal movement since 1950 appear to be very similar to those that powered the 19th-century animal movement to political prominence. For example, academic philosophy appears to have played a similar role in providing rational (and hence more respected) arguments in favor of increased concern for animals. (By and large, sentiment is not persuasive in moving the opinion leaders in modern technocratic democracies.)

There has also been a substantial shift in people's attitude towards animal capabilities (Rollin, 1989). In contrast to the decades of behaviorism and scientific positivism from 1920 to 1960, when animals were perceived to be little more than reacting machines, the recent focus on their psychological and cognitive abilities has, as in the Darwinian era, narrowed the perceived gap between humans and animals.

Also, the shift in populations from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban lifestyle is also likely to have had an effect on modern attitudes because it has weakened the societal influence of the more utilitarian attitudes found in rural populations. Finally, the rise in the women's movement in the last three decades has increased the status of female concerns on the political agenda. It could be argued that nurturing and caring are more important concerns for women than for men (women consistently express greater concern about animal treatment in public surveys) and that there has been an increased emphasis on nurturing (be it children, the environment, or animals).

Philosopher Contribution

The impact of Paul Singer's *Animal Liberation* (1975), calling for a new ethic for animals on the growth of the animal protection movement, cannot be underestimated. His argument was simple, and he backed it up with many examples of perceived animals abuse. At the time, animal protection suffered from the stigma of sentimentality, and many who worked for the cause appeared to be apologizing for the emotional underpinnings of their arguments. However, Singer brought reason and respect to the animal protection movement, not by appeals to sentiment, but by clear and compelling logic. (There is a tendency in animal agriculture to accuse Singer of emotionalism. While his examples of animal abuse in agriculture may upset people, his philosophical arguments carry no hint of either emotion or irrationality.) His arguments thus empowered many animal protectionists, giving them greater confidence, and helped launch the modern animal rights movement.

Singer's ideas were also very important in recruiting new members from the professions and academe into the movement. He articulated a provocative and yet persuasive theme that appealed to those who require a rational argument before they become involved in a cause.

Impact of Change in Views of Animals

A shift in public attitudes toward animals—namely from seeing them as dumb animals to intelligent beings with emotions and drives similar to our own—is probably one of the major societal factors driving the growth of concern for animals. The behaviorist tradition dominated thought about animals from 1920 to the early 1960's. But, in the mid 60's, scientists again started to discuss and explore the cognitive and psychological abilities of animals (Griffin, 1976). This period also marked the growth of ethology as a science and a reawakening of public wonder over the natural behavior (and “intelligence”) of animals.

In an increasingly urban society, where attitudes to animals are shaped more by companionship needs than by frontier and rural experience, animal cognition and intelligence became a popular topic. Television was an important influence, starting in the 1960's. National Geographic's footage of the human-like behavior and reasoning of the chimpanzees in Gombe and of Koko the gorilla and her pet kitten delighted millions of urban Americans. Studies with “talking” chimpanzees raised uncomfortable questions about the uniqueness of human language. Oceanaria featured dolphins and killer whales and promoted them as sweet, gentle, and very intelligent creatures. The number of, and attachment to, companion dogs and cats grew. It is hardly surprising that the public should have become much more concerned about the way animals are treated.

Urban-Rural Divide

In 1991, approximately 75% of the citizens of the United States lived in an urban environment, while only 2% of the total population were involved in farming. Urbanization has not changed that dramatically in the past 40 years (64% of the population were urban in 1950), but the current generation (consisting of baby boomers and younger) is much less likely to have had farm experience or contacts with family members who lived on farms than their parents. In addition, the post-war era has brought many changes in food processing and packaging, so that it becomes increasingly difficult to associate meat with the animals it comes from. Shopping at a butcher shop was a very different experience from picking up cellophane-wrapped packets of meat in a supermarket. Thus, the impact of the urban prism of the 1960's and later is undermining the influence of the agrarian understanding that animals and their killing for food are an important part of daily survival.

Gender Issues and the Women's Movement

Carol Gilligan has argued that nurturing and caregiving are important values for women (Gilligan et al., 1988). Indeed it is a truism that concern for animals is higher among women than among men, and it has been argued that feminism and animal protection are closely linked (Donovan, 1990; Sperling, 1988). Certainly, many of the recently formed animal protection groups were started by women, and women continue to play a significant role in the movement. A 1976 in-depth survey of a randomly selected national sample of over 3,000 persons reported that 2.0% of the female population had supported an animal protection

group while only 0.6% of the male population had (Kellert and Berry, 1981). (An unpublished survey of adult Americans found that 6.0% were members of the animal protection in 1990 and 20% had contributed money to animal causes.)

If women are more care oriented, then “care” issues should receive more political attention when the political status of women rises in a society. It is noteworthy that the animal protection movement enjoyed relatively high social status in the 19th century, when there was growing pressure to educate women and give them the vote (cf. Elston, 1987). In the 20th century, the increase in status of the animal movement similarly follows a push for greater equality for women. Singer’s book was titled *Animal Liberation* at the height of the push for women’s liberation, and this is probably more than simple coincidence. However, as with animal cognition, the link is interesting and suggestive but does not necessarily prove causality.

Farm Animal Issues

Animal protection concerns about farm animals may be divided into three broad categories—animal care and husbandry, animal killing, and the effects of biotechnology. Animal care and husbandry are, in theory, the traditional concern of the animal protection movement. However, the topic has been expanded from the traditional prosecution of those relatively few individuals who clearly starve or abuse their animals to include criticism of intensive modern husbandry systems, especially the restriction of the natural behavior of the animals. The key question for those who protest modern farm animal conditions is the extent of the animals’ suffering in these conditions.

For philosophers like Singer (who do not necessarily oppose the painless killing of animals), it is perceived animal suffering that causes them to condemn farm animal rearing and slaughter. Even if modern animal rearing has reduced death rates (for example, poultry flocks in the 1920’s routinely experienced 20-25% mortality from weather and predation, whereas modern broiler houses report mortality figures of 8-10% or less), animal protection organizations still regard the close confinement of modern housing as diminishing the well-being of the animals. The more humans control and manage the environment of the animals they keep, the more they will be held accountable for the deficiencies and well-being problems of those housing systems.

Protest against the killing of animals for meat is not that widespread in society, but, in the animal protection movement, there are increasing pressures on animal groups not to promote meat eating. These pressures originate with the animal liberation movement, which regards not only animal suffering as wrong, but also the painless killing of animals by humans. In the early part of this century, most antivivisectionists were unapologetic about the inconsistencies of eating meat (and wearing fur) while campaigning to abolish all animal research. Today, the level of consistency is much higher, and antivivisection groups report that up to 70% of their members are also vegetarian. Nonetheless, in the animal protection movement, there are still a substantial number of supporters who eat

meat. For most of these, there is no inconsistency in their attempts to eliminate animal suffering coupled with their conscientious omnivory.

A new wrinkle has been added to the farm animal debate—animal biotechnology. Public fears are relatively ill-formed but are best summed up in the use of the term “Frankenfood” for products that are derived from genetically engineered animals or plants. The actual welfare concerns that are raised by genetic engineering are no different in kind from those raised by the modern rearing systems. However, there are some deeper issues that derive from the theological notions of different “kinds” of animals (Blair and Rowan, 1990). Some people feel that, even if humans have been engaging in selective breeding for centuries, we should not take any additional liberties with God’s creation.

Public Attitudes

Public attitudes to farm animals issues are not particularly well-formed or strongly held. According to the figures in Table 2, the public agrees that animals have rights but not that they have the right to life (85% agreed that animals could be killed for food). They believed that farm animals were treated humanely but would, nonetheless, vote for regulating farm animal care. Among the different types of animals, public concerns were highest for veal calves, and this is also the area on which the animal protection movement has concentrated most

Table 2.

Public Opinion Polls—Animal Care.

	Percentages	
	Yes	No
<i>Parents Magazine, October 1989</i>		
Animals have rights	80	13
Wrong to kill for food	5	85
Wrong to kill for leather	69	27
Wrong to capture & exhibit	29	66
Animal Industry Foundation, April 1989		
Farm animals treated humanely	79	5
Vote for regulations on animal care	64	19
Animals Humanely Treated		
Beef (Wirthlin Group, 89)	69	12
Hogs	63	13
Broilers	51	19
Veal Calves	49	23
Lab Animals	33	40
Massachusetts Referendum—November, 1988 (Shurland, 1990)		
Vote for potential farm animal care regulations	29	71

of its resources and campaigns. When the public were actually put to the test on their views on farm animal regulations (Massachusetts referendum, 1988; see Shurland, 1990), they rejected the idea of establishing a commission to consider regulations by a 71 to 29 margin. However, this vote should not be taken at face value because farming interests successfully recast the debate as a defense of the family farm (it was suggested that the family farm would go out of business if the referendum question passed) rather than as promoting farm animal well-being.

Vegetarianism is another issue. Five percent of those polled in the *Parents Magazine* (1989) sample thought that it was wrong to kill animals for food (but two-fifths of that 5% still ate meat!). A more specific question about vegetarian habits revealed that 4% do not eat meat or fish and a further 14% have moral reservations about eating meat (higher negatives were found in the younger age groups). This is similar to the result from a recent national Restaurant Association poll where 20% said they looked for restaurants with vegetarian items on the menu. It seems reasonable to assume that more farm animal welfare public awareness campaigns by the animal protection movement will cause some of those to switch to a vegetarian diet.

These figures are not cause for immediate alarm for the animal production community. Nonetheless, in the United Kingdom, where vegetarianism is now the chosen lifestyle of 7-8% of the population, supermarket chains have begun to market vegetarian entrees and frozen dinners, creating alternative options to the standard meat and potatoes fare of the British.

Tactics and Strategy

The major focus of animal protection campaigns in the past has been to change laws and regulations to provide more protection for animals and to raise public awareness. There has not been much activity on the legislative/regulatory front, in part because the animal movement has had trouble developing campaigns that attack the system without taking on the farmer. The family farm occupies an almost mythic place in North American culture and is not an icon that one would wish to criticize or attack. Nonetheless, some instances of clear animal abuse (starving animals to death) have provided the type of scandal that often provides legislative openings. For example, the Downed Animal Protection Act of 1992 was introduced because of the video footage of downed animals being dragged around stockyards. Also, the veal calf industry has proved to be vulnerable to animal protection campaigns, and several bills to protect veal calves have been introduced into Congress.

Most of the animal movement is still in the “public awareness” phase as far as tactics are concerned. While most animal groups have confined themselves to relatively staid public awareness campaigns (e.g., the Humane Society of the U.S. campaign about “Egg and Bacon—The Breakfast of Cruelty”), People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) has taken public awareness to new levels. One widely reported event involved throwing a pie into the face of the Iowa Pork Queen, and they followed this with an advertisement in the

Des Moines newspaper linking the behavior of serial killer Jeffrey Dahmer (who killed and butchered his victims) to the type of activity found in slaughterhouses. It is not clear whether these aggressive campaigns have had a positive or negative impact. If one follows the old premise that it does not matter what people say about you as long as they spell your name correctly, then the PETA campaigns have been very successful. However, it is not only animal agriculture that has complained about these campaigns; a number of animal activists have also responded very negatively.

PETA has also developed another tactic with great success—namely, the recruitment of “stars” to the cause. Paul McCartney and k.d. lang, to name just two, have allied themselves with PETA and have provided their names and endorsements for both fund-raising and public awareness campaigns.

However, the most successful public awareness campaign of the past year or two has been the exposé of the way downer animals are handled in stockyards. An animal activist in Minnesota used a home video camera to produce footage of the “handling” of downer animals in the South St. Paul stockyards. The video footage has been widely distributed and shown, and the stockyards and meat packers have been scrambling to recover.

Another strategy that has produced success for the animal movement in the past is the narrowly focused campaign. There are two ongoing farm animal campaigns that have been continued for several years (as opposed to “campaigns” that have more to do with raising funds than effecting change). The Humane Farming Association (HFA) has been waging a campaign against the veal industry for several years now. Other groups have protested against veal, but only HFA has developed a sustained campaign that includes the development of legislation, the targeting of restaurant chains, and other related actions. In the five years that HFA has been focusing on this issue, veal production has dropped by more than 50%, according to HFA literature. If the claim is accurate, the fall in veal production may also be a reflection of the recession because of veal’s place as a luxury item.

The second campaign has been developed by Henry Spira of Animal Rights International. Spira is a veteran of several successful animal actions, including the campaign against the use of the Draize eye irritancy test in cosmetic testing, and he has now targeted the Perdue broiler chicken operation. In the pharmaceutical, cosmetic, and chemical industries, Spira has developed a reputation as a hard bargainer and streetwise campaigner but also as someone who will work toward “win-win” solutions and as someone who will live up to a bargain. Consequently, Spira has had good access to corporate leaders in the chemical and pharmaceutical industry since the early 1980’s and has been able to bargain for progress without actually resorting to street campaigns (other than the initial campaign against Revlon in 1980).

Because of Frank Perdue’s high profile (“It takes a tough man to make a tender chicken”), his company was an obvious candidate when Spira was looking for a campaign to focus attention on the six billion farm animals killed annually in the United States. He began with his usual direct approach to the

company, asking for a meeting to discuss possible initiatives that would promote farm animal well-being. His initial request was ignored, but Perdue eventually responded that there was no point to the meeting because he (Perdue) was not in the habit of discussing issues with people like Spira. Predictably, Spira then took his campaign to the public and has produced three advertising campaigns focused on Perdue, with the latest one featuring a photograph of a Perdue chicken enclosed in a condom under the slogan “There’s no such thing as safe chicken.” After two years, the campaign has produced few measurable results, but one of Spira’s strengths as an activist is that he perseveres and will stay on an issue for as long as it takes. In the meantime, a new group of animal activists has been formed in Maryland specifically to focus on poultry well-being.

Conclusion

While the animal movement has yet to have a significant impact on animal agriculture, nobody in the animal production business who is thinking strategically can ignore the potential of the movement and its concerns. The animal movement has expanded to more than 10 million people, many of whom are strongly committed to the cause. The groups have shown some skill at playing on public fears, and it would not take much to raise concerns about farm animals.

In Europe, public concern for farm animals appeared to be relatively low key in the late 1970’s but then changed dramatically over a decade, and it is now possible to mobilize substantial public support for initiatives to ban battery cage systems or sow tethering. It is not clear that a similar sudden rise in concern for farm animals could occur in North America, but neither is it certain that the European pattern will not repeat itself here. The same practices that elicited such public concern in Europe (e.g., veal crates, battery caging, intensive pig housing) are widespread in North America, as well.

References

- Bentham, J. 1962. *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, ed. J. Bowring. vol. 1, pp 142-143. Russell and Russell, New York, NY.
- Blair, S. A. and A.N. Rowan. 1990. Of mice and men: Patents and social policy matters. *Patent World*, January:31-35.
- Brambell Commission. 1965. *A Report of the Technical Committee to enquire into the Welfare of Animals kept under Intensive Livestock Husbandry Systems*. Her Majesty’s Stationery Office (Cmnd Paper 2836), London, England.
- Donovan, J. 1990. Animal rights and feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 15:350-375.
- Elston, M.A. 1987. Women and antivivisection in Victorian England, 1870-1900. In *Vivisection in Historical Perspective*, pp. 259-294, ed., Rupke, N. A. Croom Helm, London, England.

- French, R.D. 1975. *Antivivisection and Medical Science in Victorian Society*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Gilligan, C., J.V. Ward, J.M. Taylor, and B. Basdige, editors. 1988. *Mapping the Moral Dmain*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Griffin, D. 1976. *The Question of Animal Awareness*. Rockefeller University Press, New York, NY.
- Guither, H.D. and S.E. Curtis. 1983. *Animal Welfare: Developments in Europe—A Perspective for the United States*. Urbana, IL; Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station, AE 4536 AS 675.
- Harrison, R. 1964. *Animal Machines*. Vincent Stuart Ltd, London, England.
- Kellert, S R and J. Berry. 1981. *Knowledge, Affection and Basic Attitudes toward Animals in American Society*. Washington, DC; U.S. Government Printing Office, Document Number 024-010-00-625-1.
- Loew, F.M. 1972. The veterinarian and intensive livestock production: Humane considerations. *Canadian Veterinary Journal* . 13:229-233.
- Mason, J and P. Singer. 1980. *Animal Factories*. Crown Publishers, New York, NY.
- Parents Magazine*. 1989. Parents Poll on Animal Rights, Attractiveness, Television and Abortion. Kane and Parsons Associates, New York, Sep-Oct, 1989.
- Rowan, A.N. 1989. The development of the animal protection movement. *Journal of NIH Research* 1: 97-100.
- Salt, H S (1892). *Animals' Rights*. London, England. (New Edition issued by International Society for Animals Rights, Clarks Summit, PA in 1980).
- Shurland, B. 1990. *The Politics of Farm Animal Welfare: The Massachusetts 1988 Debate on Initiative Petition 3*. Tufts Center for Animals and Public Policy Report Number 7. North Grafton, MA.
- Singer, P. 1975. *Animal Liberation*. New York Review of Books/Random House, New York, NY.
- Sperling, S. 1988. *Animal Liberators*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Stevenson, L.G. 1956. Religious elements in the background of the British antivivisection movement. *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine* 29: 125-157.
- Thomas, K. 1983. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England, 1500-1800*. Allen Lane, London, England.
- Turner, J. 1980. *Reckoning with the Beast: Animals, Pain and Humanity in the Victorian Mind*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Wirthlin Group. 1989. *National Survey of Consumer Attitudes*. Prepared for National Cattleman's Association, September 1989.

