UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Date: November 20, 2008

I, Jennifer Dora Grubbs, hereby submit this work as part of the requirements for the degree of:
Master’s of Arts

in:
Communication

It is entitled:
Farm Sanctuary: Creating a Space Where Theory Meets Practice

This work and its defense approved by:

Chair: Stephen P. Depoe, Ph.D.

M.J. Woeste, Ed.D

James Crocker-Lakness, Ph.D.
Farm Sanctuary: Creating A Space Where Theory meets Practice

by

Jennifer D. Grubbs

Bachelor of Arts 2005

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in Communication

at

The University of Cincinnati

November 2008

Thesis Chair: Stephen Depoe, Ph.D.
ABSTRACT
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Jennifer D. Grubbs
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Under the Supervision of name of Stephen Depoe, Ph.D.

The journey into activism and the academy play an important role in the discourse construction of social movement theories. What started as an internship with Farm Sanctuary in 2007 became a critical milestone in an ongoing transformation. The following thesis consists of an autoethnographic study based on a six-week internship with Farm Sanctuary, and examining social movement theories in relation to the animal rights movement. During the internship, it was made explicit that Farm Sanctuary relies heavily on the structural and rhetorical elements of the Movement Action Plan (MAP) by Bill Moyer. However, the MAP Model is nowhere in academic discourse. The examination of the macro and micro components of the MAP Model and two traditional social movement theories provides a useful way to integrate practice and theory. With the hope of fostering a bridge between theory and practice, it was essential for the theorist to gain localized experience within the practice and integrate that into a theoretical framework.

This thesis sets to create spaces within multiple discourses for the practical and theoretical, and illustrate many crossroads in which they intersect.
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Chapter 1: Establishing the Roots

In this thesis, I explore the rhetoric of the animal rights movement. In particular, I will be examining Farm Sanctuary, one of the largest farm animal activist organizations in the world, and its relationship with the Movement Action Plan created by Bill Moyer. I spent 6 weeks interning in the Communication department at Farm Sanctuary in Watkins Glen, New York, and volunteered on the weekends to work with the animals on the farm. Six females also interned in various departments on the farm, and we lived in a house together. During my stay, I conducted in-depth interviews with the interns, employees, and co-founder of Farm Sanctuary, Shelter Director, and Director of the Communication Department. The Director of Communication described a recent transformation the organization is undergoing, and a specific theoretical approach the organization is officially situating itself around. It was then that I was introduced to the work of Bill Moyer and his Movement Action Plan. The model provides overlap with traditional rhetorical theories to social movements such as the Life cycle model.

The animal advocacy, and specifically the animal rights movement play an important role in illustrating the social movement theories in this project. This chapter is organized into seven sections that map out how the project was constructed, the goals and research questions of the study, the limitations involved, and the context in which the project emerged. The first section, Historical Background, provides an overview of the animal advocacy and rights movements, and in particular the history of Farm Sanctuary. The Literature Review contains an outline of traditional approaches to social movements and the use of autoethnography in research. The proceeding sections include Method, Research Questions, Limitations, and the Organizational Preview of the project.
Historical Background

*History of the animal advocacy movement*

The political movement of protecting animals divisively falls into two categories: animal welfare and animal rights. The welfare movement emphasizes protecting animals from undue harm and reducing cruelty towards animals, but does not condemn the use of animals in human consumption. It is in this way that the rights movement differs. The rights movement promotes an autonomous relationship between humans and animals, and the prohibition of all human use and intervention with animals in their natural environment. The rights movement insists that animals exist for their own reason, and should be considered to have individual rights without interference with humans.

Although the two movements have different ideological arguments, both support the overarching push towards animal protection. The following historical analysis details an umbrella movement combining both the animal rights and welfare movements: the animal advocacy movement.

The animal advocacy movement has grown immensely in the last forty years, but debate sparks over the issue of when the movement began. At a time when the animal advocacy movement in the United States was disorganized and stagnant, the animal advocacy movement in Britain was thriving. The organized and successful movement in Britain provided encouragement for the movement in the United States: “…one of the early inspirations for the American animal welfare movement was the well-heeled, well-organized, and relatively successful British movement for animals” (Beers, 2006, p.21). Articles written in British newspapers and magazines appear as early as 1749 detailing protest to animal “sports” such as cockfighting (p. 21). The ideological shift in Britain
was enriched by the publication of Jeremy Bentham’s *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. The treatise, published in 1789, and challenged the widespread beliefs, coined by René Descartes, that animals were incapable of thinking and similar to machines. Bentham’s treatise reorganized the concept of rights to incorporate animals. The argument presented by Bentham insisted that the question of whether animals deserve rights or not needs to be reframed. Bentham is often cited for the following quote regarding framing the issue, “The question is not, Can they *reason*? Nor, Can they *talk*? But, Can they *suffer*? (p. 21). The animal advocacy movement in Britain lobbied around this reframing and often cited the quote as a call to unite.

The animal advocacy movement in Britain consisted of abolitionists and suffragists who created links between the oppression of humans and animals. Many social reformers in Britain saw the same ideology that justified slavery at work with the enslavement of animals. After slavery was made illegal in Britain, the abolitionists joined together in support of animals, viewing the cause as the “…next logical step in civilization’s progress toward greater humanity” (Beers, 2006, p. 21). The pendulum was shifting, and animal advocates began to gather together and express their dissatisfaction with the human treatment of animals. The 1800’s marked a time when both Britain and the United States would experience the formal organization of animal advocates. The first recognized animal advocacy organization was initially called the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) in 1824 in Britain. The organization received royal status from Queen Victoria in 1840, and changed its name to the Royal Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA).
The RSPCA set a precedent as a powerful organization that would play an important role in politics. Although the organization was met with several legislative defeats, the organization was persistent in the pursuit of legal protection for animals. The RSPCA took on the task of addressing vivisection, the experimentation on live animals generally without anesthesia, in the 1860’s. This issue is hotly debated even today, and proved a challenge when the RSPCA lobbied in favor of the Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876 to regulate rather than outlaw vivisection. This lobbying effort, and others similar in the British animal advocacy movement paved the path and set examples the movement in the United States would follow.

The American movement began roughly 40 years after the start of the British movement. The U.S. was beginning to adopt domestic animal cruelty laws by the time the movement took shape in 1866. At the time the animal advocacy movement took an organized form, “…fourteen states and six territories had established legal punishment for those who abused domestic animals” (Beers, 2006, p. 23). Because the trend during this period was to stress human social morality, the domestic animal cruelty laws are a reflection of this ideology rather than deconstructing animals as property. At the defeat of the South in the Civil War in 1865, slaves were no longer property and awarded legal rights. This historical moment helped inspire the animal advocacy movement forward in hopes that society would expand natural rights to other species. Several social movements spawned from the defeat of the South, including “woman’s rights, prison reform, sanitation, civil rights, and eventually animal protection…it provided the ideological shift and strategic underpinnings for animal advocacy” (p. 25). Several activists from the abolitionist movement, such as Harriet Beecher Stowe and Caroline
Earle White, found themselves in the fight for animal protection. The momentum forced by the alliance of abolitionists post Civil War led to the founding of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) in April 1866. Founded by Henry Bergh, the ASPCA and inspired the surge of animal advocacy organizations until the turn of the century. By the early 1900’s, over seven hundred animal advocacy organizations had taken shape in the U.S., many following the model by Bergh. The origins of the American animal advocacy movement are traced to the Bergh’s founding of the ASPCA. As a side note, the ASCPA and the SPCA organizations around the world are not affiliated in any way. The modern day movement, or some call second-wave animal advocacy, is traced to Peter Singer’s publication of Animal Liberation in 1975.

History of the Animal Rights Movement

The accounts on the human enslavement of animals described in the book Animal Liberation by Peter Singer provided a new framework for the movement. The book marked a turning point in the animal rights movement, “Singer’s book opened a new door for animal advocacy and for society and general…propelled animal defenders, even conservative ones, to another level of activism and ideology” (Beers, 2006, p. 198). The text is often marked as the “bible” of the modern animal rights movement (Beers, 2006, p. 198), as it offered ideological and emancipatory frameworks that echoed heart-felt motivations of animal advocates. Singer’s book is often marked as the inspiration in the founding of several key animal rights groups.

Inspired by and working closely with Singer, Henry Spira used Animal Liberation as the model in the organization and implementation of several grassroots protests. Spira was an active player in the American civil rights movement in the 1950’ s-60, and
became a key player in the American animal rights movement. Spira is described as one of the most vocal and influential advocates of animal rights in the 1970’s. His campaigns for the abolition of animals were radical for their time, and many activists today refer to him as the father of the animal-rights movement” (Hawthorne, 2008, p. 17). The philosophical writings of Singer and the grassroots efforts of Spira helped give shape to the modern American animal rights movement.

By the 1980’s, animal rights groups emerged with strong momentum. Factory farming had dramatically shifted from a family business to an industrial powerhouse. In astounding numbers, the amount of animal farmers in the United States declined dramatically, while the number of slaughtered animals increased. The following excerpt from Gene Baur’s (co-founder of Farm Sanctuary) book demonstrates the shift in industry:

In 1950 the United States had 3 million pig farmers and 55 million pigs. That’s an average of nineteen animals per farm. By 2005, the number of pig-producing farms had dropped to 67,000, less than 3 percent of what existed in 1950. These farms housed 60 million pigs, which some massive industrial production facilities confining many thousands. Over the same period, the number of farms or ranches with beef cattle fell from 4 million to less than 1 million, even as the number of cattle in the United States rose from 77 million to 95 million. Also, over the past half century, the number of dairy farms has dropped substantially, from 3.6 million to 78,000… In 1950, 50,000 farms produced 630 million meat chickens. That’s an average of 12,630 birds per farm. By 2005, birds raised per farm had
risen to nearly 300,000, for an astonishing total of 8.7 billion meat chickens (Baur, 2008, p. 10).

The excerpt demonstrates the fundamental shift of animal farming from the 1950’s until present. By the 1980’s, the shift became noticeable to animal rights advocates, and the importance of organizing against the enormous industry of factory farming became urgent. Not only did the shift in farming incite activists, but also the dramatic increase in animal production/consumption caused uproar. Baur illustrates the increase in the United States: “The amount of animal protein produced and consumed in the United States has skyrocketed. In 1950, just over 1 billion farmed animals were killed for food in the United States. By 1975, that number exceeded 3 billion and in the late 1980’s it was more than 6 billion. By 2005 the number neared 10 billion. Along with almost 9 billion chickens, this includes 100 million pigs, 35 million cows and calves, and more than 250 million turkeys” (Baur, 2008, p. 12). The activists responded to these increases and to the industrialization of factory farming, and the 1980’s marked an important decade in several key animal rights organizations.

The People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) are one of the most recognizable names in the animal rights movement. Ingrid Newkirk and Alex Pacheco founded PETA in Washington, D.C. in 1980. Newkirk worked as a humane officer at a shelter in Poolesville, Maryland. It was there she met Pacheco, and the two exchanged dialog about their concerns for animals. The PETA website, www.IngridNewkirk.com, describes the relationship between Pacheco and Newkirk in relation to Animal Liberation: “She met Alex Pacheco when he volunteered at the shelter she worked at, and he gave her a copy of Peter Singer’s book Animal Liberation. It inspired her to found
PETA in 1980 with the goals of investigating, publicizing and ending animal cruelty” (n.d.). The first legal action PETA engaged in involved 17 crab-eating macaques that were being used in animal research at the Institute for Biological Research in Silver Springs, Maryland. The case became known as the Silver Springs Monkey case.

Pacheco had an interest in animal research, as an animal rights activist, and decided to take a volunteer position at the Institute. While volunteering, Pacheco observed a study conducted by Edward Taub, a psychologist that involved physically altering the monkey’s bodies and depriving them of care. In the *New Scientist*, Helen Gavaghan described the experiment: “Nine of them had undergone a surgical procedure known as deafferentation, in which nerves carrying signals from a particular part of the body to the brain are cut. In eight of the macaques, nerves from one arm were cut. In a ninth, the nerves from both were severed” (1991 p.1). The experimental conditions deprived the monkeys of food. Electric shocks were inflicted to force the animals to use the “un-feeling” limbs. Pacheco was outraged by Taub’s experiments and convinced local police that this was animal cruelty and the animals should be removed.

Taub was tried and found guilty of six counts of animal cruelty, although other courts overturned some of the charges due to judicial technicalities. The case remained in the public eye as PETA, headed by Pacheco, and battled the National Institute of Heath for custody of the monkeys. The case brought vivisection, and in particular PETA, to the center of the debate over animal rights throughout the 1980’s. The landmark case is still referenced as the first case for animal rights to reach the United States Supreme Court. The case resulted in hearings by the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology that played important roles in the establishment of the 1985
Animal Welfare Act along with revisions to the United States Public Health Service guidelines regarding animals used in research. The revision to the United States Health services guidelines included a clause that each institution that applies for federal funding must have an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee that is responsible for monitoring the care given to the animals in the laboratory (Anderson, 1991, p. 337).

The Silver Spring Monkeys case gave substantial credibility and power for the animal rights movement. Pacheco, however, left the organization in 1999 over conflicts regarding the group’s tactics. While the group has experienced ups and downs over the last twenty years, PETA has kept animal cruelty in the spotlight of mainstream media. PETA has forged coalitions with other animal rights organizations in legal efforts. One significant alliance PETA has made forces with in the past is Farm Sanctuary. Shortly after the creation of PETA, Gene Baur and then partner Lori Houston founded Farm Sanctuary.

Farm Sanctuary History

In the early 1980’s, Gene Baur, Lori Houston, and several other animal rights activists traveled the country trying to raise awareness about the condition of animals in factory farming. Baur and Houston were married in 1986, combined both last names into one, Bauston, and both assumed the last name. Current United States federal law does not protect farm animals from cruelty. Due to the lack of federal laws to protect farm animals, the factory farming industry is filled with grotesque abuse of animals. The animal activism response to cases of animal cruelty spans local, state, and federal levels. In 1986, Farm Sanctuary formed with the goals of raising awareness and understanding for farm animals in their efforts to combat the cruelty in industrialized farming. Gene and
Lorri had formed a small group of activists that began visiting factory farms, slaughterhouses, and stockyards around the United States, capturing video and audio footage to document their accounts.

On one particular day, the couple and fellow activists paid a visit to Lancaster Stockyards, in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Upon the visit, they found piles of animals left for dead, what AR activists refer to as “dead piles.” One of the piles had a young cow and several sheep, all left to decompose in the stockyard. The activists took a picture of this dead pile, and at the flash of the camera one of the sheep blinked its eyes. The group ecstatically ran to the sheep and carried it away to receive immediate veterinary care. The sheep was named Hilda and became the first animal Farm Sanctuary rescued. After receiving a few minutes of care, the sheep stood up and appeared capable of a full recovery. The couple, Gene and Lorri, took the sheep home with them and kept it in the backyard. As a mascot at Farm Sanctuary, Hilda lived with the Baustons for over a decade until finally dying of old age. Several similar incidents happened within the following months in 1986, and soon the couple had multiple animals living in their yard, being fostered between other animal activists. Neighborhood children became curious of the “zoo-like” backyard, and the couple began inviting neighbors to meet the animal and hear their stories. Children and adults were fascinated with the animals’ journeys and felt a unique sympathy for the animals. The couple realized the powerful potential of not only rescuing animals, but also facilitating human interactions with the animals. Gene described the beginnings of Farm Sanctuary to me during my internship:

We realized this was a unique educational opportunity and had high potential. We funded the organization by selling veggie hotdogs at Grateful Dead concerts and
catering events, and I knew a tofu farming nearby. He said we could live on his land for a little bit. We had been living in the city and that wasn’t a place for the animals. We moved to the farm in Delaware and lived in our bus for a couple years. In 1980 we heard about the land in Watkins Glen and decided to move out here…it just all happened coincidentally (Gene Baur, Personal Communication, 2007).

The possibilities for Farm Sanctuary dramatically increased when Gene and Lorri welcomed the animals onto their property and into their homes.

In its initial stages, Farm Sanctuary was a struggling organization run by all volunteers who supported the group’s activities by selling veggie hot dogs out of the a Volkswagen van. In the last twenty years, FS has worked to become the “nation’s leading farm animal protection organization, with hundreds of thousands of supporters” (Farmsanctuary.org). The work of Farm Sanctuary has been recognized across the world through main media channels. Farm Sanctuary works through three divisions: rescue, education, and advocacy. Each division is crucial in achieving the goals of Farm Sanctuary, and work together to function as an all-encompassing animal activist organization. On the Farm Sanctuary web page, the troublesome treatment of animals is described:

Sorrowfully, animals raised on today’s industrialized farms are treated like unfeeling commodities, and their basic needs are completely ignored. They are crowded in factory farm warehouses, confined so tightly that they cannot walk, turn around or lie down comfortably. Farm animals are de-beaked, de-toed, tail-docked, confined, crowded, neglected and denied the very basics of life: fresh air,
wholesome food, room to move, and most importantly, freedom - all for the sake of a profit margin (Farmsanctuary.org).

The harsh treatment of farm animals motivates Farm Sanctuary to reach out to individuals, corporations, and legislative branches to implement change. The rescue division visits the farms, stockyards and slaughterhouses and documents the conditions. In many cases the conditions are so terrible that FS seeks legal action to seize the animals. In extreme situations, Farm Sanctuary investigators have taken the animals out of trash piles or other situations of severe neglect without seeking legal persuasion. Once the animals are rendered useless or undesirable for profit, the industrialized farms typically disregard the animals and dispose of them. The animals are not even “worth” killing, but rather are just tossed away and left to suffer until they die. The rescue team takes these animals from these ghastly situations and brings them to the farms that Farm Sanctuary operates.

Farm Sanctuary operates two farms, a 300-acre farm in northern California and a 175-acre farm in upstate New York. The farms provide rehabilitation in a life-long care commitment and works to place animals up for adoption. The animals are adopted by smaller sanctuaries and loving homes across the U.S. through the Farm Animal Adoption Network. The Farm Sanctuary farms have become a permanent home for over 7,000 animals and found homes for thousands of others. Farm Sanctuary believes animals are meant to “be free to laze in the breeze, bathe in the sun, scratch at the earth, and enjoy life” (Farmsactuary.org), rather than to be treated as a commodity only meant to serve humans. The farms are open for the animals to roam, able to enjoy life without serving humans.
The farms open their doors to visitors as a unique opportunity for education. The education of Farm Sanctuary comes from experiencing the animals in a natural existence rather than an artificial recreation such as a zoo or industrialized farms. The visitors are able to volunteer to help with farm chores or enjoy the camaraderie with the farm animals. The education division provides education at the farm, and also extends its efforts across the U.S. and Canada through conferences, forums, and outreach programs. The Farm Animal Forum is an inclusive conference, welcoming animal activists with all levels of experience. The conference offers information and skills training to mobilize activists and encourage them to recruit community members. The education division also runs the annual Walk for Farm Animals that is held in over 50 cities across the U.S. and Canada. Farm Sanctuary not only rescues the animals, educates the public on farm animals and farm animal cruelty, but also pushes to make legislative changes through the advocacy division.

Farm Sanctuary believes the treatment of animals is improved through educating the public; however, the most effective way to change the current situation of farm animals is through federal regulation. The advocacy division of Farm Sanctuary runs thirteen web sites, each pushing a different campaign. The campaigns deal with various issues of cruelty throughout industrialized farming. Each animal that is rescued is involved in a case of animal cruelty. However, the Federal Animal Welfare Act which Congress passed in 1966 and amended in 1970, 1976, 1985, and 1990 (Nolen 2004 p.2), does not protect farm animals, animal activists take heavy issue with this exception. Farm Sanctuary believes that all animals should be given the same legal protection, and therefore is pushing for stricter federal regulations. The campaigns include No Downers,
No Foie Gras, No Veal, Ban Cruel Farms, Sentient Beings, Farm Sanctuary Kids, and several others (Farmsanctuary.org).

One Farm Sanctuary advocacy campaign successfully led to the introduction of the Downed Animal Protection Act in the U.S. Congress in 1992, an act that seeks protection from killing animals that are too sick to stand. In 2002, the advocacy team introduced a Florida ballot initiative that was passed that outlaws gestation crates. The nation’s first law that banned Foie Gras cruelty was a California initiative was passed in 2004. Foie Gras is the inhumane practice of force-feeding ducks, which usually takes place 12–18 days before slaughter. Usually, the duck or goose is force fed corn mash through a tube that goes into their esophagus, which enlarges their liver to abnormal size. Since the introduction of the No Veal initiative, veal consumption has decreased from 1.6 pounds per person in 1986 to 0.5 currently (Farmsanctuary.org). In addition, over 500 restaurants have signed Farm Sanctuary’s pledge not to serve created veal. The advocacy division works to initiate federal and state regulations that protect all animals from cruelty. The three divisions work in conjunction with each other to create a safe, healthy, and humane environment for farm animals.

Literature Review: Approaches to Studying Social Movements

Traditional social movement theories fall into two broad categories: developmental evolutionary theories and rhetorical discourse theories. Developmental evolutionary theories emphasize the sociological and behavioral implications of the movement, and seek to understand the chronological processes within the movement. Stewart, et. al. describes that the role of developmental evolutionary theories is, “….to understand complex communicative events, theorists have found it useful try to detect
cycles and phases of human interactions” (Stewart, et. al. 2007, p. 85). Theorists using a developmental evolutionary model typically ascribe phases to the movement that occur within cycles or in a linear fashion. Rhetorical discourse theories focus on the texts produced by the social movement and examine the language the rhetoric adopts. Cathcart describes the importance of studying rhetorical discourse, “To study a movement is to study a drama, an act of transformation, an act that ends in transcendence…And hence to study a movement is to study its form” (Cathcart 1978 p. 233).

These two types of traditional social movement theories emphasize two different aspects of social movements. Developmental evolutionary theories look at the behavioral and sociological interactions while plotting the movement along a timeline, a chart of steps within a larger cycle. Rhetorical discourse theories focus on the form and content of texts produced by the movement, and the implications of these rhetorical strategies. This thesis will compare and contrast two social movement theories, one that falls into the developmental evolutionary approach and the other that serves more as a hybrid.

**Developmental-evolutionary approaches**

Two significant sequential evolutionary theories that have gained much attention in academia are the Life cycle model coined by Stewart, et. al., and the Segmented, Polycentric, Integrated Networks (SPIN) model, coined by Gerlach in response to the Life cycle model. The Life cycle model emphasizes the monolithic structural nature of social movements, and posits that events occur within a five-stage model. Events the social movement experiences are somehow accounted for in the stages and cannot be assumed to be “random.”
Stewart, et. al. describe the social movement has having six essential characteristics. These six essential characteristics include: social movements are an organized collectivity, an uninstitutionalized collectivity, large in scope, promotes or opposes change in societal norms and values, encounters opposition in a moral struggle, and it’s persuasion is pervasive (Stewart, et. al. 2007, p. 24). The movement must meet all of these requirements in order to be considered a social movement in this framework. If the movement becomes fragmented and unorganized, or at any time part of the institution in some way, then it no longer meets this model’s conception of a social movement. The social movement must also have a large membership base and supporters. The persuasion of the social movement must also be pervasive in society, meaning inclusive and present in public discourse. The public must consider the social movement legitimate, and thus the rhetoric of the social movement tends to reinforce a positive relational power between the movement and society. The movement can use any or all of the five types of power, as described by Stewart, et. al. (2007), which are: reward, control, identification, terministic control, and moral suasion (p.322).

The movement strives to maintain legitimacy and public support. In order to do so, the movement serves specific functions to the public and employs various types of power. The movement hopes to sustain this support and power throughout the five stages in which Stewart, et. al. claim social movements go through. According to the Life cycle model, social movements experience each of the stages along a monolithic journey as they progress closer to their goal. Each social movement experiences the stages uniquely, and encounter varying degrees of turbulence along the way, “Social movements differ, change, develop to varying degrees of sophistication, and proceed at varying speeds-
rushing forward at times, stalling for longer periods at particular stages, retrenching to earlier stages, or dying premature deaths before completing all stages” (Stewart, et. al. 2007, p. 85).

The five stages of the model are; Genesis, Social Unrest, Enthusiastic Mobilization, Maintenance, and Termination. Genesis marks the first stage, the stage where the movement is conceived. The second stage, Social Unrest, is when the public becomes frustrated with current situations and aware of the current social problems. Enthusiastic Mobilization occurs when the majority is aware and frustrated with the problem and ready to bring about change. The Maintenance stage is when the movement has moved closer to its goals, but reaches a steady state where the movement must keep the activists motivated and participatory. Termination occurs as the final stage, either when the movement reaches its goals or faces final defeat. The model does not offer a follow up stage that addresses what happens to the activists after their goals have been reached or defeated. The last stage is Termination and it is either when the movement wins or dies, but not describing how the movement and sub movements evolve (Stewart, et. al. 2007, p. 104).

The SPIN Model was a response by Gerlach in the 1960’s. The SPIN model looked at the chaotic states of social movements. Gerlach believed that other social movement theories had incorrectly assumed social movements to be stagnant and centrally organized. Instead, he proposed that social movements are segmented, polycentric, and integrated networks (SPIN). Gerlach views social movements as constituted by networks that fuse and diffuse at various points during a movement’s duration. These networks are made up of activists that at times work together and at times
are in competition amongst each other for various reasons. Each organization or individual activist finds himself or herself working specifically on one issue or one set of issues that are interrelated through integrated networks (Gerlach 2001, p. 290). The movement, in this case the animal rights movement, is divided into many sub-movements that address specifically animal experimentation, animals in captivity, hunting, factory farming, and so on. The organizations and sub-movements recognize a range of leaders, and in some cases the recognized leaders conflict with one another. For example, several animal rights organizational leaders have spoken out against the leader of PETA, Ingrid Newkirk. The leaders have denounced her rhetorical strategies, campaign choices, and other aspects of her organization and leadership styles. On the other hand, leaders have also praised Newkirk and PETA for their work and successes in the animal rights movement.

Social movement organizations become segmented for many reasons. Gerlach discusses four broad reasons that are common among movement segmentation. The four reasons Gerlach provides are: personal power, preexisting cleavages, competition, and ideological differences. The segmentation is never steady or final, but is rather a fluid process where organizations break apart and fuse together and continuously morph. Leaders are also a fluid presence in the movement and organizations. Rather than a top-down model of organizational and political leadership, leaders of movement organizations hold more of a symbolic role in Gerlach’s SPIN Model. The model suggests that as the organization evolves over time and the membership base changes, different leadership styles and personalities become more important. At various times in a movement’s life span, many leaders may have held positions at one point or another. The
positions are symbolic more than authoritarian, and leaders filling these positions try to motivate and mobilize the public to work towards similar goals.

The social movement works towards its goal by moving through a set series of eight stages. However, along the way the movement experiences a great deal of chaos and segmentation. The distinction between the SPIN and Life cycle model is the emphasis on organized and effective chaos. SPIN posits that fragmented groups are actually integrated networks that share the same goals. Gerlach hopes to give social movements more credit than what the Life cycle model has allotted to them. The SPIN Model places value on chaos and tries to account for all the detours and challenges movements’ experience by detailing how and why movements experience segmentation, polycentrism, and are made up of integrated networks (Gerlach 2001, p. 291).

The Movement Action Plan (MAP) Model created by Bill Moyer adds a third dimension to these theories. The MAP Model includes stages, accounts for chaos, and describes social movement organizations as falling into four roles. The MAP Model came about after Moyer had worked closely with the anti-nuclear and civil rights movements. He had witnessed social movement organizations and activists lose hope in the cause. The struggles with the powerholders had left the organizations overwhelmed with despair and defeat. He created the MAP Model to provide hope to these activists and demonstrate how both successes and defeats are all a part of the larger picture and will not hinder the movement from reaching its goals. The MAP Model says that movements go through eight stages that occur in a consecutive order. Moyer contends that movements can become detoured or can regress into earlier stages and thus move our of consecutive order. Also, social movements can experience extreme confrontation and be stunted into
one of the stages at any given time. During difficult times, the activists can turn to the MAP Model and understand that setbacks are inevitable and will make the movement stronger in the end (Moyer 2001, p. 4).

In addition to the eight stages, Moyer argues that movements are made up of four distinct roles that organizations play; the reformer, change agent, citizen, and rebel. Each role has unique responsibilities, talents, and rhetorical strategies on how to address the challenges. The roles contribute in different ways to the social movement, and take central roles at different times. The importance is to recognize that these roles must work together and that, similar to the SPIN Model, are integrated networks. Moyer emphasizes the interconnectivity of social movement organizations, even when they are divided among sub-movements and seem to conflict with one another. In fact, Moyer sets out effective and ineffective ways to enact each of the roles. It is important to follow the effective model and not fall into the fallacies of the ineffective enactment of the roles. Moyer hopes that his MAP Model will motivate and encourage those activists that feel defeated and over-whelmed to keep in the struggle. The MAP Model provides an inclusive way to look at movement organizations and how they are relevant and necessary for the entire movement to achieve success. Moyer makes several points to stress that organizations and sub-movements must work together and never forget the mutual goals they share. At times, the powerholders may manipulate one organization or sub-group to try and convince the movement that the powerholders have really changed. The primary goal of the powerholders is to get rid of the movement as quickly and quietly as possible, so making deals on the side is always preferred over public scrutiny. As a response, activists and organizations must work together and keep open
communication amongst one another to have cohesive understandings of the powerholders (Moyer 2001, p. 17).

The MAP Model, created by Moyer introduces an additional element of social movements to be addressed. He adapts the notion that social movements experience sequential stages as they move closer towards reaching their goals. A departure and addition he makes is the discussion of the four roles of social movements; the rebel, reformer, change agent, and citizen. Each role has distinct ideological perspectives and rhetorical strategies at helping the movement. Although the movement is fragmented into distinct groups, Moyer asserts that each role is interrelated because they share the overarching movement goal. In fact, each role-plays a particularly important role in each of the eight-stages his proposes. The eight stages are (in the order the occur); Normal Times, Prove the Failure of the Official Institutions, Ripening Conditions, Take-Off, Perception of Failure, Majority Public Opinion, Success, Continuing the Struggle. The stages occur in a consecutive order, and at any time the movement can be stunted into a stage or regress back to an earlier stage. Moyer’s model is adaptive to the social movement, and while he does endorse coalitions and working in tandem as the most effective, he does account for the fragmentation that occurs during a social movement’s life span. A deeper analysis of the MAP Model will follow later in this analysis and be juxtaposed to the Life cycle model and SPIN Model.

The SPIN model focuses on the constantly changing, in flux nature of social movements and movement organizations. The sequential phases movements go through and the flexible nature of the theory allows for adaptation. According to the SPIN model, organizations are constantly changing and social movement theories must accommodate
that change in their model. Gerlach defends the SPIN model as appropriately addressing the various stages social movements experience and the period of rapid growth and change. The model allows for the social movement to be valued throughout its lifespan and the times of uncertainty and chaos organizations experience. The SPIN model and the Life cycle model are useful to defend social movements as organized and following a timeline of expected phases. The rhetorical importance of these theories is how they organize events into chronological continuums that make sense in a larger picture.

*Rhetorical discourse approaches*

A second type of social movement theories is rhetorical discourse theories. Cathcart, Carlson, and Burke all discuss rhetorical frames that the movement’s discourse adopts. The comic and tragic frames are examples of a discursive approach to social movements. The tragic and comic frames come from Kenneth Burke’s dramatistic perspective. Griffin describes Burke’s conception of social movements as, “…vast ritual dramas wherein a disaffected group internalizes and transcends social inequalities through confrontation with an “enemy”” (Griffin 1969, p. 456).

Carlson, who tries to include any movement that tries to change society while still awarding old systems the right to exist, modifies Burke’s definition of a social movement. Cathcart inserts that movements must be confrontational in order to be considered a movement. Carlson adopts Cathcart’s emphasis on confrontation, and reconceptualizes confrontational rhetoric as a type of frame the movement can adopt. A “frame”, according to Carlson, is the, “symbolic structures by which human beings impose order upon their personal and social experiences…perspectives from which all interpretations are made” (1986, p. 447). Frames are made up of attitudes and motives
that offer a map for action. The comic frame looks at consistent internal beliefs uniting to
tear down an existing system and replace it with another. Carlson (1986) describes the
rhetorical benefit of using comedy, “Comedy…reaffirms that society “must keep
convictions about social means and ends open to reason…comedy seeks belief, but never
at the price of banishing doubt and question…identifies social ills as arising from human
error, not evil, and thus uses reason to correct them” (p. 448). Carlson claims the comic
frame does not account for the movements that do not want to completely reject the
current social system or try to destroy it. It does not incorporate the variety of less
totalistic movements, and she provides the example of the Sunday School Movement.
According to Carlson, a movement can be any effort, which tries to change society, while
acknowledging the right of the old system to exist, even if that attempt is to change the
system radically or completely throw it out. Carlson discusses the comic frame in terms
of Gandhi’s movement. In contrast, Carlson believes that the tragic frame insists that no
change is possible without some kind of violence. However, the comic frame requires a
ritual form unique to its purpose. People can be observers of themselves, reflexive in
nature, while also acting. Maximum consciousness is encouraged as part of the action.
The way to free society is by creating a consciousness of the system as a system,
exposing the inherent weaknesses, and preparing this society that is now aware on how to
deal with it. Studying the comic frames allows for a re-conceptualization of what a
movement is, what constitutes goals of social change, and how those changes can be
achieved.

Christiansen and Hanson (1996) looked at how ACT UP, an AIDS activist and
sex education organization, has used the comic and tragic frames. ACT UP has enacted
die-ins, mockery, and many other rhetorical strategies that try to use humor when dealing with morbid and critical issues surrounding sexual health. Cristiansen and Hanson (1996) demonstrate how ACT UP uses the comic frame to empower the activists by reshaping public perceptions of homosexual men and individuals with AIDS or who are HIV positive as powerful rhetorical actors (p. 158). ACT UP used the comic frame to illustrate the shared values among the activists and the greater society, despite the vilification of gay men during that time (the 1980’s). Many people that opposed homosexuality vilified AIDS victims as somehow getting a due “punishment” for their sexuality using the tragic frame. As a way to address and remedy this attack, ACT UP used the comic frame as a way to ‘humanize’ the issue and individuals without reinforcing the perception of the activists and gay men as victims. Christiansen and Hanson describe the transformative power of the comic frame:

> When individuals or groups act in the comic frame, they commit themselves to an approach that runs counter to the prevailing tragic impulse in Western society. Rather than reducing social tensions through mystification, scapegoating, or banishment, rhetoric in the comic frame humorously points out failings in the status quo and urges society to correct them through thoughtful action rather than tragic victimage. (1996, p. 161)

The comic frame disrupts the normative beliefs and views of homosexual men and those suffering from a terminal illness with images of comedy, satire, and jest. Other scholars, including Dow, Arissa, and Chesbro, have studied the AIDS movement and its use of the comic frame.
Autoethnography is, “A balancing act. Autoethnography works to hold self and culture together, albeit not in equilibrium or stasis. Autoethnography writes a world in a state of flux and movement- between story and context, writer and reader, crisis and denouement. It creates charged moments of clarity, connection, and change” (Jones). Autoethnography can take many forms and ranges concerning the role of the researcher/s. O’byrne (2007) breaks down autoethnography into three different paradigms, Positivism, Post positivism, and Critical Theory. Positivism refers to mainstream “scientific” research that claims objectivity, ultimate reality, and works to explain, predict, and control. Post positivism refers to the same ontological beliefs, but aims for a critical objective and uses triangulation to gain a better understanding of the culture. The third standpoint, one that which this thesis employs, is Critical Theory. Critical Theory emphasizes subjectivity, reflexivity, and aims to critique, transform, and emancipate. This autoethnography focused on gaining extensive local knowledge in order to critique FS, transform the organization and its role in the AR movement, and eventually help emancipate animals from human domination. This paradigm, Critical Theory, qualifies this study as a Postmodern ethnography.

The Postmodern ethnography works under a framework of social construction and interrelated webs of significance. I adopted a de-centered position and subjective position. It is not possible to separate oneself from the research, nor is it possible to ever be objective. The very selection of a research topic is subjective, the methods used are a choice, and the data is then aggregated through a preferred method. I do not denounce my personal thoughts and feelings, instead, I embrace them. This thesis was shaped by my
passion for the AR movement and it seemed most appropriate for me involve myself as a participant in the ethnography. This analysis allows the AR movement to have a voice in the Academy without having someone speak for them. I do not want to marginalize those involved in this experience by claiming to speak for them. As Spivak (1992) posits, “Can the Subaltern Speak”, in this case I cannot and do not want to speak for FS or the AR movement. However, the autoethnography provides a platform to explore individuals within the movement and organization and speak for myself as a participant and observer.

Method

The data I plan to use ranges from interviews, surveys, and field notes collected from interns and employees of Farm Sanctuary, and literature Farm Sanctuary has released. This project will provide a brief history of Farm Sanctuary, perspectives of those who are involved with Farm Sanctuary, and my experiences with the organization during the six weeks. In the summer of 2007, I served six weeks as the Communication Intern for FS. This role allowed me to see the inside operations, interpersonal tensions, and organizational struggles. Some of the materials used in this thesis were gathered while I conducted qualitative research at the farm. I was able to become a member of the organization and temporary member of the culture. The internship was the platform for the autoethnography. Autoethnography as a method of study involves balancing myself as an insider, yet myself as an outside researcher. I constantly toggled with my positionality and tried to embrace the culture of FS.

The second component of my thesis will involve comparing the Movement Action Plan to the Life cycle model and SPIN Model, and its relationship with the comic frame. The theoretical grounding of this thesis will use rhetorical theories of social
movements and comparing it to Moyer’s. The data used will include interviews, literature of Farm Sanctuary, and various aspects of the animal rights movement to illustrate the theories and their differences. I will use content analysis and self-description of Farm Sanctuary leadership and look for common themes among the interviews, educational lunches, open-ended surveys, and campaign information found on Farm Sanctuary’s website. Without implementing a quantitative method of counting words or responses, I am going to be looking for emerging themes and sentiments that reappear throughout the data collected and my own experiences.

The third part of my thesis will be to examine the rhetoric of Farm Sanctuary and the self-description of Farm Sanctuary leadership in relation to a particular component of Moyer’s MAP Model. Part of Moyer’s model includes the division of social movement groups into four buckets. As stated earlier, Moyer’s four different buckets that social movement groups can fall into are: the Citizen, Reformer, Rebel, and Change Agent. Each bucket serves a different role in the overall goal to implement change to a dominant ideology. Farm Sanctuary presents them as proudly falling into the Citizen bucket. I would like to explore the concept of “buckets,” or roles of movement organizations, and how Farm Sanctuary has pigeonholed themselves into “neatly placed” roles rather than taking different qualities from each bucket at different times and advocating a hybrid model.

Through this project I hope to provide unique insight into the animal rights movement that can be applied to a larger understanding of the rhetoric of social movements. As a vegan and animal rights activist, I will acknowledge my subjectivity in this analysis, and embrace it. I am a member of and worked personally with Farm
Sanctuary. I feel that that experience enriches my analysis with passion, emotion, and personality. The multi-method approach provides the most inclusive opportunity to examine the various components of this thesis. The methods used in this thesis are exploratory examinations in nature and qualitative. I began this project with the goal of exploring and investigating without limiting the possibilities of where the project could take me. I started the project by preparing and conducting an autoethnography at FS during my internship. I wanted to become a member of the culture and organization in order to maximize local understanding. As an AR activist, I already felt a part of the culture but wanted to become an insider to FS the organization. While conducting the autoethnography, I implemented exploratory, open-ended interviews with employees, volunteers, and interns. I also collected field notes of my experience on a daily basis. The volunteers I lived with also provided me with weekly journal entries disclosing their thoughts and feelings throughout their internship. After the autoethnography was complete, I returned to Cincinnati and began to aggregate the data collected. The first part of the analysis is the data and experiences at Farm Sanctuary in the auto-ethnographic section.

The second part of the analysis was an attempt to bridge theory and practice. I want to create a useful text for not only social movement activists, but also particularly the AR movement. The gaps between theory and practice are often exacerbated by new studies. This study is different. In the academic setting, social movement theories try to bridge theories of resistance with resistance movements. However, as I found out after my internship with FS, there is still disconnect between the Academy and practice. The Communication Director of FS introduced me to the Movement Action Plan (MAP) by
Bill Moyer. The Communication Director explained that FS had reorganized itself around this theory and used it to organize the AR movement in relation to themselves. When discussing the theory with academic professors, the MAP model was unknown. If in academic settings we are learning social movement theories, why are we not discussing the very theories being used by the movements themselves? It was this question that led to the further investigation of Moyer’s MAP model. Using content analysis, I will examine if/how the MAP model fits into traditional social movement theories like the Lifecycle and SPIN model. Using the theory to compare and contrast the MAP Model with the Lifecycle and SPIN Models will allow deeper understanding of if/how these three theories can work together.

Research Questions

The multi-method approach, including both autoethnography and content analyses, will allow me to gain the most local knowledge and understanding of Farm Sanctuary and the broader AR movement. The project is divided into two sections: the structural analyses of the MAP Model in comparison to the Lifecycle and SPIN Model, and the analysis of my autoethnography. Because of the way the thesis divides into two analyses, I have identified two sets of research questions, each pertaining to the appropriate section. The first section is the structural analyses of the MAP Model, Lifecycle model, and the SPIN Model. I use the animal rights movement as a case study to illustrate the components of each theory, so that analyzing each theory was in the same context. I pose three research questions to guide me in the study:

RQ1: To what extent does Farm Sanctuary fit into the Moyer’s conception of social movements?
RQ2: To what extent do Farm Sanctuary activists fit into the *citizen* role?

RQ3: How does the application of MAP to Farm Sanctuary improve our understanding of existing social movement theories?

The second part of the analysis involved looking at the discourse, which includes interviews, surveys, and field, and experiential learning, to understand Farm Sanctuary as one example of an animal rights organization. I will assess the discourse collected using discourse analysis. I will not examining the macro structural animal rights movement or Farm Sanctuary at a macro level of how it fits into the identified theories. Instead, the autoethnography emphasizes the unique contributions and perspectives of the individuals I worked with on a very micro level. Hoping to gain a deeper understanding of the small community I worked within, I chose to focus my research in this way. I will not make generalizing claims about *every* or *all* activists or organizations. Instead, I hope to describe an in-depth understanding about how this group of people in this organization operates on a daily basis. The study will contribute to a deeper understanding of how this non-profit animal rights organization operates and how my experience has positively affected me. Although I hope the experiences had positive effects on my colleagues at the farm, I cannot make those overarching conclusions. The autoethnography was very exploratory in nature, but I wanted to guide the research with specific questions:

RQ1: How did my behaviors and feelings change over time?

RQ2: What did I learn about Farm Sanctuary as an organization that may inform traditional ways of studying social movements?

Limitations
The primary focus of this project is Farm Sanctuary, and the analysis is based on data I personally collected rather than on “official” organizational documents. The study relied on structural analyses and discourse analyses that center on my experiences, data I collected, and my situating of traditional social movement theories. While subjectivity of this study may be viewed as a weakness, it also serves to enrich and impassion the author with personhood and voice. The study is limited in the sense that I am the only researcher collecting data, and I am not triangulating the replies of the Farm Sanctuary staff and interns to data others have collected. The time span allotted for the auto-ethnography was six weeks, and is limited by time. I was not able to stay with the organization any longer, as the internship is unpaid and I have financial obligations at “home.” The time and scope of the study are the most significant limitations of the study.

Organizational Preview

Chapter One provides the introduction to this project and sets up the methodology, research questions, and a macro look at the historical background of both the animal rights movement and Farm Sanctuary. Chapter Two is a macro level structural analysis of the Lifecycle and SPIN Model as two main sequential evolutionary traditional social movement theories. The chapter uses the animal rights movement, including Farm Sanctuary, as a case study to demonstrate the components and contributions of the theory illuminates the theories. Chapter Three is also a macro structural analysis that introduces the Movement Action Plan as a practical theory used by social movements. The theory is also examined in-depth, with the animal rights movement as a case study. Chapter Four offers a micro-level look at the animal rights movement, as it is the auto-ethnographic study conducted at Farm Sanctuary. Flowing back toward a more macro-level approach,
chapter Five looks at if/how Farm Sanctuary fits into the role they have proclaimed; the *citizen* role. The analysis compares how Moyer asserts the model works and how Farm Sanctuary perceives the model to work. Chapter Six provides conclusions and my hope for future research and personal goals.
Chapter 2: Traditional Theory Illustrated Through the Animal Rights Movement

Introduction

Developmental evolutionary social movement theories contribute a great deal to our understanding of social movements. The Lifecycle and SPIN Models provide structural, organized ways to consider the life of a social movement. The animal advocacy movement, and in particular the animal rights movement, provide a case study to examine the Lifecycle and SPIN Models in greater detail.

The Lifecycle Model

Stewart, et. al. examines social movements as cyclical, constantly experiencing different stages. Stewart, et. al.’s vision of social movements can be summarized with the following quote: “Social movements are intricate social dramas involving multiple scenes, acts, agents, agencies, and purposes. They include heroes and heroines, fools and geniuses, victims and villains, evil and good, successes and failures, hope and disillusionment” (Stewart, et. al. 2007, p. 85). The Life cycle model describes six essential characteristics: social movements are an organized collectivity, an uninstitutionalized collectivity, large in scope, promotes or opposes change in societal norms and values, encounters opposition in a moral struggle, and its persuasion is pervasive.

Organized Collectivity

The first characteristic Stewart, et. al. describes is that social movements are an organized collectivity, at the very least somewhat organized. The leaders, members, and organizations within the movement must be recognizable or else, “…the phenomenon under investigation is a trend, fad, riot, or spontaneous protest, not a social movement” (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 3). The social movement may originate with a disorganized
event or series of events, protests for example, but what signifies the creation of a movement is the establishment of recognized leaders and followers. Over time, some social movements successfully sustain an organized collective, while others fall on the less organized of the continuum. The degree to which a social movement is organized, the scope of the movement’s organizations, visibility of leaders, and type of membership varies. However, no social movement consists of just one organization or leader. Social movements are a collective of a wide range of organizations, leaders, followers, and ideologies.

The AR movement does not solely consist of Newkirk or Baur, but instead the AR movement is made up of many organizations (i.e. PETA and FS), individuals (ie. Newkirk and Baur), and ideologies (rightists and feminists). The large range of organizations, individuals, ideologies, and members helps sustain the movement over time because of the summative large number of people involved in the movement.

Social movements are often confused with campaigns because social movements often run specific campaigns with specific goals. In 2007, FS began running its campaign against Foie Gras that included gathering signatures from legislature and restaurant owners pledging to disassociate themselves with Foie Gras. The campaign looked similar to a social movement. However, social movements and campaigns are different in several important ways. Social movements are organized in a bottom up fashion, and mainly made up of “ordinary people with limited and tenuous commitments to the cause, while campaigns tend to be highly organized from the top down” (Stewart et. al., 2007, p. 5). The leaders of social movements often arise from a protest group when they feel the group is developing and in need of a leader. The emergence of a leader happens over time
as the organization matures and develops as an organized collective. Leaders of campaigns, on the other hand, come about through a selection process before the launch of a campaign, and the leader then selects the other roles of leadership to follow them. The appointed individuals within the campaign organization are then given tasks to complete and roles to follow within a certain time period. The appointment and structure of social movements marks it as unique because of the collective organization from a bottom up model that consists of “ordinary people.” Thus, the Foie Gras campaign resembled a social movement. However because it was not an organized collectivity it does not satisfy this component of what a social movement is.

Uninstitutionalized Collectivity

The second essential characteristic of a social movement is that they are an uninstitutionalized collectivity. In order to be a social movement, according to Stewart, et. al., the organization cannot have any part of “…an established order that governs, maintains, or changes social, political, religious, or economic norms and values” (2007, p. 7). The established order can refer to government, religious institutions, and so on. An example of change within the institution, thus not a social movement, is Cleveland Congressman Dennis Kucinich’s role in the animal welfare movement. Kucinich is very open about his vegan lifestyle and his personal lean towards animal rights, and his political agenda is aligned closely with several animal welfare organizations. On his personal web site, Kucinich describes his platform to work towards increased protection for animals. While Kucinich works with several other Democrats in Congress to ensure improved animal welfare, this activity does not constitute a social movement. The reasoning behind this demarcation is that Kucinich and his colleagues are working within
the government institution utilizing institutionalized means and protocols, locating the actions for change within rather than coming from without. Another difference is that when the action is taking place internally in institutions, those recognized as being affiliated with the change tend to be elected or appointed into institutional roles. Stewart, et. al. point out two essential differences between institutionalized versus uninstitutionalized collectives: “…social movements exist and operate primarily from outside established institutions, and they are populated primarily with ordinary people” (2007, p. 7). Often those who hold membership in established institutions also show interest in particular social movements.

Another intersection is when groups exist external from the institution but find they have transformed into the established order. For example, the ASPCA started out as an external organization that was part of the animal advocacy movement. Bergh created the organization to defend animals against acts of cruelty and industries that profited from animal suffering. The organizations existed separate from the United States government and corporations. Over time, however, the ASPCA has found a lucrative ally with corporations. Currently, the ASPCA and corporations partner together to cross promote both organizations in order to promote a positive image.

The implementation of their program “Corporate Partners” allows for companies to donate a certain amount of monetary funds in exchange for placing the ASPCA on certain products and in their marketing material. A significant coalition exists between Iams and the ASPCA, where the ASPCA serves as their personal advisors on the conditions of animals used in research facilities that are kept in captivity. This close relationship along with many others the ASPCA enjoys has shifted the organization
outside of the realm of a social movement and into an institutionalized group within the system. In addition, the organization performs state mandated functions and receives a significant amount of funds from the government. Upon careful inspection of the ASPCA’s 2007 tax form 990, it became clear that the government also has a close relationship with the ASPCA. The document is made public through the ASPCA’s website and available for interested individuals and groups to examine. On page 3 of the Schedule A portion of the form (page 16 of the PDF) the section labeled, “Reason for Non-Private Foundation Status”, the question asked, “I certify that the organization is not a private foundation because it is: (Please check only ONE application box.)”, and the ASPCA checked, “An organization that normally receives a substantial part of its support from the government unit or from the general public” (ASPCA Tax Form, 2007, p. 16).

The ASPCA not only receives funds from the government, but it also works with the government on enforcing laws to protect animals. Television programs like “Animal Cops” and “Animal Precinct” follow ASPCA officers as they investigate claims and cases of animal cruelty. The programs show the ASPCA officer visiting the animal, gathering evidence, and going through legal proceedings to ensure ramifications for convicted cruelty. The leaders of the ASPCA are members of the in-group and are seen as a legitimate organization synonymous with maintaining order and only implementing mediocre change when absolutely necessary. The organization began as Bergh was disgusted with the conditions of horses pulling carriages in New York and he sought to demand change. The ASPCA currently lists on their “Positions” section that they support the use of horses pulling carriages, a position in favor of the corporations’ favor rather than the animals. This shift in alliances and maneuvering through official channels within
the institution, corporations and government, demonstrates the shift from the ASPCA as a social movement organization to the ASPCA as an institutionalized group. The growing trend in support of animal protection has helped the movement secure its status as a social movement, as it meets the third essential characteristic of a social movement; large in scope.

Large in Scope

The scope of the AR movement reaches international audiences, has been around for a long time, helps advance beliefs towards the consideration and existence of animals, holds a number of events and consists of many members, organizations, goals, tactics, and critical adaptations. This large scope differentiates social movements from other change agents such as religious cults, Political Action Committees (PACs), and isolated demonstrations. Those types of groups and events are important to the existence and survival of many social movements. However, these types of groups and events do not constitute a movement on their own. Stewart uses an old adage to demonstrate the rhetorical significance of PACs, pressure groups, lobbies, and so on, “A campaign is to a social movement as a battle is to a war” (2007 p. 11). The social movement consists of many battles and helps our understanding of the ideology behind the conflicts. The scope of the social movement is larger, often national or international, maintain actions towards change that cross decades, have multiple leaders over time, have many organizations existing fighting towards the same cause, consistently hold events to increase membership, run a range of campaigns, have ideologies that both expand and contract at varying times, create and reflexively modify numerous goals, and have a large range of
strategies at their disposal. In this respect, the battles (campaigns, pressure groups, and protests can collectively and summatively constitute the movement.

For example, Baur, Bauston, and fellow activists paid a visit to Lancaster Stockyard in 1986, at the time it was the largest stockyard in the Eastern U.S., with the intention to investigate and document cases of animal cruelty. It became the first campaign target for FS, however at the time FS was not an organization. The campaign was one of the few of its kind during this time, however the campaign was later accompanied by investigations of other stockyards. The campaigns continued while the scope increased and the media began paying closer attention. All of the campaign efforts, in combination with growing membership, identified leadership, and other factors FS became a part of the social movement against factory farming and animal industries. The fourth essential characteristic deals with the other side of the spectrum; the opposition.

Promotes or Opposes Change

The actions and ideology of a social movement determines what type of social movement it is classified as. In order to be considered a social movement, the movement must promote or oppose change in societal norms and values (Stewart, et. al., 2007 p. 14). The segment of society labeled animal rights activists oppose current societal norms and values placed on animals, in particular the ideology that animals exist for humans.

According to Stewart, et. al., there are three types of social movements: innovative, revivalistic, and resistance (2007, p. 14). Innovative social movements want to overhaul existing believes and replace them with new ones. The emphasis is on replacing the ideology with a new one; for example is the AR movement. Revivalistic social movements aim to swap out existing norms and values with idealized, revered
values from the past; for example the pro-life movement/anti-choice movement.

*Resistance social movements* promote current social norms and values and work to prevent any changes being implemented because they believe nothing is wrong with the status quo. If those within a resistance social movement perceive anything “wrong” with current social norms and values, they believe that over time the problem will be resolved through official channels using established means. Examples of *resistance social movements* include the anti-suffrage movement and the anti-gay rights movement.

Stewart, et. al. categorizes social movements as having reform-oriented and revolutionary oriented elements, and based on these elements given labels as moderate and radical. Reform-oriented movements focus on partial change, whereas revolutionary movements demand complete change. Movements may start out as reform or revolutionary, but over time change their goals and ideology to shift another direction. Rather than two polarized categories, reform and revolutionary should be placed on a continuum (Stewart, et. al. 2007, p. 15). The categorization of social movements as reform or revolutionary and moderate and radical is a subjective call for each individual. The label ascribed to an organization by an outsider is often misleading. The fluid nature of the continuum is similar for the label of moderate and radical social movements. One person may call PETA a radical movement, while someone from the ALF would ascribe PETA as a moderate movement. The same goes for reform and revolutionary, the label is often ascribed rather than self-imposed and therefore a relative identity. The opposition is eager to dismiss the social movement as either irrelevant or too extreme.

*Encounters Opposition*
The opposition is very important to Stewart, et. al.’s description of a social movement. The fifth essential characteristic of a social movement is that it must encounter opposition in a moral struggle. The social movement assumes itself as an ethical agent trying to defend good from evil, while establishing ethical from unethical (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 17). Social movements must work towards pointing out the injustices of the institutions and how those institutions are doing the unethical, while reifying the social movement’s work as ethical and liberating. The social movement can claim its legitimacy through reinforcing the “us versus them”, and clarifying that the “them” is the institution. It is the very rebellious anti-alliance, un-institutionalization of the social movement that reaffirms the legitimacy of the movement against the corrupt institutions. The AR movement has attempted to claim it’s high moral status by saying they refute all the cruel industries that use animals. If PETA was a part of the industry or enjoyed benefits from animal industries then it would appear less legitimate and less valid as a change agent. The stronger the social movement can argue that the injustices of society are because of the existing institutions, the more society becomes frustrated and disaffected with established institutions. This frustration helps foster the confrontation as a calculated and largely supported force (Stewart, et. al., 2007 p. 17).

**Persuasion is Pervasive**

Stewart, et. al. argue the sixth essential characteristic of a social movement is that persuasion is pervasive. In order to establish itself as a powerful social entity and maintain that degree of power the social movement has to meet several standards. There are three strategies a social movement can use to help meet the standards; coercion, bargaining, and persuasion. Coercion alters the reality of the target group in such a way
that the group cannot take any other actions than those demanded by the social movement, or else there will be considerable cost or punishment. Bargaining occurs when the social movement has some leverage, something that can be exchanged, that the institution wants. The social movement then offers this exchangeable “thing” if the institution agrees to meet some or all of their demands. Persuasion serves as the primary tool for meeting requirements and dealing with obstacles. Persuasion takes the shape of both verbal and nonverbal, and helps to induce critical thinking about current norms and social practices that in turn bring about change.

There are many mass media outlets that allow the AR movement to publicize their arguments. Leafleting is often employed to help distribute literature that educates the public about the cruel and unnecessary practices in animal industries. The internet in particular has served as a strong media outlet alliance for the AR movement. For example, Farm Sanctuary has its own website that contains all of the campaigns the organization is currently running. Each campaign has a section of what the activist can do to get involved, including contacting local officials. The internet has also led to the mass distribution and viewing of investigative footage inside factory farms and slaughterhouses. The advocacy and educational power of Farm Sanctuary greatly benefits for the mass media in this way. In addition, if Farm Sanctuary organizes a demonstration in Watkins Glen, the entire nation can be made aware and mobilized through the television. Not only can videos be shown on Youtube and other online sites, but also the local and national news channels could cover an event Farm Sanctuary throws or a demonstration they participate in. The mass media helps get the word out to the public, especially when small grassroots efforts are taking place in rural towns.
Rhetorical Function of Movement Persuasion

Persuasion is the central tool social movements use to perform various functions. The formulation, maintenance, defense, and succession of the movement is dependent on its persuasion. According to Stewart, et al, there are six functions that the rhetoric serve; “transforming perceptions of social reality, altering self perceptions, legitimizing the social movement, prescribing courses of action, mobilizing for action, and sustaining the social movement” (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p.49).

The first function, transforming perceptions of social reality, is essential to implementing change. The social movement must make the public aware that currently accepted perceptions of social reality are false and something has to be done to change it. The movement works to reframe notions of the past, present, and/or the future. The argument is made that there is an unbearable situation going on and they (the social movement) must work collectively to change this urgent problem. There are several reasons the social movement would want to reframe perceptions of the past. Either the past is unknown to the current audience, the past is widely known yet unpleasant, or the past may be more fiction than reality.

For example, the ALF takes great steps to “liberate” animals from laboratories, factory farms, fur ranchers, and so on. However, society at large has chastised the group as irrational, irrelevant, and members have even made their way to the top of the FBI’s list of most dangerous terrorists. The public perception of the history of the ALF is negative, and since their inception not seen a full victory. However, whenever a member releases public statements or memoirs the historical record is reframed. ALF members
emphasize the group’s focus on the humane treatment of animals and the urgency of releasing animals from all animal industries. The account from an ALF member may retell a history of the movement group as having a deep love for animals, sharing the desire for animals to be treated humanely and thus focusing on positive components. The movement’s past is retold as a morally responsible, rational, and justified quest to release animals from irrational, inhumane, and intolerable circumstances. The online accounts of activists with the ALF are found on the website animalliberationfront.com, and in Best’s (2004) edited book, Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?: Reflections on the Liberation of Animals. The reframing works to turn a negative history into a positive existence, and also to reify the moral significance and necessity for the organization. The retelling of history helps the public at large in their view of the social movement, but more importantly it helps the individual visualize themselves joining on the fight.

The second function that rhetoric serves for a social movement is to alter the perceptions of protestors. This is a transcending part of the movement, where individuals begin to re-conceptualize how they see themselves and in particular how they see themselves in relation to the movement. The self-perception is either in self-directed movements and other-directed movements, and each has rhetorical strategies that empower the activist. Self directed movements are created, led, and mainly made up of those who consider themselves dispossessed and are struggling for personal freedom, justice, equality, and rights (Stewart, et, al., 2007 p. 58). Examples include, the African American movement, LGBT movements, and women’s rights. Other-directed movements are created, led, and mainly made up of those who do not feel themselves to be dispossessed and are fighting for rights, freedom, equality, and justice for those other
than themselves. The AR movement and environmental movement operate on the basis that they are fighting for the other.

There is an ego function in self-directed groups and in other-directed groups. Ego function refers to how the activist in involved and implicated in the social movement in which they are working with. In self-directed groups, the rhetoric posits members as innocent, blameless victims of oppression. The rhetoric must address the self-esteem and self-worth, working to establish a self-hood of members and target audiences by working on self-esteem and confidence (Stewart, et. al., 2007 p. 58). This also occurs through searches for new self-identities and self-definitions. These identities can create closer bonds among members, inhibiting camaraderie similar to siblings. The members are able to identify with others in the group and find strength in that identity. For example, in the Women’s Studies department at the University of Cincinnati, it is refreshing and motivating to be surrounded by powerful female feminists. As a woman, simply being around others that share your passion for social justice for women is empowering. I am reminded that I am not alone and that the struggle is alive and well.

In other-directed social movements, the rhetoric does not work to refurbish, establish, or restore self-esteem, but rather to affirm a positive self-esteem. Members do not perceive themselves as oppressed, but rather as saviors or freedom fighters. The members already have some level of confidence in their work, and the rhetoric works to reinforce that confidence through praise and celebration of their compassion, morality, humanitarianism, and so on. Members are not concerned with climbing a social hierarchy because they already perceive themselves as morally upright citizens because of the nature of their work, and do not look to socially constructed hierarchies for affirmation.
However, the members do see a struggle within the social movement to locate a proper place for themselves. For example, animal activists that work within a rescue shelter often view their work as inherently moral and their position in the organization as valuable. Because of the small amount of funds rescue shelters often operate within, many of the workers are volunteers. As a volunteer myself with animal shelters, I am willing to give my time because I feel the work is so critical and do not need a special job title to prove it. Members may view themselves through victimage, being attacked for what they believe and their struggle for a better world. This victimage serves a reinforcing function, reminding members how morally superior they are because they are willing to sacrifice themselves in struggle for others. The social movement is constantly challenged and must reify its validity.

The third function of the rhetoric within the movement is to establish legitimacy of the movement itself. Establishing it and sustaining legitimacy, is arguably the primary goal or demand of social movements, the primary challenge of movements to the institution, and its most central obstacle the leaders of the social movement faces. Legitimacy is proving that the organization is justified in its quest and that the reasons for its cause are justified and rational. There are several ways that social movements and institutions exert their legitimacy. The movement aims at upholding positive relational patterns with the larger society. Institutions can wield the five types of powers; reward, control, identification, terministic control, and moral suasion. There are two rhetorical elements that are inherent to the concept of legitimacy; the act of conferring and retaining legitimacy once it is conferred (Francesconi, 1982). The act of conferring can be done by one person or group and involves the ability to use authoritative influence on a specific
subject or to issue binding directives. If the social movement confers such legitimacy, they also confer the five types of powers that, when taken together, sustain the original grant (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 62).

The most important retentive power is the power to reward, allowing legitimate institutions to reward those who conform and abide by their standards, and coerce or punish those groups that refuse to conform or challenge approved societal norms. The second power, the power of control, allows legitimate institutions to regulate the flow of information. This is the power of gate keeping, deciding what kind, when, how, and where communication occurs. The third power is the power of identification; that accrues to the institutions. The institutions uphold this power as the regulators, protectors, and proselytizers of the many things (including symbols, emblems, etc) that uphold societal norms. The fourth power is the power of terministic control, which gives institutions the power to control language. Language is that which upholds our understanding of such loaded terms like progress, oppression, and humane. For example, many of the animal industries have a close relationship with politicians in the U.S. government. A benefit the industries reap from this relationship is that the government then defines what constitutes a “healthy” diet, legal definitions of “humane” for slaughter, and how the treatment of animals is framed. The close relationship is described by Freedman and Barnouin in Skinny Bitch (2007). The fifth power is the power of moral suasion, which allows institutions to use control in the realms of attitudes and emotional attachments. This relates to the last example. The institution is able to convince people to uphold institutional decisions because it is healthy, necessary, and humane, even if the decisions have vast negative repercussions. For example, the Federal Animal Welfare Act does not
protect the public from animals who are too sick to stand, which has been connected to “mad cow disease” and the environmental effects of raising and consuming animals. Yet because the government and corporations endorse the Act as “official”, and the majority does not challenge the ways caters to corporations rather than the citizens.

Legitimacy also involves the enactment of coactive and confrontational strategies. In order to transport themselves from the margins of society to the centers where legitimacy exists, social movements must identify with fundamental societal norms through employing coactive strategies. The majority of society conceptualizes legitimacy as a “rationality of good reasons,” from Francesconi (Stewart, et. al., 2007 p. 58). The institutions claim sources that assert their rightful domain, and thus the social movements must access this source in order to appear legitimate. The social movement hopes to reconstruct history so that it alters perceptions of reality and help to legitimize the movement. As the movement stands to retell history in such a way that no one else is, the organization can even appear more legitimate than the institutions because they are alone in their telling of how it “really” happened. For example, within the AR movement, there is an emphasis on retelling the emergence of consuming animals as necessary nutritional guidelines within western medicine. Freedman and Barnouin (2007) focus on retelling the history of drinking milk, consuming animals, and myths of factory farming. The authors do so in an effort to show how corrupt the government and institutions are for telling these lies under the guise of history. Legitimacy can also be established through confrontational strategies.

Confrontational rhetoric is often used when a “rhetorical stalemate” is at work, trying to push institutional legitimacy into question and help the social movement surpass
the social order in perceived legitimacy. In order to do so, the rhetoric must make a large number of people perceive the social order as illegitimate or at least not as legitimate as the social movement (Stewart, et. al., 2007 p. 67). For example, the AR movement constantly tries to publicly expose the corrupt relationship between factory farming and government. The norms of society are also challenged as being overtly corrupt, and thus illegitimate. The norms and values in U.S. society posit that some animals are worthy of intimate relations and spared cruelty, dogs and cats, and others are not, farm animals. The AR movement shows the ways in which the institution supports these illegitimate norms.

In attempt to expose systematically distorted communication patterns in the institution, social movements employ a variety of confrontational strategies. For example, the AR movement captures live footage of treatment of animals in labs, factory farms, research facilities, and so on and claims that the government and corporations lie to us about how they are treated. They hold demonstrations, exercising civil disobedience, often showcasing photographs or playing videos in efforts to show the “truth”. The institution uses the five powers listed above, and confrontational rhetoric helps to chip away at four of those; reward, control, identification, and moral suasion. The movement functions to transform societal perceptions of social reality, change self-perceptions, legitimize the social movement. These three functions are important to shape individuals into a collective that is upset with the institution. The following three functions are essential to mapping and implementing the desired change.

The fourth function of social movement rhetoric is to prescribe courses of action. The social movement uses its set of beliefs to define what must be done, who must do it, and how it must be done (Stewart, et. al. 2007, p. 69). The organization explains what must be
done through a presentation of demands and solutions that will remedy or help a bad condition, prevent catastrophic changes, or bring about a time of utopia. The course of action defines how they can bring about these great changes. For example, the AR movement enables activists by describing what it is they are trying to change and what they are going to do. By pushing veganism, the movement endorses social responsibility over convenience. The who component is necessary because movements must show who has to do the “job.” Social movements usually shine the responsibility on the ordinary people, endorsing the concept of grassroots movement working for change or resistance to change. In order to recruit and mobilize the public, the movement must persuade enough people that only an un-institutional collective that is willing and capable to bring about or resist change to join their movement with their course of action, and that all those who do not join are a part of the problem. For example, the AR movement emphasizes that a consistent value system needs to be adopted towards all animals. They have created a divide between them and the welfare movement because of the differing ideology. They felt the movement needed to distance itself from all other groups that did not condemn all animal industries. The AR movement feels that anyone that awards one species over another is participating in speciesism and that cannot allow for animal liberation. Thus those that perpetuate value systems that position some over others and do not condemn industries based on animal exploitation are part of the problem. In exchange, the AR movement empowers each individual to do their part and that it is the ordinary consumer that can make the difference. For example, the Veg For Life campaign run by Farm Sanctuary empowers the consumer to make a difference with their
purchasing. The Vegforlife.com site offers consumer guidelines and resources of where to shop and which companies they suggest supporting.

Secondly, the social movement must put forth types of organizations and leaders whom are best for the role of solving urgent problem (Stewart, et. al. 2007 p. 71). For example, the AR movement has many organizations, but allows for the largest and most widely accepted group to stand into the light, for instance PETA. This group is well prepared to handle conflicts, litigations, and any urgent crisis. There are also strong leaders that stand out and work together with other leaders and groups for the same cause. Newkirk is heavily involved with other organizations and pop-culture-type news. Newkirk has alliances with Baur from FS, and Wayne Pacelle from the HSUS. Newkirk is collected, professional, and educated and serves as a figurehead that emerges in times of deep conflict to work with the institution.

Thirdly, the social movement may create membership limitations that create movement elites who are best capable of dealing with unsolvable conditions and the recognizing the powerful forces that product them (Stewart, et. al. 2007 p. 71). As the environmental concerns with factory farming arise, and small farmers feel the frustrations of a globalized and monopolized market, the allies of the AR movement have grown. Yet, the AR movement is very particular on who can consider themselves a true ally and member. The demarcation is necessary to show that unless the needs and rights of the animals are the primary motivator, then true animal liberation is not emerging. The AR movement feels that if an environmentalist opposes factory farming because of its high pollution, then as soon as the pollution is dealt with the environmentalists will abandon the AR movement. Although this is a fear of AR activists, because the environmental
issues have not be solved, there is not direct evidence to support this would necessarily occur. The same is true for the small farmers that have made alliances with animal welfarists as the animal industries are being condensed and outsourced. As soon as their issue is resolved, then they will disregard the alliance because there is no ideological similarity. In particular, small farmers are often a part of the institution and corporation side, and thus can never been part of the social movement.

The how shows in what ways the job must be done and what strategies are most appropriate and effective. Depending on whether a group is reform oriented, revivalistic, or revolutionary, the strategies are different. The group also has to be adaptive and understand how to change their strategies as times, demands, and circumstances change. In many cases, the movement splinters into different sections based on how they think the job should be done. For example, the AR movement is extremely divided on strategies. Consider it like a ladder, the bottom step being the least threatening and invasive, and the top step requiring a throwing out of the entire system and creation of a new one. There are groups like the HSUS that want to work with institutions to create animal welfare laws, which places them on the lower steps. In the middle are groups like PETA that believe change must happen now, but work with celebrities, grassroots, and governmental agencies to institute animal rights laws. At the top end of the ladder are groups like the ALF, instituting behaviors that many characterize as violent. They believe the problem is urgent and must be dealt with immediately, that animals are being wrongfully imprisoned and the societal norms and laws are so illegitimate and inhumane that they are morally above them and must break the laws. Each group views how to deal with the issue differently and takes different approaches on how to deal with it. Once the plan is drafted
on what needs to be done, who needs to do it, and how they ought to implement the plan, it is necessary to mobilize individuals and the collective for action.

The fifth function of a social movement rhetoric is to mobilize for action. Mobilizing for action entails empowering others to feel that they can complete the tasks and help reach the goals of the movement. With the goal of evolutionary change, persuaders have to convince large numbers of people to not only join their cause, but to also “organize into effective groups and unify through coalitions to carry the movement’s message to target audiences to bring about desired evolutionary results” (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 73). The hope is to educate large masses into not only believing in the cause, but to feel enabled to join the cause and bring out change. The group must be united in its goals and support in order to bring about change in the social world.

The first part of mobilization is organizing and uniting the discontented, which requires educating and convincing others on the urgency that they work together and bring about or resist change. This involves promulgation as well, where groups send out mailings, newsletters, leaflets, and so on to profess their cause, why others should join, and how they can get involved. Some members join with the goal of being part-time. They hope to only be involved “when they have time” or “after the kids are asleep.” Others, though, become swept up in a cause and devote much of their time to the movement. In the AR movement, activists vary on their level of commitment and time availability. As an AR activist, it is difficult to prioritize the many events that occur throughout the year with work, school, and other commitments. In the past, I have been frustrated with other activists that do not make the AR movement a priority. The task of organizing and uniting individuals is difficult because they are on different pages, will be
moved by different things, and will each devote a different amount of their time to the
cause. This can lead to the splintering of movements into various divisions, even the
institution can aid in the splintering by favoring one organization over another.

The second part of mobilization involve to energizing the discontented,
convincing them that collective action by un-institutional groups using unconventional
methods can bring about or resist change. The individuals must be encouraged to adopt a
collective identity with a common ideology and have shared views of the social
environment. There are many ways to communicate with a large audience, ranging from
print, television, radio, and internet media. The social movement hopes to transform
discontented individual into a group mobilized for the cause. For example, individuals
and small groups around the world began to express their concerns and disgust with
animal industries. However, it was Singer’s book that invigorated the masses to articulate
these concerns and enter political arenas. However, it took many leaders to truly
transform these concerned individuals into a collective willing to take action to bring
about change. Activists began holding meetings, sending out leaflets and articles that
expressed their concerns and informed the public that there are ‘others out there
concerned about the same issues. The camaraderie that followed energized the
discontented animal advocates around the world to speak up and formulate a movement
(Beers, 2006, 198).

Pressuring the opposition is the next task. There is an intrinsic component dealing
with self-change, where individuals must come to believe that they must change
themselves in order to change others, and then the collective of members engage the
opposition in symbolic combat. The tactics can range from verbal pressure using mass
mailings to the powerholders and name calling to bring negative attention to the institutions. The social movement hopes to lure the institution into admitting there is a serious problem. For example, the Michael Vick case became known across the United States, AR groups began pressuring the government (local, state, and federal) to admit there was something wrong with the system. The week the story broke, I received multiple emails from HSUS, PETA, and Mercy for Animals. Slowly people are admitting to this, and each time they do so it gives the social movement a leg up. It is important, though, that the actions remain symbolic and do not get violent.

The final task under mobilization is gaining sympathy and support of legitimizers, or social opinion leaders that are able to help legitimize a movement in the eyes of the public by appearing in support of the group. For example, when celebrities joined forces with PETA, the group was legitimized in certain ways. People began to find identifiable members and wanted to be with a group because of its famous members. Celebrities, including Sir Paul McCartney, Bill Maher, and Joaquin Phoenix have participated in several PETA public service announcements and even narrated films. A particular part of PETA’s website includes “Why I Went Vegetarian/Vegan” where celebrities share why they went vegetarian or vegan, and how that has impacted their life. Also, celebrities are used in specific campaigns to encourage their fans to not participate in a particular (or all) animal industry/ies. Musical artists like Pink and Paul McCartney has done public service announcements (PSA’s) against particular industries. Also, politicians (often after their time is served) become active in social movements. For example, Dennis Kucinich devotes a portion of his time to working with the animal advocacy movements, allowing
them to step ahead of the others because of his endorsement. Celebrities are often used to not only mobilize the movement, but also to sustain it.

The sixth function of social movement rhetoric is to sustain the movement. It takes a great length of time to bring about large social change. The movements face times of public awareness and times when they lose their spot in the public’s eyes. Social movements employ various strategies to remain in the eyes and minds of the public, especially to its members. The social movement hopes to create the dichotomy of we-they, while enforcing a set of strong beliefs about reaching the goals, and to show that the ends justify any means necessary for the cause. As the struggle for change goes on, there are many setbacks and delays. The group must be able to maintain order and discipline and react to actions that have negative effects on the movement and even threaten its support. Social movements require years of difficult work and tireless efforts with a significant member base to keep it going. Song has been used in the past to sustain the movement in difficult times. For example, the AR movement uses a wide range of videos filled with songs offering support, guidance, and hope for the future. The film Behind the Mustache by Farm Sanctuary, accessible online at Youtube and on Farm Sanctuary’s website, begins with a grim look into the dairy industry and how it supports veal. The film uses music to illustrate the compelling sadness of this occurrence, and then transitions to showing rescued calves on at Farm Sanctuary and plays upbeat music to instill hope and inspiration. The film concludes with a call to action, both volunteer and monetary. Investigative footage is often illuminated with songs that emphasize various emotions.
Sustaining the movement involves maintaining the viability of the movement. It takes not only members and support, but social movements also require funds to bring about change. When going against large powerful institutions, there is a small amount of funds available. For example, the AR movement has nearly a quarter of the funds available to the meat producers. If the movement faces difficulty and loses membership, they may turn to past campaigns and victories to help boost it back. In cases when the movement seems the ultimate underdog, they often point to significant victories in the past. For example, PETA used Pacheco’s victory in the Silver Springs Monkeys case. The case was the first animal rights case heard at the Supreme Court level and thus marks a significant time in the movement. It is important, still, to also maintain the visibility of the movement over time.

Maintaining visibility is the third component of sustaining the movement. Social movements fear falling into the back of people’s minds or out of sight completely during times of less media attention. Therefore they use various strategies to help keep themselves in the minds and eyes of the public (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 80). In efforts to remain visible they use bumper stickers, items of clothing, or even rhetorical events like die-ins. A die-in is a strategy often employed by the HIV/AIDS awareness movement to demonstrate the high death counts of AIDS inflicted individuals. PETA employs the strategy when they lie in coffins in New York City to demonstrate the deaths of animals. Also, Newkirk and activists have gone into fur stores and held demonstrations to keep the issue in the public’s eyes and mind. Stewart, et. al. argues that memorials are the key means of sustaining a movement.
**Five Stages of the Lifecycle Model**

According to Stewart, et. al., the Life cycle model consists of five stages; Genesis, Social Unrest, Enthusiastic Mobilization, Maintenance, and Termination (2007, p. 84). Genesis is the inception point when the feelings already rooted in society begin to be encouraged by rhetoricians and grow into public notice. The Genesis stage usually involves a triggering event that moved the group from an unorganized, ideologically unsure, and socially invisible point to being in a state of social unrest. Within the AR movement, an example of the Genesis Stage can be the release of Singer’s book, *Animal Liberation* (1975). The book instigated individuals to understand their own feelings of unrest in terms of a national phenomenon among animal “sympathizers.” All of a sudden, the public had a book that exposes industries that use animals. Individuals that identified as animal sympathizers now fall under the “Animal Rights Movement.”

Social Unrest follows as the second stage. Social unrest occurs after the issues have been brought to broader public attention, and the collective begins to receive media visibility as a “movement” (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 85). Singer may have been considered an intellectual in the Genesis Stage, but by the Social Unrest Stage he is considered an instigator stirring up society and leading a movement. The group of AR activists began to consider themselves part of a movement, working towards a similar goal with others. The concept of “us” and “them” emerges, and strategies and efforts aim at changing public perceptions of the reality. The book led to the division among the advocacy movement of AR activists versus everyone else, humane versus inhumane, murderers versus liberators, and so on.
Enthusiastic mobilization is the third stage of Stewart, et. al.’s model. According to Stewart, et. al., enthusiastic mobilization occurs when the movement is constructed and consists of true believers that have gone through a transformation into the cause (2007, p. 93). For example, I had already decided to live a lifestyle that did not include animal products. Because I believe the personal is political, I felt that this made a strong political statement in and of itself. However, as time progressed I was increasingly discontented with the way the world exploits animals, and decided that action through activism was the only way to change this situation immediately. Although it happened earlier than 2007 for the AR movement, enthusiastic mobilization for the movement involved channeling optimistic beliefs that they could bring about the change they desired, and this change would greatly improve their lives. The mass organizing around political action as the AR movement arose in the early 1908’s. While activists were gathering and gaining public attention, society at large is made aware of unrest among AR activists. The institutions of control, corporations and the government, begin to fear that change would overturn society and take away their control of a system that benefits those in control. As a minority on the fringe of society, AR activists’ voice is and has been marginalized in central politics and in society. Thus activism mobilizes and offers a feeling of agency in the political and social realm to be heard and move closer towards their goal to emancipate animals.

The fourth stage is maintenance. According to Stewart, et. al., maintenance occurs when the movement begins to reach new levels and have to maintain leadership while the harsh rhetoric quiets (2007, p. 99). Singer was the pioneer AR activist to make an animal rights claim regarding liberation, and the call to action. In addition, as time progressed,
new activists stood up and took leadership positions as well. As the movement hits the maintenance phase those extreme voices begin to quiet as the movement faces either victory or oblivion. The movement shifts focus and moves their desires and calls for radical change from the public sphere to the private sphere (Stewart, et. al., 2007 p. 101). It is difficult to illustrate this stage for the AR movement, seeing as it is currently somewhere in between enthusiastic mobilization and maintenance. Singer has been calling for a more dramatic change, the stoppage of all human usage of animals, than what society is used to that the movement reaches a point of either re-envisioning a strategy towards success or death. According to Stewart, et. al., the agitator is not a part of the maintenance stage, it is more about internal strategies and how, when externalized, those interact with the system. The members are focused on sustaining the movement rather then pushing it towards monumental strides. Fund-raising efforts reach the forefront and sustaining the movement in public attention is the focus instead of acts of agitation.

The final stage of Stewart, et. al.’s model is termination. Termination occurs when the movement succeeds and achieves the desired change, and then celebrates its victory, or when the movement fails and fades into obscurity (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 104). In some ways, the AR movement has celebrated several victories. For example, the recent outrcues about Michael Vick to not only public awareness, but also public policy increasing restrictions on dog fighting. Those working specifically towards increasing restrictions on dog fighting either stayed content with the victory or pushed forward to increasing restrictions more. Some movements, though, do not survive and die off before success. The anti-Vietnam War movement dissolved after the war ended in the 1970’s.
Movements rarely just disappear in the middle without either success or, in the case of Vietnam, the war ending. Strong social movements seldom disappear because of the heavy ideological embedded nature (Stewart, et. al., 2007, p. 105).

The developmental evolutionary theories of social movements help improve pedagogical discussions of the phases movements endure over time. In the heat of the action, social movements can appear chaotic and disorganized. Gerlach created the SPIN Model in response to the Life cycle model. The SPIN Model insists that rhetorical functions are evolutionary, but that a lot of things happen during a social movement’s plight and many of that at random. The SPIN Model hoped to account for and offer credence to the chaos and divisions that occurs during a social movement’s lifetime.

The SPIN Model

Gerlach began studying the structure of social movements in the late 1960’s, along with Virginia H. Hine (Arquilla 2001 p. 289). The early studies of social movement Gerlach and Hine to the conclusion that social movements are not “centralized and bureaucratic nor anamorphous, but… segmentary, polycentric, and integrated networks (acronym SPIN)” (Gerlach. 2001, p. 289). The SPIN model attempts to account for the complex nature of social movements. In order to understand the SPIN model, it is important to break down what each part of the acronym means. The following is Gerlach’s description of the components:

**Segmentary**: Composed of many diverse groups, which grow and die, divide and fuse, proliferate and contract.

**Polycentric**: Having multiple, often temporary, and sometimes competing, leaders or centers of influence.
**Networked**: Forming a loose, reticulate, integrated network with multiple linkages through travelers, overlapping membership, joint activities, common reading matter, and shared ideals and opponents. (2001, p. 290)

The SPIN model examines the complexity of social movements as organized chaos that consists of segmented polycentric integrated networks made up of unique collections of individuals that share similar beliefs and goals. Each aspect of the SPIN model can be illuminated through the animal rights movement.

*Segmentary*

The animal rights movement can be considered segmentary because of the multiplicity of groups that fall within the movement. The animal rights movement emerged as a few concerned individuals speaking out against the exploitation of animals. As time progressed the movement broke apart into specific groups that addressed particular industries. The animal rights movement today consists of organizations addressing singular issues like vivisection, factory farming, domestication of cats and dogs, anti-zoo organizations, and the fur industries. Despite the forms of the fission within the movement, when events of cruelty reach the forefront or key legislation is proposed, animal rights groups experience fusion under the assumption of the shared goal of animal liberation. The animal rights movement is not a homogenized group, but rather a diverse group of individuals who may find themselves compelled to speak out about a particular animal industry and preferring a particular rhetorical approach. For example, when Farm Sanctuary began discussing its hope to get a ballot initiative in California in 2008, PETA and HSUS joined the efforts. Proposition 2, which calls for the immediate
phase of (and ban in effect in 2015) of battery cages, veal crates, and gestation crates in California, was championed by these three large national organizations together.

Gerlach proposes that there is a process of segmentation effected by four contributing factors; Personal power, Preexisting cleavages, Competition, and Ideological differences. Personal power is the individual perception of their ability to effect change within a specific movement. The perceived level of impact an individual has instigates their desire to divide from the organization and create their own, while motivating them to recruit others to join. For example, in the animal rights movement activist, Ronnie Lee, became frustrated his perceived level of impact and created the Band of Mercy in 1971, which later became the Animal Liberation Front in 1976. His perceived personal power was low in the mainstream animal rights organizations and felt direct action would increase his personal power, thus he branched off and created an offshoot organization (Best, 2004, p. 20).

The second factor that leads to groups dividing or segmenting is preexisting cleavages. Preexisting cleavages refers to the socioeconomic differences among activists and the various walks of life activists come from. Mainstream social movement organizations are generally made up of individuals who fall onto a continuum of wealth, racial identities, and so on. The demographics of members within one organization can range dramatically, and this can pose a problem in coherent unification (Gerlach, 2001, p. 292). The history of the animal rights movement demonstrates this factor affecting segmentation. The under-representation of women in upper leadership roles created a divide among the RSPCA. There were/are many demographics that become marginalized in social movements. However gender became the most visible in the animal rights
movement. Beers (2006) discusses the gender issues that arose in the late 19th century. “…as large numbers of women joined the movement. Men, however, controlled most groups, and they relegated women to member, benefactor, or volunteer status. White and Appleton endured such discrimination firsthand; they neither shared the power with men nor received proper recognition for their efforts” (p. 53). The gender division of power was a reflection of the gender discrimination in society. Tired of discrimination and gender power struggles, White separated and created the Women’s Branch of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty towards Animals (WPSPCA) in 1869, and broke all ties with the mainstream PSPCA and created the Women’s Humane Society in 1897. The individuals that left the PSPCA to join the Women’s Humane Society were finally able to feel control over the administration, strategies, finances, and so on. Because they now had control over their own finances, they were able to be more aggressive towards funding and the specific agenda against diverse cruelty. After White’s separation from the PSPCA, many women led organizations began to emerge.

The third factor effecting segmentation is competition. A range of recognition and rewards are given to leaders and members of social movement organizations from within the movement and other social movements. Rewards vary from gaining recognition internally and externally via mass media, gaining monetary funds from wealthy organizations (foundations), and the personal feeling that their role is moving the movement forward. The access to these rewards through elected positions and receiving socially ascribed tasks often breed competition. The competition among members and leaders, particularly leaders, can have the following effects: “factions, realigns followers, and intensifies efforts to recruit new participants and broaden the base of support”
The competition among members and leaders in the animal rights movement is often used to describe the split between PETA co-founders, Newkirk and Pacheco. Several media sources described the split as one of bitter jealousy for Newkirk’s recognition and ability to gain front access to mass media outlets, while Pacheco was often placed in the proverbial backseat. As a result of this speculated competition, Pacheco left the organization and several members reevaluated their loyalty and left with Pacheco to work on independent ventures. Pacheco discusses an additional factor that impacted his split with PETA in the film, *I am an Animal: The Story of Ingrid Newkirk and PETA* (2007). Pacheco explains how he felt a clash with Newkirk over ideological issues such as level of desired change, methodology, and scope of intended audience.

According to Gerlach’s SPIN model, the fourth factor that effects segmentation is ideological differences. Ideological differences play an important role in the dividing and generation of social movement organizations as seen with Pacheco and PETA. Pacheco did not agree with the types of demonstrations Newkirk wanted to organize, and felt the organization’s ideology conflicted with his. The split between Pacheco and Newkirk with PETA arose because of a differences over ideology and methods of protest. Pacheco felt the organization was using tactics that posed a risk of blurring the goals, diverting attention off of the real issue, and replacing horrific realities of cruelty with humor and ridicule. Another example of segmentation due to ideological differences arose in the 1970-80’s among the animal advocacy movement. As the movement grew, the animal advocacy movement began experiencing divides among members over the level of opposition with the government. The animal welfare activists felt their actions should be
geared towards regulation within the existing system, whereas animal rights activists wanted to direct actions to changing the system itself rather than regulation. Members can disagree on ideological issues that ultimately led to a division in the organization and creation of a new organization. Gerlach sees segmentation as potentially positive or negative depending on how the movement addresses it. In the case of PETA, the divisions between Pacheco and Newkirk could have stalled the organization for years while they deal with their issues. It is impossible to gauge to what extent the split affected PETA because although the organization has grown immensely since then, there is no telling what could have been. Segmentation is an important component of social movements because it constantly keeps the movement’s constituency in flux, both positively and negatively.

The division and creation of social movement organizations constantly change the form and flow of the movement. The animal advocacy movement at large has seen dramatic splits and the generation of crucial organizations throughout history. The four factors affecting segmentation can take multiple forms and occur in conjunction with any of the other factors. The SPIN model incorporates the constant dividing and restructuring of social movements and the organizations that constitute them.

Polycentric

The second component of the SPIN model is Polycentric, which refers to the claim that social movements “…have many leaders or centers of leadership and that these many leaders are not ultimately directed or commanded through a chain of command under a central leader. The leaders, like the segments, are not organized in a hierarchy; they are “heterarchic”” (Gerlach, 2001, p. 294). The leadership within social movements is
claimed to be polycentric, inferring that there are multiple centers of leadership. The leadership in social movements, as described by the SPIN model, does not follow one vertical ladder of bureaucracy, but rather consists of charismatic individuals that inspire members. The figureheads of the movement take more of a symbolic leadership role rather than formal political and organizational roles. In the AR movement, figures such as Newkirk and Baur both hold the position of President of particular social movement organizations. The position does not place central leadership and authority with Newkirk and Baur, and in both social movement organizations the co-presidents have left their position, and also the organization in general. In specific circumstances, different leaders arise to deal with the challenges throughout the movement’s lifespan. The ever-changing roles and positions of leadership create a climate where leaders must constantly prove their ability to lead and defend their position to challengers. The element of change and negotiation is also seen here in the polycentric nature of social movements.

The wide range of members in each SMO provides a dynamic environment made up of diverse perspectives. At different times, it is necessary for different leadership types to stand up and lead. For example, when Baur and fellow activists arrived at the Lancaster Stockyard to video the gruesome conditions and barbaric abuse, the climate required a physically strong member to defend the investigation to the owner of the stockyard and local law officials. Baur had to shield his camera from the stockyard owner and stand up to law officials in order to keep the recorded footage. The activists that accompanied him recognized Baur as their leader and eager to follow his lead. This event marked a turning point for Baur’s role in the organization. He did not fold under pressure and put the movement goals above his own personal safety. Fellow activists noted Baur’s
strength and determination and he found himself as a symbolic leader for the AR movement at that moment (Baur, 2008, p. 23). The balancing act SMO leaders face is that of demonstrating strength and determination, yet flexibility and sensitivity. Baur could not become consumed in self-glorification or start rattling off orders, instead he had to remain the image of “just one of many.” Today, Baur shows up every day at work, at the New York sanctuary, wearing athletic shorts and old t-shirts. His office is no larger than anyone else’s, lacking any adornment that would indicate a hierarchy. Baur acknowledges that he is not the one and only leader, but that there are many departments and different individuals that have taken a leadership role throughout the history of the organization. It is this flexible and constantly changing role of leadership in social movement organizations that describes the polycentric component.

*Integrated Networks*

The third and final component of Gerlach’s SPIN model is that social movements and the movement’s organizations consist of integrated networks. The existence of many organizations under the umbrella animal *advocacy*, and more specific as to *rights* and *welfare*, does not imply that these organizations operate in isolation to one another. On the contrary, each organization within a particular movement is a part of an integrated network, “…through nonhierarchical social linkages among their participants and through the understandings, identities, and opponents these participants share” (Gerlach, 2001, p. 295). The consortium of animal organizations share a multiplicity of commonalities, ranging from interests, goals, backgrounds, political party membership, and so on. The variety of similarities that link members and organizations together contributes in positive ways to push the movement forward. Alliances between members and
organizations allow for information sharing, joint campaigns, and the ability to cross reference lists of potential activists and members. The organizations and members do not necessarily have to subscribe to the full agenda of the networked organizations. In many cases, they often can come together under common goals.

For example, the surge in popularity for veal, lean calf meat, and Foie Gras, fatty duck liver (a French delicacy derived from force feeding ducks through steep tubes directly into their livers), have led to a need for national and international campaigns from animal advocates. The campaigns that followed demonstrated how prevalent integrated networks are within social movements. Organizations such as PETA, Farm Sanctuary, and Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) joined forces for widely publicized boycotts, petitions, and legal efforts. Farm Sanctuary boasts of current results of the campaign on their website, and these include several veal producers announcing they are phasing out veal crates over the next ten years, and the ban of Foie Gras in the city of Chicago. Veal, the byproduct of the dairy industry, is the slaughtering either days old or 3-4 months old calves. In the context of this project, it is important to include the a discussion about veal, Foie Gras and the industries in which they are connected to.

In order to get milk from dairy cows, female cows are forced into pregnancy twice a year. Contrary to popular belief, female cows do not naturally produce milk naturally year round. Similar to all mammals, female cows only produce milk during pregnancy for their offspring. In order for humans, not the offspring of cows, to drink the cow’s milk, the cow’s offspring must not.

Dairy cows experience forced pregnancy twice a year, and are used for at maximum four years. After four intensive years of pregnancy, hormones, and extremely
high milk production, the dairy cow is “spent,” a term used in the industry that refers to the cow as “useless.” The dairy farmer only needs one female cow per year to replace its mother after it is slaughtered (spent dairy cows are slaughtered and often used for low grade meat in canned soup and boxed meals). All the rest of the dairy cow’s offspring is useless to the farmer. The male calves, because of the genetic altering of the mother, will never reach the weight average or be able to produce the same muscle mass as “meat” cows. Therefore veal becomes the byproduct of the dairy industry, the deep dark secret that the AR movement works to expose. The veal industry often goes undiscussed, and it is important to break down what constitutes this particular animal industry.

The two different types of veal are Bob Veal, which is cheaper and often used in lower price restaurants and most fine leather products. Bob Veal is made from the meat of a calf between 12-72 hours old. While I was at FS, Harold Brown, National Educator and AR activist, took the interns to a livestock auction. Details of the horrific experience will follow in later chapters. However, several points are relevant here. Dairy farmers brought their hours to day old calves to auction, all still had the umbilical cord attached and wet from birth. The calves were to be slaughtered either that afternoon or the next day, and were auctioned by the point. The calves were herded one by one into a small room filled with farmers. The farmers examined the calf with predatory eyes, stripping the young being of all humanity. The calf was hit with a wooden stick and forced to turn around three times. The farmers were able to assess the calf and bid per point, for example 50 cents a pound.

The second type of veal is crated veal. Crated Veal is also a type of meat from slaughtered calves. These calves are also taken from their mother only days old and sold
to veal farmers. Crated Veal means that the calves are put into crates for 3-4 months. Veal crates are 22” x 54”, which is not enough room for the calf to turn around. The calves are then chained to the cage by the neck in order to keep them from moving about so they remain lean without muscle. The calves are fed a diet extremely low in iron to keep them anemic, which keeps their flesh light pink. The Crated Veal industry’s products are well known as delicacies, a marker of high economic class. As a result of the growing popularity of Crated Veal, there is an increasing appearance of this type in many more restaurants and grocery stores. Both types of veal exist because there is a demand.

The third industry that the AR movement is running strong campaigns against is Foie Gras. Foie Gras was briefly described above, and is French for “fatty duck liver.” The Foie Gras industry has grown tremendously as it is linked, similar to veal, with high economic class. It has become a food served to show wealth, high stature, and often a rich palette. The production of Foie Gras entails placing ducks in tight captivity, and forcibly fed a mash multiple times a day. The ducks are placed in filthy crates and mechanically fed through a metal pipe. The ducks are forced into position and a metal tube shoots down their throat and shoves a mash (with absolutely no nutritional value) directly into their liver multiple times a day. The ducks quickly become overweight and their liver expands up to ten times its normal size. Many ducks die after one or two feedings because of the laceration of internal organs through the forced feedings, while others die from their liver exploding. For the ducks that do survive, on average, three weeks, they are then slaughtered. The AR movement attacks the Foie Gras industry for its extreme use of cruelty and disregard for the living creatures.
These campaigns, and the victories they experience are a direct result of the networks the organizations form. The results from integrated networks among movement organizations and members provide a powerful force, increasing numbers of funds, individuals, and information. Proposition 2 in California is a coalitional effort to ban crated veal, and the ban on Foie Gras in Chicago was a joint campaign funded by PETA, Farm Sanctuary, and HSUS. These issues are one of the places that the networks intersect within the movement.

Gerlach describes five categories of linkages that demonstrate how member participants are networked to members of other organizations. Member participants can be linked to others through personal relationships, either through being friends, married, neighbors, and so on. These relationships often supercede the movement organizations even after groups divide the relationships tend to continue. It is important to link participants to one another within the organization, and among several organizations under the same movement. As a rhetorical strategy, linking members of different organizations together and assisting in creating personal relationship helps generate cross membership, thus serves as a recruiting strategy. I have met many individuals that are active in various animal advocacy organizations across the world. It has provided me with insight and support throughout my experience as an activist. One particular example illuminates how personal relationships serve to link social movement organizations. I was invited to attend a Mercy for Animals lecture on the egg industry in 2005 in Cincinnati through the social networking site Facebook. Mercy for Animals uses a filter that screens profiles for words such as vegan, vegetarian, or any reference to the animal industry. I attended the meeting not knowing anyone there. One of the members, whom I later found
out was the head of the Cincinnati division of Mercy for Animals, approached me and started a conversation. She began asking questions about my diet, lifestyle, and history in the movement. We had a lot in common and she asked for my email to keep in touch. I was glad to pass it out and make a vegan friend in Cincinnati, as they seem to be somewhat rare. She sent an email within the next few days asking me to attend a rally with her against the fur coat industry. She and I engaged in several demonstrations and formed a close bond. Interestingly, she split with Mercy for Animals a few months later and I thought we would not talk as much because we no longer were in the same group. Within two weeks, she emailed me asking me to attend a rally held by PETA in Chicago. That was the first event I attended with PETA. We had created a close relationship through Mercy for Animals, yet it transcended the organization and we remained friends because of our interpersonal connection.

The second category of linkages is *traveling evangelists and other visitors*, which help create links within the movement network. These individuals travel to various organizations, activists, and publics to advocate their organization and recruit members. These individuals try to educate individuals on the movement itself and what particular organizations are doing. The role serves to recruit, raise funds, educate, and mobilize activists (Gerlach, 2001, p. 296). I have encountered many *traveling evangelists* leaving concerts, as the audience is generally more environmentally conscious and sensitive to animal issues. These individuals either set up a booth or even stand there with a stack of leaflets and pass them out to people. In some cases, when Farm Sanctuary heard that another animal *advocacy* organization was doing a demonstration or holding a public event, they would send representatives to also promote Farm Sanctuary. The mobility of
these activists helps to gain national recognition and support, and in some cases international.

The outlets in which a *traveling evangelist* may utilize leads to the third category of linkages, *large gatherings*. The use of large public space to discuss issues and engage in action is very important to linking members and activists within the movement. The gatherings allow for ideas to be shared, workshops run to strengthen a wide range of skills, and strong physical presences in demonstrations. Local groups are able to step up and showcase their links to national organizations as they recruit members to attend the conference, convention, workshop, or public demonstration. The link adds credibility and notoriety to local organizations that often go overlooked by the national media and movement at large (Gerlach, 2001, p. 297). Each year animal *rights* activists’ come together for the National Animal Rights Annual Conference that is held in different locations each year. The conference has gained national media attention in addition to the host location’s media coverage. Activists often engage in several public demonstrations and leaflet around the host town. The conference allows for ideas to be shared, spirits lifted with the camaraderie of shared goals, and (re)invigorating activists to the calls of the movement.

The fourth category of linkages of *communications technologies*. There is a wide range of technological tools at the disposal of society today. Social movements have become savvy to these technologies and begun utilizing them to generate strong networks. Gerlach describes communication technologies as “…telephone, radio, television talk shows, letters, newsletters, and membership magazines,” (2001, p. 297) that aid the scope an organization can reach to extend far beyond their own. The ability
for an organization to reach thousands beyond its own membership is increased through these tools. For example, Farm Sanctuary sends out a bimonthly newsletter to members. The newsletter is free, thus encouraging anyone to sign up to receive it, and contains a variety of articles. The newsletters provides an opportunity for Farm Sanctuary to highlight recent additions to the farm, such as the new calf they rescued, Maxine, in September 2007, along with pleas for specific donations. The newsletter reaches a national audience because it is often placed in public spaces. For example, Clifton Natural Foods in Cincinnati agreed to display the newsletter as well as Natural Life in Cincinnati. The newsletter then can be read by a variety of individuals who may become members.

The fourth category of linkages is the web. The flexibility and ease of communication gained new strength through the internet. Organizations could hold conferences through the internet and share ideas in an informal, transnational arena. The movement organizations gained new weight with the advent of the web site. Organizations could share their goals, actions, and ideas without physically being present or the human work of phone calls and leafleting (Gerlach, 2001, p. 298). The linkages between the environmental movement and the animal advocacy movement strengthened over the new paper-saving tool to spread the world about the organizations. The recruitment of me to the Mercy for Animals egg seminar would (probably) not have been possible without the internet. Social networking sites such as Facebook create a space in which individuals can get together and discuss issues, become informed about upcoming events, and potentially recruit members to various movement organizations. The ways in which these various linkages: personal relationships, traveling evangelists, gatherings,
communication technologies, and the web: are held together among individuals and organizations is through integrating factors.

The way in which individuals are integrated, rather than networked, rely on shared ideologies and opposition. The activists, regardless of specific organization membership, share the same broad opposition. The stronger the opposition becomes, or appears, helps solidify relationships among the movement organizations (Gerlach, 2001, p. 298). For example, the strong financial and legal alliance among the beef industry worked to bring together movement organizations under the feeling of “us versus them.” The beef industry has such a powerful bank account, especially when Farm Sanctuary was going up against it in various campaigns. The result was the alliance between HSUS and PETA with Farm Sanctuary against the beef industry. Regardless of organization-specific politics, these three animal advocacy organizations were up against the same opposition, the beef industry. The idea of the underdog helps motivate organizations that may not normally ally with another organization because they both ultimately are battling the same force. Although animal rights organizations and animal welfare organizations do not necessarily agree on agendas and methodology, they both are against animal cruelty. The recognition that both movement segments are often battling the same opposition has led to the temporary uniting of several organizations. The example of PETA, HSUS, and Farm Sanctuary uniting against the beef industry demonstrates the second integrating factor, shared ideology.

Each social movement is made up of movement organizations that fall onto a continuum of shared ideology. The animal rights movement demonstrates the continuum of shared ideology and the way in which this integrates the organizations. Members of a
particular movement organization may feel strongly about one issue and yet feel impassioned about another. For example, several animal rights activists are active in movement organizations that fight against the animal industry for food, yet do not actively address animal industries for clothing (leather, wool, silk). Members of a particular movement organization may feel disconnected with other organizations because they are not active in the same animal rights issues. However, as a core belief, an animal rights activist must adhere to the ideology that animals deserve autonomous status and should not be used in any industry for human consumption. So regardless of where the activist falls on the continuum, they still share the same underlying ideology. This helps to align a range of groups within a movement together, and sustain the interrelated value in each organization.

Conclusions

Stewart, et. al.’s Life cycle model contributed a great deal to the understanding of social movements. The Life cycle model offered a clear definition and essential characteristics that define a social movement. The Life cycle model also posited five phases that social movements endure during their lifetime. The model, however, did not get at the complicated relationships between social movement organizations, and the fusion and fission the organizations experienced. Gerlach introduced the SPIN Model to account for and explain the ways in which movement organizations divide and fuse while sharing similar movement goals. These two models, the Lifecycle and SPIN, are relatively prevalent in social movement theory discourse. Stewart, et. al. is recognized as providing one of the foregrounding social movement theories, and Gerlach for coining the SPIN Model. A lesser-known social movement theorist, Bill Moyer, provided a
model that expands our understandings of social movements. After years working as an activist with the civil rights movement, anti-nuclear, and anti-war movements, Moyer created the MAP Model as an activist toolkit. Moyer argues that his theory is unique to traditional social movement theories because the focus is on changing minds and hearts of society rather than just focusing on the institutions, corporations, and government (Moyer, 2001, p. 3). The MAP Model remains relatively un-discussed in academic literature. Once I was introduced to the theory at Farm Sanctuary, I began conducting internet searches to see if Moyer was cited in any academic articles within the University of Cincinnati’s academic article database. The search returned zero results. I began searching all databases to see if Moyer or the MAP Model was discussed at all within academia, and was frustrated to learn both were not. The next chapter offers Moyer and the MAP Model a space within academia and uses the animal rights movement to illustrate its application.
Chapter 3: Bringing Moyer to the Mainstream

Introduction

The Movement Action Plan created by Bill Moyer was a direct response to social movement members feeling burned out, useless, and frustrated with the lack of perceived success. Moyer argues the MAP Model provides activists “[a] way to picture themselves somewhere on the eight stage continuum, Rather than feel like a failure, people are able to see where they fall on the line” (Moyer, 2001, p. 5). Moyer, a social activist himself in the anti-nuclear and civil rights movements, believed social movements are needed to address the many big problems facing society. He claims that change cannot come from the powerholders themselves and other established institutions because of their vested interests, and that many policies and programs they have created perpetuate the problems themselves. He described the climate of social movements to be ripe, given that the size of social movements has doubled since the 1970’s, and they have been rapidly expanded since then.

In his own activism, he had seen people drop out from being disheartened and burnt out. The book and MAP Model were written as direct responses to this with the goal that activists would become more effective agents of social change, and they would be able to make their movement more successful. Having both practical and theoretical experience, Moyer wanted to empower the disenfranchised activists who have experienced a hard time implementing necessary social change. He describes the link he hoped to make between theory and practice:
We hope that academicians from various social science disciplines will relate MAP to traditional theories and use this model to further refine their thinking about how social movements work. By understanding the practice of social movements, theorists and scholars can contribute additional insight into how societies change (Moyer, 2001, p. 8).

The excerpt demonstrates his desire to provide a framework accessible and useful for both theory and practice. Through his experiences with social movements, he feels that the gap between theory and practice is a strong area in need of work. He goes on to defend the position social movements hold in society and reiterate the strong moral ground in which they are founded.

Moyer places strong emphasis on the importance of social movements. He describes the necessity they have in society and the place they have in society. In a strong defense, he claims:

Social movements are at the center of society. They are not exceptional or rare protest events on society’s fringe, and their activists are not antisocial rebels. Quite the contrary, progressive nonviolent social movements are crucial to the ongoing process as society evolves and redefines itself. (Moyer, 2001, p. 11)

This definition of social movements is similar to both the Lifecycle and the SPIN Model. Social movements, according to all three models (Lifecycle, SPIN, and MAP) position themselves in the center of society and essential to society. Moyer talks about the foundations of social movements as being both nonviolent and based on universal values widely held in society. Because the social movement bases its foundational beliefs on those widely held values that are at the center of society, social movements themselves
are located in the center as well. Moyer’s emphasis on nonviolence and positioning the movement in the center of society differs from Cathcart (1978) who stresses that movements must experience confrontation in order to be considered a social movement (p. 233). The emphasis Moyer makes is on the nonviolent component. Moyer strongly believes nonviolence is the optimal way to bring about true change. Moyer references Gandhi and King as examples because they based their activism on universal values and principles that are timeless, such as compassion, cooperation, and love.

Nonviolent social movements are truly inclusive because everyone is able to participate. Those social movements that enact more militaristic or violent methods will exclude those that are less physically mobile. For example, the ALF requires activists to be able-bodied enough to get into a laboratory, carry the animals out, and get away quickly. This type of activism isolates those whom are elderly, sick, or physically disabled in some way. Moyer believes that nonviolent social movements are the most effective. However he does not seem to claim that if an organization is violent that they are not part of a social movement at all. The power a social movement holds is based on its capability to rally the masses around a particular moral struggle where people take back their consent to be controlled in some way by the current government and those in power. For example, employees of Kentucky Fried Chicken may have been frustrated after reading an article or learning about a campaign run by PETA called Kentucky Fried Cruelty. The employees may become so frustrated that they start placing the campaign materials at the store. The employees feel so frustrated simply with the deception perpetrated by the powerholder that they try to expose the company on their own. They also begin a blog about it online and openly discuss their feelings and the things they
have learned from PETA and other social movement organizations. The employee is using education, a good strategy, to reach a good end.

Power Models

Nonviolence also redirects the strengths of the powerholders to the movement’s benefit by framing the social movement as the moral presence in an immoral situation created by the powerholders. This is called moral jujitsu. The strengths of the social movement and the powerholders is based on the power they posses. Moyer discusses two contrasting models of power. Power can be conceptualized as a two-prong model, where each of the prongs contrast one another and do not intersect. The first model is the Power Elite Model, which follows a triangular hierarchy where the powerful elites are at the top and the general population is situated at the bottom with relatively no power. The powerful elites serve their own interests, which involve the state, institutions, laws, and myths, traditions, and social norms. Moyer includes a visual of the Power Elite Model on page 13:

![Power Elite Model Diagram]
The Power Elite Model is a more traditional way of viewing democracy. Because democracy involves a competition between societal elites, voting becomes the primary and sometimes the sole way society at large is assumed to engage. The only right or involvement the general public has to the economic system is the option to buy or not. But, the limited avenues of access to various goods constrict this “option”. The primary target of this model is the powerholders, whom the movement tries to persuade to change their actions. Under this model of power, the Professional Opposition Organizations (POOs) take center stage as the mobilized type of social movement organization. The POOs fall into the people part of the Power Elite Model. The POOs go out of their way to meet with the powerholders, and thus spend a great deal of time in government halls and at the corporation’s headquarters. This model places a great emphasis on the powerholders, and the social movements are thus expected to accommodate the powerholders while trying to persuade them to change.

The second model of power places the emphasis on the citizens rather than the powerholders. The model is called the People Power Model and can be imagined as an inverse triangle with the people at the top and the powerholders at the bottom. In this model, all the power the powerholders can obtain is contingent on the cooperation, consent, and implicit support from the majority of mass populace. Many social movements idealize their own organizations on this model, and do so to empower the people to understand they have the power to create social change. The People Power Model adopted from Moyer (2001, p. 14) is on the following page:
Moyer argues the current model of power is the Power Elite Model, and the ideal social change agents should aspire to is implementing and modeling social movement organizations after the People Power Model. Assuming society follows the Power Elite Models, there is a great deal of disconnect between the powerholders and the citizens. With this disconnect, there is a lot of room for deception and misrepresentation. The people must challenge the currently accepting Power Elite Model and be empowered through the conceptualization of power as truly lying with the people. Social movements must seek to change the widespread acceptance of the Power Elite Model and gain support by showing the discrepancies and manipulation the powerholders perpetrate under this model.

The idea that the powerholders act with full consideration for the general populace and that they act in line with societal ideals is simply not true. Under the Power Elite Model, a great deal of society’s benefits only reach the elites, and the deficits are then distributed to the majority of the population at the bottom of the triangle. However, in order to keep the powerholders in their position, they must keep these actual policies
concealed from the majority. The powerholders lie and conceal this through a two-track system:

1. Social Myths (S.M.) versus Societal Secrets (S.S)

2. Official Policies and practices (O.P.P.) versus actual policies and practices (A.P.P)

Social myths are the slogans, beliefs, and principles that the powerholders employ to excuse their self-serving attitudes and agendas. Examples of S.M.’s in society are the usage of works like freedom and democracy. The opposite of S.M.’s are social secrets. The social secrets are congruent with the actual ideology that distributes most of the political and economic power and benefits to the elites while the mass populace and environment are faced with the majority of the deficits and inequities.

For example, the milk industry has a dirty little secret it tries to conceal from the public. Rather than describe the process in the dairy industry in which cows are forcibly impregnated and their offspring slaughtered, and then the cow mechanically milked several times a day, the dairy industry has come up with a narrative. The S.M. is the notion that cows have to be milked all the time or else they are in pain. This myth allows the dairy industry to get away with extreme cruelty and completely hides the excruciating pain with the illness directly linked to the dairy industry, mastitis. The S.S. is that female cows, the same as humans and all mammals, only produce milk for the offspring to drink after birth, and if the infant dies or refuses to drink the mother’s milk it will dry up. The perpetuation of this S.M. allows the dairy industry to get away with such cruelty. Farm Sanctuary discusses the dairy myth in their campaign “The Truth About” on their
website. Official policies and practices operate similarly to S.M.’s and S.S., where the public is deceived through the concealing of the powerholders.

O.P.P.’s refer to the publicly claimed policies of the powerholders that are consistent with the values of the S.M.’s. A.P.P.’s are what the powerholders are actually doing, and it falls in line with the S.S.’s the powerholders purport. For example, after speculation and evidence that “downed” animals are more likely to carry Mad Cow’s Disease, the meat industry responded with the O.P.P. that “downed” would not be used in food production. This O.P.P. goes with the S.M. that animals too sick should be euthanized and are too sick to get into human food. However, investigative footage captured by activists at the Westland/Hallmark Meat Packing Inc. plant showed that the A.P.P. within the industry had been to drag, beat, and force sick animals to stand. Even when the animals could not stand, footage showed forklifts carrying the sick animals into the slaughterhouse to be used for human food. This A.P.P. was one of the S.S. of the industry.

The social movement’s two main tasks are to expose the disconnect between the societal myths and the secrets that powerholders keep, and what the powerholders are claiming to do and what it is actually doing. For example, Farm Sanctuary created the Behind the Mustache campaign that looked very similar to the Body By Milk campaign by the milk industry (www.bodybymilk.com). The Body By Milk ad relies on the myth that cow’s milk is good for humans, and even necessary to have a healthy diet. Behind the Mustache counters these messages with the reality that cow’s milk is necessary in a healthy diet, and that the vitamins found in milk are found in higher numbers in many other natural food products.
This exposes that the S.M. that milk is healthy and necessary is false and used to benefit the dairy industry, and the dairy keeps these nutrition facts part of their S.S.’s. The Behind the Mustache campaign exposed the cruel conditions in which dairy cows live, the reality that cows do not need to be milked, and the relationship between milk and veal calves. In this way, Farm Sanctuary is showing that the O.P.P.’s do not line up with the A.P.P.’s. The social movement organizations each play different roles, and use the appropriate strategies and tactics to address these tasks. One type of tactic is education and advocacy, which can be used by any of the four roles.

Four roles of movement organizations

There are two main components to Moyer’s MAP Model: the eight stages and the four roles movement organizations play. Moyer believes social movements go through stages throughout their lifetime, and at any time the stages can be stunted or the movement can regress to earlier stages. The four roles of social movement organizations and their members’ play are central to Moyer’s model. Although the model sets out four distinct roles, Moyer argues that social movements must be able to play each role at various times in order to be successful in implementing change. Each of the roles plays a unique part in the movement, “Each role has different purposes, styles, skills, and needs and can be played effectively and ineffectively” (Moyer 2001 p. 21). The MAP Model describes the unique attributes of each role. However, Moyer stresses the necessary qualities that all the social movement organizations must meet. The most fundamental attribute the movement must demonstrate is that the activists, and social movement as a whole, are responsible citizens deserving of respect. As the activist demonstrates their
ability to be a good citizen, slowly the public will give the activist more respect and accept the movement in which they belong. When the majority of citizens are in support of the social movement, change is on the horizon. In order to be viewed as a good citizen, the activist shows outward support for the fundamental beliefs, values, and symbols relevant to a “good society.” In addition, the activist must clearly denounce the social conditions and institutional policies that go against these fundamental values of society. As the social movement exposes the powerholders’ A.P.P. and S.S., the movement frames itself as falling inline with society’s idea of O.P.P. and S.M. The movement juxtaposes the manipulation and deceit of the powerholders with its (the movement’s) good intentions and practices.

In addition to being good citizens, the activists and organizations must fulfill the role of the change agents, who focus on getting the public involved through education and organizing to join in solidarity against the current policies in which the movement is addressing. In response to the conditions in which the change agents are speaking out against, the activists must pose positive alternatives to create and implement the change. It is also necessary for the social movement to enact the role of the reformer by using official channels in terms of political and judicial to bring about changes into new laws and practices for individuals and powerholders. Finally, the rebel is important in bringing the issues on the social agenda and getting the public to respond to the inequities of the powerholders and official institutions. Despite the importance of being able to play each of the four roles, it is important to clarify the effective and ineffective ways to play each of the roles. If all of the roles are enacted effectively, it reduces antagonism among various organizations within the movement and among members within the
organizations, and induces cooperation amongst the various groups and allows the activists to work in tandem.

The citizen role

The *citizen* is the most visual representation of the deeply held values and principles of society. As an advocate for the basic values, the *citizen* advocates to the public that the real source of legitimate power comes from the actual citizens rather than interest groups that are merely self-interested or powerholders, which includes institutional, political, and economic powerholders. Because of the way the *citizen* aligns themselves with the core values of society, the *citizen* is viewed as being in the center of society, nowhere near the fringe. A common rhetorical line of the powerholders, in attempt to disenfranchise social movements, is to claim that the movement is on the fringe or so against fundamental values it is “un-American.” Thus, the close alignment with these core values and mainstream society, the weaker this claim from the powerholders is. Those closely associated with *citizen* organizations include entertainers, educators, scientists, and various religious groups. These groups can often be the very groups that turn away from social movements, and thus enlisting the support from token leaders helps secure those individuals who would otherwise be skittish. The two most well-know activists associated with the *citizen* is Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela. These activists demonstrated their commitment to societal principles strongly and made it a cornerstone to their activism as nonviolent civil disobedience. The *citizen* is the embodiment of S.M.s and tries to display how using those myths such as freedom, democracy, and compassion will combat the secrets and deception of the powerholders.

Moyer discusses the four essential things a *citizen* activist does:
1. Advocate and demonstrate widely held visions of the Democratic Good Society.

2. Give the movement legitimacy in the eyes of the ordinary citizens.

3. Enable the movement to withstand efforts by powerholders to discredit it.

4. Reduce the potential for violent attitudes and actions within the movement”


The citizen is a cornerstone to nonviolent civil disobedience and is a constant reminder that the core values of society are relevant and necessary to demonstrate how the powerholders exemplify the opposite of them.

The rebel role

The rebel is very different from the citizen, although the roles do have some similarities. Instead of using official channels that the reformer would use, the rebel uses methods that fall outside the typical political channels, including nonviolent direct action; educating the general populace which takes form as either marches, rallies, pamphlet distribution; and/or organizing and gaining signatures for a petition. During these nonviolent direct action events, the rebel uses their own body as a rhetorical and physical tool. The human body becomes an instrument at direct disposal to the rebel, as their body can serve as a barricade, physical embodiment of oppression, and deterrent that keeps the powerholders from destroying something from the natural environment. For example, PETA enacts several the rebel role when it has activists go naked in New York City and around the world proclaiming, “I’d rather go naked than wear fur” (http://blog.peta.org/archives/fur/). The article talks about how PETA is proud of its activists around the globe for using their bodies to make a statement against the fur industry. This campaign got a lot of attention from the media because of the use of
human bodies as a rhetorical tool. Because of the media attention usually given to nonviolent direct action, it tends to be the first recognized to be publicly challenging the status quo. Moyer quotes Martin Luther King, Jr., when defending nonviolent direct action as a tool that gets the public’s attention and forces them to reevaluate current practices: “Martin Luther King said nonviolent direct action produces ‘creative tensions’ by directing the public’s focus to the gap between ‘what is’ and ‘what should be’” (2001, p. 24). In this quote, the ‘what is’ refers to S.S. and ‘what should be’ refers to S.M. The rebel helps bring these questions into consciousness and catapult the social movement into the public’s agenda and gain media attention.

The role of the rebel is filled with excitement, although at times danger as well, thus activists must weigh if they are able to give the required commitment, bravery, and time required. Commitment is very important because there are big risks involved in engaging in nonviolent direct action. For example, those activists that engaged in the PETA campaign against the fur industry were ridiculed, threatened with violence from onlookers. Some were taken to jail for not removing themselves, and after public exposure some even lost their job. The other effects that can come from partaking in the rebel role involve becoming burned out and even losing one’s life. The role of the rebel involves great risks, but has the potential to spring the movement towards great success. Because the rebel confronts the institutions that hold power, they find themselves at the center of movement action and gain a ton of public attention. The rebel is most often found during the “take-off” stage in Moyer’s eight-stage model. Later I will discuss the various stages within the conceptualization of the MAP Model. In sum, the rebel plays six important roles:
1. Put issues on society’s social agenda through dramatic, nonviolent actions.

2. Put issues on the political agenda.

3. Show how institutions and official powerholders violate the public trust by causing and perpetuating critical social problems.

4. Force society to face its problems.

5. Represent society’s democratic and moral vanguard.


*The change agent role*

The *change agent* comes into play mainly after the movement has gained the majority opinion, similar to the way in which the *rebel* comes into play mainly during the “take-off” stage of a movement. The *change agents* work towards empowering the activists and are less visible while they get others to organize and motivated to partake in the democratic process. The goals of the *change agent* are to create a process in which the public is engaged openly, publicly, and through democratic means to address the S.S.s and resolve the social problems. The *change agent* does not make claims of having absolute truths about the world or even the social problems at hand. Instead, the *change agent* emphasizes that they have relative truths that help understand the context in which they are operating. The *change agent* works to mobilize and organize the public and help create a form where they can share their unique opinions about the social problem/s. The idea is to foster as many opinions as possible and to include them in the resolution so that the proposed solution does not marginalize anyone’s voice in particular. The *change agent* is trying to reconfigure the way in which society addresses problems, and is pushing for a shift of paradigm. In addition to focusing on reforming the problem/s at
hand, the *change agent* insists that the problem/s is part of a much larger picture. In that way, true change can only come about after society has addressed the ideologies in which allowed for such problems (Moyer, 2001, p. 24).

In order to illuminate the problems at hand, the *change agent* emphasizes the symptoms of a specific problem to educate the public and endorse changing the underlying worldview that has created and perpetuated the problem. For example, Farm Sanctuary points to the health issues, cruelty cases, and environmental demise to highlight the many problems with the use of animals in human industries. Rather than saying battery cages are the problem, a *change agent* would use battery cages as a symptom to emphasize the overarching issues related to animal domination and exploitation. Moyer lays out 9 roles the *change agent* plays:

1. Promote citizen-based democracy.
2. Support the involvement of large numbers of people in the process of addressing a specific social problem.
3. Redefine the problem to show how it affects ever sector of society.
4. Promote a new social and political majority consensus favoring positive solutions.
5. Promote democratic principles and human values in an “open system” (that is a system that is organized by citizens themselves without being controlled by elite powerholders in the closed system of an oppressive hierarchy).
6. Develop the majority movement.
7. Support the development of coalitions.
8. Counter the actions of the powerholders.
9. Move society from reform to social change by promoting a paradigm shift (Moyer, 2001, p. 25).

The change agent is the mobilizing and organizing component of the social movement, bringing together all the sub-movements, and emphasizing participation and an ideological shift.

The reformer role

The reformer works to convert the majority’s acceptance of alternatives into new laws and policies that reflect this change. Moyer says, “It is not enough to convince and involve the majority of citizens to oppose specific social conditions and advocate alternatives. Reformers must then convert the acceptance of alternatives into new laws, polices, and practices of society’s appropriate political, legal social, and economic institutions” (2001 p. 26). The reformer turns the message from the mobilized majority into legislative efforts to reform the current policies and practices. The reformer might turn to political campaigns, lawsuits, forming committee hearings, and initiating petitions that use, “official judicial, legislative, political, and other institutional channels” (Moyer, 2001, p. 26). The reformer is the liaison between the social movement and, “mainstream legal, political, economic, and legislative institutions and powerholders” (Moyer, 2001, p. 26). The type of social movement organization that takes center stage in the reformer’s role is the P.O.O.’s (Professional Opposition Organizations) with a staff of paid employees, boards, large budgets, and even executive directors that hold a lot of power. P.O.O.’s mirror the structure of corporations and do not seem to directly break free from the Power Elite Model. The work within the movement is clearly divided amongst the activists, leaving the upper level employees to run various programs and the grassroots
activist offer up the mass political clout necessary to bring about the reforms. The 
*reformer* activist alone has little innate power, but when seen as part of the collective of grassroots and P.O.O., the *reformer* becomes a key part of a powerful entity. The five roles of the *reformer* include:

1. Transmit movement analyses and goals to powerholder institutions and individuals.
2. Perform parliamentary and legal efforts, including lobbying, referenda, lawsuits, and so on.
3. Act as a watchdog to ensure the new laws and policies are actually funded and carried out.
4. Mobilize movement opposition to conservative backlash efforts.
5. Nurture and support grassroots activists (Moyer, 2001, p. 27).

Though Moyer insists that organizations within the movement should be able to play each of the roles, he acknowledges this does not always occur.

**Barriers to playing all of the roles**

He describes the barriers to playing the four roles effectively. The ways in which Moyer accounts for segmentation and diffusion among movement organizations is similar to Gerlach’s SPIN Model. Moyer looks at ideology as one of the main barriers that keep movement organizations from working together. The primary barrier is the assumption that because each role satisfies different needs and thus requires different ways of doing things and styles, the roles conflict one another. This barrier plays out in various ways. One example involves PETA and Farm Sanctuary. Because of their different approaches towards activism, at times they do not work in tandem with one another. Farm Sanctuary
may feel that PETA is hindering its potential to reach success because of its different activities. Thus, open dialogue between various movement organizations would address this barrier and help induce cooperation. Another way this barrier plays out is between the reformer and the change agent and rebel. The reformer, who utilizes official channels, makes concessions on the demands their reformer organization is making of the powerholders. This compromise is received disingenuous in the eyes of the rebel and change agent, for whom the goals and demands of the movement cannot be compromised to satisfy the powerholders. For example, there is much outcry from animal rights activists about the compromises made by the HSUS. In particular, one online article speaks in rage about the ways in which Wayne Pacelle, President and CEO of the HSUS, has allowed for his organization and a part of the movement to be co-opted by the powerholders. In the article, Best (2008) describes the betrayal of Pacelle and how HSUS has been turned into a corporation:

> For bureaucratic monoliths like HSUS, a transnational corporation, the financial priorities lie in paying lavish CEO salaries (Pacelle’s annual salary tops $300,000), maintaining costly branches and staff throughout the world, perpetuating fundraising efforts (often absorbing as much as 53% of HSUS’ budget), funding lobbyists, building bank accounts, and inflating investment portfolios (p. 1).

The quote demonstrates how, based on styles, behaviors, and activities, the various roles may seem to act in competition or conflict with one another. Best denounces the type of activism undertaken by HSUS, and attacks the reformer type of concessions made in order to bring about legislative change. In this regard, Best believes that his particular
type of activism, direct action, is the most effective and has immediate results. The barrier, in this case, is the ideology of corporations and how Best believes HSUS accurately represents a transnational corporation.

The differences the various roles can lead the movement organization to view their organization as fitting to only one or two of the roles. As a result, each organization believes their role is the central, most important role in the movement at large. Similar to Simons (1970) on movement leadership, the demarcation of roles leads to negative and condescending views about other roles as naïve, uneducated on the issues, rhetorically ineffective, and even a diabolic opposition. The opposing side of Best’s argument demonstrates that the tension between the various roles leads to negative backlash within the movement and silences any opportunities for coalitions. Best is specifically angered by the ways in which Pacelle works with the powerholders to find and arrest those committing direct acts. Best places Pacelle on the same side as the powerholders by claiming he operates HSUS more similarly to a corporation rather than social movement organization. Particularly, Best points out that HSUS supports “cage-free” eggs and “humane” meat as viable options. As a concession to the movement goals, Best views this as a hypocritical move and renames HSUS the “Hypocrisy Society of the United States,” saying it should be referred to as “H$US$” because of the financial incentives and profiteering of Pacelle. The conflicts are important when analyzing the barriers within social movements and trying to move forward.

In contrast to the above example, Moyer focuses heavily on the notion of coalition building and constantly keeping open communication among movement organizations. He believes all four roles can be played effectively the various movement organizations
at various times. There is a rhetorical benefit for educating movement organizations about the four roles and how to perform each role. There is great coalition potential that can arise from educating the public, and specifically the social movement organizations, on the MAP Model and how to employ it. Moyer describes this importance: “Dissension between those playing different roles heightens competition and reduces the movement’s power and effectiveness…cooperation and mutual support will enhance the movement’s likelihood of success” (Moyer, 2001, p. 27). The SPIN Model would agree and disagree with this position. The SPIN Model would agree that working together does allow for the most progress for the movement. However, the SPIN Model views segmentation as inevitable for the movement. The MAP Model and SPIN Model both account for competition among movement organizations, but the MAP Model argues this competition can only have negative effects. Moyer believes the movement’s ability to reach larger audiences increases when the organizations work together to set cohesive goals. The emphasis in Moyer’s model is that each role can be played effectively and ineffectively. The following chart is provided by Moyer (2001) to demonstrate how he determines effective from ineffective.
The model sets up a way to visualize how to enact each role effectively and ineffectively. Earlier in the chapter, I described the effective ways to enact each role and the goals each role has. The ineffective citizen believes the powerholders and institutions to be acting with the best interests of society, blind or naïve to the true allegiances powerholders have with elite groups and honor those allegiances at the expense of the general citizenry. Because of all these recurring narratives (S.M.s) about the United States being so wonderful, the citizen becomes ineffective when those narratives surmount their ability to be critical. The rebel, on the other hand, faces the opposite challenge. Rather than giving the powerholders too much faith, the ineffective rebel is swept away with anger and frustration towards the powerholders. They develop and direct defiant behaviors and attitudes that are anti-authoritarian towards the powerholders. This can take form in a militant protest that operates on the mindset of “any means necessary.” The ineffective rebel invokes such aggressive behaviors that their consideration for how their behaviors will impact others is diminished. As a result, their militant, abrasive actions can be closely linked to the oppressive beliefs and actions of the powerholders themselves. The contrast between the ineffective citizen, who is disillusioned with the manipulation and deceit of the powerholders, and the ineffective rebel, who overexerts militant behavior to a hyper-evil image of the powerholders demonstrates the continuum of activism (including ineffective activism) in Moyer’s framework.

The change agent and rebel also have ineffective models. The change agent also walks a thin line between being effective and ineffective under Moyer’s conceptualization. The change agent is effective when it insists the larger societal
structures and systems must be interrogated rather than just demanding some behaviors be altered. However, once the *change agent* adopts a notion of reform and focuses on short-term goals that are inconsistent with the long term, the *change agent* is no longer effective. For example, an animal advocacy organization is ineffective in reaching the goals of animal liberation if it solely asks its members to give up red meat rather than examine the ideological shift necessary to liberate all animals. On the flip side, the *change agent* can also be ineffective if it pushes for utopian concepts without putting in the labor to organize the grassroots necessary of achieving that goal. For example, the new surge in “going green” as a new pop culture component, where everyone puts in their two cents about how they are “going green.” However, this movement does not have a cohesive plan and instead organizations (and individuals) collect millions of dollars while the environment still suffers. It is important for the *change agent* to balance the risks of either going astray from the movement goals and picking up a reformist perspective and getting too idealistic without having the grassroots to support the ideals.

The *reformer*, on the other hand, has to toggle with the POO’s. The majority of *reformer* organizations are structured with offices at the regional and national level. The POO’s run the risk of adopting the same Power Elite Model of the powerholders, reflecting the corporations more closely than the movement organizations. The organization needs to always take precedence over external politics. The institutions and powerholders work hard to dismantle the movement by putting up small reforms at the turning point when the movement reaches agreement with the majority that there is a problem. For example, the majority of the public in California reached a consensus that gestation crates, veal crates, and battery cages are cruel and unnecessary. The industry
caught on to this shift and began to respond. Farm Sanctuary announced the upcoming issues that would be placed on the statewide ballot in the Fall of 2008 that would abolish the use of veal and gestation crates, and battery cages. As a response, the industry quickly reacted as the largest pork producers in the United States (located in California) revealed they had plans to “phase out” gestation crates within the next 10 years. This was an effort to get the reformer organizations to say “Oh, Okay. Then we don’t need to pursue our campaign that would require it sooner.” The reformer is ineffective when they begin to buy into this and make deals with the industry. The grassroots activists were adamant not to, and there was an ongoing discussion between those “high up” in the POO’s in the animal advocacy movement about the proper course. For the reformer to stay effective, they must constantly tear down barriers between the POO’s and the grassroots efforts, and instead empower the grassroots activists as the heart and soul of the movement.

Similar to the SPIN Model, the MAP Model asserts that each role toggles between effective and ineffective in their own ways. It is important not only to play each of the roles effectively and interchangeably, but also to constantly work with the other organizations regardless of what role they play. As Moyer concludes this section, he emphasizes the importance of coalitions, “Social change requires a complex, multi-dimensional web of approaches and coalitions that support each other, creating a unified front” (2001 p. 32). Each of the roles takes center stage at various points within the movement. Moyer’s MAP Model lays out eight stages in which he believes social movements go through. In effort to compare the MAP Model to the SPIN and Life cycle model, the eight stages in the MAP Model can be compared to the five stages in the Life cycle model.
Eight stages of a social movement

The MAP Model contains elements of both developmental-evolutionary theories and rhetorical discourse theories because Moyer believes that social movements progress through eight distinct stages over the course of several (sometimes many) years. In addition, Moyer focuses on the particular types of rhetoric the movement uses throughout the various stages. The stages are sequential, one occurring after the next in a 1, 2, 3 order. Moyer defends the creation of this model as a reassurance tool for activists: “MAP’s Eight Stages Model enables activists to identify the particular stage their social movement has reached, celebrate successes achieved by completing previous stages, and create effective strategies, tactics, and programs for completing the current stage and moving onto the next” (2001 p. 42). The model helps activists and movement organizations recalibrate where they fit into the larger picture of the movement and how to set/reach immediate goals in order to progress. There are a range of activists that address overarching issues and ideologies such as animal rights and liberation, which are very noble in their direction but might be too abstract to rouse and recruit the public to action. Rallying the public around a broad notion of animal rights is more difficult than organizing around specific industries and exploitation of animals. It is important to divide the issues into a variety of critical issues that are specific sub-issues, and then organize a sub-movement to address each of these sub-issues. For example, Farm Sanctuary runs several campaigns to deal with specific issues like veal crates, the dairy industry, No Foie Gras, Veg for Life, and so on. Each sub-movement then goes through the eight stages at different times. According to Moyer this is a rhetorical strategy to have so many movements that impact the culture, society, and political climate in such a way that the
powerholders spend more trying to keep the policies rather than change them. Some sub-movements are defeated along the way to victory. However, when the larger movement accomplishes its goal then all the sub-movements win as well. The structure of movement organizations Moyer asserts is very similar to the Gerlach’s claim that movements are made up of segmented, polycentric integrated networks. Moyer uses a similar framework and plots the movement along an eight-stage plane. Importantly, the MAP’s Eight Stages Model posits that until the opposition gets to Stage Four, it efforts are not usually recognized as a social movement. Moyer discusses how various groups experience each stage and the goals, pitfalls, crises, and conclusions of each. The first stage is stage one: normal times.

**Stage one: Normal Times**

Similar to the genesis stage in the Life cycle model, the normal times stage is the first stage the movement experiences, and the emphasis is on setting the stage. It is important to set out the structure in which society operates on a usual basis. The two main powerholders in society are corporations and the government. The problems that social movements mainly address deal with the problems created by and sustained by these powerholders using society’s political, economic, and social systems that are in turn operated by the same powerholders. The beliefs, myths and rituals, cultural artifacts and so on sustain these problems and uphold the power of the powerholders. During Normal Times, the violations of widely held values and beliefs are not on the public radar quite yet. The political scene is relatively quiet in this stage either because the problems are not exposed to the masses or the masses are in support of the policies and practices of the institution and powerholders that cause the problem/s. The public views the citizen
opposition as having a message/s that is/are too radical to be giving attention, or simply the citizen support base is not big enough to warrant public attention.

Opposition in stage one. In stage one, the opposition experiences a great deal of mockery when either they encounter the citizen opposition or the opposition gains some sort of media attention. For example, the call for women’s suffrage was marginalized out of the public political discourse and ridiculed at its emergence after the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, as seen in the seventy+ years after the convention until the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment. At this time, the majority of the public supported the official actions of the powerholders and did not see the injustice of denying the right to vote based on sex. There are three overarching types of groups that make up the opposition: Professional Opposition Groups (POOs), Ideological or Principled Dissent Groups (PDGs), and grassroots groups representative of the victims. Each type of organization is working to bring the problem/s with the powerholders to the public discussion and to raise awareness. However, at this early stage in the movement, all of the types of opposition face heavy challenges.

The POOs follow closely a hierarchical model of management with formalized lines of leadership and management. There are local, regional, and national branches of the organization, each falling to the leadership of one central leader. The organizations are then made up of a small staff of volunteers. Because of the close modeling after and relationship with powerholders, POOs have access to information that demonstrates the contradictions that the public has been told by powerholders. This aids the POOs in developing new articulations that demonstrate the departure of the powerholders from official policies and practices. An example of a POO is the HSUS, an organization that
follows a traditional hierarchical model with one figurehead and a staff of volunteers. The leadership is most visible from Wayne Pacelle, President and CEO of the HSUS. The many relationships between the HSUS and corporations have allowed for the HSUS to gain access to information traditionally hard to incur. HSUS is granted access into legislative discussions that other organizations are not because the corporations do not validate either their structure or perceived mission.

The second type of opposition organization is Principled Dissent Groups (PDGs). The PDGs are relatively small in size and do not get much public attention. This type of organization outs together public events such as rallies, pickets, and cases of civil disobedience; however, they rarely gain much media coverage. But, PDGs center themselves on the deeply held beliefs and principles of society, and instill and reinforce a moral consciousness in a world where it seems obscure. Despite the moral center and alliance with commonly shared values, PDGs are viewed too radical during the 1st Stage because of how their message diverts from what the public has been and is being told by the powerholders. Throughout the 19th century, men and women began speaking out against vivisection. These individuals formed small groups that would stage demonstrations or create a picket line in front of a research facility. The public did not have a full understanding of what violations were being perpetrated by the powerholders of their deeply held values, so these oppositional actions were often dismissed. Although both groups are dismissed in very different ways, PDGs and grassroots groups experience dismissal from society.

Hard-working citizens who desire a change in current policies and practices constitute grassroots groups. However, the majority does not yet understand the
powerholders’ manipulation and thus the grassroots groups do not yet have most of the populace on their side. Because the grassroots groups are so focused on the local level, they try to represent the victims and offer assistance to the victims themselves. The emphasis is on the ways in which the powerholders affect everyone, and thus they must be able to talk about local victims and victims around the country or world depending on the scope of the issue at task. Grassroots groups can also carry out actions that are very similar to the actions of the POO’s and the PDGs. Mercy for Animals works at the local level to educate the public on the corruption in animal industries in order to recruit and mobilize the public’s support. At age 15, Nathan Runkle founded the organization to educate rural Ohioans about the cruelty towards animals. His goals recalibrated as the organization grew, but it still remains a grassroots organization working to reach out to the citizenry. During Stage 1, the powerholders do not feel threatened or strongly challenged from the general public.

Powerholders in stage one. The powerholders consist of the powerful corporations that are constituted by the economic and political elites. The government is implicated as powerholders, and has strong alliances with corporations and economic elites. However, this allegiance violates the interests and beliefs of the general population. The powerholders, in this stage, have a handle on the mainstream channels within the society, the institutions, and the media works in tandem with them. This control is sustained by separating the public from the policies, in order to block any type of public recognition or interrogation of the policies themselves. The emphasis is to keep the actual policies a secret from the public (S.S.), because if they were exposed then the public would call for change.
Public in stage one. The powerholders are sitting comfortably in this stage, as the official policies receive support in both economic and social consensus. Yet, the public is unaware in the disparities between the official and actual policies and practices. According to Moyer’s, about 5-10% of the population is disturbed by the social issue/s/ and is in disagreement with the powerholders’ actual policies.

Goals in stage one. The main goals of the movement in this stage are to educate the public of the specific problem and demonstrate when and how the powerholders violate commonly held beliefs. Simultaneously, the activists are working to organization opposition groups that will have an active part and be able to serve as a strong infrastructure. The public must be encouraged and believe that they can bring about change, and the actions have to help move the movement into Stage 2.

Pitfalls in stage one. Because the majority is in support of the powerholders, activists can become frustrated with the struggle to be heard. It can become easy for the activists to believe they are the victims with no power in the situation, which is exactly the belief the powerholders try to instill in the public. The powerholders want the public to believe they do not have power so that they will not even attempt to change the social conditions. For example, in the 1980’s selling veggie hot dogs at Grateful Dead concerts felt like a minute effort compared to the advertising and endorsements of the animal industries. Some volunteers might have been laughed at or told what they are doing does not make a difference. Disgruntled, the activists have found resonance with this claim and abandon their public efforts with Farm Sanctuary. In the film Iron Jawed Angels, the ridicule and harassment the suffragists experienced is portrayed. Women suffragists experienced ridicule during the entire struggle, and it was much worse in the beginning
because very few were even listening. By the later stages, although onlookers got violent and the government implemented legal sanctions, the large majority was paying attention to the suffragists either way. However, some women dropped out of the movement in the beginning because they felt it was a losing battle, that the government (men) would never grant women the right to vote so what was the point? In spite of this, the doubts bring about the crisis of Stage 1, which creates a turning point in the movement.

Crisis in stage one. New grassroots activists emerge in small groups with the critical problem in mind, however they are frustrated with the lack of progress made by the old POOs utilizing official channels of the social system. These new activists, on the other hand, see the need to not only confront the official institutions, but more importantly to document that the official channels that society believes allow society to participate in democracy are not working. The new activists are interested in exposing how the official channels are controlled by the powerholders and thus will never provide the absolute solution. For example, Baur began gathering investigative footage to document how the government and corporations were violating S.M.s and the O.P.P. of the industry. As an activist, he gathered as much evidence as he could to demonstrate to the public how the powerholders deceive society and violate deeply held beliefs about sanitation, humane killing, and so on.

Conclusion. The first stage is relatively quiet because of the stronghold the powerholders have over shaping the public perspectives on the institutions. The powerholders effectively promulgate the official practices and policies to such a point that their actual behaviors, which violate these official claims, are disguised and criticism is kept out of the public discourse. Because the size of the opposition is so small in this
early stage, the activists see the problem as omnipotent and believe feel the power mainly resides with the powerholders. Even though it is a quiet time, there is great potential in bringing about dramatic changes through exposing the contradictions between the widely held societal ethics and perceptions of the powerholders and the actual policies and practices of the powerholders. This exposure provides a lucrative avenue to gain the support of the populace and initiate change. Stage 2 brings the movement closer to achieving this goal. In comparison to the Life cycle model, the first stage of the MAP Model, normal times, and the first stage of the Life cycle model, genesis, are similar. However, because the Life cycle model consists of only five stages rather than the MAP’s eight stages, more seems to occur within the movement in the genesis stage. The first stage of Moyer’s MAP Model occurs contains similar events to the Lifecycle’s genesis stage, but the genesis stage includes more events that occur later in Moyer’s Model.

*Stage two: Prove the Failure of Official Institutions/ Difficult Beginnings*

The important catapult for the movement is bringing public awareness to how the government’s policies contravene the cherished fundamental ethics of society. It is essential to demonstrate how the powerholders (official institutions and government) have violated their trust. The betrayal of the populace by the powerholders becomes amplified when the public discovers that authorities deemed “official” have abused their power of office to perpetuate this betrayal and governed unlawfully and discriminatorily.

Opposition in stage two. The primary function of the opposition in this stage is to demonstrate that without a doubt a problem exists, and that the problem was created and perpetuated by the powerholders. During this stage, the opposition gathers extensive
research to illustrate how the powerholders have created and participated in the problem.

As a *change agent* hoping to address social policies and programs, it is important for
citizens to use every official channel supposedly available that allows them to engage in
the democratic process. The social movement must engage these supposedly available
official channels in order to demonstrate that the official channels do not work. The
movement can then argue that the official channels do not work because they are
controlled by the powerholders themselves. The opposition then has covered every base
by attempting to use all areas having to do with the decision-making process. An active
and politically involved movement’s presence must be visible within the private and
public sphere, at the local, state, and federal level of the opposition. The movement
makes their presence known at the various levels of the public sphere through testifying,
demanding, and filing official complaints and doing all other “available” bureaucratic
methods that petition the establishment for change (Moyer, 2001, p. 48). The outcome is
not immediate; and it is not the goal to see immediate results. Instead, the focus is on
exposing the ways in which the powerholders actually work to marginalize the dissident
voices and prevent the democratic system from functioning in its expected way. At this
stage, some of the cases pressed could see immediate success and some levels of social
change can result. However, that is not to be expected by the majority of the opposition.

Powerholders in stage two. The powerholders are not pressed with a true
challenge at this stage. They still utilize official channels and do not exert much to have
victories, and do not alter their actual policies and programs. The powerholders do not
feel a threat from the opposition because the majority of the population still believes the
powerholders to have their best interest. Through public relations or other “quiet” efforts,
companies deal with the complaints through official channels. For example, the Communication Director at Farm Sanctuary described how the organization tried to keep their formulating and planning of the California ballot initiative, Proposition 2, quiet because they did not want the powerholders (animal industries) to find some way to silence them before their efforts reached mainstream media (Tricia, personal communication, 2007). The Proposition became public knowledge, but the powerholders’ issues management came out with a counter-proposal to “phase out” the cruel practices over the course of many years. Proposition 2 would initiate change more immediately and on the terms of the opposition. The idea is to put “red tape” around the issues as possible to keep it out of the public’s agenda. The animal industries hoped the animal advocacy movement would give up and the “problem” of the opposition would disappear. Then again, in the case of Proposition 2 the opposition did not accept the counter-campaign and instead is pushing harder to get these issues on the agenda and consciousness of the public.

Public in stage two. The public, by in large, is still in support of the official policies of the government and powerholders. The majority of the population is not conscious of the contradictions and violations perpetrated by the powerholders. The media aids in the concealment by not covering the activities of the opposition, yet showcasing public condemnations made by the powerholders of the opposition. Although the majority is not all in support, there is a slight increase in public opinion favoring the opposition to 10-20%. Moyer describes the estimated size of the opposition throughout his eight stage model, based on how he visualizes the size of the movement expand over time.
Goals in stage two. The opposition has four specific goals during this stage in the movement. (Moyer, 2001, p. 50):

- to document the problem, including the extent to which the powerholders and institutions are involved;
- to record the attempts to use the normal channels for citizen participation in the democratic institutions related to the specific issue of concern, and to prove that they did not work;
- to become experts; and
- to build new opposition organizations that start small, grow, and spread to many new areas.

The goals during this stage center around the research the opposition must do to expose the actual behaviors of the powerholders and how the normal channels citizens are expected to use to participate in the democratic process marginalizes the citizens and does not work. Also, the emphasis on expertise helps feed the process of forming new small groups that learned from the successes and mistakes of the older groups.

Pitfalls in stage two. The activists must remember that POOs alone cannot deal with the problem because they only use mainstream institutions and tactics. A challenge the activists face at this stage is also not mobilizing the grassroots opposition on a large scale. The opposition may then feel the overbearing nature of the problem and become mentally disempowered. The realization that the system does not work as it was expected to, and that the powerholders appear to be so inflexible in dealing with change that the activists become overwhelmed with feelings of powerlessness and hopelessness.
Conclusions. This stage can be in particularly hard for the activists’ morale. The media and the public do not give much attention to the opposition, and the problem/s remains under the public radar. The problem/s seems immutable and there is the risk that the problem may never be addressed and remedied. Importantly, all the actions the opposition does in this stage are relevant to the successes in future stages. If the opposition does a good job at documenting how the normal channels do not function properly in times of trouble, the discourse surrounding the social ill/s can then include changing what is considered a “normal” channel and how effective is it? Keeping a strong will and commitment to the opposition is crucial in surviving this stage. In comparison to the Life cycle model, Moyer has eight stages rather than five. The second stage of Moyer’s Model would fall into the first stage of the Life cycle model, genesis. The genesis stage incorporates the birth and initial organizing of the movement. It is not until the fourth stage in the MAP Model that the movement takes off, whereas in the Life cycle model, the movement begins to take off in the second stage, social unrest.

Stage three: Ripening Conditions

The work done over the course of months or years has been accumulating and gained momentum. The public has begun to take heed of the messages the opposition is sending, and it becomes clear the opposition is about to experience a transformation.

Opposition in stage three. In this stage, the opposition goes through an unprecedented ripening process within the movement. The allies and sub-populations of victims begin showing their support for the opposition as they have a growing consciousness and dissatisfaction with current conditions. These groups have an increased understanding of how the problem/s effects them and others, the severity of the
problem/s, and the ways in which the powerholders perpetrate it. The increased discontent can arise as a result of either, “Perceived or Actual Worsening Conditions” or “Rising Expectations” (Moyer, 2001, p. 25). The perception or reality of conditions getting worse and increased expectations of the public brings many people to pay attention to opposition groups. For example, the speculation that Mad Cow Disease has a direct correlation to the consumption of downed or ambulatory animals led to an increase in public scrutiny of the meat industry. The more the public believed there was a reason for concern, the higher their standards became of what they expected of the meat companies. The more the public became aware of the problems with consuming downed animals and that many meat companies were in fact slaughtering downed animals and putting them into the food circulation. The opposition frames the problem/s in personalized terms, showing diseased animals being beaten and dragged in agony to their death. In the case of Westland/Hallmark Meat Packing, the opposition, Farm Sanctuary, argued that those very cows were then slaughtered and used in the National School Lunch program, and possibly fed to “your” child. Farm Sanctuary publicized that the meat from the Westland/Hallmark Meat Packing Inc. had been one of the suppliers in the National School Lunch program. Once the opposition and public cohesively see the problem as affecting the majority, then they are more likely to feel compelled to action. The increasing numbers of activists lead to the development of several new groups on the local level that are small in size, which make up a new wave of grassroots opposition that identifies as autonomous from the established POO groups. The opposition continues to grow frustrated with established POO groups and the official channels in which they operate, as few (if any) results have come from. The opposition sees the established
POOs as ineffective and that their process with the powerholders is a dead end that does not bring about change.

The activities of the opposition gain momentum as well, as they begin to enact more local demonstrations and nonviolent action campaigns that sensationalize the severity problem/s in order to get the public’s attention. The demonstrations provide a model for direct action that will occur in the next stage. Some strategies that arise here are implementing email listservs and appointing a figurehead activist to travel and spread the word. For example, up until recently, Harold Brown of Farm Sanctuary was a visionary for the opposition that would visit college campuses, organizations, and so on to discuss the problems associated with factory farming. He shared his story into veganism and his current work as an animal activist, hoping to awaken a sense of urgency and desire to bring about change. Brown also provided the audience with strategies and tactics that they could use to educate the public themselves, networking tools to help them connect with one another and create coalitions, and hope that the opposition will succeed. Brown also invited activists to join Farm Sanctuary for their annual workshop training for new activists hoping to operate their own sanctuary, the Critter Care Conference (Farm Sanctuary 2007). Although the creation of a new “wave” of the opposition is occurring, it is very important that the existing key-networks work with these new groups to offer their resources that provide support, resources, and other tools that increase the solidarity within the movement.

Powerholders in stage three. The powerholders are frustrated during this stage; but, they are not very concerned with the threat of the opposition. They believe having a good Issues Management department and networks with “mainstream social, political,
economic, and media institutions” can control the opposition (Moyer, 2001, p.52). The powerholders continue to hold the official policies closely, and thus the mass populace is kept in the dark about the actual policies and practices.

Public in stage three. The public is still, by in large, in support of the powerholders because they believe the official policies and practices to be what the powerholders are actually doing. The problem is still left off of the public agenda on a national level. However, at the local level the awareness of the problem/s is growing. The opposition has grown in this stage to around 30% of people who do not support the powerholders’ behaviors (Moyer, 2001, p. 53).

Goals in stage three. The 3rd stage has the primary goal of setting the stage for the take off phase. (Moyer, 2001, p. 53):

1. Help create and recognize the emergence of a variety of ripening conditions that set the stage for the movement to take off.
2. To create, inspire, and prepare a new wave of individuals and groups by forming new networks, offering leadership training and providing expertise.
3. Prepare pre-existing networks and groups that will be concerned about the issue and involved in the upcoming movement.
4. Personalize the problem by putting faces on the statistics about victims.
5. Create small, nonviolent demonstrations and campaigns that can serve as prototype models and a training ground for the take-off stage.

The goals involve prepping the activists and groups for the movement’s growth spurt in future stages. Also, the opposition in Stage 3 is dealing with creating and sustaining new groups while trying not to marginalize those that have been involved in the movement.
from the beginning. The opposition is conditioning itself to these changes, while also concentrating on framing the issue/s so that the public is compelled to action.

Pitfalls in stage three. If these ripening conditions are not recognized, then new activists may become disheartened and drop out. The new groups and activists bring a fresh creativity and excitement that the existing POOs may find intimidating, and it is a risk that the existing POOs will abuse their power and try to crush this new wave.

Crisis in stage three. The opposition has done a successful job of recruitment and education, leaving groups frustrated and angry about the problem/s at hand and failure of parliamentary methods. In turn, these activists are at a saturation point with the problem/s and are ready for change; they are ready to burst.

Conclusions. During the 3rd stage, the stage has been set for the movement to take-off. The problem/s in which the opposition is addressing is appearing to get worse, it has been shown that the powerholders have violated the public’s trust, there are many people affected negatively by the problem/s, and the opposition has grown and created new grassroots groups. Despite the many efforts of preparation for the take-off, all the various groups of people involved (public, powerholders, pre-existing networks of opposition, and the new grassroots opposition) do not expect the movement to get as large as it will. The third stage of the MAP Model contains the events social movements experience still within the second stage, social unrest. It is not until the public support increases in the fourth stage of the MAP Model that it moves into the third stage of the Life cycle model, enthusiastic mobilization.

Stage four: Take Off!
The transformation the social movement goes through during the fourth stage changes a once unrecognized social problem a pertinent social issue that is on the top of the public agenda. Similar to the Life cycle model, Moyer argues that the catalyst that ignites the take off is a trigger event, an incident that gains a great deal of media attention and shocks the public and is then followed by a nonviolent action campaign that utilizes various activist tools. The actions following a trigger event involve the opposition organizing large public demonstrations such as rallies and marches, which occur at the local level as well. Moyer defines a trigger event as, “an incident that dramatically reveals a critical social problem to the general public in a vivid way, for example the arrest of Rosa Parks” (2001, p. 54). The trigger event can be a purposeful act designed by powerholders, individuals, or the movement, or an accidental occurrence. The triggering act is the first time the general public is made aware of the social ill/s and how the policies and practices of the powerholders create and perpetuated the problem/s. Also, the public is made aware of how the powerholders violated cherished widely held values and the public’s trust. In the animal rights movement, investigative reporting is usually a triggering event that gains a great deal of media attention. The video footage captured by a PETA activist of the Westland/Hallmark Meat Packing Inc. brought the issue of downed animals and cruel treatments of animals in factory farms. It helped expose how the corporations’ A.P.P.s are incongruent with their O.P.P.s and the lack of governmental enforcement. The majority of the public becomes outraged, and some participate for the first time in nonviolent demonstrations.

Movement in stage four. At this point in Moyer’s Model, the opposition is referred to as a movement. A new social movement is formed once the trigger event
occurs, and the activist opposition steps up and creates a nonviolent action campaign that
directly addresses the triggering event. The triggering event is given a great deal of media
attention, and the movement’s goal is to keep that focus on the social problem/s. Moyer
discusses the concept of “politics as theater” that constructs a social crisis as a crucial
public issue that belongs on the top of society’s agenda. Social movements can create
Sociodrama Action Campaigns, which enhance the likelihood of the success of the
movement because powerholders are faced with these dilemma demonstrations. Moyer
defines Sociodrama Action Campaigns as:

Dramatic and exciting yet simple demonstrations in which participants put
themselves physically into the gears and mechanisms of the means by which the
powerholders violate society’s widely held values and show that it is the
movement, not the powerholders, that promotes and represents the values,
principles, and traditions of that society. (2001, p. 55)

These campaigns situate the movement as the defenders of cherished values and the
powerholders as the perpetrators. These campaigns tend to be followed with nonviolent
civil disobedience, and then replicated in various communities both nationally and
internationally. Because of the rhetorical potency of Sociodrama Action Campaigns, the
powerholders must address the inevitable loss of public support regardless of how they
respond. Whether the powerholders carry out their policies and ignore the
demonstrations, or if the powerholders do acknowledge the campaign only to respond
with harassment or confrontational behavior, the issue still remains in the public’s eye,
riling up more citizens to action either deters the powerholders. The movement enacts a
strategy Moyer refers to as “nonviolent jujitsu,” because the more force the government
exerts to protect its image the more it backfires and portrays the government negatively. The more energy the powerholders exercise towards the movement, the larger the opposition grows against the powerholders themselves. Again, Moyer emphasizes the necessity to remain completely nonviolent in order for this strategy to work (Moyer, 2001, p. 55). For example, PETA has conducted several public demonstrations that can be described as Sociodrama Action Campaigns that deal with the fur industry. Public theater that illustrates the violent and bloody process of trapping and skinning animals give PETA a specific rhetorical advantage.

The demonstrations where activists lie naked in coffins and are surrounded by signs that say “I’d Rather Go Naked Then Wear Fur” and “Fur is Death” receive a lot of media attention. The powerholders, the corporations and the government, face the dilemma of how to deal with the campaign. The public expects the powerholders to respond to the act and defend themselves against these claims. However, if the powerholders attack PETA and confront their nonviolent acts with verbally violent slander then the opposition has their claims validated that the powerholders are “bad.” No matter how the powerholders react, any attention they give qualifies the demonstrations and gives it further media attention. The powerholders are in a difficult double bind where they face negative consequences regardless of how they react, or if they choose not to react at all.

Around the county and the globe, the nonviolent action campaigns are taking place and the movement is taking off. The actions taken by activists can be spontaneous and segmented around the world, but have similar goals in mind. The organizational structures these individuals form operate loosely without strict policies on membership.
and mostly informal structure. The new wave of the movement does not have official connections to the established POOs or existing formal ideological dissent factions (Moyer, 2001, p. 56). Because of the emphasis on using protest and resistance as a method, the commonly identified role in the 4th Stage is the rebel.

Powerholders in stage four. The powerholders are frustrated and taken aback that they are finally forced to address the problem/s to the public. The validity of the powerholders is destabilized as the charade is up and the “secrets” exposed. According to Moyer, the powerholders begin to grasp how they lost out on three laws of political and social control:

1. Keep problems out of people’s consciousness, public spotlight, and off society’s agenda of controversial issues.
2. Keep citizenry so discouraged and powerless that they believe it is futile to undertake social activism on issues.
3. Keep individual citizens isolated from each other and seeking personal gain rather than working for the common good. (Moyer, 2001, p. 57)

The various sub movements of the animal rights movement have experienced the powerholders try to exert political and social control. For example, constantly asserting how inherent animals are in human lives is an effort to silence the opposition. By insisting that these beliefs are so impenetrable that it is pointless to even try, the powerholders hope to overwhelm activists with feelings of powerlessness. Also, it works to the benefit of the powerholders to fragment the movement into specific sub-movements that are not interconnected. Driving the idea of competition, and insisting that everything cannot be done at once so movements must prioritize which aspect of the
problem they want to address, powerholders disenfranchise the coalitional power of activists and activist groups. The powerholders also want to keep the majority of the population away from the movement by claiming the movement is dangerous, radical, and made up of communist individuals who are on the fringe of society. The powerholders frame the movement as having the support of only a few politicians, and that the majority of the political body do not support the movement.

Public in stage four. Face to face, the word is spread through media coverage alerts, educated publics, and grassroots activists and groups. The media, keeping the public informed on not only the problem/s but also where the movement stands on the issue, covers the triggering event extensively. Before, the public was only presented with where the powerholders stood on the issue. As the public listens and learns the perspectives of the movement, public opinion rises in support of the movement to 40% and later 50% (all within the 4th stage) against the powerholders’ actual policies and practices. The movement emphasizes the extent to which the powerholders’ official policies and practices contradict their actual policies and practices.

Goals in stage four. Moyer lays out six specific goals the movement hopes to accomplish in this stage (Moyer, 2001, p. 58):

1. Create a new national grassroots based social movement.
2. Put powerholders’ actual policies and practices in public spotlight and on society’s agenda of important issues.
3. Create a public platform that movements can use to educate the public.
4. Create public dissonance on the issue by constantly presenting people with two contradictory views of reality- that of the movement and that of the powerholders.
5. Win sympathies and opinions of the majority of the public.

6. Become recognized as legitimate opposition.

At this stage in the movement, the goal is not to get the powerholders to change their minds, policies, and behaviors. The emphasis is on getting the triggering event out there and keeping the issue/s on the public agenda. The rebel may organize a demonstration or lead a nonviolent protest that publicizes the triggering event and how it relates to the movement’s goals. By keeping the issue in the public eye, the hope is that the majority of the public will in turn offer its support and join in on movement efforts.

Pitfalls in stage four. A similar risk that the movement faces in stage three of the Life cycle model, enthusiastic mobilization, Moyer argues that in stage four of the MAP Model movements are at risk to political naivety. Although the opposition has grown in size, there is a risk that the opposition can become naïve in believing that the powerholders will cave to the opposition. A second pitfall in this stage is activist burnout and subsequent dropout from the movement because they set the impractical expectation that the social movement could win at this stage. The third pitfall is that the activist can neglect to see how powerful and immense success that occurs within the take-off stage. The fourth pitfall is if the activists or movement develop an overconfident attitude, superiority, ideological absolutism, and violence. The movement must simultaneously acknowledge the powerful success of the take-off stage, while remaining humble in the larger struggles ahead.

Crisis in stage four. The duration of the take-off stage is between six months and two years, which is usually the shortest stage in the movement. The stage is exciting and full of dramatic events, where a number of activists see the power and limitations of
protest and the rebel is the central player during this time. The support on the local level from citizens becomes directed at work that falls under the role of the change agent in terms of local organizing and educating the public. Simultaneously, many of the rebels become frustrated because they believed through nonviolent direct actions would lead to a quick victory, which does not happen. For example, Best (2004) describes Ronne Lee’s frustrations with Band of Mercy because he thought the organizations’ nonviolent direct action would bring about immediate results. Disheartened by the bureaucracy of institutional change, Lee broke from the organization and began acting under the Animal Liberation Front (Best, 2004, p. 20). Moyer does not focus on whether or not actions are considered part of a social movement, but rather focuses on the effective and ineffective types of activist roles. Because ALF breaks governmental laws, Moyer would argue they are the ineffective rebel.

Conclusion. The take-off stage is an exciting time for the movement with monumental events such as the triggering event and the passion involved in dramatic campaigns and actions. During stage four the public spotlight is focused on the problem/s and powerholders violations of trust and official policies. This creates a social tension that brings about a crisis where the population feels their cherished values under attack. The rebel plays a central role in this stage. The public learns the actual policies and practices of the powerholders and the social issue/s become a part of the public discourse. Within the short period of two years, the movement has gotten the majority support of public opinion and can jump to Stage six, skipping stage five. However, many of the activists, in particular the rebel, do not see the many successes of this stage and feel the movement has failed. They expected a quick and resolute victory, and when they feel the
movement has “failed,” they believe their efforts to be pointless. Those rebels and naïve activists do not progress to the 6th stage, but instead move to Stage 5. Stage four of the MAP Model contains many of the same events and experiences that the Lifecycle claims will occur in the third stage, enthusiastic mobilization. The Life cycle model progresses to the maintenance stage after enthusiastic mobilization, whereas the MAP Model provides a sidestepped detour that movements may encounter.

*Stage five: Perception of Failure*

This stage takes place right when a huge success is occurring. However, some activists do not understand either the magnitude of the success or that a success even occurred at all. Either way, the activist acts as if no success has occurred and does not move to Stage six.

Movement in stage five. The activists, optimistic that change would occur after one or two years of the movement’s struggle, begin to doubt that they would experience the immediate victory they had hoped for. Instead, the activists feel like the movement has failed because the goals have not been realized and thus no victories have occurred. The feeling of defeat consumes the activists and they believe the powerholders to hold omnipotent powers that simply cannot be shaken. The media feeds into this doubt because they promulgate that the movement is irrelevant or has died off. The activists re-envision the movement to be unfamiliar to the movement they boasted of in the take-off stage because the public activism through events has decreased dramatically. The activists are frustrated and their attitude changes to that of a cynic and they may adopt damaging behavior. The activist feels the movement has let them down, but the movement has not failed. For example, animal advocates around the country celebrated
the passage of the CHIMP Act in 2000. However, under deeper scrutiny it became clear who benefited from the CHIMP Act. The CHIMP Act allocated federal funds to animal research laboratories and mandated chimps considered “surplus” must be sent to the holding area, the Chimp Haven. Activists were frustrated and angered by this manipulative governmental effort and many felt the movement reached a failed stalemate.

The activist set unrealistic goals for the movement and assumed the movement would reach those goals in a short period. Long-term goals require the investment of working for an extended period. Progress of the movement is marked with small and large victories, and many occur within the lifespan of a social movement. The activist is faced with a great deal of anxiety because they hope to reach the goals soon, and this can lead to them neglecting to recognize the small victories that occur along the way. Working closely within the movement can sometimes lead to the oversight of such victories, and often increase the anxieties that lead to impatience.

For example, working with Farm Sanctuary, I was constantly surrounded by the cruel practices in factory farming. I had photographs, investigative footage, and personal encounters with the animals to remind me of how terrible conditions are for the victims, the animals. At times it seemed overwhelming and as if I was not working enough hours or working on the right tasks. I felt like every minute that passed meant hundreds of thousands of animals were born, abused, and slaughtered in the various animal industries. I constantly had to address my concerns and reaffirm that patience is virtuous and change would come eventually. Perhaps the large amount of anxiety I felt is an indicator as to where the animal rights movement is currently at, or perhaps it is common in all stages of the movement. Regardless, the pressure and anxiety to reach the goal of animal liberation
in the face of such omnipotent and omnipresent animal exploitation still remains a challenge I face on a daily basis. It is important to remind myself that on the top of the movement’s agenda is not to change the minds or policies of the powerholders. The emphasis from the movement is on the populace and influencing their way of thinking. In fact, the longer the powerholders do not address the problem and deal with it, the more consequences they will face as society realizes how the powerholders violated societal norms for so long. The importance is focusing on how the movement impacts the majority population and pre-existing activists.

The activist must also maintain a realistic image of the take-off stage and how it fits into the larger context of the movement. The take-off stage is dramatic and hyped, but it is short lived. If the take-off is successful, then the movement moves into a more influential, yet calmer stage. The activist might perceive the decrease in dramatic events and an increase in organizing grassroots and national efforts that occur in Stage 6 to mean that the movement is failing. Out of frustration, the activist might move towards attitudes that are more confrontational and hostile. Because it may be perceived that nonviolence is not very strong as a rhetorical tool, the activist might turn towards more violent behaviors (Moyer, 2001, p. 60). For example, let’s say I was really motivated and riled up by the momentum following the Foie Gras ban in Chicago. I am expecting a whirlwind of bans around the country to follow after Chicago. After weeks with no other state following, I am sad and disappointed and wonder “why not.” I explore the possibilities as to why the momentum seems to have trickled off and end up with this answer. I believe the momentum was temporary because the “victory” was hardly any type of win. Disheartened by the power of nonviolence, I question how much more effective it would
be to break into a Foie Gras plant and take the birds out to a sanctuary. During this stage, the movement deals with these dilemmas and how the activists chose.

Powerholders in stage five. The powerholders hope to destroy the credibility of the movement by pushing images of the ineffective rebels and militant activities into the spotlight. The powerholders can even adopt a discourse of nonviolence to try to shape them in the public eye as compassionate to earn support. The powerholders can also chose the other spectrum, which is using a lot of extreme force against the movement, ineffective rebels, and key leaders. The activists feel attacked and somewhat provoked to respond, which the powerholders then frame as an ineffective rebel role. The general public views the movement as the ineffective rebel and in some ways fears how “dangerous” the movement may be. Out of fear of the social movement, which is framed as violent, the citizens then support the powerholders. The mass media is focused on representing the movement as the ineffective rebel, and thus if 1 out of 100,000 people breaks a window- then it makes the media that the movement did so. The stakes are raising for both parties as the movement moves into later stages. At this stage we see agent provocateurs that align with the powerholders and pose as activists to try and infiltrate the movement. Agent provocateurs help the powerholders create get inside the movement for information and locations of those who are un-locatable (Moyer, 2001, p. 61).

Public in stage five. The public support of the movement has increased since the fourth stage. However, in the fifth stage it is a stalemate between the movement and powerholders (Moyer, 2001, p. 61). Because of the media’s representation and connotations of being a part of a social movement, despite agreeing with the movement
many people do not identify their support. People demonstrate fear and apprehension about being identified as dissident because they believe they may lose the security of the powerholders or their position in the status quo. The constant representations of social movements as the ineffective rebel (violent and anti-American sentiments) creates a situation where the public has a hard time distinguishing between mainstream movements and ineffective rebels. The difficulty in identifying the mainstream movements from the ineffective rebels either discourages people from joining or even existing members to drop out. The powerholders and media understand these effects of their representations of social movements, and thus they make the conscious choice to represent movements in such a way that discourages membership and discredits their work. The ineffective rebel is so powerful, especially because the powerholders and media use it as an archetype for representing mainstream movements, and thus must be actively monitored and dealt with (Moyer, 2001, p. 61). For example, in my own experiences when I tell someone I am an animal rights activist I am immediately questioned. People tend to ask, “Oh so are you one of those PETA nuts or people breaking into universities?” Although the questions are usually addressed in a less-than-serious manner, it demonstrates how the animal rights movement is portrayed. In the cases of the people that have asked me, they associate animal rights with the way mainstream media portrays it. The news is looking for sensationalized stories to grab viewers, even if the stories are stigmatizing and misrepresenting a large group of people.

Goals in stage five. The central goal of this stage is getting those activists who are stuck in Stage five out of the rut and caught up with their respective movement to progress to Stage six. In order to do so, Moyer describes two categories of actions that
should be taken to reach the goals: the actions of the activists and of the movement itself (Moyer, 2001, p. 61). The activists must be proactive when they see the social movement progress into Stage six and be able to shift into the appropriate role for that stage. The MAP Model provides strategic frameworks that the activists can use to assess their movement, point out successes and create the appropriate short-term strategies and tactics that are appropriate for reaching the long-term goals and making it through the journey to success. The second category, the movement itself, requires reflexivity and adaptability. The movement must be able to create and adapt organizational structures and processes of the group dynamic that are appropriate to the stage. Secondly, the movement must educate the members on the Four Roles of the MAP Model, emphasizing the effective and ineffective ways to enact each role. Also, the movement must respect that all of the roles are important and necessary for reaching the movement goals. Third, the movement must be undoubtedly committed to nonviolence and be able to address the inclination for some activists to enact the ineffective rebel towards the end of Stage four and a lot in Stage five. Finally, the movement must be able to offer activists the tools and training necessary to ensure the model of relationships among one another is cooperative rather than controlling (Moyer, 2001, p. 63).

Pitfalls in stage five. There are many potential pitfalls in the fifth stage because of the potential for the activists/opposition to enact the ineffective rebel. Because the rebel takes a central position in stage four, many of the pitfalls that lead to and are experienced in stage five involve the rebel. The pitfalls include the failure to see how the movement is experiencing success and become overwhelmed with despair and feeling a complete lack of power. The feelings of powerlessness and frustration can overcome any prior
commitments to nonviolence, and the ineffective rebel’s attitudes and behaviors can become center stage. With this comes the idea of ideological totalism, or believing that the way they believe is the best or morally superior and that their ways of handing issues is the only way. The superiority attitude is reflected with the pitfall for activists to impose a “tyranny of structurelessness” which assumes that freedom and democracy somehow mean no organizational structure or leadership. By imposing such a belief, social movement organizations would not be able to have any strategic organization or the relegation of tasks based on need. The main pitfall in this stage is when the movement fails to successfully transition from a protest that occurs in Stage 4 to the social change movement present in Stage six.

Crisis in stage five. Stage five arises when a movement is still experiencing the take-off stage and goes on for years after, while the rest of the movement is moving into the stage of the majority public opinion. The movement experiences stage five as a transition, a detour rather than an extended stage. Stage five is relatively short and quickly diminishes as a result of two possibilities; the members drop out of the movement because they are burned out or the activists see how destructive this approach is and join the movement by embracing the appropriate behaviors for Stage six. Stage five is experienced as a “flight or fright” period for the movement, where the movement either gets it together or they drop out with frustration. For example, possibly Ronnie Lee experienced stage five’s frustrations and decided to leave the animal rights movement (Best and Nocella II, 2004, p. 20). Instead, he is a part of the animal liberation movement that calls for immediate release of all animals and uses direct action to move closer towards the goal.
Conclusion. The journey of a social movement and how each activist experiences it is unique to the individual. Throughout the journey, the activist faces identity crises and at times overbearing feelings of powerlessness that can lead them to believe their movement has failed. The movement, however, has not failed and is going through the turbulent (normal) process of success. The Eight Stage MAP Model is accessible to movement leaders as a tool to pass along to activists to help them put the movement into perspective of a long-term strategic framework. According to Moyer, this model reassures the activist that the movement and their individual role are powerful and winning rather than losing (Moyer, 2001, p. 63). The commitment of the movement to nonviolence must also be clear, laid out for, and agreed upon by all members of the movement. The commitment to nonviolence is also a strong point to reiterate in public arenas and consistently advertise in organizational documents. The demonstrations should be rehearsed and the participants trained in nonviolence and peacemaking structures. It is essential to empower the activists by reminding them that political and societal power fundamentally lies with the people, not the powerholders. It is important to stress that the powerholders already know this, and yet they try to manipulate the public to believe otherwise. The social movement must instill in the activists the dedication to nonviolence and point out the powerfully negative effects of the ineffective rebel. The movement can instill this dedication by focusing on past movements that used nonviolence and were successful, such as Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. Encourage activists to express their concerns and work through their issues rather than let them build up, and that they are a strong component of an important movement trying to improve the social conditions for the marginalized.
Stage six: Majority Public Opinion

The central mission of the movement takes a fundamental shift here from protest in crisis to embarking on a continuing grassroots struggle to transform the social conditions. The main player in this stage becomes the change agent rather than the rebel. The movement gains support from the public, who have changed their tune and are now against current policies and are open to different options. The powerholders are enabled by social, political, and economic systems that are addressing over a long period by the social movement. The movement is engaged in a lengthy process that chips away at these systems that allow the powerholders to perpetrate the social problem/s the movement is addressing. While this process takes place, a new social climate and political consensus is produced, one that transposes that while was during the normal times stage.

Movement in stage six. Prior to Stage six the movement consisted of a series of events ranging from campaigns, educational gatherings, petitions, and so on, that were unconnected and not centralized. Once the movement reaches Stage six, a centralized movement organized around grand strategies, strategic program, and leadership roles emerges to bring the through twelve phases that bring the movement to Stage seven. Moyer argues that the movement goes through twelve phases all within the sixth stage. Stage six is a critical turning point for the social movement, according to Moyer, and has several components (Moyer, 2001, p. 64). Moyer sets out the twelve phases that occur within the sixth stage, a strategic program that consists of eight components, and five strategic goals the movement addresses in the sixth stage.

The strategic program has eight components that help the movement move forward to the next stages. The components are; massive public education and
conversion, grassroots organizations, redefine the problem to show how it affects all segments of society, build a broad-based movement organization structure, and make effective use of mainstream political and social institutions and processes, selective use of nonviolent action activities, citizen involvement programs, and responding to the “re-trigger events” (Moyer, 2001, p. 66). The primary goal of the movement is to educate the public about the social conditions and ways in which the powerholders are manipulating the public through official policies and practices. The hope for the movement is that the public will be moved in response of the social conditions and become mobilized activists. Informing the public can be done through leaflet distribution, tabling at events, and demonstrations that engage citizens face-to-face. As a follow up to public education, grassroots organizations then recruit the educated citizens to join their efforts. For example, at a concert several weeks ago an individual stopped me. The man started asking me about my dietary choices and how I felt about animals. Little did he know he was stopping someone already a part of the movement! Regardless, he was eager to hand me a brochure about Mercy for Animals and suggest I get involved. Had he not followed up with information about the grassroots organization, the activism may have ended with the face-to-face exchange.

Local activists and their daily work on a local level are central to the success of Stage six. In order to reach a large audience, there must be a large range of local organizations made up of many activists and comparatively less paid staff (only about a few). The majority is mobilized by reframing the issue/s as an inclusively affective problem. Each avenue of society must believe that the problem affects them, and if they band together they can address the problem as a majority. The various sects of society
must deem the problem/s as violating their own values, beliefs, and interests. Because the focus is on involving the majority, the movement itself needs to be organized in such a way that empowers everyone. The structure must be set up so that all aspects of society can get involved in the organizations, coalitions, and networks within the movement. In particular, all four roles of activism being performed effectively ought to be included in the movement.

Through the education and mobilization at the local level, the movement has gained substantially more support than before. In adjustment to the increased support, the movement can make use of mainstream channels of political participation, including governmental officials at various levels. For example, part of the efforts of Farm Sanctuary include writing and calling into city council members and state representatives to use their elected power in support of the issue/s. Typically, these mainstream institutional structures and processes are used to educate the public and help assemble the movement. But, these structures and processes can be used to win victories in judicial, political, and legislative battles. For example, Farm Sanctuary works very intimately at the local level with customers and restaurant owners trying to persuade them not to serve/purchase Foie Gras. In the city of Chicago, Farm Sanctuary experienced a victory when it was approved to make Foie Gras illegal in the city of Chicago. Unfortunately, Mayor Daly made it a personal vendetta to overturn the ban, and was successful months later. Either way, the victory helped secure Foie Gras a position on the minds of the public and drew attention to the issue. The ban stood as a stepping-stone in the larger goal to eradicate Foie Gras at a national level. However the movement chooses to try and
gain support and experience victories, the commitment to nonviolence must be unshakable.

The movement has gained a great deal of support by Stage six, and activists may feel that nonviolent demonstrations are no longer necessary. In spite of this, the nonviolent demonstrations serve a powerful rhetorical purpose to orchestrate rallies, campaigns, and civil disobedience. The movement must make selective use of nonviolent actions in order to meet the goals of this particular stage and help bring the movement closer to reaching the ultimate goals. Also, citizen involvement through various programs is very important. Rather than conduct traditional demonstrations solely, the movement must organize programs that engage the public in activities that directly violates the powerholders’ policies and practices. Moyer summarizes the rhetorical power of this program: “This empowers citizens and energizes the movement because people can take ethical action on the issue without having to wait for the government or corporations to change their laws and policies” (Moyer, 2001, p. 66).

Although their other actions include violence, a nonviolent action that demonstrates involving the movement to violate the powerholders’ policies and practices is the Animal Liberation Front’s (ALF) operations to rescue animals from laboratories, captivity, and factory farms. The program tries to educate the public about what is actually happening to these animals, how the powerholders violate values and policies, and show the extent of public dissent while undercutting the authority of the powerholders to reach the movement’s goal of liberation from the grassroots upwards (p. 66). Although ALF activists are breaking laws that allow for such cruelty, going in and taking out these animals and describing the conditions in which they were found helps
expose the powerholders and their corruption. It allows the activists to feel a degree of power in a system that tries to disempower them. On a lesser degree of legal violation, investigative reporting is another tool that allows citizens to penetrate the perceived power of the powerholders and expose the corruption.

Moyer concludes the strategic program with the task of responding to “re-trigger events”. “Re-trigger events” are triggering events that occur in Stages six, seven, or eight that cause the movement to experience another type of “take-off” stage. For example, the Westland/Hallmark Meat Packing Company’s meat recall called a type of re-trigger event that occurred after the movement had experienced previous trigger events. The recall gave the movement an opportunity to create a national campaign against downers and a position in the national spotlight. The recall also helped move the movement forward by generating a crisis in which animal advocates could intervene as a voice of reason, claiming they had been drawing connections between “mad cow” disease and downers for years.

The second component of Moyer’s discussion about the movement in stage six is the organizational and leadership models for the movement in Stage six. Responding to the shift in support to a majority, the movement has to change the structure into a participatory democratic model. This model reaps the benefits while reducing the disadvantages of both the oppressive hierarchical and the spontaneous anarchistic models. Organizations that adopt participatory democracy require a more structural and effective means that traditional models in order to be competent, flexible, and stable. The shift in support creates a crucial time for local, regional, and national organizations’ staff and programs to work together and combine their efforts and local groups. It is important
to steer clear of the fallacy of traditional POOs that prioritize personal interests over the interests of the movement. The activists have to be willing to combine efforts with other groups, even if that means a paid position gets eliminated. The POOs cannot assume the arrogance that the staff itself constitutes the movement, but instead must empower and nurture the needs of the grassroots organizations. For example, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) is a largely recognized component of the animal advocacy movement. Despite their size, as a grassroots activist, I would feel greatly disempowered if HSUS identifies itself as the powerhouse and claims all animal advocacy victories in its name. It is important that HSUS identifies itself as a part of the movement and works in tandem with grassroots organizations rather than in competition. In this way, adopting Moyer’s identification of the four roles helps address how the organizations work together on the same level. It is important that while HSUS claims themselves to fit one of the roles that they do not privilege that role or disenfranchise the other roles as less than the others.

In the third section, Moyer discusses the strategic goals for the movement in Stage six. Although each movement will have different specific goals, Moyer lays out five strategic goals that all movements share in this stage. The five are: making sure the issue remains in the public spotlight and stays on society’s social agenda for a prolonged period, keeping in mind that the movement’s main audience is the general citizenry, not the powerholders, pointing out the movement’s key demands and the respective sub-movements and develop distinct strategies and tactics appropriate to each, directing the movement as it progresses through the dynamics of conflict with the powerholders’ push
for alternatives that move beyond, and reform measures and a call for a paradigm shift (Moyer, 2001, p. 67).

Twelve phases experienced in Stage six. The phases within the sixth stage help shape the movement and set it up for the success it will experience in Stage seven. Each phase helps empower the activists in their conscious efforts to create strategies and tactics appropriate for bringing the movement to the next stage. Moyer argues the phases occur in a linear fashion, but does not specify how long each phase can take. Each movement is unique and can experience particular stages longer than others, and no movement experiences the phases exactly the same (Moyer, 2001, p. 68). The phases are:

1. The issue is put on society’s social agenda- and kept there.
2. The movement wins a majority of public opinion against current powerholder policies.
3. The powerholders change their strategy.
4. The movement counters each new powerholder strategy.
5. Many of the powerholders’ new strategies are more difficult for them to achieve, thereby weakening their ability to continue their policies in the long run.
6. Create strategic campaigns.
7. Expand the issue and goals.
8. Win solid public opinion against current powerholder policies.
9. Promote solutions and a paradigm shift.
10. Win a majority of public opinion on the movement’s proposed alternatives.
11. Put the issue on the political and legal agendas.
12. The powerholders make dramatic shifts in their positions. (Moyer 2001 p. 72).
The first phase consumes a great deal of time for the movement. Getting the issue onto society’s social and political agendas consumes time, because the powerholders do not want to democratize the situation and want to act as gatekeepers. They fight to keep the issue off the agenda and out of public discourse. The powerholders are most powerful when the agenda does not include the social issue. However, once the issue is on the agenda, the movement has reached a huge portion of their goals. With the issue on the public agenda, it is only a matter of time as the public becomes educated and mobilized to join the movement.

The second phase occurs after the majority of public opinion is in support of the movement and against the powerholders’ actual policies and practices. In spite of this, the majority may not be ready yet to support alternatives set up by the movement. Also, the majority may only support the movement’s position on one policy, but still agree with the powerholders on other policies the movement disagrees with. For example, the majority may not support the consumption of downed animals; but, the majority still supports slaughtering and consuming animals in general. Whereas the animal rights movement does not solely take issue with downed animals, and speaks out against all animal slaughter. Because the majority supports the movement on one issue it cannot be assumed that the majority supports all of the issues of the movement.

The third phase involves the powerholders changing their strategy in response to the majority’s opposition. The powerholders take notice of the public denouncement of old policies, and adopt new ones. The adopting of new strategies does not necessarily mean the old policies have been done away with. The powerholders still have the same purposes and goals of the prior policies. For example, after battery cages made their way
into public discourse, consumers became concerned about the health of their eggs (because the chickens were living in such filth the birds were likely to have many ailments) and started speaking out. The powerholders wanted to silence the movement without addressing the real issue of overworking egg-laying hens and factory farming, so “cage-free” eggs became the new trend. Consumers flocked, pun intended, to the “cage-free” section with the belief that the powerholders had addressed their concerns. To the contrary to what is described on the box, investigative reports have documented the filth, overcrowding, and diseased conditions that occur when hundreds of thousands of hens are packed into a warehouse with the federal standard of providing “access” to the outdoors. Access is the key term, because access usually means one small door where only one bird can fit through at a time, only to find a small cement area outside rather than grass and dust to bathe in. The images on the box and the purchased peace of mind is convincing to the consumers that believe the label because it quiets their discontent on the subject. But, it is important in order for the movement to progress to the next phase that activists recognize this strategy as a silencing method to eliminate the opposition without truly altering the policies and practices.

The **fourth phase** involves countering the new powerholder strategies, which can go on for many years. The movement must foster various sub-movements and goals that address each of the powerholders strategies and programs that try to silence the movement at large. For example, the animal rights movement counters the “cage-free” strategy with investigative reporting and exposés that counter the powerholders’ attempts. The powerholders can then come back with new groups that certify “cage-free” to counter the movement. The movement then works harder to challenge the very concept of
cage-free and how it still uses many of the practices in egg-laying hen factories such as de-beaking, the disposal of male chicks at the hatchery, the slaughter of the “spent” hens before they reach two years old, and so on. The fifth phase comes about as the exchange continues and the powerholders set new strategies that are too difficult for them to reach. The inability to reach their own strategies weakens the powerholders’ ability to continue their policies in the long run because of the vulnerability to exposure. The powerholders feel the threat of the movement and set the bar too high for themselves, yet never abandon old policies. The public is aware of the back-and-forth between the movement and powerholders, and all the new strategies the powerholders have set. The inability for the powerholders to reach the new strategies is highly publicized, and the violations of the values and beliefs of the public are readily exposed by the movement.

Phase six is where the movement gets very innovative and creative in devising strategic campaigns. It is important for the movement to identify critical supporters of the powerholders, those who the powerholders count on to implement their policies and then undermine and cut off that support. For example, the industry relies heavily on public support, medical endorsements, government subsidies like the Federal School Lunch Program, and so on. The animal rights movement must create specific campaigns to counteract all of these. Phase seven involves expanding the issue and goal to be more encompassing. As activists learn about the specific issue that incited them to mobilize against it, they discover an array of other interrelated issues that are more overwhelming than the first. This can often discourage and depress activists, as in their attempts to solve a problem discover a whole host of more issues. The conditions are worse than they anticipated and seem even more impenetrable. In an effort to address these feelings,
activists must understand that this is part of the normal process and this means they are moving forward in the process to success. **Phase eight** comes as a refreshing success after years of efforts dealing with the powerholders and trying to gain public support. The solid support of educated public opinion against the powerholders reaches a new level of depth and strength.

The solutions and paradigm shift the movement is calling for must be endorsed by the movement itself during **phase nine**. The long battle with the powerholders after the take-off stage actually provides an advantage to the movement, as activists have more time to formulate solutions that go beyond their personal moral and ethical objections. Early in the movement, many activists have not given deep examinations to alternatives and the implications of them. In some cases, it takes years of involvement to become proficiently educated on the alternatives. Thus, having the time during the movement’s stages allows the activists proper time to formulate appropriate alternatives to endorse and promulgate. For example, the argument for animal liberation and veganism is supported by strong ethics and moral arguments. Still, it is the formulation of realistic solutions to the problem of animal industries and exploitation. The sub-movement against animal experimentation has spent a great deal of their efforts working with medical researchers and university programs on developing alternatives. Many of the organizations have found solutions that they believe to be more effective, ethical, and have various increased benefits than animal testing. But, in the late 19th century when anti-vivisectionists came on the scene, it may have been problematic to have achieved immediate success without the time to formulate and endorse proper alternatives. **Phase ten** occurs after the majority of the public has been convinced that the social problem the
movement is addressing is serious and that the powerholders’ policies are immoral, and must be convinced that the movement’s alternatives are appropriate. In order to do so, the movement organizes a large public education endeavor to gain the endorsement of key public individuals and organizations to align themselves with the movement.

**Phase eleven** takes place after the majority of the public supports the movement and its alternatives. The movement then uses mainstream political and legal structures and tools to confront the powerholders. At this point, the movement has a viable chance at experiencing success through lobbying politicians, endorsing candidates, and challenging candidates already in office. Also, the movement can generate petitions that can circulate at the national level and even file lawsuits against powerholders. **Phase twelve** occurs as a cumulative response to the various phases of pressure on the powerholders. The powerholders announce they are making a dramatic shift in where they stand. The powerholders can denounce previous positions and policies and introduce new “official” policies while trying to discredit marginalize the movement and their alternatives. For example, the government spoke out against Westland/Hallmark Meat Packing Company and took back previous claims that downed animals do not pose a threat to human health. On the other hand, the government bolstered other meat companies and made it clear that they believe animal industries are crucial and have vast nutritional necessity.

Powerholders in stage six. The powerholders begin to take the threat of the movement seriously when it reaches the majority stage. The powerholders use a lengthy crisis management strategy that tries to endorse their existing policies and practices while also trying to counter the messages of the movement. The powerholders try to combat the
negative attacks of the movement while adopting the movement’s language, goals, and rhetoric. For example, the meat industry now clarifies “humane” meat, “cage-free” eggs, “sustainable farming,” and the concept of “organic.” The notion of “happy cows” came about in response to the animal advocacy’s campaigns that show the many industrialized components of farming that are cruel. As Stage six moves through the phases, the powerholders may cut funding that the movement is using. For example, the government does not give large subsidies to researchers using alternatives to animal experimentation to discourage their existence. Also, medical doctors that are testing the actual nutritional effects of animal products are marginalized out of mainstream medicine and the medical discourse because it contradicts the powerholders. Later in the stage, the powerholders can even engage in negotiations or discussions with the movement, although it is only to confuse and divide the movement. The powerholders will not engage in serious negotiations until Stage seven. As the powerholders see the persistence of the movement and that their policies need to change and they risk losing various forms of power and stature, the power structure begins to split. Because of the switch in the majority’s support, many mainstream political, social, and economic leaders have to switch their stance. Towards the end of Stage 6, some of these elites speak openly in opposition with the central powerholders’ policies in self-preservation of their interests. Because of the internal divides among the powerholders, the issue is passionately debated along various sects of society. This sets the scene for Stage 7 (Moyer, 2001, p. 73).

Public in stage six. Within a few years, the public’s support of the movement can increase up to 60 percent, and on specific issues even 75 percent (Moyer, 2001, p. 73). However, as far as changing the status quo, the public is still divided down the middle.
Half of the public fears the movement’s alternatives more than the existing conditions and policies. The movement still has to convince the public to support their alternatives.

Goals in stage six. Moyer argues that all movements have the goal to reach international success inevitably (Moyer, 2001, p. 74). In order to reach an international audience, the movement must foster the grassroots local activism around the world. It is important to stress national efforts, but the heart of the movement lies in local communities and grassroots activism. Moyer sets out six goals the movement has in this stage:

- Keep both the issue and the powerholders’ violations of society’s principles and values in the public spotlight and on society’s social and political agendas;
- Switch the movement’s primary focus from rebel and protest to change agent and grassroots organizing for positive social change on the issue;
- Adopt participatory democratic organization and leadership models;
- Train activists in the MAP methods, especially how to wave Stage Six;
- Create strategic campaigns; and
- Keep winning an ever-larger majority of public opinion and involvement against present powerholder policies and in favor of alternatives, including a paradigm shift. (Moyer, 2001, p. 74).

The goals specific to this stage are nurturing the grassroots organizations while maintaining a national presence and pressure for on the powerholders.

Pitfalls in stage six. The media and powerholders try to maintain the public representation of the movement as irrelevant. All public demonstrations are dismissed as on the fringe and simply activities for people with nothing better to do. The mass media
and powerholders refuse to acknowledge any of the successes the movement experiences. For example, any concessions the powerholders make are framed as innovative reforms initiated by the powerholders as cost cutters or anything they can spin as benefiting the public. There are a number of pitfalls during this stage because although the movement is expanding and growing, the mass media and powerholders portray it as nonexistent. For instance, activists can become overwhelmed with being publicly dismissed and turn to violent or rebellious acts, believe that the movement is not succeeding and that local efforts are pointless, POO staff members can make decisions at local, regional, and national levels that disenfranchise grassroots activists, and the powerholders can even co-opt the movement using collusion or compromises that undercut the success of crucial movement goals. An example of this is the meat industry co-opting the welfare movement through all the marketing of “happy cows” and “humane.” The powerholders try to claim that they are working with welfare organizations and creating “real change” through these standards. Conversely, many of the organizations the meat industries promote are ‘front’ organizations that are actually funded by the meat industry.

Crisis in stage six. The public support for the movement becomes overwhelming and the powerholders join the demands for change.

Conclusions. The public support increases dramatically during this stage, but that does not correlate to bringing about the movement’s desired change. The powerholders do not respond with real concessions during this stage, and still hope the movement will go away. Yet, the pressure of the movement over a course of years begins to add up and the powerholders weigh the costs of keeping their policies in place with benefits the policies reap. Moyer does not posit how long it will take for movements to reach stage
six, let alone how long until the movement has moved past stage six because of the unique and individual nature of every social movement. Moyer does argue that every social movement experiences stage six, as it is a crucial turning point when an opposition is transformed into a social movement. Moyer’s language up until stage six refers to the “opposition” rather than “social movement”. Each movement experiences all of the twelve phases during stage six in order to progress to stage seven (Moyer, 2001, p. 65).

Stage six in the MAP Model is contains aspects of the third and fourth stages in the Life cycle model. The rallying and dramatic increase in member is similar to the third stage, enthusiastic mobilization, of the Life cycle model. Also, the challenge to sustain movement motivation and dedication despite challenges is similar to the fourth stage, maintenance, in the Life cycle model. Once the movement reaches stage four in the Life cycle model and stage six in the MAP Model, the powerholders begin to reevaluate their positions. In stage six of the MAP Model, the powerholders begin to weigh the cost of keeping their existing policies in place with the benefits they cause, and the powerholder realize it is a liability that overweighs the benefits.

*Stage Seven: Success*

The movement is experiencing monumental support and the majority of society is against the powerholders policies and practices in relation to the issue/s. The movement launches a final game plane that brings them to their ultimate success, which usually takes one of three forms: dramatic showdown, quiet showdown, or attrition. *Dramatic showdowns* look a lot like the take-off stage. An abrupt re-trigger event brings about a large mobilization and social crisis. The movement has the upper hand when responding to the re-trigger event because the majority support is overwhelming, giving the
movement a great deal of coercive power. This is the only endgame where the movement believes they played a central role in reaching the movement’s goal. *Quiet showdowns* occur when the powerholders are overwhelmed with the movement pressure and realize they cannot continue their policies, so they try to save-face by claiming a “victorious retreat.” The powerholders do not admit that they have been defeated and commend the movement; instead they simply adopt the goals and policies of the movement demanded. The powerholders act as if they have taken a mature reflexive step and the mass media join in reporting that the powerholders successfully reorganized itself. *Attrition* is when the success is achieved slowly and quietly, almost invisible to the public, over a course of several decades. For example, factory farms could begin phasing out parts of their facilities and slowly the facilities themselves over so many years that the activists do not even recognize the endgame process going on. The powerholders do not acknowledge the victory or make it clear that one even took place. And in many cases, the powerholders still keep their policies in tact and keep some of the factory farms open.

All three types of endgames do not guarantee permanent changes or that the movement experienced final success. The movement must monitor the endgame until change actually takes place, because it can be stopped or reversed at any point. During Stage Seven, the movement experiences an ongoing struggle where the powerholders are on the offensive until the movement’s goals are reached.

Movement in stage seven. The movement consists of a wide range of people; some consider themselves activists, while others primarily align with the powerholders. Entire segments of society are involved in keeping the issue as a focus, demonstrating how the powerholders’ current policies violate society’s shared ethics, and hold the
powerholders up to a standard with penalties. All four roles of activism are involved in a large encompassing opposition that speak out against the powerholders’ claim that they have amended their ways, enacting appropriate nonviolent demonstrations, promulgating the movement’s alternatives that include a paradigm shift. Depending on the endgame chosen by the movement, the strategies used here change. Although the powerholders try to coerce the movement and manipulate what endgame the movement chooses to pursue, the movement has the agency to choose which endgame they want to employ. The powerholders also have the agency to try and influence the endgame and how it is carried out.

Powerholders in stage seven. The powerholders face dramatic challenges as their economic, social, and political clout are under siege. The central powerholders who continue to carry out current policies are isolated from those who have spoken out against it, and are eventually defeated by the strong dissent among society. Although not every social movement succeeds, Moyer argues that as the powerholders’ stance and arguments weaken, the central powerholders inevitably make grave mistakes. Also, the more resistance from the majority and lack of support from mainstream powerholders causes the central powerholders to use more extreme acts that instigate even more public opposition. The powerholders have various strategies appropriate to each endgame. In the case of the dramatic showdown, the powerholders may hold out their policies until the absolute very end of the political process or even extra-parliamentary means. The quiet showdown may have the powerholders announce they are changing their policies; however they will do so by saying the decision was their own. In the case of an attrition
endgame, the powerholder could sit stubbornly on their policies for many years until one of the two endings above take place.

Public in stage seven. According to Moyer (2001) the majority of the public is in support of the movement demanding change (p. 78). The two sides are framed as “good” versus “bad”, leaving the public with a more obvious decision. In the case for animal rights, either the public can stand with the “bad” that represent murder, slaughter, exploitation, and so on, or the public can stand with the “good” that represents compassion, health, peace, and so on. The public perception has shifted and frames the social myths to be congruent with the movement, and that the powerholders perpetuate social secrets that defy the widely held beliefs represented in the myths. The public has been empowered to respond to policies they not only did not criticize before, but they felt their dissent was pointless because of the overbearing power of the powerholders. The powerholders can no longer marginalize the movement as “evil,” as the public is already mobilized and educated on the powerholders’ violations. The public’s verdict is in and it is in support of the movement. Society is confident in its support behind the movement’s demands and willing to work with the powerholders to bring about the demanded change.

Goals in stage seven. The movement has four goals during this stage. The goals include staging an effective endgame that hopes to reach at least some of the movements’ demands, get the activists to realize and commemorate their successes, redirect the movement’s energy and focus on establishing ongoing conditions that maintain citizen-based democracy that is effective and can address other issues, and convince the public and activists that a fundamental paradigm shift lies beneath the problem and needs to be changed in order to truly remedy the problem (Moyer, 2001, p. 78).
Pitfalls in stage seven. Despite the overwhelming support and power the movement has during this stage, activists can still be plagued with depression during this stage. In some cases, it is because the powerholders frame the changes to be successes of the powerholders themselves rather than the movement, or possibly because the mass media continually dismisses and ignores the movement. The movement must avoid the pitfalls that can occur. The movement must pay attention to the revealing signs that hint which endgame process the powerholders are practicing, not give in to fear that if they announce how close they are to victory that supporters will bail and cut off monetary support, and must feel comfortable claiming success when it occurs despite the overwhelming amount of suffering around the world relevant to the issue. In fact, it can be seen as inspiring to those suffering or those working in other movements to see success are possible. Other pitfalls include making too many concessions of key demands or basic standards just to reach a success, becoming sad after a victory on an important sub-issue because there are still other issues at task, and reaching a main reform without supporting the paradigm shift and essential social change (Moyer, 2001, p. 79).

Crisis in stage seven. The movement reaches a victory on a major goal, but does not penetrate the paradigm enough to initiate a shift and other sub-issues are still going on. For example, as of November 2008, Proposition 2 has passed in California that orders an immediate phase out and complete ban in 2015 of battery cages, veal crates, and gestation crates. Animal rights activists are happy for the measure, but this victory does not address the paradigm of animal exploitation enough to bring about animal liberation. Although I am not sure which stage exactly the animal rights movement is in, Proposition 2 in California has posed as a bittersweet victory within the animal rights movement.
With the flooding of my email inbox from animal rights organizations, the sentiment is clear that although it is a step in the right direction, Proposition 2 does not get at the ideology that animal rights activists hope to penetrate.

Conclusion: The movement cannot simply close up shop because they have experienced a victory. The movement must keep the processes, systems, and groups in operation at various levels so that the public does not become excluded from the decision-making processes again regarding critical issues. The activists face issues of dealing with what they consider success and how do they protect that success from the powerholders undermining efforts. It’s important to make sure change is an ongoing process and that the movement is reflexive and involved. Moyer, with his optimistic view of social movements, indirectly argues that movements will experience success if they work hard and stay in the game. Stages five, six, and seven offer a lot of hope for movements experiencing a great deal of struggle over many years. The emphasis on time, without ever setting clear guidelines of how many years the MAP Model asserts a stage will take, illustrates how Moyer values patience. In this way, stages five and six provide a tangible framework for social movements while they face turbulence. The Life cycle model does not provide as much leeway for social movements to deal with road bumps and detours. Stage seven does not simplify the process and claim either the movement wins or looses, as the fifth stage, termination, does in the Life cycle model. Stage seven in the MAP Model argues that although some form of victory is experienced, the struggles do not end there. Moyer focuses on a deeper struggle to change paradigms and ideologies, thus the movement’s struggles continue even after experiencing victory.

*Stage Eight: Continuing the Struggle*
The movement did experience success in Stage Seven, but the struggle for fundamental social change is not complete. Instead, the successes the movement in has experienced in stage seven become a stepping-stone in the larger goal of sustaining a citizen-based democracy that is based on cherished fundamental values (justice, equity, sustainability).

Movement in stage eight. The movement can reflexively evaluate what issues are important and move towards social change rather than reform. In effort to be reflexive about achieving success, the movement must follow up and expand the successes, re-focus the movement on other demands, promote new social consciousness, new issues, and new social movements, and move beyond reform to social change (Moyer, 2001, p. 81). The movement must proactively examine how the powerholders responded to the victory and the public’s involvement in the movement since. The movement addresses questions such as, “What social systems exist that are must be addressed in order for a paradigm shift?” The movement must focus its effort on the larger picture rather than specific reforms or particular issues. For example, ending animal industries does not mean that a paradigm shift (moving from animal dominion to animal liberation) has taken place in which the public denounces speciesism and other hierarchical structures that allowed for the industries to exist in the first place. The movement would need to examine the underlying systems that perpetuated violence and address them.

Powerholders in stage eight. The powerholders can respond in a variety of ways to the victory of the movement, including denying the movement even won. The powerholders may have accepted the change, and then proceeded by attacking the
movement afterwards and specific individuals involved. The movement must monitor the powerholders, with the range of responses they can take.

Public in stage eight. Moyer argues that the public has been changed in a positive way by the movement, and adopts some of the beliefs the movement supported (Moyer, 2001, p. 82). In spite of this, the public is unstable in its support and beliefs can be quickly altered by a variety of events. But, the public’s positive perception about the possibility of change often carries over into their involvement with other movements. Because the animal rights movement is not experiencing stage eight, I cannot use it in an example. The women’s suffrage movement does provide an example to illustrate this. After women won the right to vote, the public support for other rights for women was not stable. As war continued throughout the 1920’s-1940, the public was distracted and consumed with other events. But, several the women involved in the suffrage movement went on to involve themselves in other social movements. Alice Paul championed the Equal Rights Amendment and continued to fight for its passage until she died in 1977.

Goals in stage eight. The movement is commemorating the success and their important role in bringing about that success. Also, the movement’s success must be protected so that any counterattacks by the powerholders do not undermine their efforts. The movement’s vitality must also be nurtured at the grassroots and national level in executing the demands of the sub-movements that deal with the same issue or other issues that the movement feels are important. The final goal during this stage is pushing for a paradigm shift, and showing how the underlying beliefs and systems feed issues that the sub-movements are addressing and other movements as well.
Pitfalls in stage eight. The movement cannot be overcome with feelings of success to such a point that they feel the movement is over, and fail to make sure the changes are fully implemented and protected from criticism and counterattacks. The movement must also combat the powerholders’ attempts to claim the victory as their own. The movement must not let powerholders frame the victory as theirs, and instead proclaim that the movement is the true instigator of change.

Crisis in stage eight. In many circumstances, activists and organizations bridge their work to address other issues or even abandon activism to rest. This stage does not end until all of the movement’s demands are completely implemented and there is no danger for backlash. The movement must win the public in three ways in order to bring about a success. The movement must win the support of those who are aware of the problem, those who are opposed to official policies, and those who support the movement’s alternatives. Each group moves through the stages of the movement and experience success. Also, each of the four roles of activism must experience success in order for success to be realized for the movement. For example, each organization that plays a role within the animal rights movement would have to experience success in order to consider it success for the movement as a collective. Moyer does not assert that movements are monolithic, but he emphasizes that coalitions among organizations and sub-movements within the larger movement must work together.

Conclusion in stage eight. The eight stages do not propose an ending place, but rather an ongoing cycle of social movements, their sub-issues, and their sub-movements that find other issues to focus on and take on other activism. As a set of demands is won, there is a new level of awareness among the citizens that creates new demands and
movements for new issues. The process requires each role of activism, and some stages require one role more than the other, even though all are important for the movement’s success in each stage. For example, in stage four the rebel takes center stage, whereas the change agent is important in stage three. Although these roles take more central positions during different stages, each role experiences all of the stages. Social movements and their effects are best thought of as long-term rather than immediate. There are immediate successes, and there are also important long-term ones that are necessary for the paradigm shift. Nonviolent social movements allows for people power and involvement from all walks of life. Social movements, according to Moyer, “advance the world further along the path of meeting the spiritual, material, psychological, social, and political needs of humanity” (2001 p. 85). People’s social movements hold the potential to reshape the world in which we live and dismantle oppressive systems in place that are destroying humans, animals, and the natural environment.

In Relation to Farm Sanctuary

Moyer’s MAP Model breaks activism down into four roles and charts the progress of the movement along an eight-stage cycle. The model does not indicate an ending place for the movement and insists that movements are ongoing and feed into one another. The model is meant to be an activist’s tool to help empower themselves and their movement. Rather than become overwhelmed with the long processes in which movements endure, the MAP Model insists that each step of the way is part of a larger plan towards success. The many challenges movements face and the uphill battles activists endure can lead to burnout, loss of momentum, and even activist dropout. Moyer argues that his model
provides hope to those activists and movements’, claiming it’s all a part of the Movement
Action Plan that eventually leads to success.

Moyer’s explicitly states his conviction to remaining nonviolent as a social
movement in order to bring about genuine social change. As an organization, Farm
Sanctuary also demonstrates the commitment to nonviolence. The Organizational
Statement the Communication Director gave me illustrates this commitment. Both the
Mission and Vision Statement illustrate the emphasis on rescue, education, and advocacy
to combat cruelty with compassion. In particular, in the Approach section, Farm
Sanctuary says it, “…seeks compassionate ends through compassionate means” (Farm
Sanctuary 2008). The emphasis is on maintaining peaceful approaches and trying to bring
out internal self-realized change. Farm Sanctuary has created a public image that focuses
on fostering positive changes through positive reinforcement and education. The
sanctuary serves a two-fold purpose, one to provide a safe home for farm animals, and
secondly to allow the public to interact with farm animals on an individual basis. The
sanctuary is open to the public and welcomes people of all lifestyles and dietary choices.
As an inclusive organization, Farm Sanctuary stresses working with other organizations
and welcome all of the public to join the group. In this very fundamental way, Farm
Sanctuary fits very well into Moyer’s conception of social movements.
Chapter 4: Entering the Unknown

Introduction

The following chapter contains materials gathered at Farm Sanctuary during a summer internship in the Communication Department in 2007. Using autoethnography, in-depth interviews, and open-ended surveys I was able to not only gain personal experience as an intern, but also get to know unique individuals working within the organization. Autoethnography allows my voice and experiences to come through and add another element of understanding to the research. The chapter begins with my transition into veganism and animal rights activism, and then flows into my internship position with Farm Sanctuary, the various forms of data collections used while at the farm, and my personal experiences within the organization.

The Beginning

The doors to Farm Sanctuary opened to me on July 29, 2007. From that moment forward, my life was completely changed. I had been invited inside Farm Sanctuary’s national headquarters and sanctuary in Watkins Glen, New York as the Communication intern for roughly two months. As the plane reached a halt in the Ithaca Airport runway, I was overwhelmed with anxiety. I had spent all summer preparing myself by reading all the quintessential texts on veganism and the AR movement. I wanted to be fluent in the discourse before I arrived at the farm. I had told myself everyone would be great, that there was nothing to worry about. It wasn’t the travel or the fact that I was going alone. I had embarked on many solo travel adventures in the past all over the world. This was not like my three-month trip throughout Israel alone. This was different. I was not just picking up and traveling to a culture to immerse myself and then leave. I was going to
become a part of this culture, the AR and vegan culture, for the rest of my life. I was making a journey into FS that I would never fully leave. I begin the autoethnography with this to stress the significant emotional value I place on my experiences with FS.

The auto component of this ethnography was made possible through the internship program at FS. I would not have been able to fully penetrate the interpersonal level of FS without the intimate relationships fostered through the internship program. FS has always had interns, even before the organization was an “official” organization. Gene and Lori had friends work with them as “interns” when the couple lived in a van and sold veggie hot dogs at Grateful Dead concerts. The interns were close friends and considered to be a part of the (then) Bauston family. The first animal rescued by FS, as described earlier, was a sheep found on a dead pile. The sheep was named Hilda after the first intern that FS ever had. Gene told the interns this to demonstrate the importance of the internship program at FS. The interns have always been unpaid, volunteer positions. Because of constant monetary constraints, volunteers are often the driving force behind social movement organizations. While the current internship program is unpaid, the interns are given the option to live at the Vegan House and are taken to the local cooperative grocery store each week to purchase their own vegan foods. The Intern Coordinator prepares one lunch per week, called Educational Lunches, for the interns. The Educational Lunches provide the interns an opportunity to choose a topic to be presented by one of the many staff members while enjoying a free meal. The lunches range from Learn about the Shelter Animals from Susie Coston, the Shelter Director, to Vegan Cooking Lessons with the Intern Coordinator. The internship program included
various ways to integrate the interns into the FS culture. The following is my experience
as an intern at FS and my journey into AR activism.

I had investigated various animal rights organizations and was searching for a
summer 2007 internship. I came across Farm Sanctuary’s web site and had never heard of
them before. I was fascinated with the idea of a farm animal sanctuary, that individuals
were pulling animals from dead piles and bringing them to a safe haven. I came across
the story of a cow from Cincinnati renamed Cincinnati Freedom. On February 15, 2002,
the white cow hurled over a six-foot fence at Ken Meyers Meat, a slaughterhouse in
Ohio. She darted the traps and tranquilizers shot at her by the SPCA, and eluded police
for 11 days. The spectacle became so large the National Guard was brought in and the
story was featured on “Good Morning America.” She was captured in Clifton on
February 26, 2002. Ironically, February 26 is also my birthday. It became an issue as to
where the cow should be sent. The slaughterhouse wanted the cow returned, but activists
and those following the story were not going to allow that. At the end of March,
Cincinnati artist Peter Max donated paintings worth over $180,000 to the SPCA for them
to sell at their next auction. The exchange left Max in custody of the 1,050-pound cow.
Max, a long time member of the organization, had already been contacted by Farm
Sanctuary and decided to send her there. The cow had received many names from the
media throughout the chase, and Max renamed her Cinci Freedom. He felt the name
glorified her courage and desire for freedom and where she came from. Shortly after,
Cinci Freedom received the key to Cincinnati from Major Charlie Luken.

The story of Cinci Freedom made a particularly significant impact on me. I
remembered hearing about the cow that escaped and the fight to secure her safety after
her capture. I felt closer to Farm Sanctuary knowing that Cinci Freedom was enjoying the green pastures and freedom the sanctuary had to offer. At my birthday dinner that year, my family and I talked about the cow and how it was a present to me in a sense that a cow secured her own freedom on my birthday! Each animal story on the web site brought tears to my eyes and hope. I was saddened that every animal is not able to hop that fence or survive factory farming, but was also hopeful that those that do have a home like Farm Sanctuary. For these reasons, I decided to apply for the Communication Intern position. I decided the best time for me to pursue the internship is from the end of July until the first week of September. I filled out my application in mid November and waited patiently to hear back. I was nervous and excited about the possibilities.

Transformation into Veganism

The internship was located in Watkins Glen, NY, about 45 minutes outside of Ithaca. I did not know anyone affiliated with the organization, nor did I know anyone in the area. I had been a vegetarian for four years at the time, and had given up eggs a year prior. Despite these changes, I had not yet committed to the vegan lifestyle. Veganism refers to abstinence from all animal industries, including entertainment, food, clothing, textile (furniture and goods), cosmetics, medications, and all other products that either contain animal products/byproducts and/or are tested on animals. I refer to veganism as a lifestyle because it differs from vegetarianism, which refers to dietary choices. Veganism is an ideological choice to not participate in any industries that use animals. Coming from being vegetarian, I was only used to making dietary distinctions about animal products. I was nervous about fitting into the vegan culture as a newcomer to the culture. After my application was submitted in November, I gave up all animal food products. I received an
acceptance letter in mid February. I decided that was the final sign that this is the path I am meant to adhere to.

I began selling my leather shoes and wool sweaters, and gave away most of my non-vegan products. Vegan cosmetics, personal care items, and cleaning products mean that there are no animal products and byproducts present, and also that the product and its ingredients were not tested on animals. I phased out most of my cosmetics and hair products simply for financial reasons, and as soon as the products were empty I purchased vegan replacements. I wanted to be somewhat accustomed to the lifestyle before I began my internship. I received mostly negative feedback from friends and family during the transition into a vegan lifestyle. They seemed supportive of the idea of eating vegan, although they deemed it “impossible,” but they did not see the logic in not wearing leather and wool. They also looked at vegan cosmetics, personal care items, and cleaning products as overpriced. It is often overlooked as cruelty to wear animals or use products that are strictly not tested on animals.

The most common criticism of abstaining from leather is that the animal is already dead. When it comes to wool, outsiders just assume that sheep produce excess wool and that it requires humans to shave them. To the contrary, sheep used in the wool industry are breed-altered to produce excess wool, and the introduction of shearing or shaving impacts the re-growth. Without human intervention, sheep are able to sustain their own wool throughout the seasons and never need shearing or shaving. Another misconception is that the shaving process is naturally painless and done with electric shavers. With the popularity of UGG boots and the like, Australian wool has gained immense popularity. The sheep are bred at extremely high numbers and kept in
overcrowded and filthy quarters. A senseless process that is commonly used is tail docking, which entails using shears to chop off the tail (and usually grabs most of the skin on the rear) without any anesthetic or anesthesia. It is done in a quick assembly line without any attention to nerves, blood vessels, and pain. In addition, once a “wool sheep” becomes spent, which means its wool production has slowed after several years, it is sent to slaughter either overseas or in its host country.

Leather, on the other hand, is a by-product of multiple industries. Often leather is derived from a slaughtered animal. The most common source of leather is veal calves. As described in chapter one, young calves disregarded from the milk industry are either slaughtered within 48 hours of birth or called “Bob Veal” and the others are crated for four months and used in “higher grade” veal. In most cases, Bob Veal calves’ skin is used in cheaper low-grade leather. But most of the finer leather comes from crated veal. It is often overlooked by consumers that their designer handbag or fancy wallet is the skin of an infant calf. Regardless of whether the animal was slaughtered for its skin or not, when it was slaughtered its profiteer calculated in the value of its skin. I include these brief descriptions because it is important to stress the cruelty involved in two overlooked industries. Being a vegan has led me to understand many industries that go overlooked and are naturalized through dominant ideologies including capitalism, consumerism, and commodification. Capitalism has transformed the model of farming from an individual need to a mass-produced industrialized market. Consumerism has led to the fetishization of commodities and the hyper-consumption of products in this country. The increased purchasing has led to a mass-production model where living beings are commodified into
products to be bought and sold. Clothing, cosmetics, and food have become class markers that, in their framing at elite products, mask the grotesque cruelty and filth involved.

Prior to fulfilling the internship, I had done many things without thinking twice. I had purchased many, many things without considering their source. Once I received the acceptance letter from Farm Sanctuary, everything I did went under a microscope. I felt bad for the choices I had made in the past, the industries I had blindly supported. I went insofar as to investigate who owns each company, including companies that sell vegan lines. The corporate capitalist web seems impenetrable by even the most devout. Regardless of the degree of my impact on the companies, I became resolute to never give direct support again. After I had “veganized” my life, I felt anxiety that someone at the farm would find me at fault for something. I was nervous that it was not enough, that I had missed something. I had purchased faux leather shoes and did not even feel comfortable bringing them because I did not want someone to mistake them for leather. The preparation for my journey alone had truly changed my way of thinking.

The month of July flew by and it was already time for me to leave. My confidence level had grown since plunging into veganism, and I felt ready to join the ranks. Although my family was nervous to send me off to somewhere unknown, and was anxious I would come back an outsider, they offered support and love. My immediate family had made arrangements to visit the farm one week into my internship. This played an important role in bringing the experience home for me. The trip demonstrated my family’s commitment to me and their understanding of my life changes. They viewed this internship as life changing, and wanted to be somewhat a part of these changes. With
their support and understanding, I boarded the plane and began my travels into Farm Sanctuary.

*Arrival to Ithaca*

Because of the rural location Farm Sanctuary in Watkins Glen, the closest airports are in Ithaca and Elmira. I had opted to fly into Ithaca because I knew more about the location and it was cheaper. Interns are responsible for finding and affording their own travel and the Intern Coordinator provides airport shuttle. Not a stranger to solo travels into somewhat unfamiliar territory, I was excited to meet the Intern Coordinator and begin the internship. The plane landed and I realized how remote my location truly was. Ithaca, supposedly the “big city” for Watkins Glen residents, had an airport with two terminals. My plane was one of two planes that would land the entire day. I was focused on collecting my over-packed luggage, and then a shorter bald man approached me wearing a green Farm Sanctuary t-shirt. Not to stereotype (although I did), but I expected a longhaired bearded Grateful Dead looking guy to pick me up. Instead, I was greeted by a shorter version of Jesse “The Man” Ventura. Standing somewhere around 5’7”, the Intern Coordinator had a shaved head and a well-trimmed red goatee. I include this aside because it was the first of many preconceived expectations and stereotypes that were debunked. The Intern Coordinator was extremely welcoming and right away sparked up conversation. He told me of his journey into veganism, and how he came across Farm Sanctuary. He had started out as an intern over five years ago. He was so moved by the devotion to animal rights and the feeling of community at Farm Sanctuary that he never left. He said it was a feeling that I would understand a few days after I returned home from my internship. He said Farm Sanctuary provides something so unique it cannot be
duplicated or described in words. It is a small haven of like-minded people that share the same passion for animal liberation. To quote to most common adage used by other Farm sanctuary employees, “You will never find so many vegans in one place anywhere in the world.” The adage rings especially true as I reside in Cincinnati, Ohio, and a vegan is as rare as an erupting volcano in this city. Although I did not fully understand the utopian nature of Farm Sanctuary until after I returned home, I went into the experience with that mindset.

The Intern Coordinator took me to the cooperative grocery store in Ithaca, GreenStar, to purchase my groceries for the week. I had never shopped at, let alone heard of, a cooperative grocery store. The local vendors and growers were able to receive a fair share of the profit with the grocery store, as opposed to being given flat rates that are usually much lower than the markup. I had never seen so many vegan alternatives in one place, and such an inclusive collection of goods. The only downfall is that there was also tons of dairy, eggs, and meat for sale being advertised as “humane.” The Communication Director, in her Educational Lunch, discussed later in the chapter, addressed the dissonance I feel as a vegan with “humane” marketed products. I was able to gather together the groceries I needed for the week, and received a discount because I was affiliated with Farm Sanctuary. We loaded up the van and started out on our journey. The drive into Watkins Glen is about 45 minutes from Ithaca, and the Intern Coordinator and I spent the entire time talking about our experiences transitioning from carnivores into the vegan lifestyle. It was as if I had entered Vegan Country and the Intern Coordinator would be the ambassador during my stay. He was the sole person interns had to turn to with questions and concerns. His role was to serve as the liaison for interns into the local
community and Farm Sanctuary staff. He made shuttles back and forth during the first 48 hours of my stay bringing the remaining interns. Two of the interns did not fly, and were driven by family and friends. Thus, none of the interns had cars of their own to provide independent transportation.

Arrival to the Farm

With the permission of my fellow interns, I am able to share their unique experiences into veganism and with Farm Sanctuary. I refer to them in anonymous, but consistent titles as Intern A, B, C, D, E, and F. I was excited to meet everyone and find out his or her own experiences in the movement. The Vegan House was comprised of women from all over the world. The women with whom I shared this experience (including their place of origin) are; Intern A from Canada, Intern B from Oregon and Philadelphia native, Intern C from France, Intern D from Michigan, Intern E from Michigan, and Intern F who did not live in the house with us but worked in the Campaigns Department. Each of us came from different geographical locations and different journeys into the animal rights movement. Our ages ranged from 18-31, and the education level was either current undergraduate or graduate student. The house had three bedrooms; two were for the interns and one was a “cat room.” The rooms for the interns had one set of bunk beds and one stand-alone bed and were equipped with dressers and closet space. The “cat room” had one bed and a couch, but mainly it housed the cat food and litter boxes. The house had one television, but did not receive any channels. Because the television did not pick up any stations, there was a surplus of VHS tapes and a few DVDs provided in the house. The videos were all donations of either interns or faculty who had lived in the house and wanted to make it better for future interns. The house also
had one barely working computer without a working internet connection. The Intern Coordinator informed us that the house was to receive wireless internet within the next few months, but at that time interns had to use the “Staff house” computers to access the internet.

Several staff members were allowed to live on the farm because of their job requirements. For example, the Intern Coordinator was to be available to the interns at any time, so he was given a room to live on the farm. The “Staff house” was a converted barn that served several purposes. The first floor houses the animal hospital, the Shelter Director’s office, Susie Coston, and the computers. On the second floor there were bedrooms that were occupied by various people who worked for the organization. Interns were allowed to use the computers in the Staff House all day until 10 pm. Those that lived in the staff house showed mixed emotion towards the interns having access to the staff house. One staff member with whom I was close felt that it was a bit hypocritical. Staff members were not encouraged to just stop by the Vegan House, and thus felt they should be given the same privacy. On the other hand, others did not mind the presence at all. In conversation, several other staff members discussed how the interns do not come upstairs (where the bedrooms are), and have always shown respect when visiting the Staff House. Although mixed emotions were expressed, while I interned at the farm there were never any issues that arose from interns visiting the Staff House to use the computers.

Day-to-Day Routines

Daily life on the farm was unique to each intern per his or her internship placement. My schedule, and any other intern that worked in the office, was simply Monday through Friday. My days off were always Saturday and Sunday, and my shifts
were always 9-5. I had the option of starting earlier and leaving earlier (8-4), but as a night owl I decided to take the later wake-up. Interns from various departments had changing schedules that rotated each week. Shelter interns had to take turns doing “sheds,” which entails herding all the animals within a certain parameter into their appropriate sleeping quarters and locking them in. Staff members were responsible for closing sheds for the larger animals and ones farther away from the Vegan House. Sheds were a rotating responsibility that was completed around 8 or 9 p.m. The days off for other interns rotated as their schedules were adjusted weekly. Because at least one intern worked on the weekend, and I was always off of work on the weekends, it provided time for me to shadow the other interns and perform their daily tasks. I will go into further detail about these experiences later.

Communication Department

On the first day of work at the farm, the Intern Coordinator ran all of the interns through an orientation. Orientation involved learning the rules of Vegan House and of Farm Sanctuary, work schedules, a run to the grocery store, and an intensive tour of the farm. On the tour, we went from building to building, meeting employees and volunteers and hearing about what the various people do on the farm. The tour gave us an introduction to the buildings and their purpose. The office seemed like a warm environment, and everyone I met seemed genuinely excited to get to know me. When we reached the Communication Department, the Communication Director approached me and asked if I would come back in a few hours for my orientation to the department. When I arrived later that day the Communication Director had put together a calendar for my entire stay. She had divided up my days to spend time with each of the
Communication employees that performed varied tasks. The Communication Department, although it one of the biggest departments in the office, was relatively small when compared to previous places of employment. Each employee covered a different aspect of communication, ranging from mass communication, technology, public relations, photo editor/videographer, and journalism. The week was divided into spending Mondays working with Employee D in journalism, Tuesday and Wednesday working with Employee B and F on public relations, and Thursday and Friday was spent doing photo archiving with Employee A. Employee C worked on technology and website data, but I only spent two or three days working with that employee during my entire internship.

*Journalism*

I spent Mondays working with Employee D on writing assignments. With a strong background in journalism and creative writing, Employee D was responsible for writing all of the documents Farm Sanctuary sent out. She wrote articles for the seasonal newsletters, sent letters to supporters of Farm Sanctuary that participated in the Adopt-a-Farm-Animal project, and generated all of the public releases. I worked on several projects with Employee D. The first entailed writing to participants in the Adopt-a-farm-animal project. The project provided a way for supporters to feel close to the animals residing at the farms (both New York and California). For a nominal fee, that ranged by the type of animal you wanted to “adopt,” a supporter could sponsor a farm animal for one year and have the option to renew each year following. For example, let’s say I went to visit the farm and fell in love with a goat named Gloria (which I really did) and I wanted to stay connected to that goat in the future. For $25 a month, I could sponsor
Gloria and in turn receive letters that update me on how she is doing and her health. Although the donation does not just go directly towards Gloria, it is a useful fundraiser to ensure proper care for all of the animals. If Gloria passes away while I am sponsoring her, I would receive a detailed letter describing when and how she passed away and the option to either terminate my sponsorship or transfer it to another animal of my choice.

Part of my work with Employee D entailed writing these death letters to sponsors. Because of Employee D’s heavy workload, these letters had accumulated and she had a pile to complete. In order to write the death letter, I had to go through the Shelter Director notes from each month to track the animal’s declining condition. Each month the Shelter Directors (at the time there was one in New York and California, whereas now Susie Coston has taken over as National Shelter Director) were responsible for writing lengthy progress reports on each animal. Every animal had to be accounted for and his or her individual health and behavioral issues had to be documented. These reports were available through the local computer drive and in many cases were a great resource. In some cases I found elaborate notes and could offer a poetic detailed account. In other cases, I was unable to find anything in the notes that described the exact cause of death. In those cases, I was told to use broad language and kind of “dance around” describing how the animal actually passed.

The other part of my work with Employee D entailed writing media releases for rescues, campaigns, and compiling the 2008 calendar. The media releases usually involved telling the rescue story of a new animal at the farm. For example, while my stay at the farm several new animals were rescued and brought to the farm. Four piglets had been seized from a squatter living illegally in Maryland on a piece of property that had
been abandoned. When the police came to arrest the man for trespassing, they found the four piglets in terrible condition. The local humane agency contacted Farm Sanctuary and arranged a permanent home for these siblings. Renamed Emily, Dennis, Farley, and Ogar, the piglets were nurtured back to good health and able to enjoy the luxuries of the farm. I was assigned to cover this story and generate a media release to announce their rescue and call on supporters to donate funds. Several other rescues occurred during my stay, including two infant goats, mother and daughter goats, a group of mail order peeps were seized from the post office, and several cases at the California location.

Each story I wrote entailed visiting the animals on the farm and meeting with Coston, the National Shelter Director. Coston knew each animal personally and could describe unique attributes and quirks they displayed. She was a great resource into the daily lives of the animals. She was happy to meet with me on several occasions to acquaint me with the animals and their stories. On a farm where many animals look alike, it amazed me how she naturally could identify each animal and knew their entire history off hand. The New York and California shelters have offered homes to hundreds of animals, all of which Coston is accountable for. My work with Employee D can be adequately described as journalism.

Public Relations

The second component of my internship was working with Employee B supervised by Employee F on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Employee B was the newest addition to the Farm Sanctuary Communication department. Her job title was the Communication Assistant, so much of her work was assisting other employees on various tasks. Employee B worked closely with Employee F, who oversaw the public relations
aspect of the department. One of the larger events that Farm Sanctuary runs is the national Walk for Farm Animals. Supporters around the country can initiate their own Walk and are provided kits to help them through the organizational process. The kits include instructions on how to organize invitation lists, education materials, and the guide to raise funds. Farm Sanctuary notifies local media outlets about the event in a two-stage process. First, the news outlet is notified six weeks in advance to post the event in their calendar listings. The second is to send the media outlets a press release that describes the event in greater detail and includes more information about Farm Sanctuary itself. Both releases are sent out through public relations software, Cision, a media database. The database allows you to create your own profile and select media outlets that seem appropriate to receive your releases. Each city has its own media, ranging from print, online, voice, and video.

My job with Employee B was to go through each Walk for Farm Animal host city and make sure we have the correct correspondence information for each media outlet. For example, if the calendar editor had been replaced and listed in the Cision database, then I had to update Farm Sanctuary’s profile to reflect this. The software was very easy to navigate; yet the media outlets were slightly confusing. Radio stations had very few contacts listed, whereas newspapers had dozens. The contact information for newspapers was difficult to decipher and sift through because of the multitude of listings. With over fifty cities hosting Walks, this job took many hours during the entire stay. Because of the high cost for Cision, Farm Sanctuary only had one access name. There were often issues over who could have access at what times. Besides this small complication, the work with
Employee B was straightforward and did not require much verbal interaction. The third portion of my workweek involved very little verbal interaction as well.

*Photo Archiving*

On Thursdays and Fridays I worked with Employee A in the digital archiving department. Employee A was one of the “tech” crew responsible for archiving photographs and videos in physical and digital forms. Farm Sanctuary has conducted many investigations of factory farms, slaughterhouses, and various cruelty cases. The result of 20+ years of such work was thousands of hours of video and thousands upon thousands of photographs. Each rescue animal over the last 20+ years also had his or her photograph taken as some point during its life. Before the digital days, the photographs were printed and put into a binder with a name written next to it. Slowly, Employee A has been scanning these photographs and saving them onto the local drive under the following extension Name_Pig. Each photo was saved under a series of subfolders, starting with either New York or California, then species.

The amount of photographs needing to be relabeled, and several had to be rescanned, was overwhelming. Because the system was not entirely functional yet (the local drive was being updated and used outdated technology), the project was ongoing. As I was correcting archived photos and placing them into the F drive, new photographs were being archived in random folders using the outdated save format. Employee A seemed confident that this project had a point, but at times I questioned the efficiency of it. Here I was, sorting through dozens of binders trying to label the file by the animal’s name and species and save it into a temporary folder. The F drive was not fully accessible yet and would not be the permanent home for the photographs. Nevertheless, the process
of labeling each photograph by the animal’s name did seem perfectly logical. When outside sources request a video, photo series, or kit of some kind, Farm Sanctuary compiles archived materials and distributes them. The lack of organized archives could make that very difficult. For example, let’s say I visited the farm last year and fell in love with a duck Lucy. Months later I wanted to do a paper about how sentient Lucy feels pain and does not want to be killed, thus why I chose compassion over killing. The pictures I took of Lucy did not come out so well, so I contact Farm Sanctuary and request a few photographs of Lucy. If Lucy had not been one of the main animals featured or received a lot of media attention upon her arrival to Farm Sanctuary, her photographs may be obscured in the archives. In this case, it would be very useful to go into the New York folder, look under Ducks, and type in Lucy for a search. The work I did to help reorganize the photo archives will hopefully ease the lives of many in situations such as these.

Workspace Environment

The office space was a truly unique place to work. Employees were encouraged to dress comfortably, jeans and t-shirts and flip-flops. The only dress code was not to walk around barefoot (which I saw several employees doing). In addition to the casual dress code, I was shocked to see employees were allowed to bring their pets to work. Almost every employee had a dog bed at his or her feed and several toys scattered around. Pets were not only allowed, but also openly welcome. At the off chance you stopped by the office, you would probably be run over by at least one dog running down the hall and have several cats brushing by your legs. The office was the home for a handful of stray cats that had not yet found homes. In fact, one cat that lived in the office
was the pet of an employee. He had cats and dogs at home and when the cat was very young he tried to bring it home and introduce it to his cats. After several disagreements with his pets, the employee was disappointed he was unable to socialize the animals harmoniously. Instead, the cat, named Petunia, had grown with him over the years and he kept the litter box and scratch post in his office. Petunia became a permanent resident of the office.

The atmosphere was very casual in the office and felt more like a second home. With a full kitchen as the break room, it was almost as if sitting down at a family table during lunch. During my first day at the office, I was taking in all of the anomalies I had never experienced before, such as pets welcome and cats hanging out at the office. I had just sat down at my desk when I spotted Gene Baur walk in wearing a Hawaiian shirt, board shorts, and flip-flops. He was just chatting it up and being really friendly and looked over at me. He noticed a fresh face and immediately came over. In the journal I kept during my stay, I wrote a lengthy entry about this encounter. He came over and introduced himself to me and thanked me so much for my work. He did not introduce himself as the Co-founder and President of Farm Sanctuary. Instead he reached for my hand and said, “Hi, I’m Gene” (G. Baur, personal communication, August 1, 2007). This struck me because having only worked in corporate settings, head management seemed to love bragging about their title and role in the organization. Baur was more focused on expressing his gratitude and extending a welcome than tooting his own horn. An employee pulled Baur aside and they began talking about the technology needs in the office. The conversation relocated slightly farther away from me, but I could still overhear. Baur was insistent that they needed a new computer for the interns despite the
tight budgets. He expressed concern for the interns, as if he believed their work was so important that providing them with a decent computer is imperative.

The physical layout of the office was also somewhat interesting. I expected to see a modern office layout with more interactive open space. Instead, it was a very traditional cubicle setting. The workspace was divided into cubicle sections per department. The Communication Department was separated from the other departments by a square shape formed by cubicles. Everyone’s desk faced a cubicle wall, and had small barriers on either side to divide from one another. It reminds me of a fort build by children, where they can talk to one another yet is blockading outsiders off with tall walls. The other departments were divided similarly, but did not have as much space as Communication. On the first floor the office employees worked on logistics, filing, and other clerical work. There was also a large boardroom on the first floor where the departments could have their weekly meetings. The Lending Library was located in this boardroom. My desk was not located within the Communication area; instead, it was awkwardly placed in the hallway. I had an older computer and one small desk with a rolling chair. I had no privacy and was often in the way of those passing through the walkway. I kind of felt like it was a way to watch the interns and keep them on track. I had internet access and was allowed to use the Communication Intern email through their internal server. This meant that I was able to contact anyone on the farm and that when mass communications were sent out- I was able to read them. My computer did not have restricted internet, and I was able to check personal emails and browse the internet at my own discretion. Although the location of my desk made me feel slightly under surveillance, I did feel personal freedom during my workdays to complete my tasks independently.
Organizational Tensions

Whether I was working with Employee A, B, C, D, or F, I did not have to report to them throughout the day. I would be assigned a task and when that task was completed I simply reported it and was given a new task. On some days, they were busy with their own work and I had to wait some time until I was given a new task. I felt that they appreciated my work and often received verbal recognition. I was invited to the Communication Department’s weekly meetings where the Communication Director went through upcoming deadlines, successes and failures of recently past deadlines, and various interpersonal concerns. The first meeting I went to I noticed an issue between the Communication Director and another employee (not included in the list of employees provided above). During the meeting, the two seemed to disagree about the scope of the organization and the upcoming events. The Communication Director was pushing for a national focus and moving Farm Sanctuary to the forefront of animal protection movement. Although the Vision Statement and Mission Statement of Farm Sanctuary demands the end of violence towards animals and pushes a vegan diet, the organization does not claim to be an animal rights organization. Simply because the organization does work on reform campaigns and tries to be an all inclusive organization where anyone can feel compelled to join. The employee that disagreed with the Communication Director had been with the organization for many years and watched the transformation from a small grassroots organization to the celebrity alliances and national recognition. The employee felt it was losing its focus and dedication by pushing for larger measures and trying to gain national attention. Several days after the meeting, the employee resigned.
from the position/ was relieved. The rumor mill began churning and I heard several different stories before the end of that day.

Many people were sad to see the employee go for several reasons. My few encounters with the employee had been very pleasant. This employee radiated energy and passion towards animal liberation. The employee had adopted several pigs from Farm Sanctuary and kept them on their personal property. Although I only knew this employee for a short time, I was disappointed that I would no longer be working with them. This situation is one of several that happened during my stay at the farm. I received two mass emails sent out by employees announcing their resignation as well. Because these other employees were in different departments, I did not catch as much gossip about their decision. Regardless of the rumor mill, I did notice tension between employees that had been with the organization for many years and those that were newer. All of the employees in the Communication Department had been with the organization for less than 10 months, except for the employee that quit after my first week. I was surprised by the short-term nature of the employment in the various office departments. I found that shelter employees had a longer employment record than those working in the office. I personally had a very hard time leaving the farm because of the close connection I had with the various animals. Everyday after work I would walk through the farm and visit the various animal barns. I would stop at each barn and enter the pens for intimate visits. I did so to conclude every day of work with a reminder of who I’m doing this for and why. The relationships I had with the animals drew me closer to the organization itself and made me feel a stronger sense of commitment. I felt that I was working for the animals rather than for Baur or Farm Sanctuary. Possibly, some office employees had
less time to visit the animals and were unable to form that close bond with the animals or sense of commitment.

*Open-Ended Survey*

Through my personal experiences and interactions, I picked up on tensions in the house and around the office. I wanted to gain a deeper understanding of specific tensions and positive qualities of Farm Sanctuary in the office. I comprised an open-ended survey that allowed me to uncover various tensions within the organization. During the last week of work in the Communication Department I distributed an open-ended survey to the Communication employees trying to better understand their relationship with Farm Sanctuary and their feelings about working for the organization. I wanted to gain an understanding of the reasons why individuals chose to work with a non-profit organization, and in particular an animal advocacy organization. I also wanted to learn more about what each individual felt was positives and negatives about working with Farm Sanctuary, and how/if it was comparable to other non-profits (if they had experience with additional). Each employee agreed to fill out the anonymous survey and was given instructions. The survey included a short description at the top describing my intentions and interests. I emailed the survey to each of them so that they could type the answers (time saving) and asked them to print their survey and place it in the envelope I put on my desk. Also, because their surveys asked for typed responses rather than handwritten, they could feel more anonymous and free to write without censor.

The survey was broken up into three parts; Your History, Farm Sanctuary, and Internal Relations. Each section contained questions that tried to understand their unique perspective on the organization, the movement, and their relationship to animal advocacy.
I have included a copy of the survey that was emailed to the Farm Sanctuary Communication employees on the next page:
I won’t space it out because I’m not sure how much room to give. The more you say- the better understanding I will have. To sum up what this is:

I am looking at FS in particular, but in a larger picture, as an example of a non-profit activist organization. I have been interviewing the other interns to gain understanding of their jobs and thoughts. As a communication intern and student, I feel looking at the Communication Department itself would provide a lucrative area for research. Everyone is kept anonymous, and my thesis is not for FS. I don’t intend to even share my thesis with the organization, depending on the conclusions I make. I will keep everything anonymous, regardless. My thesis is a critical cultural ethnography, and being critical, I am looking for tensions, issues, and making suggestions for change. You are all helping me TREMENDOUSLY by sharing your thoughts and experiences. The more detailed the better, but I understand that you are all under a heavy workload. Thank you SO much for your help!

Your History

1. How long have you worked for FS?
2. Were you hired into the position you currently hold?
3. What brought you to FS?
4. Are you vegetarian or vegan?
5. Have you ever worked with an animal rights/welfare organization before?
6. If yes, How does that organization compare to this one? Do they operate similarly?
7. Have you ever worked with a non-profit of any kind? If so, where?

8. How does that organization compare to this one? Do they operate similarly?

FS:

1. What do you find unique about FS?

2. What do you find most frustrating about FS and why?

3. What do you find most satisfying about FS and why?

Internal Relations:

1. Have you ever visited the animals on the farm? IF SO, how often?

2. Do you feel connected to what happens on shelter?

3. Do you feel connected to what happens outside of the Communication Department?

4. How effective do you find the internal communication? (Do you feel you get accurate and up to date information from all departments? Do you even get information updating you on all departments?)

5. How do you feel email impacts your communication with others? (People seem to email questions, even if the person is sitting right next to them).

6. How often do you have a face-to-face conversation with employees from other departments?

7. Do you feel your job would benefit from a more open communication with all employees?
8. What is one aspect of your job you would not change?

9. What is one aspect of your job you would change?

10. Is there anything you would like to add that you feel could improve my understanding of your job/this organization?
There were five employees in the Communication Department, not including the Communication Director. Four of the employees agreed to complete the surveys and be a part of this thesis. The surveys were coded by recurring themes, focusing on phrases that appeared throughout the surveys. Using qualitative research approaches, the surveys were read closely individually and then compared to one another. The surveys were implemented to provide another way to gain deeper understandings of each of the unique employees in the Communication Department. Interestingly, all but one of the Communication employees had worked previously with a non-profit organization. However, only one had worked with an animal advocacy organization and that was what specifically drove her to work with Farm Sanctuary. I was interested in their level of commitment to the movement, and thus included the question Are you a vegetarian or vegan? I did not ask others during my internship because I assumed everyone was vegan. As time went on, I felt it relevant to ask in the survey and be able to clarify how many adhere to the vegan lifestyle. Only one of the employees was a vegan and all the rest were vegetarians. I found this particularly interesting because of the nature of the work. It seems troubling to work for an organization that asks the public to make compassionate choices and lead a vegan lifestyle if its own employees are not abiding by the very mission. One of the employees from another department informed me that legally, Farm Sanctuary could not discriminate against applicants solely based on whether or not they were vegan. There seemed to be tension surrounding this issue between the vegan employees and those that were not. The tension became visible when one of the Communication employees made an offensive remark to me.
I have long since abstained from bottled waters and own a variety of plastic and stainless steel bottles to refill. Naturally, I brought a few of the bottles with me to Farm Sanctuary. I had finished an assignment and was going over to Employee B’s desk to get my next task when another employee noticed my water bottle and it happened to be from Starbucks. She looked over at me and with a stone serious face remarked, “How can you claim to be doing anything morally right if you shop at Starbucks.” I was completely taken aback. The office was usually very quiet while everyone worked and a completely open layout only divided by cubicles. Everyone on the entire floor heard the comment (the tone was rather loud) and was outraged. I did not want to get into an altercation and simply brushed off the comment as a sarcastic jab. Later that afternoon, I was in the kitchen (the break room) eating my lunch when two other employees came to sit with me. They started going on about how that was so out of line for the employee to make the remark and how I should report it to Baur or the Executive Director, Jeff Lydon. What seemed to stick out most to the employees that continued to approach me throughout my internship, is that how dare the employee question my intentions if they cannot even give up cheese. The employee was not a vegan and openly professed the difficult challenge to give up dairy.

I remember one person approaching me saying, “I hope you did not take that personally. You are a great addition and committed enough to the movement to go vegan. That’s more than X can do” (employee, personal communication, August 2007). I did not know at the time that the employee (that made the remark to me) was not a vegan. Up until that point I was in the utopian state in assuming that everyone affiliated with the organization is a vegan. I found this to be a small area of tension between employees that
are vegans and those that are not. Once I found out some of the staff members were not vegan, I must admit that I also looked at them differently. It was a feeling of betrayal in a sense because I believed we are all fighting the same battle against the same opponents. I was naïve to think that simply because they worked for Farm Sanctuary they must be the shining examples of what the organization aspires for. I was sorely mistaken and very disappointed.

The interns are required to be vegans in order to live on the farm, so I just assumed employees were also required to be vegans. As I found out over time, Farm Sanctuary could not ask and openly discriminate against people based on whether or not they were vegan. The organization could find loopholes in interviewing processes to try and demarcate the omnivores, but the ideology of Farm Sanctuary seems incongruent with such practices. Perhaps this is where Farm Sanctuary illustrates the SPIN Model’s notion of “integrated” by ideology? Farm Sanctuary demonstrates that activists are integrated by the ideology of wanting to help improve the lives of animals, despite the differing ways in which they challenge the ideology in their own lives. I found this open-minded policy to be indicative of Farm Sanctuary’s inclusive nature. The policy was in tune with the inductive ideology that it is better to bring in all kinds of people to the organization and given the right information and time, individuals will come to make compassionate choices on their own. Rather than create a policy that only vegan employees or individuals can work for the organization, Farm Sanctuary welcomes everyone but does ask that while on the farm individuals abstain from bringing in animal products. For example, although off the farm many employees are not vegans, when they are visiting the farm or working Farm Sanctuary asks they respect and observe a vegan
lifestyle. This means that everyone brings a vegan lunch to the farm or goes to the People Barn (visitor center) and purchases vegan food to eat. This serves a two-fold process in that it maintains the vegan identity of Farm Sanctuary and it also helps introduce people to vegan choices. Several employees raved about the food in the People Barn, and had they never taken a job at Farm Sanctuary would probably never have tried. One of the employees indicated that they had worked there for 10 months responded to the question asking their dietary habits, “Vegetarian, trying to be vegan” (Anonymous employee, personal communication, August 2007). This indicates that for various reasons, one of which may be Farm Sanctuary, employees are exposed intimately to veganism and feel compelled to adopt it.

I and several other interns had not decided to go completely vegan until being accepted into the internship program. In several candid conversations at the Vegan House, we discussed how easy the transition had been especially once getting to the farm. Three of the interns made the switch into veganism on their first day at the farm, one of which switched from being an omnivore into being a vegan. I became close friends with one of the Communication employees and she opened up to me about herself and other employees she was close with. She explained that although her colleagues were not vegan, they had given up several animal products for vegan option once they began working with Farm Sanctuary. Although they did not make the complete switch, as I learned from my own experience, going vegan is a process rather than an overnight transformation. Even those that do make the decision overnight, learning about the various by-products and derived vitamins and minerals that can creep into any food product takes time.
I asked the Communication employees if they had worked with a different non-profit organization prior, and how they felt it compared to other organizations. One employee pointed out the distinct nature of Farm Sanctuary: “I find the organization’s mission in general to be unique, it is not a general Animal Rights organization, but has a specific agenda...The organization’s mission is well focused” (Anonymous employee, personal communication, August 2007). The employee found the inclusive mission to be strength for the organization. Another employee also indicated the relationship between their loyalty to the organization and the presence of rescued animals. When asked what they found most unique about Farm Sanctuary the employee replied, “We have animals here at the shelter, give direct care to actual, individual animals that are suffering. This is the main differentiator between FS and other animal welfare/protection/rights orgs and reason why I became a member in the first place...By far; the most satisfying part of my job is when I get to interact with the animals. Without a doubt” (Anonymous employee, personal communication, August 2007). From my own experience, after a long day in the office, walking through a farm animal shelter and visiting with factory farming survivors motivated me and reminded me of why I was doing this work.

In the third section of the survey, I asked how the employee felt about internal relations. Every employee stated in some fashion that they would like to see improved inter department communication. The relations between departments were commented on as either a frustrating aspect of Farm Sanctuary or a feeling of disconnect within the organization. One employee was very explicit in their negative feelings towards the internal communications at Farm Sanctuary, “Very poor internal communication...lack of communication of vital information,” and when asked if they feel connected to what
happens outside the Communication Department the employee reported, “Not as much as I’d like” (Anonymous employee, personal communication, August 2007). Another employee was candid about their disinterest in other departments. Although they acknowledged the poor internal communications, the comments seemed to prefer so. In response to Question 3 from the Internal Relations section, the employee said, “Yes, but only with shelter, some with education. No real interest/knowledge of campaign goings on. Absolutely no interaction with admin, unless I don’t turn in my timesheet or I see admin folks in the break room…Internal communication is shoddy, seems to operate on a need-to-know basis, which doesn’t provide any context or reason for what happens. Frustrating” (Anonymous employee, personal communication, August 2007). Although the employee said they have no interest in what happens in certain departments, the second part of the response says it is frustrating to not be regularly informed. All of the responses on the surveys indicated that interdepartment communication is poor and in need of help.

The second consistent comment was on pay. Not unique to a nonprofit organization, Farm Sanctuary has extreme budget constraints. Because of the magnitude of the two sanctuaries, a majority of the budget is spent on animal care. With an annual budget of around $5 million, animal care takes up a huge portion of the funds. The next large chunk of the budget is spent on campaigns, investigations, and publications. The organization is resolute to continue the campaigns, investigations, and releasing publications without great hesitation. The organization also demonstrates a commitment to offering animals a shelter, even if it is temporary. The vet costs of rescued animals can easily jump into the thousands, and that just within the first weeks of the animal’s arrival.
Many of the animals come to Farm Sanctuary malnourished, physically abused, in need of hygienic grooming, and most importantly to be neutered (each species has its own type of procedure). For example, the month of June marked an incredible amount of flooding in Wisconsin and left hundreds of pigs clinging to life. The waters had reached the floodgates and many farmers left their animals to die in the water. Farm Sanctuary was one of the first organizations to arrive at the scene and begin immediate respite care. Emergency funds were requested through various campaigns online, yet the majority of the funds come from the organization’s budget.

After the animals’ care and food is accounted for and the various investigations, publications, and campaigns receive funds, the budget for employees is considered. Although I did not gain access into the budget meetings, the organization was undergoing extreme makeovers of its budgets while I was there. I did overhear several issues employees had with announced budgets thus far. The Communication Department was receiving slightly more money than it had the prior year, but it was for funding projects rather than salary boosts. Every Communication employee commented on the very low pay. One employee said in response to Question 9 of the Internal Relations section, “Salary/benefits. I can’t say it enough. Pay is not enough to live on. Benefits may as well be out of pocket. Really undermines any positive reinforcement/good work reviews we get” (Anonymous employee, personal communication, August 2007). It seems as though employees felt that a low salary was a reflection of the value the organization placed on their work. This employee was indicating that they expected to see a salary increase to indicate the organization’s appreciation for their hard work and dedication. On the contrary, employees should be able to separate personal gain from the equation. Animals
and the campaigns to protect animals should be the main priority in the budget, and employees should be happy to make the sacrifice.

The internship with the Communication Department provided me with an incredible opportunity to meet and work with individuals in the animal advocacy movement. I was exposed to a work environment different from any other work experience I have had yet. The jaded notion that everyone that works for a nonprofit organization is a member of the movement it belongs to was something I quickly overcame. I found out that many of the people who work for Farm Sanctuary are not members of the animal rights movement in particular, and this phenomenon is not unique to this organization. Many would identify as possibly animal welfare, but that is a large generalization. I was given the chance to perform daily tasks in three diverse areas of Communication that are essential to the organization. Each employee was very different and offered a unique personal perspective. I am forever indebted to the employees at Farm Sanctuary, in particular the Communication employees, for truly welcoming me into their community. I was accepted as a member rather than an amateur outsider, and exposed to very intimate and candid interactions. The hours spent in the office are only a small fraction of the countless hours spent in the house and working around the farm in other departments.

Vegan House

Each person at the Vegan House brought a distinct journey into and perspective toward veganism. I was intrigued to learn more about those journeys and perspectives on an interpersonal level. In preparation for my thesis study, I put together a series of questions in the form of an in-depth interview. The interview was exploratory, and thus
the questions were subject to change depending on the flow of the interview and what the intern wanted to discuss in greater detail. I did not want to reduce their experience to a set of generic questions and answers that did not reflect their far-from-generic perspectives. We decided the best place to conduct the interviews would be at the picnic table in front of the house. They took place in the evening after work and lasted between 20-45 minutes. The interns agreed to being recorded so I would have an easier time documenting all of their responses.

The second form of data collection with the interns involved them keeping a journal during their internship. They were told to write whenever they had time and that there was no expectation as to how long or often entries must be. I did not want them to feel like I assigned work or that it was a burden. The purpose of the journal was to offer another outlet to gain understanding about their experiences and feelings. In times of stress or elation, I hoped the interns would write at least a short passage to document those thoughts. Because of their busy schedules and exhausting workdays, several interns did not write in their journal. Two interns were able to keep a journal during their stay, and used simple notebook paper. On the last day of their stay, they gave me their journals to analyze. I told them they could be anonymous, yet both decided to put their names on it. I still chose to protect their identities and gave the interns anonymous names; Intern A, Intern B, Intern C, Intern D, and Intern E. One of the interns wrote several entries whereas the other intern wrote less. I told the interns I would not read the journals until I got back to Cincinnati and began synthesizing my research.

The springboard questions for the interviews guided me through the conversation. Because the interviews were very informal and took a conversational format with great
flexibility, the questions served as mere springboards into more personalized questions. The interviews were self-directed, and took place outside of the Vegan house at the picnic table in the front yard. Similar to how I assessed the open-ended surveys, I used the interview data to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of my colleagues and how these activists responded to working within the organization. The interviews were tape-recorded, so when I returned to Cincinnati I began to transcribe the tapes. I analyzed the interviews based on explicit thoughts shared and compared them to responses given by other interviewees. The questions included:

1. What position do you hold?
2. What duties do you perform on the farm?
3. How do you feel your work contributes to Farm Sanctuary?
4. Do you feel any tensions at work? Around the farm?
5. What do you find most difficult about working with Farm Sanctuary?
6. What do you find most rewarding about working with Farm Sanctuary?
7. What is your favorite animal (species and/or name)? Why?
8. Were you a vegan before coming to Farm Sanctuary?
9. If not, how hard was it to make the switch?

The interviews revealed several interesting issues in various departments. By analyzing the explicit language and experiences discussed in the interviews, I identified recurring themes in the interviews with interns. One common theme expressed by the interns who worked on Shelter (in various departments) was that there is so much work, so little time, and not enough people to do it. The feelings they expressed ranged from
exhaustion to excitement to desperation. Each person seemed resolute that the work they do is imperative to the organization. Taking care of the animals is not something they can slack on, nor can they put it secondary to interpersonal issues. When I asked Intern D, a shelter intern, if she feels any tensions at work, she replied, “There is no option not to complete your work. The animals are a necessity. You can’t talk amongst yourselves. There is too much work and we would end up staying late. If we don’t complete our work then animals don’t eat or get care. I think we should have two people working, but there are not always people to do that” (Intern D, personal communication, August 2007). She went on to describe the internal tension to complete her own work in the allotted time. Employees and interns are given a lunch break, but certain tasks need to be completed before that break can be taken. Each intern demonstrated that caring for the animals takes precedence over their own needs. For example, one of the interns described an occasion when they encountered a sick animal. Because of the genetic modifications and severe abuse farm animals endure, the longer they live the more health complications they develop. In many cases, the animals would have been slaughtered within their first year of life, but they may live for over 20 years at Farm Sanctuary. One day, an intern went to check in the Pig Barn where the older pigs are kept. The pigs are bred to gain hundreds of pounds within a short period of time, and continue to gain weight their entire life. The genetic modification also causes the pigs to gain much more weight than they would naturally. It is not uncommon for pigs to develop arthritis within the first few years of their lives and begin having difficulty standing. Because of the extremely artificial weight gain, their hooves have such painful arthritis and other complications that you see them bending their hooves inward and walking on knees.
As the pig ages, this becomes too much to bear. Eventually they cannot stand up at all and become ambulatory. Interns and employees visit these pigs in their special barn and provide them with specialized care, including turning them to shift weight, feeding them special mashes, cleaning and dressing their sores from being ambulatory, and so on. The interns (including myself) were very fond of these animals because they were so sweet, even though they were experiencing such pain. One day, an intern went to feed one of the oldest of these pigs and found her crying out and refusing to eat. Although it was time for the intern to eat lunch, she was adamant about getting Coston, the National Shelter Director. The intern gathered the staff necessary to address the health concerns and in the process had completely skipped her lunch break. In her interview, she described the situation as a non-issue. She had other animals to feed, and they could not feed themselves. She felt that her hunger was less important than the animals and the commitment took precedence. This story is not an uncommon one, demonstrating that the care of the animals on Shelter is of the utmost importance.

The Shelter interns showed great interest in what the office work of myself and Employee B, the Campaigns Intern, entailed. The only time they encountered the office or any of the departments within was on the first day of work during orientation. Because the interviews were conversational, the respondent would often ask me questions in response to those posed at them. Several interns showed surprise when I said employees had quit/ or had been fired after my first week. It was as if the only drama they experienced had been with the animals rather than with people. The discussions usually centered on the hectic schedule and exhausting tasks that seemed to pile up. Shelter interns worked intimately with the animals and were able to form close bonds. I included
the question about who their favorite animal was and why because I wanted to explore those intimate and personal relationships. When that question was asked, the interns tended to get more color in the face and looks of excitement. All of us had a favorite animal, or at least a handful that we really liked. To be able to gush about which animal/s we love spending our time with is a great distraction from the stress and hectic nature of non-profit work. I found this part of the interview particularly revealing. The interns got very excited and began describing quirks about the various animals they work with. They were able to describe personality traits, physical markers, and memories they have with that animal. This also indicated that the Shelter interns had created very close bonds with the animals and developed personal connections to many of them.

The interviews with Shelter employees did not provide a lucrative discussion of internal tensions and conflicts. Instead, they indicated that the interns and employees shared camaraderie with their dedication to the animals. Thus, there were no examples of conflict and strife among interns or between interns and employees. Intern D gave me one example of the disinterest in conflict: “The other day someone forgot to close the gate to one of the chicken barns. At first a few others and me were frustrated, but there wasn’t time to sit and dwell. It was annoying for a minute but then we had to just round them up and close the gate and keep going. There wasn’t time to sit around and complain. We are all working towards similar goals and it is not worth it” (Intern D, personal communication, August 2007). The story demonstrates the interns’ focus on the bigger picture, the disinterest in micromanaging each other. The close connection to the animals seemed to motivate them to work harder and not get hung up on the small stuff. When comparing this sentiment to my experience, the departments seem so distant. Many of the
office employees did not have interaction with the animals in their job description, or did not describe having a close connection. In contrast, Shelter employees felt strongly about their work and commitment to the animals. Rather than feeling interpersonal tensions, the interns described the tension of fighting the clock and doing their work to the utmost standard. As stated previously, perhaps the Shelter employees’ and interns’ close relationship with the animals drew them closer to the organization and made them feel more dedicated.

Rather than focusing on interpersonal issues, the interns spent more time talking about the stress of getting everything done before the sun set. Intern A described completing sheds as a battle against the clock that brought them together. After a long day of work, beginning at 7 am, the interns rotate closing sheds. As work days continued to get longer the interns took on more tasks, and did not return from work until around 5 or 6 p.m. The interns would be hungry for dinner and would try to get their meal cooking before they had to do sheds. Sheds take about 30-45 minutes depending on if the animals have already made their way to the appropriate shed. Intern E described how it had made sheds much easier when someone else came along. The interns described being exhausted at the end of the day, yet because they knew the job would be done faster and easier for one another, they took turns going with one another. The interviews reflected the camaraderie among shelter staff (including inters) and the commitment to doing their job sufficiently and time-consciously.

The question of whether or not the interns had been vegan before beginning their internship or not also sparked animated discussion. The interns that had gone vegan at the farm were eager to share their journey and to describe how they felt during and after the
transition. Intern D described having apprehension prior to coming to Farm Sanctuary and how she was hesitant to go vegan. She had volunteered at a local farm in her hometown and did not see the problem with small farms. She admitted to eating meat on occasion and said she purchased her eggs and milk from the local farm. She said once she came to Farm Sanctuary, she was able to learn about the relationship between small farms and factory farming. When she would visit the farm and see the animals roaming around, she did not think about what happens to the animals when they are no longer able to produce a profit. Also, she described learning about the health effects and psychological effects from breeding and raising an animal in artificial settings in order to produce a commodity as mind blowing. This portion of her interview was quite personal and truly required her to trust me.

I must admit that sharing my thoughts and feelings about my life before veganism was difficult. I felt embarrassed and somewhat ashamed for not acting compassionately sooner. I was angry with myself for consuming products that were produced in the expense of cruelty towards animals. I did not discuss my transition openly unless I felt comfortable with the person and trusted they would not judge me. I had worked very hard to foster trusting relationships with the interns and make them feel comfortable confiding in me. I was not surprised to hear that the other interns felt embarrassment and remorse for waiting as long as they had to go vegan. The transition for the interns who were not vegan prior to arriving was described as easy and simple. One evening, another intern approached me and wanted to talk. They wanted to hear about the egg industry and why it’s bad to eat eggs when it comes from “free-roaming” chickens at her local farm. She also wanted to know about the substitutes I used to replace eggs. That same support was
not available to me when I was beginning my transition. This is one example of an additional support system provided by Farm Sanctuary.

The combination of communal trips to the grocery store, shared recipes, reading suggestions, sharing similar experiences, educational lunches, and working for an animal advocacy organization allowed for an easy transition for the interns. A recurring theme in all of the interviews was the unique environment provided by Farm Sanctuary and the vast amount of knowledge they had gained. In my case, I had access to some of the most recognized animal rights videos and books in the Lending Library (a library located in the office) as well as direct interactions with key players in the movement. All of the Shelter interns discussed the privilege of working with Coston and learning from such an established animal care provider. The Campaign intern also discussed how lucky she felt working with Baur on a daily basis and sharing cubicle space with Harold Brown.

Regardless of departments, all of the interns, including myself, felt a sense of honor having the opportunity to work with and learn from the experts.

My interview with the Campaign intern offered a similar experience to my own. Along with the Shelter interns, she felt overwhelmed with the amount of work that needed to be completed. She admitted to coming early to work and staying several hours later than expected. She said she just could not walk away from the desk until she felt that she had made a dent in the workload. She demonstrated this sentiment when she said, “We are just nipping at the heel of everything. I kind of wish I could just stay here another week and just organize everything…We are way under-staffed. It’s basically just Employee E” (Intern B, personal communication, August 2007). Employee E was a Campaigns Department employee that, as of November 2007, no longer works for the
organization. Employee E is one of the employees I became very close with and has continued to maintain a friendship with. The director of the Campaigns Department, at the time a newly hired addition, is stationed in Washington. The intern described only receiving emails from the Director, and had never spoken with her over the phone. The Director was supposed to be overseeing all of the intern’s work, but the intern felt an extreme disconnect from her. Because there was only one staff member in Campaigns to work with the intern, she explained that she would have liked to have more of an orientation. “No one really instructed me or gave me clear things to do. I just started getting Foie Gras e-mails and thought it was just for my knowledge and the next day Intern F (an intern that did not live in Vegan House and was hoping to transition from intern to an employee within the month who acted somewhat as a superior to this intern) asked if I had done the E-Alerts (alerts sent via e-mail to the listserv) and I had no idea what he was talking about” (Intern B, personal communication, August 2007). She told me this story and followed it with describing her desire to do as much as she could to the highest level of integrity. She felt apprehension about her work at times because she did not receive clear instructions or direct feedback. She did not want to seem incompetent or clueless. She felt this could be remedied by having a full orientation of the job and requirements, clear instructions on daily tasks, and timely feedback about her work.

The second issue the Campaign intern pointed out was the use of e-mail as the primary method of communication. Intern B described her surprise to see e-mail used so often in such a small open office. The Campaign Department was a small area in the far left corner of the office and was divided into cubicles. She was surprised the first day of work to receive an e-mail from the person sitting next to her rather than a verbal greeting.
“Intern F e-mailed me on my first day and he was sitting right next to me! I get this e-mail introducing him and at the end he asked if he spelled my name right. I wanted to turn to him and just say, ‘Yes!’ But instead I replied to his e-mail” (Intern B, personal communication, August 2007). The use of e-mail was also described as useful in other situations. “I was transferring an e-mail research project to Intern F and I felt like maybe I was doing a bad job. So in this case I had Intern F sitting right next to me and Employee E behind, so I liked e-mail because I could just e-mail Employee E and ask her without Intern F knowing” (Intern B, personal communication, August 2007). In situations where someone had to share an uncomfortable comment or ask a question, the intern preferred e-mail. As a quick communication source that allowed for private discussion, e-mail served a good purpose. On the other hand, the intern also felt the in-person interactions became scarce and impersonal. She and I were able to discuss these types of issues in great length because we both worked in the office. We talked about staying late and trying to help out as much as possible. We also talked about how we felt far away from the animals and wanted to have more interactions. Both of us volunteered on our days off and shadowed Shelter interns.

The interviews were an excellent time for me to connect with the other interns and share our thoughts. I learned that there are several recurring issues that Farm Sanctuary faces throughout the farm. The interns all expressed gratitude towards Farm Sanctuary for providing them with this unique opportunity, love for the animals on the farm, and a sense of honor of being able to work with an array of amazing activists. I also learned, though, that there are job-specific issues that do not overlap from office jobs to shelter jobs. All of the shelter interns and the employees I asked felt that the most important
aspect of their job are the animals and did not have any examples of interpersonal
struggles that became an issue. On the other hand, my reflections about the
Communication Department and the experiences described by the Campaigns Intern did
have examples of interpersonal struggles and a lack of connection between employees
and the animals. Only one of the Communication employees, Employee D, claimed to
visit the animals more than once a month.

The interviews allowed for me to openly discuss and to interact with the interns
on a one on one basis. I enjoyed meeting with them and sharing our thoughts about the
job, the movement, and the organization itself. We also talked about our private lives and
how veganism might transfer when we got home. At the time, my partner was not
vegetarian or vegan, and several others had the same dilemma. Luckily, by the time I had
returned from my internship he had independently transitioned into veganism and was an
avid animal rights activist. But that’s another story for another day. In the Vegan House,
the interns and I talked openly about our families and how they had/would react to us
going vegan. It was interesting to hear the variety of situations; some positive and others
utterly heart-wrenching. Intern C had been completely alienated from part of her family.
On holidays, they refused to serve anything vegan, and were adamant about serving meat.
Others, including myself, had great experiences of our gaining family support, and in
some cases of helping a family member go vegetarian and/or vegan. We were all excited
but apprehensive about returning to our home environments. Even for those who had
gone vegan prior to the internship, it was still going to be different outside the farm. We
were so used to living with vegans, visiting farm animals on a daily basis, and working
towards reaching animal liberation. Although we were nervous as to how this experience
would transfer home with us, we were excited to share our experiences. The interviews were a great way to get to one the interns and learn about their unique experiences and feelings. The journals also gave me an intimate way to understand the intern’s unique experiences.

Journals

Two of the interns, along with myself, kept a journal throughout the internship. Because of hectic work schedules and trying to experience as much as possible, we did not write extensively in the journals. After the first day of work, I wrote an entry describing my observations and thoughts. I described the tensions I observed during the Communication Department meeting. I noticed a variety of individuals and the range of philosophies regarding the organization. Some spoke out about how they felt Farm Sanctuary needed to take a firmer public stance on certain issues. They expressed concern that Farm Sanctuary is often affiliated with “welfare” issues, and in particular about the animal legislation in California. Other employees were excited that there was going to be welfare legislation on the ballot in the most populous state (Proposition 2). I also observed a disagreement between the Communication Director and an employee over the “ease” of completing a particular assignment. The Communication Director felt the assignment was necessary and that it could be completed in a reasonable amount of time. The employee disagreed and felt that the assignment was a large undertaking and was more complicated than the Communication Director was describing it. Two of the employees were trying to explain to her the multiple levels of this assignment, including time, cohesiveness, and money. I was able to actively participate in the meeting and share my thoughts at any time. I tried to express a tone of respect and reservation when I shared
my opinions because I was new to the organization and department. I noticed each employee took different tones when addressing the Communication Director and others. One of the employees had been employed for several years prior to the Communication Director’s arrival with the company, and they seemed to struggle over authority. The employee spoke over the Communication Director and often used a sarcastic tone with her. I was new to the organization, so I did not understand or know the interpersonal relationship they shared. In my journal, I wrote a lot about the lax dress code and the presence of companion animals in the office. I felt very comfortable going to work in jeans and a t-shirt and wearing simple flip-flops. The casual dress code was reflective of the social environment as well. Within minutes, I felt at ease with the employees and around Baur. The employees ranged in age from early twenties to late sixties. Although I was on the younger end of individuals working in the office, I did not feel inferior or as if I had to regard them with any special reverence. They approached me and were curious to get to know me. I was also eager to meet the employees and get to know them. In my journal, I wrote about my desire to get to know everyone in the office and hopefully to make lasting friends. On the first day, my desires included wanting feel more involved. I expressed this when I wrote, “Right now I’m kind of archiving, indexing, and cross-referencing. I want more involvement and interactions and interns.” My journal reflected an excited and apprehensive journey into the Communication department and Farm Sanctuary itself. As time progressed, my entries became brief with a tone of excitement. I began talking about the individuals I was closest with and how connected I felt to them. Work became habitual, and I was able to integrate myself as much as possible. I felt that over time the employees had gained enough respect for me to give me more in-depth
assignments and to engage in personal conversations. I became close with Employee E and Employee B (two employees closest to my age) and we hung out multiple times outside of work and away from the farm. Towards the end of my stay, I wrote about being scared to come home and leave this vegan “utopia.” I was nervous I would not have support at home, that I would be overwhelmed being back in the omnivore’s world.

The journal itself concluded with that tone, and a tone of fulfillment. I felt satisfied with my work and excited to come back and visit. I could not wait to share my experiences and spread the word. Although I was satisfied with my work, I did not want to walk away from working within the movement. I was resolute that working towards animal liberation would be the cornerstone of my life.

In her journal, the Campaign Intern expressed similar sentiments. She wrote about how amazing her internship was and how grateful she was for the opportunity. She said, “This internship has been an amazing opportunity to communication and exchange ideas with other people who share certain values yet come from a variety of backgrounds, perspectives, schools of thought, life experiences…all with a similar core desire to live compassionately” (Intern B, personal communication, August 2007). Her journal focused solely on how privileged she felt to have been given this opportunity. She was open about her desire to stay involved with the organization and movement itself. The journal was filled with statements of gratitude and a pledge never to forget her experiences. The intern also included feelings of guilt that she could not stay and complete from tasks. She felt that there was so much work remaining and she did not want to leave it unfinished.

Unlike my experience and the Campaign intern’s, the shelter interns had to adjust not only to the environment but also to the physical exertion required for their job. The
journal of Intern A, the shelter intern, followed her transition into working a physical job for such long hours. After her first day of work she wrote about being “exhausted, hot, and tired.” She expressed genuine concern that because her job was so physically demanding she feared she would not be able to enjoy the company of the animals. She was pleasantly surprised as her first day progressed. “Later in the afternoon I was able to feed the baby goat and play with Rosie, the chicken who cannot walk. These encounters raised my spirits and helped me remember why I am here. Although the work can be strenuous and repetitive, I will never get bored or give up because I must keep going for the sake of the beautiful animals that reside here” (Intern A, personal communication, August 2007). She described a significant transformation that shaped her perspective on the work with the animals. She seemed to put aside her physical exhaustion and rededicate herself because of two interactions with animals. She went on to write an entry around the middle of her internship describing how she had adjusted. She wrote about how her muscles had adjusted to the work and no longer caused her pain, and also that the weather had cooled so she no longer had “sweat attacks.” This entry focused on the large amount of work put in by the staff. She described her perspective on this work:

One thing I cannot get over is the amount of time the staff puts in here. I know people work from 7am-6pm with no lunch. It is crazy and I don’t know how they do it everyday. On top of the long hours, almost everyone seems to be nice and caring! They are all strong minded, hardworking, and compassionate individuals. I am glad I got to spend time with many of them because they have definitely changed my thought process and increased my knowledge base (Intern A, personal communication, August 2007).
The entry focuses on her reverence towards shelter employees. She seems fixated on how hard they work and maintain such a kind positive attitude.

Her final entry was written on her last night and reflects on her time spent. This entry marks a point of departure from the journals kept by the Campaign intern and myself. Rather than lament on leaving the animals behind or guilt because of leaving the work behind, the intern states she is “ready to go home.” She does reflect on how much she has learned, the people she is glad to have met, and the diverse backgrounds she has encountered. She describes having learned a lot about animals, veganism, and how a non-profit organization is run. “I have also learned many strategies on how to teach people about factory-farming, veganism, and general compassion towards all animals. I will take this knowledge and spread it to as many people as I can, and hopefully I can change just one person” (Intern A, personal communication, August 2007). She describes her experience as informational and fulfilling, and demonstrates excitement about bringing it home to her community.

The journals written by the Intern A, a Shelter intern, were useful in understanding the life on the farm and the struggle to adjust our bodies to extreme physical work while doing something so morally important. The journals provided me an opportunity to learn about the thoughts shared by my fellow interns. I was able to gain a better understanding of work in different departments. The interns and I became close enough to share intimate details about our transformation into veganism and the animal rights movement. I am grateful that these people welcomed me into their lives and shared their thoughts so candidly with me. I believe that we grew closer not just from living in a house together, but also from participating in several life-altering experiences.
Educational Lunches

Farm Sanctuary and the meals prepared by the Intern Coordinator, provided the educational lunches to us. The interns and I were given a list on topics to choose from and various employees around the farm presented the topics. The lunch topics we chose included Animal Healthcare presented by Susie Coston, History of Farm Sanctuary/Veganism presented by Don, Media by the Communication Director, and Q&A With Gene Baur. The Educational Lunches occurred on Wednesdays, and all of the interns were given the same lunch break and met in the People Barn/Visitor Center. The lunches were elaborate meals prepared by the Intern Coordinator and selected by the Interns. The interns and I were given menu choices each week and had to agree on a meal and tell the Intern Coordinator a few days in advance. The meals ranged from a French toast bonanza (5 different types), Indian food (including red and yellow curried rice), and Italian food (spaghetti).

Our first Educational Lunch was the History of Farm Sanctuary/Veganism by the Intern Coordinator, Don. We ate in the People Barn and then sat outside in the grass in a casual circle. He began telling us about Farm Sanctuary and how it began. It was a very broad overview, but enough to acquaint us at the time. The interns and I asked questions about the absence of Lorri Bauston, Baur’s ex-wife, and were given very short answers. The main discussion centered on veganism and a range of popular debates. The lunch was interesting, but I already knew many of the things the Intern Coordinator said. I was looking forward to the other presentations and learn more from other employees on the farm.
The second Educational Lunch was to feature Coston describing caring for the animals. Because of a work overload and time constraints, Coston was unable to do the presentation for us. Instead, We had a Q&A with Harold Brown on the subject of “The Truth About Free Range and Organic Farming.” During this lunch, Harold presented us with cases of animal abuse and violations at farms that claim to be “humane” and “organic.” He brought us reports from the USDA about organic standards, and the lack thereof. The interns and I were shocked that the label USDA meant very little in terms of ensuring true organic practices. Instead, Brown gave us alternative organizations that can certify organic foods. Brown also told us his story into veganism. He grew up on a dairy farm and had raised/milked cows his whole life. As an adult, he followed the family business and ran his own dairy farm. He had seem animals slaughtered and been told it was customary, part of the life cycle. He remembers one day looking into the eyes of cow and having a rush of feelings of guilt and remorse. He had an epiphany that he no longer wanted to work in this industry. When he talked about his moment of realization, he got emotional and had to cut off. The lunch was informational, and also an emotional experience.

The third lunch was the Q&A with Gene Baur. Baur was excited to meet with us and share his stories. Before he began, I told him about my research and he agreed to be recorded. He described his upbringing on the west coast, in the California hills and mountainous area. His dad was the manager of a hotel, and constantly surrounded by refugees from Mexico and Guantanamo (during the ‘70’s). He observed these refugees and empathized with their horror stories. He began to see these people in a similar light to the abused animals around the world.
Baur told us about the days selling veggie hotdogs out of a Volkswagen van at Grateful Dead shows. He described starting the organization as a slow process that began with visiting stockyards and conducting investigations. He shared one experience:

If you go in the evening, the doors are usually left open. You can just walk in. One time a guy caught me and he refused to let me leave. I insisted he call the cops, and when they came we were each put in separate cop cars. The guy wanted me to hand over my camera and tape, but the tape also had footage from all kinds of stockyards so I did not want to. The cop agreed to let me go and keep my stuff if I deleted the footage I had taken at that particular stockyard. (G. Baur, personal communication, August 22, 2007)

Baur told this story early in the Q&A session and it drew in our attention. After he told the story, one of the interns began asking about doing investigation and the risks involved.

Interns were interested in what kind of risks Baur was willing to take in his investigations. Investigative reporting has always played an important role for Farm Sanctuary. Baur told us the story of Hilda, the sheep rescued and named after the first intern. He took this time to thank the interns for their dedication and work at the farm. He ensured us that our work is central to the survival of the organization and the movement itself.

Although the interns were enjoying the praise, we had a lot of hard-pressed questions to ask Baur. We wanted to know where Farm Sanctuary falls on the continuum between welfare and rights. Baur approached this question with slight hesitation as he collected his thoughts:
There is this huge debate going on between rights and welfare. Everyone wants to know- are you rights or animal welfare? And I believe we are both and it should be considered on a continuum. Overall, things change in small steps. You take a little step, and then you take another. If you take one step you don’t sit there and shout, “YAY, Everything is perfect.” You have to keep moving forward and taking steps. Of course our mail goal and dream is for a vegan world, which falls under animal rights. But we are working slowly towards that by establishing laws and restrictions for the treatment of animals. For example, we are pushing for veal and gestation creates to be discontinued. And although that seems a little two-sided (they might just make a small change and try to get us “off their back” or some people are afraid of the slippery slope), we are still trying to get as many steps in as possible- even if they are little. (G. Baur, personal communication, August 22, 2007)

The answer seemed to get mixed reviews. Although he answered the question, some of us still were confused on the central focus. We began asking questions about how he views “extreme animal activist behavior” by groups like the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). We wanted to know if Farm Sanctuary would denounce the behavior or to some degree understand the ideology. Baur seemed to understand where those people get the motivation to take animals out of laboratories and factory farms, but he also discussed the negative side of this behavior. “I think some of that stuff turns people away. But sometimes it’s that stuff that brings attention. And sometimes it takes away from the animals. When it becomes more about the tactics than the cause then something is wrong… I think the most extreme acts are done by desperate actors and desperation is not
the best state to act it” (G. Baur, personal communication, August 22, 2007). He seemed understanding and did not outwardly discredit work done by the ALF. Baur pointed to the slippery nature of that type of behavior by saying it can either be positive or negative, but rarely in the middle.

Rather than speak about “extreme activist behavior” in a dismal manner, Baur wanted to demonstrate some aspect of open support among a range of organizations. He emphasized that Farm Sanctuary is focused on alliances rather than enemies. He described his organization as not just against cruelty, but also for a compassionate, sustainable, and humane way of living and farming the earth. His optimistic tone permeated when he discussed the cognitive dissonance he and other activists face within this movement. There is urgency within the movement to say all animals right now, yet the movement faces many slow transitional processes require patience and time. Baur described the challenge: “Our work is ethically impossible. Ethically, we have the responsibility to save all of the animals right now. It’s hard when you walk into a battery cage facility and there are 80,000 battery cages. Why do you save?” (G. Baur, personal communication, August 22, 2007) Baur then offered a comforting quote: “I think of that quote they use in Alcoholics Anonymous that Confucius said, ‘Give me the strength to change the things I can, the serenity to accept the things I cannot, and the wisdom to know the difference’” (G. Baur, personal communication, August 22, 2007). The response drew in our attention to the overbearing amount of work ahead of the movement.

Although Baur’s reference to the Confucius quote offered some comfort, we all took a moment of silence to reflect on just how many animals die every minute, hour,
day, and year. He then went on to describe the size of other organizations as much larger than Farm Sanctuary. Not only is the membership base of the HSUS many times larger than of Farm Sanctuary, the annual budget of the HSUS (around $120 million) is 24 times larger than Farm Sanctuary’s annual budget (roughly $5 million). The meat industry side of the opposition is so large it is incredible. “Just one meat producer operates on a $200 million budget.” Baur stated the obvious when he said, “We are like a fly compared to what we are going up against” (personal communication, August 22, 2007). The amount of resources available to the opposition and even other organizations within the animal protection movement is so large-scale, especially compared to Farm Sanctuary. With such a small budget and two farm animal sanctuaries to operate, Baur described the trouble of prioritizing campaigns.

The decision-making that goes into the prioritization of campaigns seems to weigh on Baur. The process of choosing which campaign will take headline, for example dairy or Foie Gras, measures multiple variables:

Some consider Foie Gras low hanging fruit because most people are quick to say, “Oh, that’s terrible.” Americans are so quick to point the finger of blame. And it is an easier battle because of that. The dairy industry is HUGE and so embedded. For example, the federal school lunch program requires BY LAW that every lunch has one cup or mini carton of milk on it. The kid doesn’t have to drink it, but they have to be given it. (G. Baur, personal communication, August 22, 2007)

Baur’s example invited passionate responses of disgust. The interns expressed their concern with this policy and the amount of milk that gets thrown away as a byproduct of this one example. Several of us spoke out that we should abolish this policy and simply
demand schools not abide by this regulation. Baur responded by describing two different types of campaigns the organization can run. “We have two different kinds of campaigns—the red and green. The red campaigns are the ‘STOP’ or ‘DON’T DO THAT’ types of messages and the green campaigns encourage the action they should take, like ‘Go Veg’ websites or ‘Here try this’ messages” (G. Baur, personal communication, August 2007). It seemed as though Baur emphasized the “green light” campaigns more often, wanting to encourage others to try things rather than demand they do not.

Overall, Baur is passionate about the organization. He seems to have his hands in several cookie jars. He is excited about the campaigns and is an excellent speaker. When we sat down to lunch and hear his presentation, he went into detail about how grateful he is for our presence and everything we are doing. Constantly, we are reminded how much they appreciate us. Baur seemed excited to meet with us and get to share his stories. He was open and honest when presented with challenging questions. He did look at his watch during the entire presentation and seemed content sitting and discussing with us. When one of the interns offered her opinion or presented a question, Baur’s expression and body language changed to excitement and anticipation. At the conclusion of the Q&A session, Baur thanked each of us and asked how we were doing. He wanted to know what we thought so far and extended invitations to us for upcoming events and events during the year.

The final Educational Lunch was presented by the Communication Director on Media. The Communication Director also agreed to being recorded during her presentation. As a public face for the organization, it is impossible for her to remain anonymous to the public. For this reason, I begin referring to her here as Tricia rather
than just the Communication Director. Before she even began eating or introducing herself, one of the interns began asking about how to help their own animal rights group on their college campus. Intern E was interested in setting up a website and ways to send out media releases to publicize the upcoming events. Tricia seemed very excited to share her wisdom and experience on this subject. She began rattling off Internet resources and Farm Sanctuary media that can be linked to networking sites such as *MySpace* and *Facebook*. When Intern E mentioned she already had a Farm Sanctuary video tagged on her *Facebook* Tricia yelled, “Yaay! Yaay! That’s wonderful! Thank you, thank you, thank you” (Tricia, personal communication, August 29, 2007). Tricia was enthusiastic during the entire session, rattling off ideas at rapid speed.

After going into great detail about online and community resources available to activists, Tricia took a step back and began talking about the history of the Communication department:

We work with all other departments getting the campaigns, the projects, and the activities that they do out there to the public. And really helping to frame messages on the way that (she corrects herself) who we are, what we stand for, and what our goals are. Where the education department does a lot of grassroots and focusing on individuals and kind of making that connection with individuals, I guess in that way communication is a counterpart, the kind of the voice that is more of a general voice speaking to a much broader audience. So in a way that we frame things and in the way that we get things out we have to always keep our audience in mind. (Tricia, personal communication, August 29, 2007)
Tricia began to speak in circles when trying to explain what specifically Communication does. This was not because she did not understand the roles Communication plays, but because Communication plays so many roles at different times. She discussed the time she asked Baur who Farm Sanctuary’s target audience is and he responded, “Everyone, we want everyone to go vegan and consider farm animals and give them the respect they deserve.” Despite the wide-reaching audience, the lack of resources often constricts campaigns keeps many organizations from generating a campaign that reaches everyone. In dealing with this dilemma Tricia said, “So the key is always to narrow who your audience is to determine who do I want to influence, some way to get them to do what you want them to do (she laughs)” (personal communication, August 29, 2007). She discussed the target market or audience of Farm Sanctuary as women between the ages of 18-35, and how the messages become tailored to different audiences. The target audience has been women in the 18-35-age range for the organization since inception. She did not go into detail why she believes this to be so, but did say that for whatever reason women have been more receptive to animal suffering and the idea of compassionate choices. The tight budget of Farm Sanctuary puts added pressure on the organization to make the most of each communication sent out and campaign.

Tricia went into detail, similar to Baur, about the budget gap between Farm Sanctuary, other animal advocacy organizations, and the meat industry. The multi-billion dollar ad campaigns and marketing campaigns from agribusiness has great success framing animal consumption in ways that make it not only acceptable but also preferable for the masses to consume as much as they could possibly want. Farm Sanctuary tries to counter messages like these with clever strategies to counter the disparity in budget.
Tricia described the process of generating messages that counter these widely held beliefs and challenges the long held myths about the nutritional value of animal products. One specific strategy is using research to put the health concerns of consuming animal products, and Tricia described the website Veg For Life. The site breaks up the argument for veganism into three categories: For the Animals, For your Health, and For the Environment. The most popular link is the For your Health section, and through surveys and market data Farm Sanctuary has found that the majority of people go vegetarian/vegan for health reasons:

People are actually more apt to choose to go veg for animal welfare reasons over environmental reasons. Although that is changing. And we also know that people that go vegan predominantly overwhelmingly choose to go vegan for ethical reasons which is usually a combination of a baseline of ethics based on those three categories. (Tricia, personal communication, August 29, 2007)

The Communication department is responsible for understanding these patterns of those who have changed, and understanding how those people came to those changes because that is what shapes the messages they create and how they reach out to the public. Although Tricia mentioned the specific target audience, she emphasized the importance of reaching out to a very general audience.

The inclusive nature of Farm Sanctuary came through in this section of the session. Tricia emphasized the importance of reaching out to those that have not and probably would not have considered farm animals. For many, the only association they have to farm animals is at the grocery store, seeing their flesh wrapped in plastic. Since
that is the average association and the majority of experiences for individuals, that is
exactly what Farm Sanctuary should focus on. Tricia summarized:

   So understanding that we are coming from that perspective as well (laugh) also
   poses a challenge because one of the things that is our goal is to get people to
   understand the sentience of farm animals. To get people to understand and accept
   that they have the same capacity to feel as one’s cat or dog or you and I would
   feel. (personal communication, August 29, 2007)

She felt it important to stress to us that everyone is a potential receptor to the message
and worth reaching out to. When discussing the trend for women to join and support
animal advocacy movement, Tricia brought up the masculine culture and the relationship
to animal consumption:

   I think that the male demographic is coming around to that but I think they are far
   and wide again, and I make massive generalizations because you kind of have to
   when you are trying to change the hearts and minds of millions of people, there
   are always exceptions to the rule. Generally, there is a certain culture, male
   culture, and the expectations and the notion to bulk up and those expectations do
   not exist in the female realm. (personal communication, August 29, 2007)

She was confident when discussing the slight shift in culture to be receptive to the animal
issue.

   Tricia touched on an important issue to the animal rights movement, and that is
   the social construction of masculinity in relation to animal domination. This is an
   important area of research that I hope to see addressed more in future research. Despite
the gender differences that impact the receptiveness of males and females to animal advocacy issues, American society in general has began shifting in a more positive light.

At this point Tricia began talking about the concept coined in the book by Martin Gladwell called the “tipping point.” The book, *The Tipping Point*, by Gladwell (2000) discusses the point in society when the pendulum begins to swing in favor of the movement. Gladwell has studied social movements and how social movements move from a grassroots perspective or from a kind of counterculture to become part of the culture that there is usually a series of events that take you to that tipping point (Gladwell, 2000). Tricia described that the Communication department looks at past movements like the civil rights movement and suffrage movement and studies how the understandings of what is socially acceptable change and how that evolves over time. She expressed confidence that although society is not nearing a tipping point of mass veganism in the near future, society is reaching a tipping point of bringing awareness of factory farming and the destructiveness of it. Tricia described the hazards that are made public as this tipping point approaches:

Not only to the animals, but also on the environment and workers, public health issues, that we are at point getting ready to hit that tipping point. I would say it is only in America, but it is going to start in America because we are a massive export of meat. We export more meat than any other country, and if it starts here then it will create a domino effect. (personal communication, August 29, 2007)

Globally, the animal advocacy movement is also gaining momentum. The European Union is ahead of the United States on the awareness of factory farming and noticing the un-sustainability of factory farming, and in response has passed laws to allow animals to
stretch their legs and spread their wings. But the European Union still allows for animals to be raised for food, so the movement has to be thought of as multi-generational. In a moment of inspiration, Tricia talked about the importance of our work in the moment, “What we are doing today, we are laying the ground work for our children and our children’s children. That is what it takes to move to that kind of awareness” (personal communication, August 29, 2007). The interns responded to this with reassurance that their work does have merit and is crucial to the survival and success of the movement.

The question was posed, as it was to Baur, if Farm Sanctuary considers itself animal rights or welfare. She was reluctant to call the organization solely animal welfare because of the fear that people may feel more comfortable consuming animal products because the welfare reforms allow animals to stretch their wings and pigs to stretch their legs. The surge of products advertising “happy cows” and “organically fed- hormone free” has led to a false sense of compassion. Yet, animal welfare and rights activists do not have the answer to the question of which is better. Is it better to not support welfare laws that make conditions better for the animals in the now and only push for abolition laws for the future? These are the types of questions Tricia described and did not offer her answer to. She claimed Farm Sanctuary serves both welfare and rights purposes, a similar answer to Baur:

We are a vegan organization that has a vegan campaign, the Veg For Life, we run both abolitionist campaigns like Foie Gras, which is to eradicate Foie Gras from the U.S. to get rid of it. But at the same time we also work on welfare legislation as well. But we do know that both are making an impact in some way. So by minor welfare measures we do help provide a better quality of life than
what the animal would have been afforded without the laws. Any isn’t it our responsibility as animal rights activists to at least offer that? Are we just going to say, “Let’s forget about that and just focus on vegan outreach only?” At this point I firmly believe, based on market research and what we know, is that only a small percentage of the population that is going to take that vegan outreach message. There is another percentage of the population that is going to take it, but you have to bring them along over a period of time as they come to realize it. Now, there are other people like myself that make a voyage to veganism in a day. I came here a meat eater, met a turkey, and in a week I was vegan. So there are times when there are drastic changes when people have an “ah-ha” moment.

(personal communication, August 29, 2007)

Moyer would analyze this statement as demonstrating how social movement organizations should be able to play various roles interchangeably. The change agent must be willing to make sacrifices in order to get stepping stone victories. Farm Sanctuary demonstrates this by working on welfare measures while advocating for a vegan world. The discussion became very intriguing as we discussed how we all went vegan. It was interesting to hear Tricia describe her rapid journey into veganism, and the pleasure that has followed.

The discussion of media outlets and the rhetorical tools used by the Communication department seemed to fascinate the other interns. After the session concluded, several interns had questions for me. They wanted to know what I worked on and how I felt about what she said. I felt Tricia did a great job describing the department and the challenges they face. I felt somewhat honored to have my supervisor come and
present for my peers, and help them understand better what I do in the office. The ways in which the interns understood each other’s jobs seemed somewhat weak. They had not asked or shown interest in shadowing me at work and understanding what goes on in the office. I was happy to see their excitement and interest in learning about the work. I did show great interest in and shadow the Animal Care intern, Intern E, on my days off.

Shadowing Animal Care Intern

Every Saturday and Sunday, I woke up and went to work with Intern E, the animal care intern. On the rare occasion she would have the day off, I asked if there were tasks I could help the other interns complete. The shadowing experience helped me understand the hard physical labor and emotional connections that went into their work.

The morning began at 8 a.m., when we went to the Shelter House. There we met with one of the animal care employees and began boiling the eggs. Because the rescued hens came from factory farming, they still produced eggs. When hens lay eggs, they lose protein that is difficult to replace. Rather than using the eggs for human consumption, we boil the eggs and feed them back to the chickens and pigs. The eggs are put on a slow boil for several hours. We then move from shed to shed and clean and replenish the water tanks. This involves very heavy lifting, and the cans get heavy and must be transported from the hose to the shed. The intern had taught me strategies to stay as dry as possible, but some of the soak was impossible to avoid. The waters took about an hour, and then it was time to check on the eggs.

The eggs were usually done by then and had to be mashed up. We began preparing lunch for the animals. One of my favorite stops was feeding the goats and sheep. This involved climbing above the barn to the hay/straw loft. We had to pull six
clusters, cut the rope binding it and break it up into hand-fills. The hay was dropped down from above in clusters all around the barn so each animal had access to some. Once it all was thrown down, we then went down the ladder and spread it out further—even hand feeding some of the older sheep. Several of the goats and sheep were fed a special mash to meet their dietary needs. For instance, Gloria, a very special older goat, has a difficult time eating and keeping weight on. I had to prepare her mash and get her into an isolated pen so no other animal could interfere. This often took some time because the younger and/or more dominant sheep and goats tried to get in. Gloria herself would often try to escape the pen because she wanted to rest. Once she was in, I gave her the mash and left her in there until she was done. This was also done with chickens and turkeys, for a wide range of reasons.

After it appeared that all the sheep and goats had received enough food, we moved on to the bunnies. The bunnies were given food in their trays, and one head of lettuce was distributed as treats. We did not have to spend a long time in the bunny shed because we would return later to pick up the trays. We then went on to the chicken, turkey, and duck sheds to put out their food. Animals in all of these sheds were given food and then left to consume the food, as we would return after lunch to pick up the empty trays. The last stop was another favorite, the pig barns. I truly enjoyed visiting with all of the pigs and feeding them. We began by putting all their food into trays, which immediately summoned the piglets. Slowly, the other pigs would rise from resting in the hay or playing in the mud to get their food. We would also put around five of the boiled eggs in the trays. There were roughly 8 trays about 3 feet long that the pigs would roam and feast from. The piglets were usually bitten and pushed away by the older and more
dominant pigs, a pecking order of sorts. As an attempt to spoil the piglets, I would call them over and drop an egg right into their mouth. I fell in love with all of the pigs for their unique personalities and expressions of joy. This was the first part of the feed portion, and following lunch was the second part that involved going out and picking up trays and changing the water again.

As a shadow, I slowly was given more and more trust. The first day I really just followed her around and did not engage in the feeds or water changing. By the second day, I was confident that I could take on tasks independently. I found this experience not only educational, but also personally beneficial. I felt I had a close bond with each of the animals I interacted with, and was able to learn a great deal about them. I also gained essential skills in the daily care of operating a sanctuary. Without the experience, I would not understand or truly appreciate the work that goes into caring for these animals. As an exhaustive labor of love, the care was truly top notch. The employees were also excited and appreciative that I wanted to help. They began trusting me with other responsibilities and privileges. For example, I was able to visit the animals in their sheds without an employee or other intern because of my proven capabilities. I am truly grateful for the Shelter staff and Animal Care intern, Intern E, for allowing me to shadow her and participate in her daily work.

Trip to the Live Animal Auction

The final aspect of this auto-ethnographic study involves the trip led by Harold Brown, nicknamed Farmer Brown, to the live animal auction on Thursday August 16, 2007. The auction is comprised of live farm animals from all different species and breeds. I took extensive field notes at the auction and also wrote a reflective letter to friends and
family after the experience. I include this experience because of the emotional effect it had and the bond it helped foster between the fellow interns and I. The following is the letter I wrote to family and friends and put inside my journal from the farm. Rather than recreate the experience, I have included the entry. The following is the letter:
So this is how it went. We got there and walked through all the pens that had different animals. They have crates full of goats (babies) and some older ones-then a pen of 8 sleeping piglets (all maybe a couple days old and being sold to be raised for pork- which means killed in six months). Then they had big cows- like spent dairy cows (a dairy cow is used for a maximum of four years until they are considered spent and then sent to slaughter) and a few bulls that are used for steak and larger cuts of beef. They had adult pigs and adult and baby sheep. They had two auction rooms. One was a larger area for the big animals they sell (cows and pigs). Then we went into this tiny little room where they do veal calf auctions and sheep/goats/and smaller animals. This was awful. I walked in and it was a tiny room and I see a little baby (the calf) being shoved around in circles so people can just investigate the type of meat they can get. It was like they didn’t see a one-day-old baby; they saw a dollar sign, food, and fine leather. Most leather uses calfskin from the Bob Veal (the kind of veal that they get from 1-3 day old calves). Anything that uses high-end leather is usually made from calves because their skin is softer and not as thick as adult cows. It was SO awful. These calves (or any veal calf) are the product of the dairy industry.

In order to get the milk- the cows must give birth and then we steal their milk from the babies. Just like humans, cows don’t product milk randomly. Cows only produce milk for their offspring after birth. So what do they do? They artificially impregnate the cows twice a year, take the babies, and mechanically milk the cows at abnormally exhaustive rates. And the babies are just disposable. So they keep the mother who is lactating and take her babies away right at birth.
(the mother usually doesn’t even see them after they are taken out, sometimes pulled out from the womb by force). The industry takes the babies and sends them to auction the next day to be used for Bob Veal (a little less expensive) or they crate them in 2x4 crates. Those are the ones that are chained by the neck to the wall; unable to turn around, they will be killed in four months. The farmer only needs to keep one female calf each year to be raised as a replacement for the mother once she is slaughtered after her four-year sentence. Any that is the hidden part of the dairy industry that people don’t know or just forget about. But it is escapable.

Anyways-

So I walked in the room and saw them shuffling the calf around. All the sudden I became overwhelmed with emotion and felt like I couldn’t breathe and had to step out. But when you step out of the auction room you are where all the calves are led and caged together after they are auctioned. This guy leads the calf out of the auction room and out of the side and back into the walkway (where I was) so I could see him shove the babies into crates together. One of the hard parts of seeing them was noticing these babies still had their umbilical cord attached and wet from being born only 24 hours ago. I couldn’t look at them without thinking they were going to be killed that afternoon or tomorrow morning. They were so scared and afraid of humans, but when one would come over they kept trying to suck our fingers and our clothes (trying to get milk). It was awful. I went back in a few minutes later and watched the rest of the calf auction and sheep auction. They were just shoved around like dirt. It was old sheep and babies. And this one was screaming and you could just tell it was really
scared. The little area they were marched around had a wooden fence and the sheep was trying to get out so hard that it got its head stuck, but this man attending the auction had his food resting on the fence and just started kicking the sheep’s head back in.

After that auction I wandered over to the adult pigs awaiting auction. It was disgusting. The pigs were overcrowded and completely scared of humans. They were COVERED in scars, scratches, open wounds, and bruises. They looked like slaves that had been whipped. Their eyes were seriously haunting. That is what struck me the most of the whole thing. The animals’ eyes. The older ones were scared to death of humans, some looked like they had just given up. The tiny babies were just so confused and scared of their fate. The older ones like almost knew. But all of them had these eyes that said a million things. Honestly, I can still see them.

The hardest part about being there was knowing that this was just one of millions of stockyards around the country and world. And on top of it- this was a “mild” one. They didn’t use electric shock rods like most other places. At a stockyard down the road, one of the workers who also works part time at the other stockyard told Harold (Brown) that we, animal rights activists, should visit there. He has seen workers beat downed (animals too sick to stand are referred to as downers) calves to death on multiple occasions. One of the most famous cows at Farm Sanctuary is Opie, then a veal calf found on a dead pile. The farmer, angry his veal calf didn’t sell during the auction, simply left the sick calf on top of a
stack of dead and disregarded animals. Opie was found by Farm Sanctuary activists during an investigation and lived at the farm for over 16 years.

I had so many thoughts and emotions yesterday. I was so disheartened by society. How can people pretend they don’t know or just simply not investigate? I mean I didn’t know a lot of what I know now until I started researching- but it just seems so embedded in society. I mean there were kids working there, families playing with the animals, etc. There was this little boy playing with a calf and his dad kept telling him to stop. The little boy was petting the calf and giving it gentle kisses on the nose. Finally the dad started yelling at his 3-year-old son and the little boy looks up at his father and says (referring to the calf), “He just misses his mom.” It’s like the little kid gets it but his dad doesn’t. The young child realizes this scared infant calf is crying out for its mother and does not want to be slaughtered. Every day thousands of animals are killed- and this was just one tiny component of it. I am glad I went because now I’m a witness for the animals and I did something. People think vegans are crazy. They think we eat grass and are abnormal.” As if this treatment towards animals and disregard for life is “normal.” We hug our kids, pet our dogs, and consider ourselves humane. But this is all going on behind closed doors. It is inescapable. And I think I am “normal” for unblocking all of this and dealing with it. I hope these e-mails help others understand why it is so easy and refreshing to change my lifestyle and be active in the groups I am active it.

So that is my experience in a nutshell. There are other things I saw that I can’t talk about yet, I don’t even like to think about. I hope that wasn’t too long,
but I wanted my family and closest friends to know. I am not pressuring anyone and I respect everyone’s freedom to chose. I just hope it answers the question of “Why” and “How” to my lifestyle choices.

Anyways- Go Soymilk! Love you all,

Jenny

(J. Grubbs, personal communication August 17, 2007).
Reflections

The best way to share this important experience of my internship was to include the actual letter I sent home. I feel that this letter captures the rage, sadness, and pride I was feeling during and immediately after the experience. During the ride to the stockyard, the interns and I discussed our apprehension and tense nerves. Afterwards, many of us were still crying and trying to comprehend it all. We sat in silence most of the ride, trying to put away the horrors we saw and the image of the scared eyes. Once we returned home, Brown came inside and led a discussion for us. The interns and I gathered in the family room and started sharing our thoughts. Brown told us about his experiences with that stockyard, the good and bad. We took turns saying our impressions and feelings about the experience. It was a very emotional time for all of us, as none of the interns had ever seen a live animal auction. The interns and I shared very personal emotions and we agreed to keep those just between us. Out of respect for my fellow interns, I did not take any field notes during this time.

The letter provided an outlet for me to share my experiences, while trying to make a political statement to my family and friends. As I wrote the letter, I realized how this experience had greatly impacted me. I had become a part of an organization, a culture, and a movement that would forever shape who I am as a vegan feminist activist. The internship itself has changed my life dramatically. But more importantly, the time spent analyzing the data collected and reflecting on my experiences has kept the internship alive in my being.
Chapter 5: Farm Sanctuary and the Citizen Role

Introduction to the theory

Early into my internship, I began to express curiosity in the organizational structures at Farm Sanctuary. Tricia was very open with me that Farm Sanctuary was going through a massive transformation, internally and externally. All of the websites and media were being completely redesigned, including redesigning the organization’s logo. I wanted to learn more about what was shaping this reformation and about the rhetorical strategies they were using. Tricia presented me with the theory that she claimed the reformation centered on, the Movement Action Plan by Bill Moyer. The theory breaks social movement organizations into four categories, or buckets, and claims each bucket plays an essential role in the success of the overarching movement. The four roles are the Citizen, Rebel, Change Agent, and the Reformer. Moyer describes the importance of each role, “Each role has different purposes, styles, skills, and needs, and can be played effectively or ineffectively” (Moyer, 2001, p. 21). Understanding all four roles is important to understanding how Farm Sanctuary organizes itself around being self-proclaimed Citizen.

According to Moyer, it is important for activists to establish themselves as respectable citizens who believe in the fundamental values, principles, and symbols that are well recognized as part of a good society. Conversely, it is also necessary to be a rebel who rejects the social conditions and institutional policies and behaviors that violate these fundamental values, principles, and symbols. The activists also need to be change agents who are trying educate, organize, and engage society to speak out against the
current policies and practices and work towards remedies that will positively help society. And finally, the activists have to also fulfill the reformer role, and work with official political and judicial channels to bring their solutions into the form of new laws, policies, and behaviors within the public and private institutions. The activists can play each of the roles as the movement progresses through the movement’s various stages. The second component of Moyer’s’ MAP theory is the 8 stages of social movements, something I will get to later. It is important for the activists to distinguish between how to play each role effectively and ineffectively, and to adopt effective behaviors for each role. If each role is played effectively, and interchangeably among activists, then according to Moyer, movements can reduce antagonism, and promote cooperation between different groups of activists and organizations. Activism becomes a cooperative effort among various movement organizations, and they are able to reach the movement goals smoother and sooner.

The Citizen Role

The first role Moyer describes, the citizen role, is the role Farm Sanctuary claims they fit the best. The citizen is the embodiment of the core societal beliefs and values, demonstrating that the true legitimate power lies in the citizenry rather than self-serving institutions or institutional powerholders. The citizen must remain in mainstream society and not be seen as outlier or someone on the fringe. Those that the citizen would recruit to become token spokespeople include entertainers, educators, and various religious groups because they symbolize stable core values. Those that are weary or resistant to social change movements and messages calling for reform would feel more comfortable hearing the message reinforced by individuals who are esteemed in society and society’s
fundamental values such as education and religion. Two well-known activists that embodied the *citizen* role were Martin Luther King, Jr. and Nelson Mandela. Moyer describes four essential things does:

1. Advocate and demonstrate widely held vision of the democratic good society.
2. Give the movement legitimacy in the eyes of ordinary citizens.
3. Enable the movement to withstand efforts by powerholders to discredit it.
4. Reduce the potential for violent attitudes and actions within the movement. (2001, p. 26)

The roles the *citizen* plays require the activist to align itself with core societal values, especially the belief in democracy.

Farm Sanctuary as an organization, and the individuals within, make many references and comments that boast of how the organization plays a *citizen* role in the movement at large. Starting at the macro-level, I will look at the messages sent from Farm Sanctuary as an organization at large to the public and internally as an intern. The messages embossed on a great deal of Farm Sanctuary’s merchandise cite powerful quotes. The quotes come from a range of activists that practice/d nonviolent civil disobedience. Farm Sanctuary highlights these quotes on their public merchandise, thus its activists are adorned with quotes promoting nonviolent civil disobedience. For example, Farm Sanctuary’s online store features a T-shirt available for men and women that feature a quote from Mahatma Gandhi. Other activists who are quoted include Martin Luther King, Jr., Theodor Adorno, Alice Walker, and Buddha. These activists appear not only on apparel, but also on postcards, key chains, posters, and so on. Moyer cites several of these activists as examples of *citizen* activists.
The quotes remind activists not only of the successful activists that were committed to nonviolent civil disobedience, and the quotes also allow the public to see Farm Sanctuary’s intention to align itself with these types of activists and their ideologies. The merchandise also motivates and inspires its members by using powerful quotes from important social change agents. From my own personal experience, I felt very connected and invigorated when I got my T-shirt from Farm Sanctuary that cited Alice Walker. As a vegan feminist, I felt a part of a larger movement and community. I also felt proud to use my body as a billboard for the movement. The clothing speaks to the activists and society at large. The merchandise that Farm Sanctuary has chosen is a reflection of their personal desire to align itself with the citizen role. Employees, supporters, and visitors to the farm have the opportunity to wear and carry these various merchandise pieces. Thus, the merchandise is a rhetorical tool to instill a particular identification (as citizens) both internally and externally among the employees, supporters, and visitors to the farm.

Internally, I was also given specific references that linked Farm Sanctuary to the role of the citizen. Tricia presented me with the MAP Model and immediately clarified that Farm Sanctuary appropriately plays the role of the citizen. During the Educational Lunch presented by Tricia, I brought up the MAP Model and wanted to learn the specifics as to why Farm Sanctuary, in her opinion, fits the citizen role.

The educational lunch with Tricia revealed Farm Sanctuary’s perceived close alignment with the citizen role. Both Tricia and Gene described Moyer’s MAP Model and began placing various animal advocacy groups into the various roles. I began to question to what extent Farm Sanctuary fit the MAP Model itself and if indeed the organization
did play the role of the *citizen*. In the following analysis, I will look at the claims made by Tricia and Gene, information gathered from interns and employees, and my personal experiences to analyze how and if Farm Sanctuary does play the *citizen* role within Moyer’s conception. Also, Moyer emphasizes the difference between playing the *citizen* role effectively and ineffectively. The second component of this analysis is to examine whether or not Farm Sanctuary is actually enacting the *citizen* role effectively or not.

The *citizen* role, similar to the other roles, can be played effectively and ineffectively. Specific behaviors can transform the actions of a movement from positive to negative and carry the risk of undermining the entire movement. The *citizen* has faith in the movement and its ability to use official lines of power to transform the social conditions. However, the *citizen* becomes ineffective if they believe too naively in the official policies of the powerholders, and believe that the powerholders are actually acting with the good of society in mind. It is important that the citizens not become jaded to the deception perpetrated by the powerholders and the powerholders’ leaders, and continuously reminds them that the powerholders act with specific interest and attention to the elites and do so at the expense of society at large. The powerholders and institutions work very hard to socialize the public to be uncritical, to believe the notion that the “American way of life” is a grandiose utopian system that assumes all powerholders act with the best interest for the public. In reality, believing this turns a blind eye to the ways in which the United States supports violent dictators and establishes their own democratic rights by acting *against* the work of the oppressed and marginalized. The *citizen* becomes enacted ineffectively when it becomes naïve to the
true injustices and utter disregard the powerholders actually have for the public (Moyer, 2001, p. 30).

The alignment with the *citizen* role is a self-proclaimed one, expressed through internal and external decisions. From internal to external, Farm Sanctuary wants to be perceived as and convince its activists that they are fulfilling the *citizen* role. When Tricia introduced me to the MAP Model, she boasted about the role Farm Sanctuary plays: the *citizen*. In a sense, she seemed to glorify the *citizen* role as the most accepted by society, the least radical, and the most mainstream. Interestingly, Tricia also described how the three other most well known animal advocacy organizations fit into the MAP Model as well. As was typical in the office, Tricia had multiple tasks that had to be completed at the same time. As a result, she only gave a brief overview at the moment. She ran to her office and printed off a list of documents and then delivered them to me. She handed me a paper that described the four roles of movement organizations and then a brief summary of the MAP model. I was very interested in this model and how Farm Sanctuary felt they fit into the *citizen* role.

**Educational Lunches**

Farm Sanctuary provided the educational lunches and the interns selected the speakers. In chapter four I described the process of selecting the speakers and the structure of the educational lunches. Two of the educational lunches, the ones presented by Tricia and Gene Baur, provided relevant information to analyzing Moyer and the ways in which Farm Sanctuary fits the *citizen* role.

_Educational Lunch with Tricia_
Tricia was selected as a presenter during our Educational Lunches. I had mentioned to her beforehand that I think the other interns would be interested in the MAP model. As she ran through media outlets and public relations, she got on the topic of advertising. One of the interns asked her to speak on Farm Sanctuary’s perspective about guerilla marketing. Tricia replied:

So you can also use guerilla-marketing firms too. We are talking to a few. They have a street team that goes out there and blankets a town be it to promote a movie and they want it plastered all over a building or area. Sometimes it is doing it without the permission of the location you are placing the ad. (laughs) So that’s why they call it guerilla marketing. Like guerilla warfare, that’s where the name comes from. Get in, get out, without being noticed, leave your mark. (Tricia, personal communication, August 2007)

Tricia then began talking about Farm Sanctuary’s interest in possibly using this type of marketing. She described a proposed effort that involves manually placing stamps on people with Farm Sanctuary’s new logo as they pass by on the street. After thinking about it for a moment, she then clarified that this strategy might not fit into the way Farm Sanctuary sees itself. Although the strategy is low in cost and easy to implement, she made the point that this strategy might not align neatly with the way Farm Sanctuary views activism.

Although she at first seemed open to using guerilla marketing, she quickly shifted to describing why Farm Sanctuary would not use guerilla marketing. As she transitioned her position, she introduced Moyer’s MAP model. The other interns had only heard snippets about the theory from me around the house. None of the interns had every heard
of Bill Moyer, let alone his theoretical perspectives on social movements. In the presentation, Tricia transitioned from describing why Farm Sanctuary would not necessarily use guerilla marketing to the MAP Model.

Um the only thing is, the way we view ourselves, and there is this model I actually gave it to Jenny [me] to look at. One of the things that came out of our strategic planning board this past year was, “What role do we want to play as an organization in the movement?” You have your reformers, you have your innovators, you have your rebels, and you have your citizens. And generally most organizations fall within one of those four categories. (Tricia, personal communication, August 2007)

Interestingly, Tricia referred to the change agents as innovators. She continued to do so throughout the remainder of the interview. I did not want to correct her in front of everyone, so I just let it go. She went on to describe who Moyer is to everyone and his background. She then described the MAP Model as a model developed for social movements. I found this interesting because she did not make any reference to who or how many universities were using it, but instead rooted the MAP Model’s credibility in it being a model for movements themselves. At this point, I understood the MAP Model to be a practical model rather than heavily used in academia. It was fascinating to hear Tricia describe how Farm Sanctuary has played each of the roles and also the emphasis on the other movement organizations adopting this model. She insists that the movements must be aware of what role they are playing in order to play that role effectively.

Tricia was very well versed on the MAP Model and made a point to describe the need for other movement organizations to acknowledge where they stand in the
movement as a collective. She described, “In order for a social movement to move to another level, all the different organizations that exist within a particular movement should reside within, you know, reside- claim, within one of these buckets.” It was here that Tricia began historicizing Farm Sanctuary as the ideal organization that has transformed itself into the various roles. She described the strategic planning board session: “And so we were like ‘okay we have been innovative [change agent] in the way we have done things’, and in a lot of ways we have been the rebel because we have done direct rescue. We have gone in and seen an animal in pain and lifted the animal off of a dead pile and taken the animal home. Um which sometimes it wasn’t done legally, (laughs) and that’s our history. Hilda who was removed from the stockyard. They didn’t exactly ask if they could take her, they just took her.” Tricia seemed to gloss over the ways in which Farm Sanctuary plays/ed a rebel by solely describing the direct rescue component. She did not go into detail about the many cases of litigation that have followed direct rescues, or the times confrontation has resulted from removing animals from stockyards. Later, I will describe Baur’s conception of the MAP Model and his perspectives on how the other organizations fit into the model.

Tricia did, though, discuss the innovative nature of doing direct rescues in the 1980’s. “But 21 years ago, yeah, no one was going into a stockyard and rescuing animals.” She was proud of this component and emphasized the importance of doing direct rescues and investigative reporting. Although she was proud of the direct rescues and investigative reporting Farm Sanctuary has conducted, she framed the actions as all falling within the citizen role. She seemed to want to place these actions in the organization’s past rather than describe how these actions still take place today. Instead,
she said, “So that’s our history and we know where we came from. But we’ve also grown as an organization and we have grown beyond grassroots.” At this point she seemed to shift the discussion from a possible debate about whether Farm Sanctuary actually does fit the *citizen* role or not into a glorified look at Farm Sanctuary over the years.

The presentation has transformed from a historical timeline look at Farm Sanctuary into compartmentalizing where within the model the other three main animal advocacy organization fit in. Tricia believed that because of the wide membership base and the expansion the organization has experienced that Farm Sanctuary has moved away from the *rebel* status, and also away from the innovator [*change agent*]. She claimed that currently the organization resides within the role of the *citizen* and referred to this as the “right to know.” She referred to the *reformer* as HSUS, claiming that they are the ones willing to compromise while Farm Sanctuary is not. She began to laugh and said, “We are not exactly willing to compromise. We still have that vegan message and know what our mission is.” She believes the citizen fits this model, and one of the reasons Farm Sanctuary emphasizes investigations is because the public’s right to know.

Tricia described the main purpose of the organization, of Farm Sanctuary, to get the word out to the public and help them understand it is their right to know. She described PETA as more of the *rebel* role, and clarified that this did not mean they will not partner together on joint campaigns in the future. She goes went so far as to say, “In fact I know we are going to use them in this coming year, but we are going to be very strategic about how we do it. We don’t just want to blanketly like hand over, tell people, you know, do whatever it takes to get our thing out there, because sometimes that can backfire too.” She believes that partnering with a *rebel* organization or encouraging Farm
Sanctuary members to enact some of the rebel strategies can become problematic because the people the organization reaches out to. Partnering with a rebel organization could also hinder the reform measures Farm Sanctuary is pursuing. If the organization became affiliated with rebel organizations or strategies that are more of the outliers or push the boundaries, it could have a negative effect on the legislative efforts that Farm Sanctuary is currently taking. Tricia went into detail about why she believes activists turn to rebel behavior.

When people are losing or think that they are losing they get restless and they start doing things that are more guerilla tactics and sometimes it works and sometimes it backfires. So we are not really desperate at this point. I think we are going to be able to do it its just all in due time. And it is being patient and letting due process work its way through and the legislation to work its way through.

(Tricia, personal communication, August 2007)

Tricia was confident that Farm Sanctuary did not fall into any other categories as well as it fell into the citizen. The rebel seemed to be a part of the organization’s past, although she did not truly embrace the ways in which Farm Sanctuary did fit the rebel role. Instead, she seemed to gloss over it by saying that Farm Sanctuary performed direct rescues and that it did not necessarily get legal permission to do so. When other interns asked about PETA and the relationship Farm Sanctuary has with PETA, Tricia seemed to steer clear of making a connection.

Instead, she said that Farm Sanctuary and PETA have worked together on initiatives and that they would do so on the future. In some cases, it has helped to partner with PETA because of their large budget and membership base, and at other times it has
hurt Farm Sanctuary’s reputation as being mild mannered and pretty mainstream.

Interestingly, Tricia claimed that HSUS is the organization that makes negotiations and compromises, whereas Farm Sanctuary is unwavering in its demands for veganism and animal liberation. This seems to contradict the many reform efforts undertaken by Farm Sanctuary. Farm Sanctuary has several initiatives it has co-written, co-sponsored, and even led individually that are mere reforms to the animal industry. For example, the huge media attention Farm Sanctuary has given to its initiatives in California highlight the reform measures Farm Sanctuary is willing to take. Rather than describing Farm Sanctuary as having an unwavering message, it is more appropriate to say the ultimate goal of Farm Sanctuary does not change, but that they are willing to push for reform measures until the ultimate goal can be reached.

Nonetheless, Tricia was a staunch advocate for the citizen role and the ways in which Farm Sanctuary fits this role. She emphasized the admiration Baur has for activists like Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. as well as his feelings toward nonviolent civil disobedience. She made it clear that she believes the citizen role is the preferred role and seemed to devalue the other roles. By placing HSUS in the role of the reformer, and then saying that they are willing to compromise on their goal/s, she was making the point that the reformer is a flip-flopper. Not to credit Bush’s presidential rhetoric, but the image of a social movement organization as a flip-flopper is unsettling to me as an activist. Even the thought that the organization I support would make concessions and give in on certain issues rather than stick to their core values is very unfavorable. The discussion went through the list of the other roles and the organizations that fill each role, and in some way discrediting the other roles. It was as if she was insecure that we might join another
organization, and wanted to beat it over our heads that Farm Sanctuary was the best. It was not an elitist attitude or direct bashing of any other social movement organization. Rather, it was just the constant reiteration that Farm Sanctuary is the citizen and the citizen is the most accepted, mainstream, yet fervent organization in the movement.

_Educational Lunch with Gene Baur_

Gene Baur, co-founder of Farm Sanctuary, led the second Educational Lunch. I described this interview in great detail in an earlier chapter, but I did not describe his comments and framing of the MAP Model. I wanted to include his remarks in this section instead because I felt it was more relevant to put that information here. During the Educational Lunch, I brought up Moyer’s MAP Model and in particular the role of Farm Sanctuary. The interns were asking about how and if Farm Sanctuary has worked with PETA and other organizations. Gene responded with, “There are so many different groups. You have your legislative efforts like HSUS and ASPCA, and then grassroots organizations like PETA and in some ways HSUS. The goal is to mobilize as many people as you can and to meet together and create a strategy. There are four different buckets of activists.” Baur expressed his admiration for the other organizations and his personal relationships with the leaders of both PETA and HSUS. He insisted that Farm Sanctuary was not at odds with these organizations. Rather, he said that throughout the history of his organization he had partnered with many other organizations that practice different modes of activism. Openly, Baur stated, “We have made a lot of friends in the movement and a lot of enemies. But that’s part of this whole process, supporting your friends and getting the enemies.” He made it clear to us that he was interested in fostering positive relationships with other animal protection organizations.
Baur went on to discuss the history of Farm Sanctuary and the process through which he and his ex-wife found the land to create the sanctuary itself. After deeper probing by me, Baur returned to discussing the Moyer model. Unlike Tricia, he did not offer any background information on Moyer or the MAP model. Baur did reference the same organizations and put them into the same categories, also leaving change agent without an example. He placed the organizations as follows, “The reformer, the mainstream organizations that seem to work within the institutions, are the HSUS and the ASPCA. The rebel, which is more confrontational, goes after the organizations and tries to work outside the institution. An example of the rebel would be PETA, or a far more extreme would be ALF. The citizen is more like Martin Luther King, Jr. and Gandhi. It involves a peaceful more groundwork approach and tries to work within the system and with the system.” When it came to discussing the change agent, Baur was unable to give a description or organizations he felt fit into that category. I am unclear as to why neither Baur nor Tricia referenced an organization that fulfils the change agent role within the animal protection/advocacy movement. Also Baur did not use Tricia’s language to refer to the change agent as the innovator. Tricia appeared very well versed in the MAP Model and how it applies to the larger network of social movements. Despite Baur’s lack of emphasis on the model itself, he did emphasize that Farm Sanctuary exemplified the citizen role. He declared the alignment when he said, “Farm Sanctuary is the citizen. We believe in taking the appropriate methods at the appropriate times.” He went on to say, “Each part of the movement helps and is necessary, but when the discussion is more about the tactics than the cause- then something is wrong.” His description of the debate between the animal rights versus welfare demonstrates his
compliance with the *citizen* role. He described each side as valid and Farm Sanctuary as a middle ground organization. I use the term appeasement because he seemed to want to please both sides. He argued that Farm Sanctuary fits both sides of the spectrum, when the sides seem to have strong ideological differences. Although he convincingly discussed the need for welfare measures *until* animal liberation occurs, he seemed to send mixed messages.

Either Farm Sanctuary is a staunch opponent of factory farms or it believes farms can exist and be improved upon with welfare measures. I wanted Baur to draw that line and make it clear that Farm Sanctuary will never applaud factory farming for its reform measures, but rather continue to push further for abolitionist type policies. Instead, he said:

> Of course our main goal and dream is for a vegan world, which falls under animal rights. But we are working slowly towards that by establishing laws and restrictions of the treatment of animals. For example, we are pushing for veal and gestation crates to be discontinued. And although that seems a little two sided (they might just made a small change to get us “off their back” or some people are afraid of the slipper slope), we are still trying to get as many steps in as possible—even if they are little. (Baur, personal communication, August 2007)

I found this point to be a slippery slope of its own. At what point does Farm Sanctuary draw the line and say, “Enough welfare measures, we demand a resolute cease for factory farms to exist”? To insert my personal belief, I believe welfare measures are in some ways acceptable because they temporarily aid animals in dire need of legal protection. However, and I cannot stress the *however* enough, I firmly believe it also has a reverse
effect on the animal rights movement itself. People often read the welfare measure as a grandiose reformation that excuses their participation in animal cruelty and exploitation. A great example of this is the new sensation about “cage-free” eggs. I have had several conversations with omnivores that describe their efforts to purchase “cage-free” eggs as somehow excusing their consumption of eggs. One of my good friends once referred to “cage-free” as “cruelty-free.” With utter disgust, I grabbed my laptop and pulled up Mercy for Animals’ Egg Industry Exposed report. The point I am stressing is that to claim to be both welfare and rights seems not only impossible, but also self-divisive.

I find Baur’s position to be indicative of the self-proclamation of Farm Sanctuary as a citizen. By claiming to be both a rights and welfare organization, Baur is trying to please both types of organizations. He seems to be making compromises in order to gain recognition in the movement and to also move the welfare movement further ahead. I make this point because it directly contrasts with what Tricia said about Farm Sanctuary. She claimed that Farm Sanctuary is not like HSUS because HSUS made compromises, whereas Farm Sanctuary is a vegan organization with a vegan message. I felt it self-conflicting to claim a vegan message and yet work towards reforming factory farming into what some would call, “humane.” It is my belief that a vegan organization with a vegan message would focus all its efforts on abolishing the use of animals in human industries. Given the small budget that Farm Sanctuary operates under, it seems contradictory that most of its campaigns are reform rather than abolitionist. Despite this criticism, I do praise Farm Sanctuary for its abolitionist campaigns such as No Foie Gras, Dairy-Free Campaign, Veg for Life, Sentient Beings Campaign, and the Anti-Cloning Campaign. In contrast, I see the other campaigns such as the Anti-Confinement
Campaign in California, also known as Proposition 2, which outlaws veal grates, battery cages, and gestation crates, which is a welfare measure. I do see the rhetorical strategy of implementing small victories and mind bombing the public with campaigns that expose animal cruelty. But with reservations do I see those efforts as promoting animal rights.

Baur did defend the campaigns in such a way that does meet the citizen role. He defended the welfare campaigns as an effort to be inclusive and bring the public to reach compassionate conclusions on their own. He explained, “I believe that if you raise awareness and people are educated they will make compassionate decisions. No one wants to see themselves as cruel or inhumane.” As an activist, I see a great deal of similarities between Baur and archetype citizens such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Gandhi. Baur’s demeanor and attitude towards activism is very peaceful, patient, and positive. He does not seem embittered or hardened by the struggles he has experienced in the movement. Rather than being consumed with pessimism about society, he described himself as having the utmost faith in society. He truly believes that if Farm Sanctuary provides the information and exposes the industries that in the proper amount of time society will come around to the vegan message. When discussing what he terms, “extreme animal activist behavior,” Baur showed great compassion.

He demonstrated understanding for the psychological process one experiences as they move towards “extreme” behavior. In an effort to defend Farm Sanctuary’s choice of action without degrading other forms of activism, Baur says, “We feel that there are other ways to get our message across. We do what we think makes the most sense at the time and hope for the best.” He did not outwardly dismiss or condone “extreme” activist behavior, although he did insist that the attention should not be taken away from the
animals and their suffering. I find Baur to be another archetypal *citizen* activist because of his demeanor and outlook on the movement. To the contrary of Tricia’s description of the history of Farm Sanctuary in relation to the four buckets/roles of social movements, Farm Sanctuary has followed a different path. As an individual activist, Baur strongly resides in the *citizen* role and his intention was to found the organization as a *citizen* organization. Despite Baur and Tricia explicit claims, the role of Farm Sanctuary more accurately represents a fluid hybrid of all of the roles.

**Conclusions**

Following with Moyer’s chart (2001, p. 28), the *citizen* is a model version of your mainstream activist. The *citizen* is one that aligns strongly with the widely held social norms, and conducts acts of dissent through accepted channels. The *citizen* is more comfortable turning to local chapters of organizations rather than the large national headquarters. As Baur described his journey into activism and his foundational beliefs about instituting change, it seems clear that he follows this mentality. When Farm Sanctuary reached the national level and became a strong player in the movement, Baur and longtime activists had to recalibrate the organization and deal with the transformation it had undergone. The Communication Department employee that quit on my first week as an intern openly stated her discomfort with the national status the organization was reached. She had been with the organization for many years and had always seen the organization as a grassroots organization. With the increasing sponsorship and endorsements from celebrities, Farm Sanctuary didn’t actually fit into the “small grassroots” type of organization. She suggested the idea that Farm Sanctuary was “selling out” its roots.
Hybridity

In my view, the bucket or role Farm Sanctuary fits is not solely the citizen, although it does incorporate aspects of this role. I argue for taking Moyer’s model of four separate roles and re-conceptualizing social movement organizations as a hybridity of all the roles. Farm Sanctuary exemplifies this argument, and thus I will move the description of the organization beyond the self-identified citizen role claimed by both Baur and Tricia.

So far it has been suggested and defended that Farm Sanctuary fits the citizen role. However, Farm Sanctuary has and does invoke the rebel role in several ways. The rebel goes outside mainstream political avenues and implements nonviolent direct action, educating the community through events like rallies, marches, leafleting, and generating petitions (Moyer, 2001, p. 24). Although Farm Sanctuary has not gone so far as to use their bodies to disrupt or completely halt factory farming, they do exercise nonviolent direct action. The use of direct rescues problematizes the claim to the citizen role because of how closely that act meets the rebel role. Moyer describes the attributes that fit rebel nonviolent direct action as being brave, courageous and in some cases dangerous (Moyer, 2001, p. 24). I would use those words to describe going into a stockyard or factory farm and removing an animal from a dead pile and all the while videotaping the horrors for an investigation. The acts require the activist to be devoted to the movement, be patient, and be able to take risks that may induce criticism, punitive action, incarceration, being fired from their jobs, feeling burned out, and possibly even death. The act of removing animals and in several cases trespassing helped to expose the horrors behind the closed doors in the animal industries. These investigations helped show the public the large disconnect
between what is going on and what should be going on (at least under legal terms). The rebel activist uses nonviolent actions that are dramatic to get the important issues to the top of society’s agenda, to promulgate the violations of public trust conducted by the official powerholders and institutions, to create a situation in which society must address the social inequities at hand, and to do so in such a way that is consistent with society’s democratic and moral values, including democracy. Nonviolent investigative reporting accomplishes all of these things. In this way, the nonviolent direct rescues exemplify Farm Sanctuary’s participation in the rebel role.

The membership recruitment and presence on online networking websites demonstrate how Farm Sanctuary also fits the change agent role. Farm Sanctuary works very hard at trying to empower the public and get them involved in the organization. Both Tricia and Baur talked about how the power actually lies with the public, and one of the movement’s jobs is teaching the public that they have this power and how to use it. Both of Farm Sanctuary’s MySpace and Facebook pages provide public forums for the online users to discuss how they feel about the issues at hand. This democratic system allows for everyone’s opinions to be voiced and become a part of the proposed solutions. The emphasis in the membership recruitment and online networking sites is on implementing a paradigm shift or a shift in traditional views. The emphasis is on the larger picture, despite the small steps in each campaign. Although the small campaigns demonstrate how Farm Sanctuary fits the role of the reformer, the big picture goal exemplifies the organization as a change agent. In the case of battery cages, Farm Sanctuary may work to reform the use of battery cages, but ultimately it points to the problem with animal domination as an ideology and demand change in this “bigger picture” way. Specifically,
looking at how Moyer defines the role of the change agent, the similarities with Farm Sanctuary become clearer.

Within the animal advocacy movement, the roles of the change agent include: emphasizing citizen-based democracy, trying to bring in large numbers of people to deal with factory farming and animal industries, reframing factory farming as something that effects everyone in every walk of life, showcase the majority consensus, both socially and politically, that pushes for positive answers to the problem through an open system run and organized by the citizens and not controlled by elite powerholders, by fostering coalitions, and by moving beyond a reform societal change to insisting a paradigm shift (Moyer, 2001, p. 25).

Beginning with the first of the role described above, emphasizing citizen-based democracy, Farm Sanctuary relies on the involvement of everyday citizens and their own personal commitment to go vegan. The recruitment efforts have continued to grow since I began involved with the organization over one year ago (July 31). The “friend” list on both the MySpace and Facebook has grown immensely. People are creating discussion forums to discuss the organization and recruit new members. The email listserv helps reach large audiences in short periods of time either for calls for donations or trying to recruit members. From personal experience, I have forwarded my Farm Sanctuary email to my own ‘address book’ when I get a call to action. I would guess I am not the one and only person to do so. Baur talks openly about his goal to change the way people think about animals and animal industries.

The image of factory farming tends to be remote, distant from society at large. Farm Sanctuary makes a strong effort to reframe factory farming as an issue close to
“home”. Linking factory farms to environmental demise, health concerns, and most importantly, an ethical predecessor to human-human violence helps frame factory farming as something that influences everyone.

Once factory farming is framed as an issue that affects everyone, Farm Sanctuary insists that the solution to this problem is not simply reform but rather a shift in paradigm. For example, in his presentation, Baur stated his belief that if everyone is presented the right information and given the right amount of time, people will make compassionate choices. His remark demonstrates a long-term commitment towards animal liberation because he believes the change must come as a resolute shift in people’s thinking. In these ways, Farm Sanctuary also fits the change agent role.

The fourth and final role Moyer lays out in the MAP Model is the role of the reformer. As said above, the campaigns of Farm Sanctuary, as legislative efforts trying to reform politics demonstrate the ways in which the organization fits the role of the reformer as well.

The reformer, as described by Moyer, argues that it is necessary not just to get the majority of the citizens involved and in opposition with the social conditions:

Reformers must then convert the acceptance of alternatives into new laws, policies, and practices of society’s appropriate political, legal, social, and economic institutions. The reformer uses parliamentary and legal strategies, political campaigns, lawsuits, committee and commission hearings, and petitions intended to be used in official judicial, legislative, political, and other institutional channels. (Moyer, 2001, p. 26)
The reformer thus emphasizes that activism is most effective when enacted through official institutional channels.

Although Farm Sanctuary does not operate as a Professional Opposition Organization (POO), the campaigns are operated on the notion that a paid staff and Executive Officers generate national campaigns that are then enacted by local grassroots activists. For example, the No Foie Gras campaign is an abolitionist campaign with the ultimate goal of making Foie Gras illegal in the United States. Conversely, operating as a reformer, Farm Sanctuary has enacted phone call activism. This involves the Campaign Department generating a small monologue for activists with potential responses to hypothetical comments from the opposition. The specific targets of the campaign are restaurant owners in various communities around the country. The phone call is to elicit the support of the restaurant owner and get a verbal or written pledge that they will not serve Foie Gras. The materials and directions come from Farm Sanctuary’s national headquarters, but the “leg-work” is intended to be done by grassroots activists around the country. Although Campaign employees and interns have made many of these phone calls, the hope is to mobilize the grassroots efforts and involve citizens.

Also, many of Farm Sanctuary’s campaigns involve legal action, such as petitions and lobbying. For example, Proposition 2 in California is a legal attempt at prohibiting the use of veal crates, gestation crates, and battery cages by 2015. Baur himself has been involved with several legal cases either to win “custody” over an animal who was discovered by Baur or a Farm Sanctuary activist at a stockyard, slaughterhouse, or auction to be neglected with an illness or extremely abused, or an escapee. Baur supports the idea that although he wants the change to come from within, he realizes that the
journey is long. Therefore, he supports reform measures in the meantime to at least assure
that the animals are being treated better in some ways. In this way, Baur has spoken in
favor of, sponsored, and chaired several monumental legal cases.

Although I acknowledge and understand Baur’s allegiance with the citizen role, I
find it rhetorically effective to consider how Farm sanctuary enacts all of the roles in
different ways. The interviews and merchandise analysis helps demonstrate how Farm
Sanctuary plays the role of the citizen, but also how the organization plays the other roles
in various ways. Baur’s identity and role in the movement help shape the organization
within his ideological perspective, yet given the large growth of the movement,
international membership base, and many hopes for change, the organization’s
ideological scope has grown larger than Baur’s leadership can accommodate.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

The project which I embarked upon over a year ago has taken me on an interesting journey. Through the analyses of my experiences at Farm Sanctuary and illustrating the overall animal advocacy movement using the SPIN an MAP model, one thing has remained clear: the animal advocacy movement is gaining strong momentum. It is difficult to say exactly why the movement has gained so much momentum in the last few years, but a strong indicator that has is the passage of Proposition 2 in California. The internet has provided endless access to investigative footage and campaigns dealing with animal exploitation. In addition to easy internet access to materials, celebrity involvement in animal rights has also drawn attention. I began this project while I was simultaneously beginning a personal “project” in my private life into animal rights activism and veganism. The personal transformations I have experienced over the last year and a half have been heavily shaped by the research and work I have done with the animal rights movement. I have thoroughly enjoyed writing this project and dealing with a topic so special to me. My hope is that this project is accessible and useful to animal rights activists and anyone interested in using social activism as a tool to institute positive change.

Project Overview

The first chapter of my thesis includes a discussion of the history of the animal rights movement. Although I realize there are many ways the history could have been addressed, I tried to focus on the mainstream development of the animal rights movement within the United States. During different times around the world, landmark events
happened in the animal rights movement. In some cases, the events in England served as a triggering event for the movement in the United States. In those instances, I included important people or events from other countries that helped shape the American animal rights movement. Chapter One provides a macro understanding of the animal rights movement, and Chapters Two and Three provide a macro look at two specific social movement theories; the SPIN model and the MAP Model.

The structural analysis provides theorists and activists two ways to understand social movements. The SPIN model falls under the category of a traditional social movement theory studied in academia. The MAP Model, on the other hand, is less recognized in the academy and more among practitioners. The MAP Model was given to me by Farm Sanctuary as a strategic perspective they were organizing themselves around. By comparing the two theories, I hope to bridge the gap between theory and practice. It is important for theorists to not become so disconnected from the discourse being used outside of the academy. Hopefully the analyses to follow this one will include Moyer’s MAP Model in the discussion, as it provides unique perspectives and insight that complement traditional theories already in the discourse.

Moving to the micro level, Chapter Four presents the autoethnographic study with Farm Sanctuary. This chapter looks at the various types of data I collected while interning in the Communication Department with the organization. It was a reflexive process in which I transcribed hours upon hours of interviews, notes, and surveys gathered during my stay, and then analyzed the information. Working with the organization forever changed my life as an activist and scholar, and I decided to turn it into my thesis project to immortalize the experience. I want the internship to become a
permanent part of history and included in the current discourse. As the researcher and subject, I was able to enrich the discussion with my own experiences and thoughts.

Chapter Five brought the discussion from the micro, Farm Sanctuary, to the macro again by looking at if/how Farm Sanctuary fit into the MAP Model in the way the members had claimed. Both the Communication Director and the organization’s co-founder discussed the MAP Model and how Farm Sanctuary embraced the citizen role. In this section, I examined the ways in which the employees described how Farm Sanctuary fit the citizen role. I looked at the types of campaigns the organization runs, specific information on the web site, and their merchandise.

The structure of the project followed a pattern of starting with the macro, moving to the micro, and then going to the macro again. I wanted to continuously weave the specific sites of analysis with the larger discourse. Before traveling to Farm Sanctuary, I set up a series of open-ended questions. I did not have specific questions I was hoping to answer, but I did hope to learn about the organization in general. I wanted to learn about how activists felt while working there, what their personal stories were about going vegan, and if there were internal conflicts that keep the movement from going forward. I had a utopian idea about social movements as these entities devoid of hierarchies and interpersonal struggles. Although I did not have specific questions, I was interested in becoming a part of the culture. I reached several conclusions from the autoethnography.

Autoethnography: Concluding Thoughts

The internship provided a multi-level experience that gave the prospective for a rich auto-ethnography. The organization was comprised of employees and interns that were more than willing to share their thoughts, feelings, and experiences with me. I was
welcomed into the hearts and lives of many during my stay. I consider Farm Sanctuary a second home and made a visit back since the internship. The people and animals at Farm Sanctuary truly impacted my life and have shaped my future. I am greatly indebted to the individuals I encountered and the opportunity I was afforded by Farm Sanctuary. As an exploratory component of my study, I proposed two research questions:

RQ1: How did my behaviors and feelings change over time?

RQ2: What did I learn about Farm Sanctuary as an organization that may inform traditional ways of studying social movements?

The first research question addresses my personal growth during the internship, which was vast. When I arrived at Farm Sanctuary, I was nervous and insecure about how I would be received as an activist. I was relatively new to veganism and expected a house full of veteran vegans who would judge my late arrival to the lifestyle. These feelings, and many other preconceived feelings, were put to rest very quickly. The first night I was there, two of the interns from the previous month offered to take me to visit the animals. The only other times I remember visiting farm animals was at the petting zoo in Cincinnati. I remember the visceral reactions from petting and laying with the animals that night. The sun was setting and we just sat there listening to the sheep “Baa-ing.” I knew from that moment on nothing would be the same. My whole world became in perspective of the movement and feeling a personal obligation to these animals.

Each day I woke with newfound appreciations for a simpler lifestyle. Walking to work each morning, I was able to stop by and wave to the animals. My work as an activist was reaffirmed each morning when I encountered the animals. I was able to visualize the animals benefiting from my work, and the billions of animals that are in
need of liberation. As my feelings became stronger, my behaviors changed as well. While interning, I had an overwhelming fear of returning to my home and community. I was nervous that I would feel defeated by going back to a omnivore world and leaving the presence of rescued animals which stood as a reaffirmation that the movement was experiencing small victories. One afternoon I was searching the gift shop and found a book by Carol Adams, “Living Among Meat-Eaters,” that truly helped me work through these issues. Adams provides a framework that helps vegan activists understand omnivores as “blocked vegetarians.” The idea posits that most of us were at some time “blocked” and something, or a series of events, led to us turning vegan. As a peaceful alternative, it is useful to consider the world as “blocked,” and that the confrontation they exert tends to arise out of resentment towards those who have “unblocked” themselves. Thinking in this way helped alleviate the anger and frustration I was feeling, and ease my nerves about returning home. In fact, it helped energize me as an activist to work to “un-block” the majority.

Within the second week I began conducting interviews with other interns and recording presentations by Baur, Tricia, Brown, and so on. The interviews were a private time for me to get to know my colleagues and supervisors. The interns felt comfortable sharing personal stories about their home life, their journey into veganism, and issues on the farm. I began to see all of the interns and I as a family unit sharing a new experience. I learned a great deal about each of the interns and their experiences. This study did not have the goal of generalizing, but instead allowed me to gain in-depth local knowledge. The way this study was organized, I was able to learn about each of the interns on a
personal level. The more time we spent together, the more personal information the interns felt comfortable revealing.

During my internship with Farm Sanctuary, I was transformed from a passionate individual new to veganism to a staunch animal rights activist involved in the nation’s leading farm animal rights organization. I left Farm Sanctuary with the tools to bring my experiences home and transfer them into grassroots activism. Also, prior to the internship I had met maybe one or two vegans. If I had met more, I would not have known because they did not tell me. Farm Sanctuary gave me the opportunity to meet and network with vegans from around the world. It pointed out that I am not alone, and that there are hundreds of thousands of others like me around the globe. The organization provided the educational and emotional tools to become a powerful animal rights activist.

The interviews revealed a constant theme of personal dedication towards the animals. Several of the interns talked about how interpersonal concerns take a backseat to caring for the animals. In their daily schedule, the interns and employees have so many tasks to complete that bickering and fighting amongst one another is not included in the time budget. If interpersonal issues do arise, solutions are reached quickly because caring for the animals take precedence. My experience in the office was the opposite. There were clear established cliques and conflicts amongst employees. The interpersonal struggles were not put secondary to the campaigns and communications, possibly because it is not perceived as impending as feeding an animal or providing it water. The surveys distributed to Communication employees explored the relationship between visiting the animals and lifestyle choices. Only one of the employees reported they were vegan, and they visited the animals relatively often. The other employee that visited the animals most
often reported that they were vegetarian, and trying to go vegan. All other employees specified they were vegetarian and did not indicate a plan or hope to go vegan. Perhaps the presence of the animals and their daily needs are what keeps interpersonal conflict down. Either way, the dynamics among office staff and shelter staff did seem to be different.

These experiences contradict my earlier belief that Farm Sanctuary was a vegan utopia. I had the preconceived notion that everyone involved with Farm Sanctuary was a proud vegan and staunch animal rights activist. This was a naïve belief, as I was made aware of the many people involved in running a national organization that also has an animal shelter. The internship provided a “reality check” in several areas. I learned that most of the interns were not vegan prior to their internship, that a handful of the staff at Farm Sanctuary was not vegan, and that it is very difficult to gain the majority support even in the host town of the organization. There seemed to be many uphill battles for Farm Sanctuary that were being dealt with in an individual level.

Throughout the stay I evolved as an activist, growing stronger in my convictions and getting thicker-skinned in the game. Going to a live animal stockyard and witnessing animal auctions, I was opened to the ugly realities. I have watched a great deal of investigative footage and documentaries done on factory farming and never had such a powerful visceral reaction. I will never forget the feeling of exasperation for air that I felt in that small room where the auctions took place. The looks in the people’s eyes as they sized up each animal has forever burned itself in my mind. I can still smell the odors and hear the screams, and I do not want to forget them. These experiences shape me as an activist and changed the way I involve myself. After that trip, I felt dedicated more than
ever to the cause. The first thing I did when I got back to the Vegan House was wrote down my experience in great length. I bore witness to extreme acts of cruelty and those animals were killed within days after the auction. It became my responsibility as a witness to speak out. My internship with Farm Sanctuary and the series of data I collected provided me a strong springboard forward. I became empowered and embittered both at the same time, and nonetheless resolute that my life will be dedicated to animal liberation.

The second research question looks at what I learned about Farm Sanctuary as an organization that may inform traditional ways of studying social movements. Most importantly, I learned that it is invaluable to immerse yourself in the movement itself. I would not have gained such a rich understanding of the organization without having spent time working with them. Farm Sanctuary provides a unique opportunity that researchers could use to study the organization through the internship program. With various internships in the different departments, researchers from different disciplines could study diverse aspects of the organization. Working first-hand with the co-founder and other key activists provides a rich opportunity to gain a rich understanding of the movement and organization. The internship program also offers a great opportunity to live in a house with other vegans that are interning with the other departments.

The Vegan House was a special location for data collection and in-depth understandings of how the day-to-day tasks are accomplished. I was also able to learn about the different journeys into veganism and animal rights that each activist had experienced. For some, the journey was rapid and took place over a short period of time. For others, it was years of dealing with personal debates and interpersonal issues with
their families that brought them to veganism. Sociologists interested in studying what variables are involved in a person’s decision to go vegan might benefit from this type of experience and data collection possibility. The Vegan House, as a housing option provided by an unpaid internship, is an important factor when activists apply for internships. In my case, it made a big difference that housing was provided because the internship was unpaid. A great deal of activist-type internships are not paid, and it would be interesting to analyze whether the unpaid internships that provide housing are more popular than those that do not. These variables were important to my selection of Farm Sanctuary as an internship site. I felt much more comfortable committing to work with an organization in New York for six weeks, unpaid, after I read that communal housing was provided.

In relation to the interviews with other internships, there was a great deal of focus on how the animals’ care takes precedence over any interpersonal conflicts. This is an area that future research could address and explore if there is a correlation between care-giving work and incidences of interpersonal conflict. The dynamics in care-giving activism should be analyzed in the specific context of animal-care because of their dependence (although the dependence is human-inflicted) on humans. I found this area to be particularly sensitive to activists because they feel their work is directly responsible for the animals and that if they run behind, the animals’ care if in jeopardy. I think this correlation helps researchers understand that local knowledge is important and should be included in the research. With the heavy focus on local knowledge in this study, it is important for traditional ways of studying social movements to value the local
knowledge. Social movements are built on grassroots local efforts and should be analyzed with respect to this micro-model.

Structural Analysis

Shortly into my internship, I was introduced to Moyer’s MAP Model and the four roles of activism. I had never heard of dividing activists into categories with specific tasks that take have various roles during various stages. I found this theory interesting and had not encountered this theory when studying traditional academic theories in the past. I wanted to analyze the MAP Model in relation to sequential evolutionary theories and rhetorical discourse theories. I set up three questions that would guide my research as I compared the MAP Model with the Lifecycle and SPIN models, and assessed how/if Farm Sanctuary fit into their self-proclaimed role within the MAP Model. The questions were:

RQ1: To what extent does Farm Sanctuary fit into the Moyer’s conception of social movements?

RQ2: To what extent does Farm Sanctuary fit into the citizen role?

RQ3: How does MAP fit move forward social movement theories?

These questions allowed me flexibility as a researcher to assess a wide range of data. The first research question required an analysis of Moyer and his perspectives toward social movements. The MAP Model has two main components: the eight stages and the four roles. The second research question asks specifically if Farm Sanctuary fits the citizen role, looking at the micro of the theory. The first research question allowed me to analyze the broader, overarching perspectives Moyer has of social movements. After a close read of his book, it became clear that a central component of Moyer’s theory and
perspectives is nonviolence. Moyer centralizes nonviolence as the key component of an effective social movement and necessary to bring about change. Similarly, the co-founder of Farm Sanctuary, Baur, continuously discussed his strong commitment to nonviolence. He openly discusses his idolization of nonviolent civil disobedient activists such as Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi. His commitment to nonviolence shines through the organization’s campaigns, merchandise, and Organizational Statement. The campaigns are inclusive in nature and invite anyone interested to explore the organization and visit the sanctuaries themselves. In a general sense, Baur aligns very clearly with the way Moyer conceptualizes social movements. Baur emphasizes education as the central component of the movement. He believes that educating the public about the disconnects and contradictions between the powerholders’ official policies and actual practices will lead the public to make compassionate choices. Baur seems to understand Moyer’s conception of being an effective social movement, and playing the various roles effectively.

The eight-stage component of Moyer’s model also aligns with Farm Sanctuary’s perspective. My experiences with Farm Sanctuary and in particular the interviews with Baur and Tricia describe the “long-haul” commitment. Both Baur and Tricia discuss the huge amount of work ahead of them, and they ground it in acknowledging that some successes have occurred along the way. Although the scope of this analysis was not to claim where within the eight-stage model Farm Sanctuary or the animal rights and welfare movements fall, that would be an interesting analysis. Neither Baur nor Tricia mentioned or made claims concerning the eight-stage model and how far along the movements are. This may be a limitation of studying social movements using
developmental-evolutionary theories while the movements in the present tense. Many of the examples cited by Moyer and Stewart, et. al. refers to historical events and movements that have already reached their immediate goals, for example the civil rights and women’s suffrage movement. It is difficult to study social movements while they are active because anything can change at any moment. Despite the challenge, Baur and Tricia did talk about a slight tipping of the scale in favor or the animal advocacy movements. Increased awareness was discussed as a success, and both Tricia and Baur mentioned specific examples of investigative reports and public responses. Moyer describes his intention for creating the MAP Model as a model that would empower and motivate movements to see the bigger picture and stay in the “game.” Baur stressed the importance of feeling the small and big successes, but also never forgetting that hundreds of billions of animals are abused and slaughtered each year. I could see that the MAP Model and Moyer’s perspectives had influenced both Tricia and Baur.

The first research question asks to what extent Farm Sanctuary fits the model, and I believe the data demonstrates that the organization greatly fits Moyer’s conceptions. Baur has a hopeful perspective that even in times of great “defeat,” he remains positive and committed that in the long-term the goals will be reached. He has never faltered from a commitment to nonviolent civil disobedience and consistently stresses the importance of coalitions. He boasts about joint campaigns and legal efforts Farm Sanctuary has been and is involved in, and how that works to the movement’s advantage. He does not denounce any specific organization or claim that a particular organization’s role is less valuable than Farm Sanctuary’s role. He demonstrates a strong understanding and
appreciation for Moyer’s conception of the four roles, emphasis on coalitions, and commitment to nonviolence.

Baur and Tricia both speak specifically to Moyer’s citizen role within the MAP Model. Baur and Tricia defend the role of Farm Sanctuary as falling closest to the citizen role, and that they are playing the role effectively. I began analyzing the interviews with Tricia and Baur and several website documents to see how closely the organization fit this particular role. The second research question asks, “To what extent does Farm Sanctuary fit the citizen role?” Moyer lays out four distinct roles that organizations play in the social movement, how each role is enacted effective and ineffectively, and during which stages particular roles become central. The conclusions I reached are that Farm Sanctuary does fit the citizen role to a great extent. However it also fits the three other roles in various ways. The ideological alliance of Farm Sanctuary does enact the effective citizen role, and the merchandise and campaigns use the rhetoric of the citizen. They align themselves with “on-the-ground” activism and local communities, emphasizing education as the most powerful tool. Yet, the two other components in the organization’s Mission and Vision Statement are rescue and advocacy. The rescue component of Farm Sanctuary enacts the rebel role, as the organization conducts investigative reports and takes animals left for dead from slaughterhouses, factory farms, and lives animal auctions. The advocacy component enacts the change agent and reformer because of the range of campaigns, legal efforts, celebrity endorsements, and organizational structure. The organization adopts components from each of the various roles and enacts them effectively.
Farm Sanctuary does not fall into the traps Moyer discusses of enacting the roles ineffectively. Although Moyer emphasizes that social movement organization must be able to enact the various roles at different times, he recognizes that the roles are four distinct categories. Moyer is arguing that movements must be able to perform the citizen role, for example, and then at a different time abandon the citizen role and enact the change agent role. This position compartmentalizes the roles into four categories that do no overlap or intersect. The roles cannot and should not be thought of as monolithic categories that are distinctly separate from one another. Rather than conceptualizing the roles as four different categories that do not overlap, visualizing the roles as a Venn Diagram provides a more adaptable and useful model. The roles can overlap and organizations may find it beneficial to enact behaviors and tools useful by each of the roles. Farm Sanctuary is able to have an even more effective role in the animal advocacy movement by adopting the ideology and rhetoric of the citizen, while staging reformer and change agent national campaigns and legal cases as advocacy efforts, and performing rebel behaviors by removing animals from cruelty and slaughter and placing them in an animal sanctuary. These various roles combined allow Farm Sanctuary to have a powerful presence in various communities, and help better achieve their goals for a compassionate world. The third research question looks at the theory in a macro perspective and how it fits into traditional social movement theories.

The MAP Model provides significant contributions to traditional social movement theories. In particular, this study included an in-depth discussion of the SPIN and life cycle theories as examples of traditional social movement theories. The life cycle model became a widely used social movement theory, and is given a great deal of academic
attention. The life cycle model proposed that social movements have a structure and follow a series of phases. The life cycle model asserts that social movements are monolithic and if they become fragmented are weak. The model was critiqued as being too deterministic and assuming movements occur in a very steady and organized way. The MAP Model allows for flexibility and adaptivity for the individual, organization, and movement at large. The stages in the MAP Model are also important to advancing the life cycle model. The life cycle model lays out five stages the movement experiences in a linear consecutive order. The MAP Model organizes eight different stages that occur consecutively. The movement can skip a stage, become stunted in a stage, and/or regress to previous stages as well. The stages in the MAP Model account for the unexpected detours that may cause some activists to drop out of the movement. Educating activists about the MAP Model helps social movements see that they are not the first to encounter roadblocks, and that even the little victories count as a success.

Because social movements are difficult to study “in the moment”, and are most often studied “after-the-fact”, using developmental-evolutionary theories are less useful to the movements themselves. The life cycle model would be difficult for movements to apply to themselves, and I found difficult to apply to a movement that is ongoing. When searching for examples of the various stages of life cycle and MAP, I found myself stuck with historical examples rather than current. It is hard to determine the significance of an event or stage of a movement in present tense because anything can change. Tomorrow the movement may experience a significant success or setback, and it would reframe how the theory applies. The MAP Model includes a developmental evolutionary component with the eight stages, but it also contains a section on the rhetorical discourse with the
four roles. The MAP Model includes a description of the roles movements’ play and how their rhetoric must be appropriate to the role. In this way, the MAP Model provides a hybrid of developmental evolutionary theory and rhetorical discourse theory. The MAP Model then provides theoretical and practical tools for theorists and activists to apply the model to the movements. Social movement theories should move towards encompassing both the evolutionary structure and rhetorical components of movements.

I propose expanding the MAP Model to include a component of autobiography as part of how the researcher studies the social movement. The reader may spend most of the time reading a theorist’s perspectives on a social movement trying to figure out where the theorist stands. It saves time and intrigues the reader to understand how the researcher came to study a particular movement, what experience they have working with other movements, and what they learned as an individual from the experience. In addition to appeasing reader curiosity, the research itself is enriched by adding personal experience. In my own experience, my social movement involvement is very personal and invokes a lot of passion in me. Channeling this passion in social movement theorists and allowing their own experiences as an activist and/or theorist enhances the research.

Future Research:

The animal rights movement has experienced dramatic changes and successes in the last few years. Academic research must continue to include the animal rights movement as a significant change agent at work. Society is nearing the tipping point, and I hope future research embraces the progress of the movement and catapults it forward. In a world where the personal is political, even waking up in the morning with convictions is a
political act. As an academic scholar, I firmly believe that learning and teaching is a form of activism. Future research must endorse this perspective and empower the many academics that have strong political beliefs that have been forced to give up nonprofit activism in struggle for tenure, publications, and class requirements. Social movement theories must not ignore the significant changes movements are experiencing. I discovered the MAP Model by having Tricia hand it over to me. Every academic I have discussed my project with has never heard of Moyer or his theoretical perspectives. Although the theory has similarities to traditional social movement theories, it provides additions and corrections. These supplements and corrections should be included in the discourse. If reflexivity is to be a central component of research, then the macro discourse must exercise reflexivity as well.

Personal Goals for the Future

While working on this project, I discovered a great love for feminist theories and emphasizing intersectionality in the discourse. During my second year as a Communication MA student, I joined the MA program in Women’s Studies. I am currently a second year Women’s Studies MA and have already begun planning future research. My hope is that future research focuses on how systems of oppression are connected so that coalitions can be fostered. I hope to facilitate an interdisciplinary connection between social movements and academic theorizing. Many changes will affect my generation in the future, and social movements have already seen a rise in the last five years. With global warming, globalization, corporatization, and a wide range of issues in between, the time for change is now. It is imperative that I dedicate my academic and personal life to educating, mobilizing, facilitating social movements and
the coalitions necessary. I am currently working on paving the way for Vegan Ecofeminism as a necessary next step for feminist discourse at large. In this new theoretical perspective, oppression is an inclusive term rather than a reinforcement of hierarchies in and of itself. I am currently applying to Ph.D. schools around the country to study intersectionality and coalition building in Women’s Studies research. Under the guidance of Dr. Depoe, I have felt inspired and encouraged to keep going forward. I am so grateful for his time, effort, and encouragement that have lead me to this point. I am lucky to have worked with such a passionate individual that illustrates how activism and education work hand in hand.

This project has cemented my dedication to enacting change in minds and behaviors. Through education I hope to illuminate how systems of oppression interact, and how society can undermine these systems. Through political activism, I am working with non-profit organizations on education, advocacy, and funding rescue missions for animals. I believe both forms of actions are necessary and valuable to bringing about genuine long-standing change. I have learned a great deal about myself, and the true and immense power I hold. I am a valuable member of the academic and activist community, and strive towards increasing that value over time.

I feel it necessary to thank my wonderful family for their support and guidance during these life-altering years into veganism, animal rights, feminism, and the list continues. My mother and her constant interrogations, “Did you work on your thesis today,” has really kept me in check. My mother knows what she wants in life and has always been a fighter to accept nothing less. She has been a role model to me my entire life, embodying all that is powerful, independent, compassionate, and intelligent. My
mother has taught me how to be a strong individual impassioned with goals and direction. When it comes to my father, I think my quest into higher education has made his head spin. When I told him I was working on my second masters and applying to PhD programs he responded, “You have got to be kidding me!” My father has worked hard his entire life to ensure that my siblings and I appreciate and have access to education. Whenever I have needed him, my father has been by my side showing me support and love. In the hardest, most intense moments of my life, I can count on my pops to crack a joke or say something inappropriate that will make put a smile on my face. My parents have been true mentors throughout my life. If it were not for their constant emphasis on compassion and education, I would not be the person I am today. No matter what anyone says, I will always need my parents cheering for me on the sidelines. My siblings have also embraced the changes in my life and in wonderful ways. I am proud to say my mother and two sisters are vegetarian, and on their ways to veganism (I hope!). They gave me hope that change is possible, education is the key, and patient mentoring is essential.

My grandparents are quintessential components of my life. I have spent most of my life trying to wrap my mind around the oppression, challenges, and yet happiness they have experienced throughout their lives. My maternal grandparents come from a war-ridden Poland and lost a majority of their family at the hands of the Nazis. My maternal grandfather, a truly inspiring individual, has taught me that patience and kindness are the most important emotions one can feel. My maternal grandmother, my rock, has never let a day go by that I did not know how important I was to her. She has taught me how to be a powerful woman in times of struggle, and that love endures all. As she cares for my ill
grandfather, I am astounded by the amount of strength and devotion one person can have for another. It is something I can only aspire to in my own life.

Unfortunately, my paternal grandmother passed away before I was born. Ironically, she passed away on the 25th of February, the day before my birthday. Because of a short and violent battle with leukemia, I was never able to meet her. However, from stories shared I feel I embody aspects of her. She was a vibrant woman that was willing to do whatever it takes to provide for the people she loves. She was an active member in the Jewish community and active in each of her children’s lives. My paternal grandfather is a shining image of humility and honor. He represents all that is courageous, admirable, and loving in my life. I feel I have inherited his thirst for knowledge and the dedication to study. I always enjoy getting together with him for our lengthy discussion. He is an educated and compassionate man who treats those around him with the utmost respect, and specifically, my maternal grandfather whom suffers from Parkinson’s Disease, whom he can bring a smile from in the hardest of times. My paternal grandfather was also lucky enough to find an equally respectable and admirable woman to share his life with. I am lucky to have such amazing and impacting adults shape who I am and enrich my life. They have all taught me that compassion and patience outweigh all else, and that in the most difficult of times it is important to stop and be grateful for those you love that surround you.

Last but not least, my loving partner has supported and guided me immensely through this process. Nights awake with frustration, and moments where I simply became overwhelmed with emotion; you were there to encourage me. I will always appreciate how you helped me through this process and encouraged me to keep going forward. I was
so honored that you went vegan around I did, and that we have been able to share this
journey together. I hope together we can change the world.

Thank you.
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