Perverse visibilities? Foregrounding non-human animals in ‘ethical’ and ‘sustainable’ meat consumption.

Paula Arcari

~.~.~.~.~.~.~.~.~.

Abstract: The invisibility of meat production operations and their associated non-human animals is commonly understood as a causal factor in the use of non-human animals as food. This paper critically explores this assumption using empirical evidence from a study of producers and consumers of ‘ethical’ and ‘sustainable’ meat in Melbourne, Australia. Rather than challenging meat consumption, I find that increased visibility of non-human animals and their ‘processing’ resettles consumers in ‘improved’ practices of meat consumption. Identifying a failure to address the underlying and persistent normalisation of non-human animals as food, I argue that advocacy and dietary campaigns need to mount a more profound challenge to the status quo regarding both meat *and* non-human animals.

~.~.~.~.~.~.~.~.~.

In 1975, Peter Singer wrote that few people think about the lives of non-human animals raised for food and, of them, “not many know about modern methods of animal raising” (Singer 96). Those who “require” non-human animals to be killed for food, he said, “do not deserve to be, shielded from this or any other aspect of the production of the meat they buy” (150). Singer did not say that he thinks better knowledge of how non-human animals are raised or slaughtered for

Paula Acari (paula.arcari@rmit.edu.au) is a PhD candidate at the Centre for Urban Research, School of Global, Urban and Social Studies, RMIT University, 124 La Trobe Street, Melbourne, VIC 3011, Australia.

Acknowledgements

This research was conducted as part of a broader PhD study funded by the Australian Government’s Australian Postgraduate Award (APA) scheme, and located within RMIT University’s Centre for Urban Research. The author thanks her supervisor A/Professor Tania Lewis for her valuable feedback on an earlier version of this paper.

food would alter people's consumption practices, but he certainly implied that it would make it less easy. A few years later, Linda McCartney famously said, "if slaughterhouses had glass walls the whole world would be vegetarian,"¹ a quote adopted by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) as the title of their 2009 documentary, "If Slaughterhouses Had Glass Walls," narrated by Sir Paul McCartney (PETA "Glass Walls"). The Animal Activists' Handbook propounds the same thesis: "...if the realities of factory farms and slaughterhouses were as visible as the meat they produce, all thoughtful compassionate individuals would be vegetarian advocates" (Ball and Friedrich 17). The assumption underlying these sentiments and many current advocacy efforts is that if people were to have increased knowledge or direct experience of *how* non-human animals are raised and killed for food, they would be less likely to eat meat. This assumption links a readiness to consume meat to the invisibility of the means of production, attributing causality where, I argue, there is none. In addition, and on closer examination, the focus is on how animals are killed in industrial slaughterhouses. This is where the implicit aims of prominent non-human advocacy organisations are in danger of being lost, or easily subverted. I say implicit because the common use of phrases such as animal 'liberation,' animal 'rights,' animal 'protection,' and ending animal 'cruelty,' and a focus on conditions of industrial slaughter, can make it unclear whether ending the use of non-human animals as food is the aim,

or simply improving the conditions in which they become food.

I argue that if the former is indeed the goal then this needs to be made explicit, and that a focus on the visibility of production processes is then a misdirection of efforts.

During the 40 years since Singer's book, issues associated with the intensive, industrial-scale production of meat have received increasing media attention and this has translated to the market place with more specialised product labelling and big retail partnerships with animal welfare groups and leading animal advocates, including Singer (Lewis and Huber 2015; Satya 2006). There is, in general, greater public awareness that there are certain issues associated with the intensive, industrial-

Consumers (n=26)	
Gender	
Female	19
Male	7
Age	
<25	1
26-34	11
35-44	8
45-54	5
55-64	1

Table 1. Summary of interviewed consumer

scale production of meat, even if the exact nature of those issues remains unclear. For those concerned or interested enough, there are many easily accessible ways to learn about every stage

of meat production via TV exposés and reality shows, film documentaries, cooking shows, news media, non-human animal advocacy campaigns, innumerable websites and blogs, and on-line videos. Many non-human animal advocacy campaigns are designed to target those who may not themselves seek out this information, often employing confronting tactics, images and/or messages to highlight how non-human animals are transformed into meat. And yet, annual growth in per capita meat consumption continues to outpace population growth – respectively, between 1.6% and 2.5% since 1991 (Alexandratos and Bruinsma 74) versus between 1.24 and 1.18% since 2005 (United Nations 2)². Thus while there is increased availability of information about *how* meat is produced, obtaining meat from non-human animals has never been more popular, and it maintains a central (and growing) role in the global food system.

I propose that misattributing causality to the invisibility of meat production in facilitating meat consumption directs valuable campaign efforts towards strategies that encourage production processes to become more visible while doing little to challenge the consumption of meat in any fundamental or lasting way. The rationalistic assumption that if people had more information about how non-human animals are raised and killed for food then they would eat less meat is flawed and can even result in perverse outcomes by creating an additional market for meat from non-human animals that have been treated ‘better.’ In this paper, I show that if the ultimate goal is to end the use of non-human animals as food then strategies that focus only on *how* ‘meat’ is produced and consumed (whether visibly, sustainably, humanely, ethically), fail to challenge an underlying normalisation of non-human animals as food and thereby, at best, fall short of their potential. At worst, they may sabotage their own goals and, perhaps inadvertently but also sometimes purposefully, help guide the livestock industry towards new market opportunities.

To illustrate this failing, I attend to in/visibility in practices of meat production and consumption. I am speaking primarily of material in/visibility; however, I begin by tracing the argument through the literature where discursive invisibility is also invoked as a key reason why the use, and abuse, of non-human animals for food continues largely unchallenged. Inviting

Producer/Consumers (n=15)	
Gender	
Female	7
Male	9
Animals	
Chickens	4
Pigs	7
Cows	9
Lambs	5

Table 2. Summary of interviewed producer-consumers and the animals they raise for meat.

closer scrutiny of these ideas, I draw on empirical data comprising semi-structured interviews with 26 consumers and 15 producer/consumers of meat that is specifically labelled and promoted as being ethical and/or sustainable in the greater Melbourne region of Australia. I conducted the 41 interviews between June and November 2014 as part of my broader PhD study exploring practices associated with ethical and sustainable meat to identify key elements that contribute to the persistence of meat consumption and the use of non-human animals within social practices. After transcribing the audio-recorded interviews (of between 1.5 and 3 hours each), along with relevant observational notes, I explored my data for themes and subsequent coding using the qualitative analysis software NVivo. Names have been changed to protect the identity of participants.

Complementing previous work on the visibility of non-human animals and slaughter practices in media discourses (Gillespie, “How Happy”; Gutjahr, “The reintegration”; Parry, “The New Visibility”; Parry, “Gender and slaughter”), instead of challenging the use of non-human animals as food, I find that an increase in the material and discursive visibility of non-human animals in the context of meat production contributes to a focus on their treatment and how to make this more ‘acceptable,’ and therefore a reinforcement of meat eating—albeit in a ‘better’ way. Drawing on notions of transparency, authenticity and the commodification of ethics in studies of consumption, I explore the effect of de- and re-fetishisation in relation to meat and non-human animals. I then explain how increasing the visibility of non-human animals used as food extends notions and practices of access, entitlement and control, making reference to theories on the look or ‘gaze’ in visual culture and cinema studies. This perspective offers deeper insight into the ontological meaning and problematic function of the gaze as it relates to non-human animal ‘others.’ It thereby moves the discussion beyond the visibility of animals per se, and towards a more critical focus on the type of gaze or ‘regard’³ that this visibility facilitates. This perspective helps to explain why increasing the visibility of non-humans in meat production processes does little to change, and may in fact reinscribe, their use as food.

Identifying a focus on *how* non-human animals are used as a broader problem, I show how campaigns and strategies that aim to challenge meat consumption by framing it as unsustainable, unhealthy and unethical similarly foreground *how* *meat* is produced and consumed. The associated use of non-human animals remains largely hidden and escapes critique. Such strategies effectively steer meat producers towards value-adding opportunities to

commodify these concepts and thereby meet new markets for sustainable, healthy, ethical and happy meat. Hence, both strategies that focus on increasing visibility and strategies that focus on *meat* foreground *how* animals are used and *how* *meat* is produced and fail to challenge the use of animals as food. This a major failing, and I conclude by suggesting how the use of non-human animals can be prioritised as an equal issue, thereby introducing the possibility of a more profound and much needed provocation of the status quo regarding meat *and* animals. This would be one where the goal of ending the use of animals as food is made explicit, not simply because of associated environmental or health benefits, but because their use, and not just their treatment, is unethical⁴.

Invisibility - an agent of ethical disconnection?

Recent scholarly work on the role of in/visibility in the treatment of non-human animals can be linked to earlier categorisations of non-human animals according to their usefulness to humans. Building on Cudworth's typology of non-human animals as wild, companions, labour, food, fashion and entertainment ("Environment and Society" 160; "Seeing and Believing" 168) (itself based on categorisations made by Benton in 1993), Morgan and Cole (113)⁵ take this further to illustrate diagrammatically how these categories are also associated with different material and discursive attributes—from subjectivity to objectification and from visibility to invisibility.

The implication of Stewart and Cole's thesis is that the closer non-human animals can be brought to being seen as visible subjects, rather than invisible objects, the less likely they are to be abused and killed (or at least no more than objectified and invisible human 'others' currently are). This is an assumption that O'Sullivan has also investigated ("Animals, Equality and Democracy"), looking at the way non-human animal protection instruments are biased in the level of protection afforded to some categories of non-human animals over others. In particular, O'Sullivan finds that "animals with a high level of visibility are more likely to receive greater and more effective legislative attention" (172). However, and most importantly, she notes that there are significant exceptions, where bias is based also on species membership, a bias that tends to be (culturally) determined (172). I argue that non-human animals typically used as food⁶ are one such exception, and that the trend towards ethical and sustainable meat (in Western nations) reveals that a focus on visibility as a means of challenging the use of non-human animals as food, is largely misplaced. Non-human animals that have achieved a relatively high

degree of subjectivity (for example being given names) and are highly visible (including at slaughter) are still unproblematically used as food.

To date, scholars have focused on factory farming to make their point regarding invisibility vs visibility. Morgan and Cole do note that in the case of meat from a ‘happy pig,’ prior to slaughter he or she is to some extent regarded and treated differently (125). However, they remark that the seemingly contradictory positions of non-human animal-as-subject and non-human animal-as-object can co-exist (125). I will show how there is something more forceful at work here; how, in fact, increased subjectivity and visibility of non-human animals used for food takes place unproblematically and can also work to increase the acceptability of eating meat, even casting it as the ethical choice over not eating it at all. As Sally, one of my research participants, says, being vegan is “just doing nothing” whereas by purchasing ethical meat, you are “doing something.” Veganism is similarly perceived by former vegan, Gillian, as overtly unethical and “caring less and less about animals” when the prescribed role of non-human animals in “genuinely functional and holistic” systems is taken into account. Ethical meat is positively understood by these and other participants as a “real tool of social change” (Anne). In the next section, I describe how visibility, or transparency, has come to characterise food culture and how it is broadly interpreted.

A visceral history – from function to form.

In Europe and the US, the visceral realities of meat production were once much more routinely visible than they are now. Typically concentrated in certain city streets known as ‘shambles,’ up until the mid-19th Century slaughter took place in the open air for everyone to see. It was the growth in meat consumption beyond a level that was hygienically containable by these shambles and the impracticalities of increasing numbers of non-human animals being herded through increasingly populated areas that led to the centralisation of operations outside the cities (Harskamp and Dijstelberge “The Shambles”; Lee Chap 7). Sensibilities with regard to slaughter appeared primarily concerned with the messiness, the stench of blood running through the streets, and emerging concerns with hygiene, rather than with moral or ethical questions of using non-human animals in this way. Sinclair’s *The Jungle*, originally published in 1906, demonstrates similar concerns where rather than generating any robust sentiments against eating

non-human animals, his grim exposé of Chicago slaughterhouses was a key instigator of new federal food safety laws.

The assumed squeamishness of people today regarding the truth of where their meat comes from is, I suggest, not so much a reason for the invisibility of slaughterhouse operations but rather a socially constructed response to changing production practices. There is a marked and well-documented shift occurring, not away from but towards the realities of meat production (Linne “Grazing”; Murphy “Blessed”). A growing number of people evidently *want* to get closer to it, or they perceive they must in order to align with an increasingly widespread and tacit understanding of ethical eating.

Translating the shambles to the 21st Century

For those inclined to know more, there is now a prolific amount of publicly accessible information relating to slaughter and butchery. There are websites, blogs and forums advising how to ‘properly’ kill chickens, rabbits, pigs, goats, sheep, or cows⁷ as well as Youtube videos stepping the viewer through the process visually and graphically. Scores of media ‘events’ tackle and expose various aspects of killing non-human animals for food. Some invite public participation such as ‘Wilbur 101,’ produced by the ABC in Australia, which followed one piglet, Wilbur, from birth to slaughter (“Wilbur 101”). Public input was sought on every decision affecting his life and after, including whether or not to castrate him, vaccinate, how to slaughter him, and how to label the meat he finally became⁸.

A 2015 BuzzFeed video story followed a group of “Foodies” taken to “kill their food for the first time” (“These Foodies”). The popular BBC series “Kill it, cook it, eat it”, which ran for four seasons and 18 episodes from 2008 to 2011, took volunteers out to meet, care for, and slaughter a range of non-human animals. ‘Back-to-the-land,’ a reality TV series, follows celebrity farmers such as Matthew Evans and Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall as they learn to live off their land (and non-human animals). There are many other such examples. A steady stream of books on the topic have appeared over the last decade (Bourette “Meat: A Love Story”; Gold “The Shameless”; Kingsolver “Animal, Vegetable”; Friend “The Compassionate”; Fairlie “Meat: A Benign”; Krasner “Good Meat”; Reed “The Ethical Butcher”; Niman “Defending Beef”; Leigh “The Ethical Meat”), plus articles promoting the benefits of home-grown ‘ethical’ meat

appear regularly in on-line and hard copy news media and magazines (Abels “What it Takes”; Cox “Farm Fresh”; Logsdon “Raising Your Own”; O’Connell “Want to eat”).

For those wanting a first-hand experience, local, small-scale farmers are also weighing in on the novelty of meeting your meat before dining on it nose to tail (Figure 1), a foodie predilection that received satirical treatment in an Australian stage play by Eddie Perfect simply titled, *The Beast*, which first performed to Melbourne audiences in 2013.⁹

Figure 1 A local farmer’s promotion of his ‘Nose-to-Tail Dinner’ starring Kaiser the pig (Source: author)

‘Artisanal’ workshops hosted by farmers and permaculture hubs also offer to teach people how to kill and ‘dress’ chickens, humanely slaughter lambs, and butcher cows. Many of my interviewees had themselves slaughtered non-human animals for food or witnessed the killing, and they were quite unfazed by the experience. After chopping off a chicken’s head, Sally describes how she hangs it on a post to bleed out while she “go[es] off to make a cup of tea.” Gillian, expecting to be traumatised by killing her first chicken found it interesting that she was not, noting instead that it “made beautiful soup.” Participants express notable excitement at the prospect of witnessing or doing it themselves, especially in less conventional ways such as pig shooting or “boar hunting with bows and arrows” in France, which never actually happened for Sally, but nevertheless “sounded quite exciting.” Often, experiencing the killing of a non-human animal either directly or by visiting an abattoir is described as potentially confronting but a

necessary ethical imperative - a way of demonstrating “a bit of humility and respect towards the animal” (Natalie).

Ethical performance and culinary capital

This shift towards a style of meat consumption that is engaged with the whole process has been described as part of a general trend in foodie culture where the goal of “making transparent” (Goodman 902) serves to commodify what were previously hidden conditions of production and provision (see Cook and Crang “The World”; Coles and Crang “Placing alternative”; Lewis “The Ethical Turn”). What has been de-fetishised thus becomes re-fetishised through the “romanticised [and value-adding] notions of personal connection and physical immersion” (Pottinger 662) that characterise ethical consumption (see Cook and Crang “The World”; Goodman “Reading fair trade”). Ocejó describes the rise of upscale butcher shops in the US as illustrative of “a groundswell of artisanal and craft-based endeavours occurring across the country” (108). Following the “philosophy of transparency” (109), he says the craft of butchery is elevated to craft butchery, where as much of the formerly ‘backstage’ process is shown as possible, including graphically breaking down bloody non-human animals in front of customers. The success of the craft butcher’s performance relies on the customer also knowing and playing their part:

[...]they must show that they “get it” through their own performance in the interaction... they must be “skilled customers”... Those who do not show it get labeled as “hopeless,” or stubborn and difficult to reach and bring into the taste world. (Ocejó 119)

There is a similar sense among my participants of their being privy to better knowledge than ‘others’—others not skilled in eating ethical and sustainable meat, creating a sort of culinary and cultural capital. Some go further, describing those who eat ethical and sustainable meat as “healthier in mind and body and spirit” (Gillian), and alluding to a certain common trust and understanding that not everyone shares. This can lead to meat purchasing being carefully orchestrated to avoid undesirable consequences:

She said, did you get the chicken? I said Yeah, I got the chicken, she says, Oh good, you know you can’t trust Greg to get a good bird you know, so there’s this kind of understanding that I’ll go and get the meat because if we leave it to Greg he’s going to get a supermarket bird and none of us were comfortable with that...I’ve given him shit for that before, you know, his dirty birds. (Maria)

An emerging elitism that sees previously low-brow, mundane, or hidden work being framed as art, craft, and artisanal has been noted by Emily Matchar in her book, *Homeward Bound: Why Women are Embracing the New Domesticity*. Matchar describes the rise of DIY food culture and homesteading amongst a growing tribe of ‘from scratchers’ (96) as illustrative of a re-valuing of everything ‘natural,’ ‘traditional,’ ‘instinctive,’ and ‘authentic’ (4, 5). A desire, or perceived need, to experience meat production more ‘authentically’ can be interpreted as part of this broader DIY ideology. As Gillian says, “...it’s about everything, it’s about knitting, it’s about mending, it’s about making do.” However, other authors see something different, more revealing and altogether more problematic in the ready acceptance, and indeed active embrace, of the realities of non-human animal slaughter, something beyond simply an extension of the anti-corporate, DIY philosophy.

DIY and stylised violence

Gillespie (“How Happy”) contrasts the harsh, low-paid and repetitive work of typically disenfranchised populations in the slaughterhouse with the DIY experience reserved mainly for well-heeled gourmet connoisseurs and concerned middle-class consumers. In their usually one-off involvement in the actual slaughter, she says they are connecting to the act of violence against the non-human animal, not the non-human animal him/herself (120) - a process she describes as ‘connected disconnection’ (118), emphasising that the non-human animal’s death is just one step on its way to becoming the meat that it always was. But this is a necessary step to experience at least once if you want to be a different, more concerned consumer - skilled at the art of ethical consumption and aware of what that requires of you.

*Is it possible to have ‘connected connection’ with *meat*?*

A common sentiment, and even dictate, among my participants turns Singer’s 1975 statement - that those who ‘require’ non-human animals for food do not deserve to be shielded from its production - on its head. To ‘do it yourself,’ or at least witness it, unshielded as it were, bestows a free pass, a way to address that disconnect that has been (mis)construed as a modern problem. Now, the maxim “if you can’t do it then perhaps you shouldn’t be eating it” (Sally) carries the implicit message ‘do it, then you can keep eating it,’ and again, “If I can’t kill it, I don’t deserve

to eat it” (Tracey) implies, ‘if I can kill it, I deserve to eat it.’ If unable to ‘do it yourself,’ then, “you should at least be able to bear witness” (Natalie), to “know that this is the process” out of “respect for the whole animal” (Damien). The same logic pervades online blogs, media articles and comments on the subject.

It is apparently no longer acceptable for self-described ethical meat eaters to remain disconnected and ‘wilfully ignorant’ of where their meat comes from. Concern for how non-human animals are treated behind slaughterhouse doors has translated into a carefully constructed kind of transparency or “graspable materiality” (Pottinger 662) that neatly assuages or ‘inoculates’ against these concerns, to use Pachirat’s term (“The Glass Walls Fallacy”). But as Pachirat highlights, even within slaughterhouse walls, those involved in the actual killing of non-human animals may number just three or four people out of hundreds (44). Moreover, due to the highly compartmentalized structure of slaughterhouse operations, the killing is spread across a number of stages, each out of line of sight of the other, making it difficult to identify at what point along the kill floor line the non-human animal actually dies and who could be said to be responsible for his or her death (158-159). So perhaps, as Gillespie suggests, if more people were to experience the ending of non-human animals’ lives in a routine fashion under the time-constrained conditions of a slaughterhouse rather than as a one-off experience, they would connect with the non-human animals themselves, rather than the act of violence. However, past research indicates this is unlikely to be the case.

Over 30 years ago, Herzog Jr and McGee (somewhat incorrectly), noting Singer’s premise that almost everyone would be vegetarian if they had to kill their own meat,¹⁰ set about exploring this with a group of students on a liberal arts college campus in the US. The college housed a 300-acre farm devoted to raising cows and pigs for meat and students who elected to be on the farm crew, all aged between 18 and 24, were responsible for slaughtering the non-human animals. The authors recruited 27 students, including 3 vegetarians, who had slaughtered at least one non-human animal each, although the median among his cohort was 14 slaughters. While self-selection will be an inherent bias in this study, it is not an agricultural or veterinary college, and the students could represent an analogue for today’s ‘ethical’ consumers concerned with how their meat is produced. They were also conducting a slightly more routine, though still not intensive, level of slaughter that extended beyond the ‘one-off’ experience of Gillespie’s

gourmet connoisseurs, and indeed most of my participants. One question the authors explored was whether these students' slaughtering experience would have any effect on their diet.

Only 9 of the 27 students reported that the act of slaughter had initially bothered them in some way. For 7 of these, it took between one and three slaughters for them to feel habituated. The remaining two described having an increased appreciation for good quality beef. Participation in the slaughter resulted in 4 of the 27 students reportedly reducing their meat consumption. Many found the visceral reality of the act disturbing, even affecting their dreams; however, the authors' main conclusion is that the students were ambivalent about slaughtering (132). Much like my research participants, the authors observe "[a]lthough [the students] usually do not enjoy slaughtering and are often initially upset by it, most felt that it had been a good experience" (132). Even three who refused to do the actual slaughter still considered eating non-human animals as necessary and what they were bred for.

A key problem with the logic of the argument that participating in slaughter and butchery would help create more vegetarians and vegans is that those very acts require a tacit agreement, on some level, to seeing non-human animals as food. A degree of disconnect is already inherent, so any other kind of connection is not possible in this situation. If the normalised, human-constructed 'contract' between these non-human animals and humans, the one that insists this is their life purpose, is not rejected, then the best that can be hoped for, and which seems to be the case, is that people may feel a little uncomfortable or "suffer internal conflict" (Gillespie 116). But because that discomfort is taking place within a context where the original disconnect, that sees the non-human animal as food and not as a being, has already been socially normalised, the more likely outcome is that people will decide to have more respect for their food, be 'more conscious' about what they are eating, and maybe, just maybe, eat less. However, my formerly vegetarian and vegan participants are actually eating more now that it is 'ethical.' It appears that increased knowledge and experience of slaughter has been incorporated fairly seamlessly into new understandings of how to eat meat more responsibly and consciously.

From de- to re-fetishisation

All of my participants report allocating a lot of thought to the environmental and ethical issues associated with meat production and consumption. Moreover, at least a third of them have been vegetarian or vegan at some point in their lives. For all of them, the emergence of ethical and

sustainable meat, as the antithesis of the invisible, disconnected, large-scale mass production of objectified livestock ‘units,’ seems to have repaired and strengthened what may previously have been shaky relationships with eating non-human animals.

Presented with alternatives to factory farmed meat that allow them to know, and ideally see, more of the non-human animal and their story, they then “feel better about it” (Natalie). As Lisa says, “once I learned more about ethical and sustainable meat it made me feel ok to eat it as long as I knew the source, and as long as I knew where it was coming from.” For Heather, knowledge of where the non-human animal comes from and how it was raised, “deals with any potential guilt I might have about farming them for our consumption. I feel like I’m comfortable with then consuming it.” For consumers like Gillian, who is “adamant that I’m going to know what these animals have gone through,” purposefully seeking this knowledge is broadly understood as the pathway to eating meat ethically. It is *how* non-human animals are used for food that has caused these consumers to pause and reflect, and perhaps feel guilt or ‘suffer’ in some way, but then only temporarily. As Gillian says, “once I found ethical bacon, it was like okay, no more vegan.” The use of non-human animals as food remains so deeply normalised and rarely problematized, even within approaches to meat production and consumption that emphasise transparency, that such feelings are typically transitory or easily rationalised by drawing on a range of common understandings relating to health, biology, human evolution, instrumental reason, the value of life and a rejection of human exceptionalism:

It’s more optimal to eat more meat (Geoffrey)
 Humans were born to eat meat (Lucy)
 To get a little bit smarter, meat was necessary (Fiona)
 [non-human animals] are existing for that (Blake)
 If we didn't eat them they wouldn't exist (Gillian)
 We are also animals (Maria)

Hence my participants variously assert that they need meat in order to be healthy, that our biology dictates that we should eat it, that it is responsible for our evolution, that non-human animals have no other purpose and indeed rely on us to grant them the ‘gift’ of life, and that as animals, we cannot and should not deny our own ‘natural’ role in the food chain.

For my participants, reincorporating the non-human animal as a visible subject serves as an incentive to flesh-eating, not a deterrent, as Parry also observed (“New Visibility” 7). The non-human animal adds colour, movement, sound, smell, theatre, story, and essentially, life to the ever-present and final object of the exercise - the meat. We see here a re-formulation of the

parameters that define acceptable *ways* to produce and eat ‘better’ meat (beyond even organic and free-range). This is accompanied by a tacit understanding of those who do not follow these rules as unethical, unthinking, and unconscious consumers. Here the process of re-fetishising the de-fetishised begins.

While strategies that focus on *how* meat is produced and consumed could arguably be considered a step towards improving the lives of many non-human animals, the object of this attention is still overwhelmingly **meat**, i.e. the product of their flesh and not the non-human animals themselves. Ethical and sustainable meat and associated campaigns for ‘less and better meat’ therefore do not problematise the use of non-human animals as food but rather how they are used and how they are eaten (i.e. respectfully). My participants are very clear about what makes a meat ‘product’ ethical or not in this regard: meat from a “happily grazed animal” is preferred over factory raised meat (Natalie); chicken or pork that is “not organic or sustainably labelled or free range” is widely considered unethical (Charlotte); often eating any pork is unimaginable, or at least causes discomfort, because “pig’s are so intelligent, it’s like dogs” (Sophie); while knowing “the story of the animal” (Anne) is commonly given a high priority. Even when their ethics are admittedly more equivocal, as Natalie admits, “there’s a part of me that thinks I really shouldn’t eat [pigs] cos they are just so incredibly bright and gorgeous,” deference to the status quo and faith in the positive power of the market take precedence, as she goes on to say, “this is our culture, they’re one of our food animals so...I’d rather support the ethical raising of pork and boost that industry, than not eat it” (Natalie). Several of my participants even suggest how industry practices could be improved by expanding the use of visibility, turning it into a commodity. For example, including “transparent labelling” with “a photo of the way that animal was raised...and the kind of death it had” (Gillian), and installing cameras inside slaughterhouses. The more visibility, it seems, the better. This would also presumably increase the perceived ethical value of the associated meat.

Since the study by Herzog Jr and McGee over 30 years ago, it appears that little has changed in terms of how increased knowledge and experience of meat production and non-human animal slaughter shapes understandings of using non-human animals as food. What *has* changed since then is the popularisation, de- and then re-fetishation of that knowledge and experience as part of a new ethical rubric, and their embodiment (through suggestion and labelling) in the end product. As other authors have suggested in their analyses of media

discourse (for example Gutjahr; Parry), practices of slaughter and butchery have effectively been commodified and are being used to add value to ‘better’ meat in a way that clearly distinguishes it from ‘dirty,’ factory farmed and supermarket meat.

The (big) business of transparency

Capitalising on a previously ignored, low-brow aspect of meat production and turning it into a value-add is not only the remit of small-scale farmers. The economic value of visibility is also being recognised by big business, and cameras in slaughterhouses appear not too far from becoming reality. Danish Crown, a pig slaughterhouse in Denmark that processes 20,000 pigs a day, making it one of the largest in the world, have installed a glass viewing gallery to show “100 percent of what happens here, not 99 percent” (Wiper “Danish Crown”). From Monday to Friday, an average 150 visitors a day trace every step of the process as the pigs are turned into meat, including the slaughter (although not their actual death in a Co2 gas chamber 10 metres below ground)¹¹. A smaller ‘packinghouse’ in Vermont, USA, has similar public viewing windows from which visitors can watch cows, calves, pigs, lambs and goats being slaughtered and processed (Abels “In Vermont”). Unlike at Danish Crown, visitors here can watch the non-human animal’s actual death, starting with the captive bolt gun to the head. Other slaughterhouses in the state are also open to the public although they stop short of having glass walls. While not everyone may be able to visit a slaughterhouse, there are abundant online opportunities to read graphic and typically illustrated accounts of other’s visits, and watch videos, some produced by the meat companies themselves.¹²

Flying against an industry culture dominated by fear of exposure and persecution, which has contributed to the emergence and spread of Ag-gag laws, a new breed of slaughterhouse is appearing that openly invites the public gaze. Where once the invisibility of these operations was (and still is) used to critique practices of meat production and consumption, they are now being brought out of the shadows. Yet, rather than turning everyone vegetarian or vegan, this new visibility is being commodified and incorporated into the broader normalisation of using non-human animals as food, lending it an ethical tint by making it ‘better.’ Part of the reason for this, I suggest, is that looking can affirm rather than challenge relations of dominance and control.

The acquisitive gaze

The power behind the look has been theorised in feminist and (post)colonial literature and especially studies of visual culture and cinema where ‘others’ are objectified under the male or colonial gaze (Mulvey “Visual Pleasure”; Adam “Cyberstalking”; Sturken and Cartwright “Practices of Looking,” Yancy “Colonial Gazing”). Such a gaze is never neutral or, as Victor Burgin said, “indifferent” (118) and can even be abusive. There is a sense in which the look or gaze is a further appropriation or devouring of a body over which the subject already claims ownership. As Pick says, it is “an act of mastery over the other” (“Vegan Cinema”), and in the case of non-human animals, the mastery demonstrated by the devouring gaze foreshadows the literal devouring of the non-human animal’s body. The “vibrant assemblages” of non-human animal, human, technology, bodily fluids, breath, and nature that occur during a slaughter, and which are increasingly captured visually or described in graphic prose by those witnessing or doing it themselves, convert the non-human animal’s death into a kind of “hypnotic aesthetic” (Pick “Vegan Cinema”). The act of killing, poetically recast or re-fetishised by this aesthetic, “presupposes unlimited access to animals” and highlights the “similarity between violence and looking that simply takes for granted the fact that animals are there for the taking” (Pick “Vegan Cinema”).

Within the current trend for meat that is ethical, where transparency and direct experience are the ideals, there persists the notion that a form of intimacy between human and non-human animal produces a ‘good killing’ and “redeems instrumental relations between humans and animals” (Pick “Vegan Cinema”). As Maria says of participating in slaughter, “there’s an ethical cost in trying to develop a less substantiated relationship with the animal...a real intimacy.” In the same way, post-humanists such as Haraway and Bennett theorise human/nonhuman relations as a “becoming with” (Haraway 3) in an undifferentiated assemblage of all “vibrant matter” (Bennett 13). Yet these intimate encounters, or vibrant assemblages, are always pursued to nourish and fortify the human observer, to confirm his or her own identity (Pick “Vegan Cinema”). Thus, the realities of human entitlement, access, and control that are presupposed in the killing of non-human animals for food are concealed behind an appealing narrative where humans participate in the normalised act of killing, just as other non-human animals do, in acknowledgement of their natural role in the food chain and with respect for those non-human animals whose lives ‘must’ be taken.

Furthermore, not everyone can raise and kill their own non-human animals for food, and therefore the bucolic narrative of the ‘natural’ is not accessible to the majority of consumers who rely on the large-scale, mostly invisible, intensive meat industry. By getting closer to production processes in whatever way they can, consumers are appropriating a part of the narrative and contributing to its re-fetishisation. The visibility of and participation in non-human animal slaughter and butchery merely expand the scope of a commodification where one no longer simply buys the meat, but may also own some part of the life, and his/her story, that provided it. And it is this type of alternative consumption, imbued with broader significance, that is being undertaken as a direct and positive response to the various issues being associated with meat.

However, instead of ‘buying something [else]’ being conceived as the only way to ‘do something,’ as Sally said, can ‘doing nothing,’ or desisting from something, be recognised equally as doing something? The possibility of “letting be” then arises—of purposefully foregoing “the automation and acceleration of the gaze” that denotes non-human animals’ unconditional availability (Pick “Vegan Cinema”). Recognising the structural ties that exist between acts of violence and acts of looking, this perspective allows for what Pick articulates as “the possibility that animals may not want to be looked at, or that in turn we may not have the right to look at them, or we may wish to look differently at them” (“Vegan Cinema”). ‘Doing nothing’ in this respect is a rejection of the dominant, socially constructed norms and fictions that decree that these non-human animals’ lives have no intrinsic worth, that they belong to us from the moment of their birth, and their only purpose in existing is to provide food for humans. It is thus the more radical response to issues of meat production and consumption as it denies the urge to solve problems via the market, it and asks that we forego the economic opportunities that seeing non-human animals as a resource have thus far provided us. By renouncing the anthropocentric (or perhaps more accurately, Capitalocentric)¹³ construction of unlimited access to non-human animals, ‘doing nothing’ refutes the impulse to own, expose, control and master, and it respects the lives of non-human animals, not through ‘good killing’ but by considering their lives as their own—a “notion of animal privacy that denies human eyes and their technological proxies unlimited access” (Pick “Why not look”). Facilitating more looking through increased visibility does not in itself confront questions around how non-human animals are used as food. On the contrary, it affirms human entitlement to non-human animals’ lives,

demonstrates this entitlement, and subsumes any concerns regarding the treatment of non-human animals by constructing this entitlement as a law of nature.

Through the glass (walls) darkly

I have argued that, contrary to persistent and popular assumptions, a higher material and discursive visibility of meat production processes does not challenge the normalisation of using non-human animals as food. It draws attention to *how* meat is produced; however, the role of meat in ‘balanced,’ ‘healthy,’ and even ‘ethical’ diets remains unquestioned. The turn to transparency, visibility and also increased subjectivity in meat production and consumption is therefore occurring in a context where the status of non-human animals as food remains intact. In terms of Morgan and Cole’s thesis, whether they are raised ethically, humanely, sustainably, and even given names, these non-human animals are always understood to be there for meat and therefore occupy a unique, interstitial space somewhere between pets and food.

Even non-human animal advocacy and direct action campaigns that use confronting imagery and film to ‘expose’ meat production practices tend to focus on the violence done to non-human animals on their way to becoming meat, and less on their construction as food (Cassie “Not all ham”; McWilliams “If You’re Buying”).¹⁴ Relying on a similar misconception that such information will significantly alter individual consumer attitudes and behaviour with regard to meat, these campaigns do not challenge the deeply entrenched normalisation of non-human animals as food across interconnected practices of food (buying, preparation, cooking, consuming) and understandings of how to ‘do’ sociality, commensality, gender, caring, hospitality, respect, and health ‘properly’ (see Delormier et al. “Food and eating”; Halkier and Jensen “Methodological challenges”; Warde “What Sort of Practice”). Tackling the normalisation of non-human animals as food across these and related practices would leverage a more powerful argument for sustained and long-term change with regard to the use of non-human animals and not just the consumption of meat. As long as the normative construction of non-human animals as food and of humans’ naturalised entitlement to them remain unchallenged, they can never be entirely *not* food—after all, “that’s why it exists, is to be killed” (Lisa). Human entitlement to and ownership over their lives and their bodies persists, however visible they are. Visibility simply encourages the development of new ways to make their eating ‘better’ and more acceptable while retaining that ‘connected disconnection.’

*It's not only about *meat**

Campaigns that focus on associations between meat consumption and sustainability, environmental degradation, climate change and/or health, in the hope of dissuading people from consuming meat, are, I suggest, similarly limited. They allow the construction of animals as food to remain firmly in place and thus leave room for 'sustainable' production methods, 'healthier' consumption guidelines, and more 'humane' ways of treating non-human animals (which also produce 'healthier' and 'tastier' meat) that reaffirm meat's legitimacy while providing 'benign' alternatives that are minimally disruptive to diets. What makes these the more likely outcomes of such campaigns is that the persistent ideology of meat as a 'natural' food from non-human animals who have no other purpose remains firmly in place and is rarely challenged directly. *Meat* tends to be the only 'problem' being addressed and non-human animals are rarely mentioned.

Such strategies are not simply a misdirection of much needed advocacy effort. On account of what (or who) is omitted, they also give rise and lend legitimacy to, related dietary campaigns that promote ways to eat meat more sustainably, healthily and ethically by following a flexitarian, reducetarian, climatarian, humaneitarian, carnesparsian, or part-time carnivore diet, adopting Meat Free days/weeks/months and considering regulatory measures such as a Meat Tax (Carrington "Meat Tax"). These campaigns and strategies collectively maintain that there is "compelling evidence" (Dibb "Looking forward") that eating *less* meat and/or only certain types of meat is not only sustainable, healthy, and ethical, but also environmentally friendly and helps reduce emissions, especially when you choose "better meat" (Dibb and Fitzpatrick "Let's talk about"; Goodyer "Reducetarian - the middle ground"; Rainey "Vegetariansim versus 'flexitarianism'").¹⁵ Non-human animals rarely enter the picture and, in the case of Meat Free Monday, the success of their "meat free" (or more accurately reduction) message is measured simply in terms of the number of people "concerned about looking after themselves and the planet" and those "trying or thinking about trying to eat less meat" (Meat Free Monday). Yet, a recent report from Chatham House (Wellesley et al. "Changing Climate") indicates how little traction efforts to reduce meat consumption based on the environment and health have with EU consumers (Burrows "More headaches"). Moreover, while suggesting that consumers may be more open to regulatory means of reforming diets than assumed (such as a Meat Tax), the

authors report that due to population growth, achieving “healthy levels of meat eating” through these and other measures mapped out in the report “would not reduce the size of the global meat industry” (Carrington “Meat Tax”).

Naturally, such messages, built around the creed of *reducing* consumption, do not antagonise a meat industry keen to shift and adapt to a (as yet proportionally small) changing market in order to remain profitable (see Cawood “Focus on Sustainable”; Phelps “Why beef”; Searby “Trading up”). Rather, they signal a market opportunity where “...volume declines are likely to be offset by an increase in value as consumers trade up to higher quality meat, in particular organic products and those that specify the place of origin...” (Searby “Trading up”). The pantheon of ‘less meat’ exponents, such as Eating Better,¹⁶ appear ready to lend their support to businesses to help them meet this new market for ‘better meat.’

Although these campaigns and alliances could potentially produce positive short-term outcomes in terms of reducing per capita meat consumption (and presumably limiting the number of non-human animals killed for food), they do not challenge societal norms that designate certain non-human animals as food, and therefore they do little to change the status quo for these non-human animals in the long term. The implicit and persistent message is that it is ok for humans to eat non-human animals, just not so much, and maybe ones that have been treated better. So the natural question becomes, what is the end goal? - how many non-human animals will it be ok or ‘moderate’ to raise and kill in order to be sustainable, healthy, ethical? Is one meat-free day/week/month per person the goal? Do the lives of those non-human animals who are never born, because less meat is being eaten, take precedence over those who currently exist for food (Henry Salt’s ‘logic of the larder’)?¹⁷

As long as they do not address underlying societal norms and practices of using non-human animals as food, these sorts of arguments and campaigns risk perverting the goal of ending the use of non-human animals for food by highlighting areas of concern that the industry can address to maintain its legitimacy in the public eye. The outcome is a shift towards meat that is sustainable and environmentally friendly, meat that produces fewer emissions, meat that is healthy, meat that is humane, and, through increased transparency and access to the processes of production and slaughter, meat that is ‘visible’, transparent and therefore ethical. Following these efforts to their logical conclusion, if all meat eventually becomes sustainable, environmentally

friendly, healthy, and ethical—more ethical even than not eating it—meat free days and their ilk become redundant.

Communicating a clear end game

However, this perhaps indicates that ending all use of non-human animals as food is not the goal of these campaigns, and if it is not, then they are not clear about what the goal is. If it is simply for fewer non-human animals to be killed for food, which problematically assumes that the lives of ‘contingent beings’—those never born—are more important than those of existing beings (Visak 15), then I suggest non-human animal advocacy organisations that are clear about their intent to eliminate all use of non-human animals need to clearly distance themselves from these campaigns. Alternatively, campaigns can ensure that they include the message of ultimately ending all use of non-human animals, emphasising that their short term, individually focused reduction strategies are one means to a bigger end. For those organisations, perhaps unaware that they are failing to address the issue of non-human animal use or believing they have to avoid it to appeal to a mainstream conceived as skittish, I suggest that they need to be aware of the potential effects of their campaigning and aim to counter these effects with a more comprehensive and inclusive construction of their arguments that addresses the use of non-human animals as food and not just *meat*. This means making broader intersectional understandings of the connections between practices characterised by use, power relations, and oppression an explicit part of their discourse. Purposefully avoiding these broader connections implicitly characterises (wrongly, I believe) a ‘general public’ quick to be confused or put-off by such knowledge and leaves the normalised use of non-human animals as food unchallenged. Including them would give their strategies more ontological bite, being about much more than improving non-human animal treatment or eating less and ‘better’ meat from ‘happy’ non-human animals that ideally you killed yourself.

Acknowledging and broadcasting a clearer end-game of no use would go some way to promising more stable and long-lasting changes. Once non-human animals are no longer viewed as resources for human use in any way, whether highly visible and subjectified or not, their intrinsic animal-ness and being-ness cannot be modified or negated by technology or otherwise, and there is nothing left to acceptably commodify. This fundamental conceptual shift needs to accompany all efforts to reduce and shift meat consumption practices, including alternative

proteins, mock meats, and in-vitro meat. Otherwise, the fate of non-human animals will always be uncertain and unstable, resting as it does on the shifting, unpredictable, and fickle foundations of human practices where they are forever at risk of (re)becoming meat. On the other hand, if it does, then there is a counter pressure working towards a future where there cannot be healthy meat, sustainable meat, or ethical meat. There cannot be any meat at all. Our belief in the market to solve problems surrounding ‘meat’ has rendered most people incapable of considering abstaining as a positive move, instead associating it with deprivation. Buying ‘better’ versions is considered “doing something,” and therefore the more ethical choice. Somehow these associations need to be decoupled.

Conclusion

Peter Singer’s and Linda McCartney’s wishes have come true in a certain sense. A small but increasing number of people are participating more directly in meat production processes so that they are no longer shielded from the raising, killing and butchering of the non-human animals they eat. And even those once mythical glass walls are starting to appear.

This paper has demonstrated that there is a noticeable shift occurring in how self-described ‘ethical’ consumers think the slaughter and processing of meat should be approached. Perhaps influenced by the successful efforts of advocacy organisations over past decades to expose unregulated slaughterhouse violence towards non-human animals and bring *how* non-human animals become meat out of the shadows, increasing numbers of consumers believe in, and are calling for, greater transparency (Purdy “Open the Slaughterhouses”). The expected disruptive effect of such efforts has been filtered through everyday social practices and normalised understandings of meat and non-human animals to bring about an increased focus on welfare and improving the ways in which meat is produced. Being able to observe what was previously invisible only emphasises the unbridled access we have to non-human animal’s lives, confirms their status as usable, and highlights our privilege in being entitled to that use. This new visibility is therefore highly problematic and not some more evolved, “clear-eyed” (Joyce) way of seeing our world.

I have also suggested that the co-opting and commodification by industry of what was intended as a critique of meat production and consumption is not restricted to the visibility or transparency of meat production processes. The potential of campaigns that focus on associations

between *meat* and sustainability, environmental and climate change, and health is, I argue, similarly diluted by allowing room for industry to respond with sustainable, environmental-friendly, and healthy meat. They effectively show industry the pathway to new markets, helping them remain viable. While *meat* consumption and *how* *meat* is produced remain the focus of these campaigns, what is consistently neglected, and what thereby makes them consistently fall short of their potential to challenge the status quo, is the normalisation of non-human animals as food. Without simultaneously tackling this dominant ideology, they present no ultimate vision beyond some ‘acceptable’ level of humane and sustainable consumption of meat. The associated use of non-human animals to produce this meat is always implied and therefore still conceived and portrayed as unproblematic. It is through including the non-human animal question, along with questions of meat, that I suggest this ideology can at least start to be unsettled, introducing the idea that meat consumption *and* using non-human animals as food are equally unnecessary and undesirable.

The question of *why*, rather than *how* non-human animals are used as food is a useful one to serve as a fulcrum around which to formulate and grow a counter discourse and start to normalise a different understanding of non-human animals and the value or ‘purpose’ of their lives, one that recognises these have been defined (and genetically modified) in accordance with human ‘needs.’ However, to labour further on answering the question ‘why’ is also, I suggest, a distraction from the disruptive work that is most needed right now. Numerous authors and scholars already offer extensive accounts of the ‘why’ which encompass patriarchy, capitalism, religion, culture, myth, ritual, social Darwinism, explorations of human psychology, spirituality, compassion, empathy, ethics and much more (see Adams “The Sexual”; Fiddes “Meat: A Naural”: Spiegel “The Dreaded”: Singer and Mason “The Ethics”; Joy “Why We Love”: Nibert “Animal Oppression”: Simon “Meatonomics”; Gruen “Entangled Empathy”; Piazza et al. “Rationalizing meat”; Rodriguez “Until every Animal”). While continuing to grow and refine this understanding is important, what perhaps gets lost is how to act on this knowledge—how to use it to start changing the status quo for non-human animals.

It is non-human animals and their subjective lives that tend to be entirely missing/invisible from discussions that focus on *meat*, and this is a gap that could be addressed by broadening the focus and reintegrating them into the discourse as visible actors/agents, not simply as visible material. More importantly however, it is their enduring (re)constitution as food

within associated practices that needs to become a priority focus for critical analysis, with an eye to the material infrastructures, competencies, and primarily meanings that support this constitution. Therefore, along with the greater visibility of non-human animals as actors/agents, it is the normative practices and associated elements of which they are a part that need to be made more visible in a way that invites a critical examination of their normative status. In this way, the deeply embedded understanding of non-human animals as food that underpins all practices of meat production and consumption can start to be questioned and unsettled (and ideally de-normalised). This would occur alongside and integrated with the unsettling of meat that is already taking place, though I argue within a limited context, constrained as it is by the prevailing and persistent norm of non-human animals as food. Locating a critical questioning of the use of non-human animals at the center of all meat-related strategies and campaigns anchors the issue of meat to a deeper philosophical and ethical base, which would, I suggest, result in more effective advocacy campaigns and strategies because they are aimed at intervening in, and disrupting, normalised practices involving meat *and* non-human animals.

Notes

¹ Although commonly attributed to Sir Paul McCartney, it was Linda McCartney who first said this. As far as I can tell, it first appears in her 1995 cookbook, *Linda's Kitchen: Simple and Inspiring Recipes for Meals without Meat*.

² There are shifts occurring in the global market with growth decreasing in some nations and increasing in others and changes in the types of meat being consumed. See Christine Chemnitz and Stanka Becheva, *Meat Atlas: Facts and figures about the animals we eat*.

³ From the French *le regard*, meaning to look at, observe, consider, think of with a particular feeling, relate to, evaluate, judge.

⁴ Notwithstanding circumstances where access to and availability of alternatives is limited which is a matter of equitable distribution and access rather than specific necessity.

⁵ An earlier version of this diagram appears in Stewart and Cole's *The Conceptual Separation of Food and Animals in Childhood*.

⁶ Those being cows, sheep, pigs and chickens—more than 70% of meat produced annually comes from pigs and chicken, while cows account for a further 22% (FAO 2014)

⁷ For example:

- Poultrykeeper.com: <https://poultrykeeper.com/general-chickens/how-to-kill-a-chicken/>
- Mother Earth News: www.motherearthnews.com/homesteading-and-livestock/how-to-butcher-a-homestead-raised-hog-zmaz82sozgoe.aspx
- Farmstyle.com.au: <http://farmstyle.com.au/question/slaughtering-sheep-and-cattle-use-family-and-friends>
- Wikihow.com: www.wikihow.com/Slaughter-Cattle

- Gov.uk: www.gov.uk/guidance/slaughter-poultry-livestock-and-rabbits-for-home-consumption

⁸ How best to label Wilbur 101?: www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/bushtelegraph/how-best-to-label-wilbur-101/5105866

⁹ The Beast: www.mtc.com.au/about/the-company/archive/2013-mainstage/the-beast/

¹⁰ What Singer in fact said is, “[i]t has been said that if we had to kill our own meat we would all be vegetarians. There may be exceptions to that general rule, but it is true that most people prefer not to inquire into the killing of the animals they eat” (150).

¹¹ According to Temple Grandin, CO₂ gassing is less stressful for the pig than electric stunning, especially in Denmark where they have removed the Halothane stress gene from the pig population. Those with the gene, she notes, “have a bad reaction—they panic” (Morin “This Slaughterhouse”). This genetic modification was originally undertaken to reduce mortality rates during transport, which it did eight-fold (Warriss 99).

¹² Just a fraction of such accounts include:

- Chico Locker and Sausage Co. Inc. “A look inside the glass walls of a slaughterhouse.” 27 August 2012. Web. 20 October 2015.
- Smith Meadows. “Behind the scenes at a local butcher shop.” 15 April 2013. Web. 20 October 2015.
- Eisendrath, Ben. “Loving a good slaughterhouse.” *The Atlantic* 30 March 2012. Web. 21 October 2015.
- Forbes, Paula. “Oprah tours a Colorado Slaughterhouse.” *Eater*. 3 Feb 2011. Web. 20 October 2015.
- Grover, Sami Grover. “A look inside a humane slaughterhouse.” *Treehugger*. 2 May 2011. Web. 20 October 2015.
- McEvedy, Allegra. “My visit to the slaughterhouse: crossing the line between life and meat.” *The Guardian* 29 August 2014. Web. 23 October 2015.
- American Meat Institute. “The Glass Walls Project.” Narrated by Temple Grandin. August 2012. Web. 23 October 2015

¹³ The Capitalocene is defined by Moore (“Capitalism”) as the “Age of Capital” characterized by “a new configuration of exploitation (within commodification) and appropriation (outside commodification but in servitude to it)” (Chap. 7).

¹⁴ Also seen in Animals Australia’s campaigns against live export, ‘battery’ sheep farming, and chicken ‘mega’ farming; RSPCA campaigns against live export, battery hens and mulesing; ASPCA campaign against factory farming; Mercy for Animals investigations of cruelty; Voiceless campaigns against factory farming and battery hens.

¹⁵ See also www.climates.network/climatarian/; www.parttimecarnivore.org; www.humaneitarian.org; and www.facebook.com/carnesparsian.

¹⁶ Eating Better is a UK-based alliance with a focus on eating “less but better meat”. To that end, it supports farmers of ‘sustainable meat’ and regularly promotes their businesses on its website (www.eating-better.org/about.html). Most recently, Eating Better held business engagement discussions designed to help businesses promote less and better meat (via twitter feed, November 2015).

¹⁷ This is, in any case, a questionable argument given that the number of animals slaughtered annually for food continues to increase globally faster than population - a growth in some animals offsetting slight declines in the growth of others (See Chemnitz and Becheva).

Work cited

- ABC. "Wilbur 101: from paddock to plate." Australia: Radio National, Bush Telegraph. 11 June 2013. Web. 23 October 2013.
- Abels, Caroline. "In Vermont, a Slaughterhouse Invites an Audience." *Civil Eats*. 17 March 2015. Web. 20 November 2015.
- Abels, Catherine. "What it Takes to Make a Decent Living Raising Ethical Meat." *Civil Eats*. 13 July 2015. Web. 1 December 2015.
- Adam, Alison. "Cyberstalking and Internet pornography: Gender and the gaze." *Ethics and Information Technology* 4.2 (2002): 133-142. Print.
- Adams, C. *The Sexual Politics of Meat*. 1990. New York: Continuum, 2010. Print.
- Alexandratos, Nikos and Bruinsma, Jelle Bruinsma, *World Agriculture Towards 2030/2050: The 2012 Revision*. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations, Global Perspectives Studies Team. ESA Working Paper No. 12-03, 2012. Web. 12 December 2015.
- Ball, Matt and Friedrich, Bruce. *The Animal Activists' Handbook: Maximising our Positive Impact in Today's World*. New York: Lantern Books, 2009. Print.
- Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2010. Print.
- Bourette, Susan. *Meat: A Love Story*. New York: The Penguin Group, 2008. Print.
- Burgin, Victor. "Situational Aesthetics: Selected Writings by Victor Burgin." Ed. A. Streitberger. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009. Print.
- Burrows, David. "More headaches for "less meat" messaging." *Food Navigator*. 30 November 2015. Web. 2 December 2015.
- Buzzfeed. "These foodies to a farm and killed their own dinner." 2 February 2015. Web. 18 April 2015.
- Carrington, Damian. "Meat tax far less unpalatable than government thinks, research finds." *The Guardian*. 24 November 2015. Web. 25 November 2015.
- Cassie D. "Not all ham is created equal—a guide to buying pork products this Christmas." *Sustainable Table*. 1 December 2015. Web. 3 December 2015.
- Cawood, Matthew. "Focus on Sustainable Beef." *The Land*. 6 May 2015. Web. 17 November 2015.
- Chemnitz, Christine and Becheva, Stanka. *Meat Atlas: Facts and figures about the animals we eat*. Berlin: Heinrich Boll Stiftung and Friends of the Earth Europe, 2014. Web. 26 May 2014.
- Coles, Benjamin and Crang, Philip. "Placing alternative consumption: commodity fetishism in Borough Fine Foods Market." *Ethical Consumption: A critical introduction*. Eds. Tania Lewis and Emily Potter. Oxon: Routledge, 2011. 87-102. Print.
- Cook, Ian and Crang, Philip. "The World On a Plate: Culinary Culture, Displacement and Geographical Knowledge." *Journal of Material Culture* 1.2 (1996): 131-153. Print.

-
- Cox, Suzanne. "Farm Fresh Meat: Better for You and Your Wallet!" *Grit: Rural American Know-How*. 19 February 2012. Web. 1 December 2015.
- Cudworth, Erika. *Environment and Society*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Cudworth, Erika. "Seeing and Believing: Gender and Species Hierarchy in Contemporary Cultures of Animal Food." *Eating and Believing: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Vegetarianism and Theology*. Eds. Rachel Muers and David Grumett. London: T&T Clark, 2008. 168-183. Print.
- Delormier, Treena, Frohlich, Katherine L., and Potvin, Louise. "Food and eating as social practice - understanding eating patterns as social phenomena and implications for public health." *Sociology of Health and Illness* 31.2 (2009): 215-228. Print.
- Dibb, Sue. "Looking forward looking back." *Eating Better*. 9 January 2014. Web. 10 December 2015.
- Dibb, Sue and Fitzpatrick, Ian. "Lets talk about meat: Changing dietary behavior for the 21st Century." *Eating Better*. December 2014. Web. 15 December 2014.
- Fairlie, Simon. *Meat: A Benign Extravagance*. Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2010. Print.
- FAO (2014) Sources of Meat. 25 November 2014. Web. 1 October 2016.
- Fiddes, Mike. *Meat: A Natural Symbol*. 1991. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Friend, Catherine. *The Compassionate Carnivore*. Philadelphia: Perseus Books, 2008. Print.
- Gillespie, Kathryn. "How Happy is Your Meat? Confronting (Dis)Connectedness in the 'Alternative Meat industry.'" *The Brock Review* 12.1 (2011): 100-128. Print.
- Gold, Scott. *The Shameless Carnivore*. Clarkson Potter, 2008. Print.
- Kingsolver, Barbara. *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle: A Year of Food Life*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2008. Print.
- Goodman, Michael. "Reading fair trade: political ecological imaginary and the moral economy of fair trade foods." *Political Geography* 23.7 (2004): 891-915. Print.
- Goodyer, Paula. "Reducetarian – the middle ground between vego and paleo." *Sydney Morning Herald* 23 March 2015. Web. 28 December 2015.
- Gruen, Lori. *Entangled Empathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*. New York: Lantern Books, 2015. Print.
- Gutjahr, Julia. "The reintegration of animals and slaughter into discourses of meat eating." *Ethics of Consumption: The Citizen The Market and The Law*. Eds. Helena Rocklinsberg and Helena and Per Sandin. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers, 2013. 379-385. Print.
- Halkier, Bente and Jensen, Iben. "Methodological challenges in using practice theory in consumption research. Examples from a study on handling nutritional contestations of food consumption." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 11.1 (2011): 101-123. Print.
- Haraway, Donna. *When Species Meet*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.
- Harskamp, Jaap and Dijstelberge, Paul. "The Shambles (York)." *On Books and Streets – An Approach to Cultural History*. 26 May 2013. Web. 22 June 2015.
- Herzog, Harold A. Jr and McGee, Sandy. "Psychological Aspects of Slaughter: Reactions of College Students to Killing and Butchering Cattle and Hogs". *International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems*. 4.2 (1983): 124-132.
- Joy, Melanie. *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs and Wear Cows*. San Francisco: Conari Press, 2010. Print.

-
- Krasner, Deborah. *Good Meat: The Complete Guide to Sourcing and Cooking Sustainable Meat*. New York: Abrams, 2010. Print.
- Lee, Paula Young, Ed. *Meat, Modernity, and the Rise of the Slaughterhouse*. New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire Press, 2008. Print.
- Leigh, Meredith. *The Ethical Meat Handbook*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers, 2015.
- Lewis, Tania. "The Ethical Turn in Commodity Culture: Consumption, Care and the Other." *sic: Journal of Literature, Culture and Literary Translation* 2 (2011). Web. 16 April 2014.
- Lewis, Tania and Huber, Alison. "A revolution in an eggcup? Supermarket wars, celebrity chefs, and ethical consumption." *Food, Culture and Society* 18.2 (2015): 289-307.
- Linne, Tobias. "Grazing the green Fields of social media." *Exploring the Animal Turn: Human-Animal Relations in Science, Society and Culture*. Eds. Erika Andersson Cederholm, Amelie Bjorck, Kristina Jennbert and Ann-Sofie Lonngren. Lund: Pufendorfinstitutet, 2014. 19-32. Print.
- Logsdon, Gene, "Raising Your Own Beef for Food." *Mother Earth News*. April/May 2002. Web. 1 December 2015.
- Matchar, Emily. *Homeward Bound: Why Women Are Embracing the New Domesticity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2015. Print.
- McWilliams, James E. "If You're Buying a Turkey from Wholefoods Because It Was 'Humanely' Raised, Read this First." *Slate*. 24 November 2015. Web. 26 November 2015.
- Meat Free Monday. "MFM survey shows meat free message is continuing to connect." 24 October 2015. Web. 5 November 2015.
- Morin, Roc. "This Slaughterhouse Wants You to See Where Your Meat Comes From." *Vice*. 15 September 2014. Web. 20 November 2015.
- Moore, Jason W. *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*. New York: Verso, 2015. Print.
- Morgan, Karen and Cole Matthew. "The Discursive Representation of Nonhuman Animals in a Culture of Denial." *Human and Other Animals: Critical Perspectives*. Eds. Bob Carter and Nickie Charles. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 112-132. Print.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999: 833-844. Print.
- Murphy, Kate. "Blessed be my Freshly Slaughtered Dinner." *The New York Times* 5 September 2015. Print.
- Nibert, David. *Animal Oppression and Human Violence*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013. Print.
- Niman, Nicolette. *Defending Beef: The Case for Sustainable Meat Production*. Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2014. Print.
- O'Connell, Joanne. "Want to eat sustainable meat? Grow your own pork." *The Guardian* 4 August 2014. Web. 1 December 2015.
- O'Sullivan, Siobhan. *Animals, Equality and Democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- Ocejo, Richard. "Show the animals: Constructing and communicating new elite food tastes at upscale butcher shops." *Poetics* 47 (2011): 144-163. Print.
- Parry, Jovian. *The New Visibility of Slaughter in Popular Gastronomy*. Masters Thesis. University of Canterbury. 2010. Print.

-
- Parry, Jovian. "Gender and slaughter in popular gastronomy." *Feminism & Psychology* 20.3 (2010): 381-396. Print.
- Pachirat, Timothy. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011. Print.
- Pachirat, Timothy. "The Glass Walls Fallacy: Reflections from an Industrialized Kills Floor on the Promises and Pitfalls of Transparency." University of Melbourne. Australian Animal Studies Association 2015 Conference, Animal Publics: Emotion, Empathy, Activism, IN. 12-15 July 2015. Keynote Address.
- PETA. "Glass Walls". n.d. Web. 8 October 2015.
- Phelps, Mark. "Why beef must listen to consumers." *Stock Journal*. 1 August 2014. Web. 17 November 2015.
- Piazza, Jared et al. "Rationalizing meat consumption: The 4Ns." *Appetite* 91 (2015): 114-128. Print.
- Pick, Anat. "Why not look at animals." *Necus European journal of Media Studies*. June 12 2015. Web. 3 November 2015.
- Pick, Anat. "Vegan Cinema: Looking, Eating and Letting Be." University of Melbourne. Australian Animal Studies Association 2015 Conference, Animal Publics: Emotion, Empathy, Activism, IN. 12-15 July 2015. Keynote Address.
- Pottinger, Laura. "Ethical Food Consumption and the City." *Geography Compass* 7.9 (2013): 659-668. Print.
- Purdy, Jebediah. "Open the Slaughterhouses." *The New York Times*. 8 April 2013. Web. 20 November 2015.
- Rainey, Sarah. "Vegetarianism versus 'flexitarianism' – what's not to like?" *The Telegraph* 22 January 2013. Web. 28 December 2015.
- Reed, Berlin. *The Ethical Butcher*. Berkeley: Soft Skull Press, 2013. Print.
- Rodriguez, Saryta. *Until Every Animal is Free*. Danvers: Vegan Publishers, 2015. Print.
- Satya Magazine. The Satya Interview with Peter Singer. October 2006. Web. 21 August 2014.
- Searby, Lynda. "Trading up: can a shift from quantity to quality lift meat market malaise?" *Food Navigator*. 13 November 2015. Web. 16 November 2015.
- Simon, David. *Meatonomics*. San Francisco: Conari Press, 2013. Print.
- Sinclair, Upton. *The Jungle*. 1906. Dover Publications, 2001. Print.
- Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*. 1975. New York: HarperCollins, 2009. Print.
- Singer, Peter and Mason, Jim. *The Ethics of What We Eat*. New York: Rodale, 2006. Print.
- Spiegel, Marjorie. *The Dreaded Comparison: Human and Animal Slavery*. 1988. New York: Mirror Books, 1996. Print.
- Stewart, Kate and Cole Matthew. "The Conceptual Separation of Food and Animals in Childhood." *Food, Culture and Society: An International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 12.4 (2009): 456-476. Print.
- Sturken, Marita and Cartwright, Lisa. *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. Print.
- Visak, Tatjana. *Killing Happy Animals: Explorations in Utilitarian Ethics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Print.
- Warde, Alan. "What sort of a Practice is Eating?" *Sustainable Practices: Social Theory and Climate Change*. Eds. Elizabeth Shove and Nicole Spurling. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013: 17-30. Print.

-
- Warriss, P. D. *Meat Science: An Introductory Text*. 2000. Bristol: CABI Publishing, 2010. Print.
- Wellesley, Laura, Happer, Catherine, and Froggatt, Antony. *Changing Climate, Changing Diets: Pathways to Lower Meat Consumption*. London: Chatham House, November 2015. Web. 25 November 2015.
- Wiper, Alastair Philip. "Danish Crown Slaughterhouse, Denmark." Alastair Philips Wiper. 6 January 2014. Web. 13 April 2014.
- Yancy, George. "Colonial Gazing: The Production of the Body as "Other." *Western Journal of Black Studies* 32.1 (2008): 1-15. Print.