



Norwegian University
of Life Sciences

Master's Thesis 2020 30 ECTS

Faculty of Landscape and Society

Conceptualizing Animals: The Role of Welfare in the International Politics of Animal Agriculture and Animal Liberation

Kristen Michelle Walter

MSc International Relations
Department of International Environment and Development

The Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric, is the international gateway for the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU). Established in 1986, Noragric's contribution to international development lies in the interface between research, education (Bachelor, Master and PhD programmes) and assignments.

The Noragric Master's theses are the final theses submitted by students in order to fulfil the requirements under the Noragric Master's programmes 'International Environmental Studies', 'International Development Studies' and 'International Relations'.

The findings in this thesis do not necessarily reflect the views of Noragric. Extracts from this publication may only be reproduced after prior consultation with the author and on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation contact Noragric.

© Kristen Michelle Walter, August 2020
Kristen.Walter.kw@gmail.com

Noragric
Department of International Environment and Development Studies
The Faculty of Landscape and Society
P.O. Box 5003
N-1432 Ås
Norway
Tel.: +47 67 23 00 00
Internet: <https://www.nmbu.no/fakultet/landsam/institutt/noragric>

Declaration

I, Kristen Michelle Walter, declare that this thesis is a result of my research investigations and findings. Sources of information other than my own have been acknowledged and a reference list has been appended. This work has not been previously submitted to any other university for award of any type of academic degree.

Signature.....

Date.....

Acknowledgements

If you were to tell me five years ago that I would be finishing my master's degree, I would not have believed you. Life looked very different then and if it were not for the love and endless support of others, I would not have had the courage to take the step to even apply. For that, I am eternally grateful. While there are many people, I have received a great deal of support and assistance from, I would like to credit a special few.

First, I want to thank my supervisor Paul Beaumont for seeing the vision I had for this thesis and helping me bring it to a reality. Though this thesis is unconventional for the field of IR, your guidance helped bring it to fruition. I would also like to thank Kirsti Stuvøy for your guidance and courses in Critical Theories which illuminated a new entry point into IR for me.

Second, I want to say thank you to my husband, Petter Hallaråker, who has been nothing but a blessing in my life. Thank you for supporting me in my education and activism, as well as being there when the weight of this thesis topic felt heavy. Also, a special thank you for the neck massages, as looking at a computer for hours a day over a period of years has taken a toll. You are a rockstar.

Third, I would like to express my deep gratitude for my mom (Cathy), Grammy and Papaw, Michael, Ashley, and Mark for their support on the home front, state-side. Family is everything. I would also like to acknowledge the support felt in spirit from those that are no longer with us, my dad Mike and Grandma Mary. Thank you all.

Fourth, I want to extend the warmest thanks to the Hallaråker family here in Norway for their welcoming nature and their genuine support. Tor, Berit, Tomas, Kjetil, Markus and Grethe, thank you. I will be forever appreciative of our “Walhalla” (Walter-Hallaråker) family.

Fifth, a special shout out to the Snoodhuset crew and those at “the office” of 3rd floor Clock building at NMBU, and the “surprisingly subtle” crew. Your friendship means the world to me.

And lastly, though not a shout out of thanks, I want to acknowledge the nonhuman animal lives lost in which this thesis is based around. I hope this thesis does their experiences justice.

Any errors are mine alone

Abstract

Agriculture has been greatly important in the process of food production, and while agriculture is referenced to in IR, it tends to be referenced to as part of sustainability, accessibility and human rights discourse. Indeed, focus in international relations has predominantly been on the human experience which in turn leaves out a social, economic and political element of the situation of nonhuman animals. This anthropocentric as part of the human/animal dichotomy lens has left the experiences of millions nearly unheard. It is this that makes the concept of “welfare” interesting to analyze within legislation because though contestation over food norms and animal norms exist, legislation has adapted to the challenges with a set of rules that ensure “good treatment”. While this research focuses on Norway as an example of this, Norway represents just one of many states where contestations around food norms are being made and welfare legislation is in place. These contestations come in various forms, from the assertion for better practices, more focus on sustainability, to calls for an outright end to the meat and dairy industry for animal liberation. The international stakes of norm contestation in regard of animals are high as the rules and practices in which a society operates are supported and informed by these norms. What happens in turn is that the marginalization of animals and oppression of a selection of species is continually accepted as part of the way of reality. It is this dynamic of power, language of support through legislation and the acceptance of practices that will be challenged via a Critical perspective informed by Critical Animal Studies. Critical Theory provides the lens in which to investigate the power dynamic that facilitates marginalization of nonhuman animals. While a CAS approach leads the thesis through a set of principles geared toward deconstruction of the dichotomies that inform the relationship between humans and nonhumans. Both theories focus on liberation and therefore this thesis too will operationalize the concept of animal liberation.

Key words: Welfare, liberation, human/animal dichotomy, animal rights, animal rights Movement, norms, practices, Critical Animal Studies

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VII
ABSTRACT	IX
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	XIII
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	2
1.2.1 <i>Research objective and research questions</i>	3
1.3 METHODOLOGY.....	4
1.4 ETHICS AND LIMITATIONS	5
1.4.1 <i>Ethics</i>	5
1.4.2 <i>Limitations</i>	6
1.5 STRUCTURE OF THESIS.....	7
CHAPTER 2. CAS AND THE HUMAN/ANIMAL DICHOTOMY	8
2.1 ANIMAL LIBERATION AND CAS	8
2.2 JUSTICE, EQUALITY AND CAS.....	10
2.3 CONSTRUCTS OF NONHUMAN ANIMALS	12
2.4 ANTI-CRUELTY, WELFARE, AND CAS	13
2.5 SOCIAL JUSTICE AND CAS	15
2.6 CAS IN ACADEMIA	16
2.6.1 <i>CAS in Critical theory</i>	18
2.6.2 <i>CAS and Constructivism</i>	20
2.7 NONHUMAN ANIMALS, ANTI-CRUELTY AND PHILOSOPHY.....	23
2.8 LIMITATIONS TO JUSTICE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	24
2.8.1 <i>Animal rights, nonhuman animal research in Norway</i>	26
2.9 CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.....	27
CHAPTER 3. WHAT ARE THE INTERESTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL REGARDING NONHUMAN ANIMALS	29
3.1 A CHANGING MARKET	29
3.2 RESPONSIBILITY OF THE MEAT INDUSTRY	30
3.2.1 <i>Welfare responsibility</i>	30
3.2.2 <i>Economic responsibility of meat industry</i>	31
3.3 ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND NORWAY	33
3.3.1 <i>Animal rights movement and animal rights organizations in Norway</i>	34
3.4 ANIMAL-BASED FOOD NORM CONTESTATION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT	38
3.5 ANIMAL LIBERATION AND GOVERNANCE	40
3.6 CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.....	41
CHAPTER 4. INCONSISTENCIES IN THE NAWA	42
4.1 KILLING AND THE NAWA	42
4.2 BREEDING AND THE NAWA.....	47
4.3 POWER DYNAMICS IN THE CREATION OF THE NAWA	48
4.4 CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.....	52
CHAPTER 5. NORWEGIAN ANIMAL AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES AND NONHUMAN ANIMAL EXPERIENCES	54
5.1 PRODUCTION PRACTICES: BREEDING	54
5.2 PRODUCTION PRACTICES; SLAUGHTERHOUSE	57

5.3 CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.....	58
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION	60
REFERENCES.....	63
TABLES.....	68
<i>TABLE 1</i>	68
APPENDIX	71
APPENDIX A	71

Acronyms and abbreviations

AV	Anonymous for the Voiceless
CAS	Critical Animal Studies
DxE	Direct Action Everywhere
IO	International Organization
IR	International Relations (academic field)
NAPA	Norwegian Animal Protection Agency
NAWA	Norwegian Animal Welfare Act

“The most crucial insights and implications of the challenges to humanist histories and the debilitating dualism between human animal and nonhuman animal are obfuscated and blocked by esoteric language, detached standpoints and apolitical comportment in a world in crisis, and humanity at the most critical crossroads in its entire history”

(Best S. , 2009, p. 11)

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

65,865,820 individuals were killed in Norway in the year 2018 alone. This number represents but a fraction of the total number internationally and on neither level were investigations made. Indeed, a crime had not been committed. This is because the individuals were not human but “(farm)animals” and therefore their deaths were justified by the support of socio-cultural and economic norms. In Norway, the normative conceptualization of some animals as food has led to **321,320** cows, **63,836,796** chickens, turkeys and ducks (**62,738,774** of which were chickens) and **1,707,704** pigs who have been killed for the meat industry in 2018. This brings the number to **65,865,820** individuals in Norway within one year (Statista, Number of slaughtered cattle in Norway in selected years from 1996 to 2018, 2019), (Statista, Number of slaughtered poultry in Norway in selected years from 2012 to 2018, 2019), (Statista, Number of slaughtered pigs in Norway in selected years from 1996 to 2018, 2019). The Norwegian meat and dairy market represent just one market as part of an interwoven system of markets and norms internationally. Though challenges to these animal norms exist, the position of animal liberation remains a minority amongst the meat norm majority.

As part of a compromise on the challenges of food norms over the treatment of animals used farms, the concept of “welfare” was applied. In Norway, this norm has manifested itself in legislation as the Norwegian Animal Welfare Act which builds on the idea of “welfare” to extend the concept of “intrinsic value” onto nonhuman animals (Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7). While this extension represents food norm changes in regard to the ethics of our treatment of nonhuman animals, it ultimately reinforces the premise on which animal agriculture sits which is that humans are different from animals and that justifies the dominion over their species. Because this is international in nature, entire species are held in an oppressed position as they await their turn in line for slaughter.

Typically, in IR, the statistics as provided above could be problematized to show perhaps a phenomenon within the global political economy or to examine some impact on a community.

All of which are relevant topics for research. However, the experiences of nonhuman animals oftentimes do not make it into IR research, even though the numbers of systemically marginalized individuals globally reach seismic levels. Critical Animal Studies is used as an approach amongst various academic programs to address the human/animal dichotomy that secures animal-using practices in place by illuminating the struggles of the nonhuman demographic. Also, as part of its Critical framework, it works to develop upon an understanding of the power dynamics involved in the global systemic marginalization of groups (human and nonhuman) based on species, class, race and gender.

The NAWA provides a means of examining the language used that upholds certain values around nonhuman animals and meat. A human/animal dichotomy however, as part of an *animal* welfare act point to inconsistencies within the very foundation and therefore provokes a research interest into the practices that happen as result. Dichotomies are the representation or posing of two concepts as being opposite of one another or entirely different from one another. Though humans are animals, nonhuman animals are typically referred to as just “animals” which divides the conceptualizations of “us” and “them”. This conceptualization means that an entire species of individuals faces systemic marginalization based upon how they were born.

As CAS scholar Steven Best puts it,

the most crucial insights and implications of the challenges to humanist histories and the debilitating dualism between human animal and nonhuman animal are obfuscated and blocked by esoteric language, detached standpoints and apolitical comportment in a world in crisis, and humanity at the most critical crossroads in its entire history (Best S. , 2009, p. 11)

1.2 Research problem

The NAWA has emphasized welfare, as opposed to liberation. Welfare focused evaluation of animal rights have emphasized a life to be free from “unnecessary suffering” (Norwegian Animal Welfare Act, 2011) while deciding what is necessary suffering based on their species. After consideration of the global political economy and animal agricultural effect on climate change, it is important for both the welfare of animals and the progress we will have as a species in our regard for the environment around us. It is not enough to be unconscious before slaughter. “If we examine more deeply the basis on which our opposition to discrimination on grounds of race or sex ultimately rests, we will see that we would be on shaky ground if we were to demand

equality for blacks, women, and other groups of oppressed humans while denying equal consideration to nonhumans” (Singer, 2002, p. 3).

1.2.1 Research objective and research questions

The objective of this thesis is to discuss some of the limitations of animal welfare legislation with regard to animal rights of animals used on farms in Norway. This will be done by illustrating examples where a dichotomy is presented in the Norwegian Animal Welfare Act and surrounding discourse on welfare in The Act. This dichotomy will be analyzed through the perspective of Critical Animal Studies, which focuses on animal liberation (including both human and nonhuman animals) as a means to become self-aware of socially created hierarchies that legitimize marginalization.

The goal of this research is to gain insight into the concept “welfare” as it pertains to food production practices. This will then illuminate any potential limitations to the concept of justice for nonhuman animals. The research, by taking a CAS holistic approach will answer three separate but relating questions.

RQ 1: “How is the NAWA situated within a global context?”

Norway and the NAWA represent one of many states globally with legislation and norms supporting a concept of animal welfare, animal agriculture and a meat industry.

RQ 2: “What inconsistencies exist within the NAWA itself?”

A CAS approach guides the deconstruction of these inconsistencies by looking at the language used and dichotomies it represents.

RQ 3: “How is the concept of welfare according to the NAWA fulfilled in animal agricultural practices according to a CAS perspective?”

By looking at how the NAWA standards manifest in practice allows for a look directly at the experiences of those the NAWA was written in regard to, nonhuman animals.

1.3 Methodology

Discourse analysis will be used to research the phenomena of the very human conceptualization of nonhuman animals and “animal welfare”. The purpose of discourse analysis is, after all, to help us understand the expectations or behavior that seem to be second nature now. Yet in truth, our expectations of human behavior have changed over time and thus, so have the laws that we create to enforce these expectations. Within our social world, our societies create meanings. And then we change our minds. The purposes of this research on animal welfare in Norway is to analyze how the concept of welfare has changed, how alternatives to liberation have been marginalized and highlight the processes and power relations that keep a particular meaning in place

By borrowing pieces of Ivar Neumann’s discourse analysis “toolkit” (Neumann, 2008), it is first important to decide which texts to examine, second to find material to be analyzed equally alongside the first texts such as news articles or ads, third to group these together based on a similarity, fourth to divide the phenomena found within the pieces into groups based on their different representations of that same phenomena, fifth to decide on the way the groups will be analyzed, and sixth to self-reflect on what has been found through the data collected.

What this means practically for this research on animal welfare in Norway in particular is to **first**, utilize the NAWA as a primary text because it sets the minimum standard for the treatment of nonhumans in Norway. The NAWA represents a set of compromises because various organizations, groups and departments had cooperated with Stortinget (the Norwegian parliament) to create it. These compromises shine light on the normative standard that individuals, corporations and farms must not only adhere to, but have agreed upon. From this point, the actors involved in the creation of this version of The Act. The time frame looked at for this research will cover the time of the drafting of the NAWA into present time. By looking at this timeline, insight may be drawn in regard to welfare as a concept and the limitation it poses for the justice of nonhuman animals. These research questions naturally pose part of a complex system of norms and represent a view of where the norm sits as the concept of justice progresses. Because the purpose of the essay is to deconstruct the human/animal dichotomy within the NAWA legislation and normative culture, the focus will not be on the measurement of welfare itself but on how the concept of welfare is used to further advance the human/animal dichotomy. This dichotomy arguably justifies the vastly different behavior of humans toward nonhuman animals used on farms.

Second, comparing the NAWA with what happens in practice. This requires taking a general look at the media but a larger focus on the “Regulations on the Killing of Animals legislation” outlining how to humanely slaughter in Norway. “Animals” being mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish, decapods, squid, octopi and honeybees according to the NAWA (Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7). While this research will predominantly focus on mammals on farms, it is not limited to mammals on farms and may extend scope to birds and fish on farms and others nonhuman animals being used in Norway. It would also be beneficial to compare to a degree with another form of legislation that secures certain freedoms to nonhuman animals used in the meat industry. While the research focuses on Norway, the case may be applied on an international level as the norms are not bound within Norwegian state lines.

Third, utilizing concepts to dismantle binaries within the discourse. For example, the use of the term “*welfare*”, “intrinsic value” and “unnecessary suffering” to highlight issues that underpin the systemic oppression of nonhuman animals.

Fourth, to take the concepts above and discuss the representations of them as they make up the human/animal dichotomy. This can be in the form of the language used (i.e. categorizing “animals” as species other than humans), economic incentive (i.e. animal agriculture), and norms (i.e. food, humane).

Fifth, to utilize a specific way to analyze the data collected. In this research, I will be applying a Critical Animal Studies perspective to analyze the data. One principle of CAS is to focus on dichotomies and the normative structure that upholds nonhuman animal using practices. A CAS focus on the “human/animal” dichotomy takes a particular stance for the liberation of nonhuman animals as a part of an effort to end oppression of all systemically marginalized groups.

1.4 Ethics and limitations

1.4.1 Ethics

Worth mentioning is a potential personal limitation to this research. I am a vegan, American immigrant living in Norway. Through the influence of Critical Theories while studying IR at Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet and The University of Cincinnati, my identity has only given me an energetic boost toward the exploration of the experiences of internationally marginalized groups and the norms involved. The CAS approach is driven by liberation and

assumes a hierarchy exists, as per the principles (referenced to in **Chapter 2** and listed in *Appendix A*) making it purposely both academic and activist in nature. Many indeed that will starkly reject the basis of this thesis based upon different philosophical, cultural, religious and other normative backgrounds of the world that debate would most certainly ensue on the very premise of challenging nonhuman animal-eating norms. Let alone, the attempt to extend the scope of the field of IR to discuss the experiences of nonhuman animals and their relevance within the normative structure of international relations.

1.4.2 Limitations

A methodological limitation to this research is the means in which the data has been collected. The methods were chosen purposely to illuminate national normative framework as part of a global animal norm framework, but because of the structure of the research questions, the research takes a somewhat limited approach in exploring the complexity of food and animal norms. With that being said, further research using CAS while exploring other variables would be ideal to take this thesis further and formulate a deeper understanding of current food norms and how they fit in with a concept of (animal)global justice. This research is therefore not limited negatively necessarily, but an extension of scope would be of interest.

While focusing on the NAWA and the regulations on how to humanely kill in Norway, the scope does not focus specifically on consumer values, the global political economy or specific contestations toward certain food norms. However, by extending a CAS approach, these topics, amongst many others, may be explored. Without extending the scope for more data, the analysis within this research touches the surface of a complex system of norms. For CAS research in IR on food and animal norms, qualitative interviews or mixed method surveys could also examine how welfare is situated internationally via investigating public perceptions of the relationship of human and nonhuman animal, cross examining with welfare expectations and breaking down animal norms in meat identities. Or perhaps, research too could explore the representation of animals in meat and meat alternative marketing to explore the and compare between states over a period of time. But as of now, the research serves to problematize animal binaries in a way that begins to frame the global political, socio-economic and cultural factors involved.

1.5 Structure of thesis

The thesis is divided into six chapters. **Chapter 1** lays out the methods, research design and limitations to this thesis. Chapters 1-5 will begin with a brief introduction to the chapter and be followed by concluding thoughts on key takeaways from the chapter. Following the introduction, **Chapter 2** presents the theoretical literature and begins to address a foundational level of **RQ 1**, **RQ 2** and **RQ 3**. CAS, the theoretical framework this study is introduced as an alternative method to current mainstream approaches toward the concept of animals for the purpose of providing background information while situating this research within IR and existing philosophical debates. **Chapter 3** seeks specifically to answer **RQ 1** while presenting a portion of actors, in Norway and internationally, and their interests in regard to the normative conceptualization of the human/animal binary. **Chapter 4** addresses **RQ 2** as it dives into the NAWA contents to highlight language that supports the human/animal dichotomy. **Chapter 5** applies the analysis the previous chapter to answer **RQ 3** and discuss the experiences in practice of nonhuman animals based on the human/animal dichotomy within the welfare standards. Lastly, **Chapter 6** ends the thesis with a key takeaway of the thesis as a whole.

Chapter 2. CAS and the human/animal dichotomy

The purpose of **Chapter 2** is to clarify the theoretical standing on which this thesis follows and provide a basis on which **RQ 1**, **RQ 2** and **RQ 3** will be answered. **Section 2.1** looks at Critical Animal Studies itself in order to clarify its position of liberation and oppression. **Section 2.2** looks at the scope of justice as a norm in progression in regard to who may be entitled to it. As is any norm, justice is being continually shaped and constructed. **Section 2.3** discusses how “animals” have been socially constructed. **Section 2.4** discusses the concept of “welfare” and how it is applied in animal agriculture. **Section 2.5** begins to bridge the plight of nonhuman animals with other social justice issues. **Section 2.6** breaks down the field of CAS and how it is situated within academia. **Section 2.6.1** situates CAS as a branch of critical theory as it relates to other critical efforts in IR to explore the power dynamics of marginalization. **Section 2.6.2** examines constructivism and norm progression as they are a premise on which the research sits epistemologically. **Section 2.7** looks at the concepts of welfare and the progression of anti-cruelty in the field of philosophy. Philosophy is important to bring even in the field of IR as justice and equality continue to be sought. **Section 2.8** examines the field of International Relations and the limits within it in regard to justice and equality followed by **Section 2.8.1** which begins to look at Norway how the welfare and nonhuman animals have been researched. Lastly, **Section 2.9** sums up this chapter with concluding thoughts.

2.1 Animal liberation and CAS

The research into the rights of nonhuman animals from cruelty afflicted upon them is important in the fight against global oppressions. “Animals—defined as “brute beasts” lacking “rationality”--- thereby provided the moral basement into which one could eject women, people of color, and other humans deemed to be subhuman or deficient in (Western male) “humanity”” (Best S. , 2009, p. 17). A way for hierarchies to stay in place, such as the ones that come out of the human/animal dichotomy, systems are set in place to break the natural will in individuals that seeks freedom and relies in a codependent manner on life necessities such as shelter, food, etc. It could be said at this point, “but what about dogs?” as most families do cherish their dog for reasons that

have nothing to do with what the dog is able to give them. The point still stands however, “the dog-human relationship”, or more general the human-animal relationship, “must move toward a complex of mutuality and reciprocity, of, as Haraway argues, “significant otherness” (Best S. , 2009, p. 128). In regard to this domestication of animals, “if a training methodology is based solely on dominance, on a slave and master dichotomy, it is simply not acceptable if we are, as human animals, to accept our biological history and change our environmental future” (Best S. , 2009, p. 128).

A critical lens offers an important viewpoint of systemic oppression by focusing on the narrative of a predominantly marginalized group. Hierarchy categorizes some as “worthy” while others ultimately without voice for their own perspective because of anthropocentric governing systems and international relations theory. Critical Animal Studies, like much of Critical Theory, invests time into learning about the stories of individuals and communities. The difference in CAS is that it looks to the oppression of nonhuman animals as a means of solving a larger oppression issue. To do this, a framework was created. Steven Best, Anthony J. Nocella II (Best and Nocella: co-founders of the Institute for Critical Animal Studies), Richard Kahn, Carol Gigliotti, and Lisa Kemmerer formulated ten points that the CAS perspective follows (Best, Nocella, Kahn, Gigliotti, & Kemmerer, 2007). It important to list them in full both for the purpose of showing how CAS may fit within IR as well clarifying the precise stance it takes in regard to social justice and liberation. See *Appendix A*.

Notable also is that as a theory, CAS “is informed by a normative commitment---such as grounded in ethology, ecology, and the moral philosophy of animal rights to animal liberation”. Which is to both speak toward the ethics and the theoretical practice of this thesis. CAS offers insight into the spectrum of critical theory with its “holistic understanding of hierarchical power systems (e.g., racism, sexism, classism, and speciesism) and their intricate interrelationships” (Best, Nocella, Kahn, Gigliotti, & Kemmerer, 2007). With this being said, it does come from a strong anti-positivist position that acknowledges reality as we know it is constructed by relationships. These relationships are interconnected and that is precisely why a study on concern with climate change and a study on concern with animal rights/animal welfare is great to pair with a critical theory. It acknowledges hierarchical power systems, derived from ideologies that have been constructed throughout history. It is also important to note that animals within a CAS perspective do in fact have agency and do in fact have a voice. Though their voice

is not human, their voice should not be ignored. Through acts like national welfare acts, we see is an attempt in state policy that their voice is not to be ignored. This is done through an attempt to keep suffering to a minimum, but according to CAS misses the point. Suffering is an ability by many but does not determine the individual's value.

CAS would argue that a variance in cognitive ability between two individuals does not justify the killing the another. Justifications of differing treatment of different animals is based on ableism. CAS scholar Daniel Salomon asserts “the framing of animal ethics needs to be critiqued; a neurotypical bias remains implicit in the way animal ethics is typically framed, which keeps intact and perpetuates speciesism” (Salomon, 2010, p. 47). “Neurotypicalism privileges a form of cognitive processing characteristic of peoples who have a neurotypical (non-autistic) brain structure, while at least implicitly finding other forms of cognitive processing to be inferior, such as those natural to autists and nonhuman animals” (Salomon, 2010, p. 47). CAS would argue that this justification is inconsistent with the normative values we have created as a society that show that these differences in capabilities are not sufficient to justify the sentencing of not only those that are innocent of any crime, but those that are innocent and have perhaps a lower capacity to learn in the way that humans do, to death or to a life of confinement. This argument of CAS is based on the concept of speciesism. “Speciesism...is a prejudice or attitude of bias in favor of the interests of members of one's own species and against those members of other species” (Singer, 2002, p. 6). Similar to other social justice movements for the rights of the oppressed, the fight against speciesism seeks to end systemic and social oppression based not on merit, but on a simple difference in the way one is born.

2.2 Justice, equality and CAS

CAS challenges the ableist and speciesist justifications for treatment of others. It does so by challenging the categorization of “worth” of others in the plight for equality. CAS addresses justifications for the meat industry that nonhuman animals simply do not have the same emotional or physical needs as humans, and because their intellect is supposedly inferior to humans, their species (regionally decided with cultural norms) is the chosen ones to be used and sold for parts. CAS would argue that this ableist argument does not meet its own requirements and therefore

misses an underlying point. The ability of a being to think critically, hold memories, see in color, feel heartbreak, pain or love in the same regard as a human disregards the fact that the experience of these things is on a spectrum for humans as well and it would be a gross violation against human rights to kill the “one billion people [who] experience some form of disability”, or the “110-190 million people [who] experience significant disabilities” (The World Bank, 2020).

The drive for rights, freedom and justice have been a part of the progression of human order. Categorizing is one thing from another is only natural as it helps to decide right from wrong, good from bad, assess the value of, etc. The problem with categorizing on the other hand is that it situates a power dynamic. One must, at the very least, take time to evaluate the positioning of the categorization. This would mean, practically speaking from a critical animal studies perspective, taking a look at where the claim that nonhuman animals are not worthy of living out their natural life--- free from exploitation.

However, there is currently no such certainty for the nonhuman animal lives in the meat industry. A just future would be the experience of a system that delivers fair accountability. One that does not capitalize off the death of the innocent. What that system would manifest itself as in a globalized society that is divided by drawn boundaries, cultures and identities is unknown. While this research focuses on Norway, Norway is just one of many countries that have a meat industry. The Norwegian meat industry and Norwegian welfare legislation is not especially unique in that it is one of many cases to analyze with a CAS lens. The food industry system is a giant machine that for the most part has been trusted. Trust in the sense that a consumer may depend on the system to provide safe food and that the system is established enough to run relatively consistently and avoid major crises. Trust of the management system within the food industry has reinforced normative behavior within the system. A management system is a system of rules, protocols, and expectations to follow to run efficiently.

Critical animal studies offer a holistic approach to social justice, meaning that social justice issues, though are not parallel, are interconnected and relate back to the core issue being a system of oppressive dualism strategies used to fashion a hierarchy and reinforce the status quo. The status quo, like any norms created and dismantled, is protected under language and practices. The status quo in the case of this research being the international where these norms creating the human/nonhuman binary is reproduced and challenged. To address a lack in justice for nonhuman animals means addressing the language and practices used in regard to nonhuman animals. To do

this, one must look at the categorization of animals as it is a construct that directly affects the level of protection and freedom the “type” of animal gets.

2.3 Constructs of nonhuman animals

Nonhuman animals are categorized as wild, domestic and farm. Nonhuman animals in general, though perhaps regarded with fondness culturally and normatively, are at the same time seen as products to be traded and consumed. The line seems to be drawn at domesticated animals, or pets, and certain species in “the wild”. Wild animals at times being seen as needing to be protected, while others are seen as needing to be killed. And sometimes, they are seen as needed to be killed in order to be saved. Various reoccurring rationales are given for protection and killing, based in speciesism, ableism and even welfarism. The speciesism is evident in the categorization of cats and dogs as companions or food. For the west, typically cats and dogs are categorized as companions and it would be unfathomable to use them for food. The categorization of a pig as bacon and not a cat shines light on one piece of the welfare issue that is in current categorization of nonhuman animals does not protect animals based on their intrinsic worth or value based on what they provide for humans. One is considered domestic and the other is considered more or less a domesticated farm animal, and therefore their fate is sealed within an industry interested both in generating the demand for and supplying the bodies for the consumption of one but not the other. With the goal being to lessen the suffering of the innocent, the call to equalize the normative value and respect a coexistence of various abilities across the species, the sentiment of this should not be confused as a free-for-all suggestion to kill every animal equally. The suggestion, as per critical theory and critical animal studies is to investigate the categorization itself and dismantle dichotomies that further insinuate an “us versus them” situation with those at the top of the hierarchy deciding who deserves justice when their life is taken from them within the same system that claims that it will protect them from “unnecessary suffering”. The norm of some animals being categorized as farm animals leads to certain practices. These practices are of course informed by the ultimate outcome humans have decided for the species in question (food) alongside a cultural understanding that pain is bad, and pain is to be avoided for everyone. Welfare norms, rules and legislation are the outcome of this scenario where humans seek to have it both ways: kill and protect the innocent.

As human rights and international law focused scholar David Bilchitz states, “the traditional classification of animals as legal objects has already been challenged by the enactment of animal welfare legislation” (Bilchitz, 2009, p. 38). Prior classification of animalkind had been that nonhuman animals were not in any way what we as humans are and that informed a belief that they held no value to consider. This sentiment was inherently oppressive and came from a place of limitation in questioning and therefore understanding. As the tides of this norm changed, nonhuman animals were promoted to having value on some level that made them eligible for consideration against cruelty and later, and later implemented language in which protected their good welfare. In Norway for example, the NAWA specifies that animals have intrinsic value which directly speaks to the change in conceptualization of nonhuman animals in Norway. This created a system of justice and accountability so that nonhuman animals may lead a good life. However, as bioethics, anti-elitist, anti-speciesism scholar Y. Michael Barilan states, any “justice that denies the possibility of a good life is a seriously deficient concept, probably even an incoherent one” (Barilan, 2004, p. 25). After all, what makes for a “good life”? Is a “good life” a life in which one is assured to receive adequate housing and the basic needs of sustenance? Or is a good life perhaps also inclusive of the freedom from enslavement? Can the concept of apply in our exploration of the normative makeup of animal husbandry? Answers to these questions may be found in examining the power structure that upholds the human/animal dichotomy.

2.4 Anti-cruelty, welfare, and CAS

One solution to the matter kill and protect dilemma has been through anti-cruelty and welfare legislation regarding animals and food production. The legislation dictates both means of slaughter. Producers then try to produce at a rate that meets the consumer demand alongside managing that the nonhuman animals do not feel *too much* pain. In practice, what this looks like is the choice between CO₂ gassing as a more humane method of slaughter or a bolt to the skull. In order to do this, sometimes means creating diversions to avert the nonhuman animal’s attention away from the stimulation of smell or sight from those that have been killed in the assembly line before them. Welfare as a mainstream understanding “includes health and the extent of positive and negative feelings” and that “a range of measures of behavior, physiology, brain function, immune system function, damage, strengths of preferences, etc. is needed [to assess the welfare of

an individual]” (Broom, 2008, p. 79). Fear of death in this case would be bad welfare and dying without pain would be good welfare.

The use of a purely welfare-based approach on the measurement of a someone’s wellbeing, as we know from social justice issues, is simply not enough. A more comprehensive approach is required to understand the struggles of nonhuman animals. Especially when the struggles are a direct result of human interference which implies a level of responsibility and accountability. Categorizing nonhuman animals in the sense that humans are human, and animals are animals neglects the fact that humans are but one species of animal. The use of language is important here as it is used in the advancing the human/animal dichotomy.

It should be noted that farmers who grow crops and breed animals for food do so for the sake of keeping humans alive. A noble pursuit, no doubt. The farmers of animal agriculture are also backed by tradition, religion, and a general demand amongst other things. The demand is perhaps more so for food than the desire to see animals die. This concept is actually quite complicated because, “many people enjoy eating meat but dislike causing pain to animals. Dissociating meat from its animal origins may be a powerful way to avoid cognitive dissonance resulting from this ‘meat paradox’” (Kunst & Hohle, 2016, p. 758). In short, “they enjoy eating meat, but dislike causing pain to animals” (Kunst & Hohle, p. 758). The human/animal dichotomy continues strongly because we as humans recognize that, “meat eating is morally problematic because it contrasts our desire to avoid hurting animals with our appetite for their flesh,” but there is the dilemma between loving animals and loving to eat meat and that this is precisely the “meat paradox” (Loughnan, 2012, p. 15).

Welfare legislation comes in with the focus on the individual’s ability to cope with their environment. If they are unable to manage (mentally and physically) with their situation, then it is considered bad welfare. But this, as this thesis will assert, misses the mark on how that environment came to be in the first place. CAS would argue that it is the dominion humans have taken over nonhuman animals that allows such poor welfare to exist. That the hierarchy itself and the justification and differentiation of regard for ones well-being and livelihood needs to be dismantled instead of putting a metaphorical bandage on the wound that keeps re-opening, arguably stemming from “the meat paradox” humans find themselves in where they like animals and do not want harm to come to them, but are willing to eat their body parts and flesh.

Bad welfare defined, as per regional cultural normative understanding and welfare legislation, as the environment of said nonhuman animal includes cruelty (unnecessary suffering), lack of stimuli, lack of necessary resources (food, water, shelter, etc.), wounds left unattended to, etc. Broom (2008) states, “welfare measurements should be based on knowledge of the biology of the species and in particular, on what is known of the methods used by animals to try to cope with difficulties, on signs that coping attempts are failing and on indications of success in coping” (p. 80). But again, CAS would challenge the uses of these definitions and criteria and emphasize that it misses an opportunity to work at the root of the issue. CAS “seeks to dismantle all structures of exploitation, domination, oppression, torture, killing, and power in favor of decentralizing and democratizing society at all levels and on a global basis” and by sifting through why it is humans conceptualize nonhuman animals such as cows, pigs and chickens as so different, seemingly deserving of their slaughter, in comparison with humans themselves or other warmly regarded and welcomed animals such as cats and dogs, it is the hope of CAS that a new, more consistent structure can be built.

2.5 Social justice and CAS

Social justice issues are the issues facing the marginalized. Their marginalization strategically makes global justice as a whole a difficult issue to solve because their marginalization is kept in place by norms and practices on a multitude of levels. When the public is called upon through activism to bear witness to the struggles of a marginalized demographic, a change in norms and practices is the hoped-for outcome.

Intersectionality of identities, especially those already marginalized in the status quo, can make issues of social justice for different groups difficult to reach. While the experiences of individuals and groups can differ greatly in how their struggle is perceived in the systems of the status quo, there is both a gross neglect of the rights of people of color, women, the LGBTQ+ community, religious dominations, etc. in the world.

We know that actual violations exist because we have a system in writing that at the very least provides the language in which to evaluate the rights of people. but because we have a measurement system into what is expected for human rights that is used prove a violation against the cultural norms that have been agreed upon both internationally in judicial manner for

enforcement and justice. A critical lens allows a to see potential correlated in their different struggles to the same oppressive systemic behaviors that have plagued issues of justice and liberation for human history.

2.6 CAS in academia

The Institute for Critical Animal Studies, “rooted in animal liberation and anarchism, is an international intersectional transformative holistic theory-to-action activist led based scholarly think-tank”, was founded by two scholars: Sociologist Anthony J. Nocella, II and post structuralist Steve Best. The two also have notably co-authored **Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals** which examines the line at which terrorists and freedom fighters are categorized and problematizes the way that animal activist group, Animal Liberation Front---ALF, has been categorized by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Best & Nocella, 2004). The founding the ICAS was to establish a means “to unapologetically examine, explain, be in solidarity with, and be part of radical and revolutionary actions, theories, groups and movements for total liberation and to dismantle all systems of domination and oppression, in hopes for a just, equitable, inclusive, and peaceful world” (The Institute for Critical Animal Studies, 2020). The work has been in turn a pivotal piece for the Animal Rights Movement.

CAS according to ICAS draws on critical philosopher, Paulo Freire, to focus on theory (the publication and research side of academia) and practice (engaging in activities that encourage dialogue) in order to bring about social change. ICAS refers to Freire that this collaboration between actions, or praxis, is critical for social change. CAS takes it a step further and also includes the modern side of discussion and engagement which is outreach through methods like social media, newsletters and merchandise (The Institute for Critical Animal Studies, 2020). While ICAS takes a front seat in paving the way for critical animal studies thought, as an institute, it “does not claim a monopoly on the field” so that “others within the CAS community would develop their own initiatives” (The Institute for Critical Animal Studies, 2020). An openly intersectional theory and practice allows for a more holistic approach to the issues that face the marginalized.

Because CAS is “a field of research dealing with issues related to the exploitation and liberation of animals; the inclusion of animals in a broader emancipatory struggle; speciesism; and the principles and practices of animal advocacy, animal protection, and human-related policies”

(Pedersen, 2010, p. 2). CAS's goals are to "abolish not only animal exploitation, but also the exploitation of humans and the natural world" (Best S. , 2009, p. 44). With that in mind, my intention throughout this thesis will be to do the same. When regarding systems of oppression, it is important that academia does not become one as well. In fact, CAS makes itself more accessible to people (academics and activists) because it lays out ten principles that it adheres to. The research from academia is useful when it is applicable and comprehensible and accessible.

Language can act as a barrier to accessibility. The language in academia is no different. Jargon and "ism's" put its content out of reach to the general community. However, CAS cuts through the jargon in order to "breakdown and mediate oppositions between theory and practice, college and community, and scholarship and citizenship, in order to make philosophy (in a broad sense) again a force of change and to repatriate intellectuals to the public realm" (Best S. , 2009, p. 12) and "illuminate problems and pose solutions through vivid, concrete, and accessible language" (p. 12). Repatriating intellectuals to make what is discussed in academia of practical use to society as a whole, especially when it focuses on so much on the systems that are a part of our day to day life. The focus on clear language in CAS theory makes it theoretically easier to bridge activism with academic research.

Though CAS has not typically been looked at from an IR perspective, the fact of the matter is that the meat and dairy industry is a part of an international norm and a part of international relations. Though nonhuman animals are not the ones that vote in elections or protest in the streets, they have been overwhelmingly used for the benefit of humans through labor, experiments, animal agriculture, etc.. Nonhuman animals are a part of the world that humans have a unique advantage in affecting. It is therefore both of interest in IR to explore theoretically and international relations to explore in practice. For the field of IR, it would be perimount to investigate in order to dismantle the underlying issues that have created an environment of oppressive hierarchies.

Few have used the NAWA as a case in itself to study in academia. Ethics concerned philosopher, Ellen-Marie Forsberg, when wrote on the NAWA Act in comparison to its predecessor, the Animal Protection act of 1974. The changes in legislation are indicative of the norms of a culture. While the well-being of nonhuman animals is hot for discussion today, it is not an altogether new topic. As Forsberg points out, "cruelty against animals has been forbidden in Norway since 1842, but Norway did not have a separate act on protection of animals until 1935" (Forsberg, 2011, p. 352). It is one thing to create legislation prohibiting the act of cruelty to another,

but it is another to actively put in extra measure to protect someone from having cruelty done onto them. This may seem counter-intuitive, as if one would most definitely imply the other. But that is not necessarily the case. Especially not when it comes to the concept of what is property and what one is legally allowed to do with their property. Special duties are allotted to and expected of humans via the legislation to uphold good welfare of animals. However, the concept of some nonhuman animals being the property of the human animals, supported by legislation that favors animal-agriculture means that certain duties to protect simply do not apply in the same way to the cows, chickens, pigs, and others as they do to cats and dogs.

Forsberg pointed out the NAWA's strength in clarifying "unnecessary suffering" by replacing the term with "protected from danger of unnecessary stress and strains". An issue she points out in the NAWA is that "The new act does not include a statement on natural needs and instincts in the introductory paragraphs, but includes a later paragraph under "the animals' living environment": "The animal keeper shall ensure that animals are kept in an environment which is consistent with good welfare, and which meets the animals' needs which are specific for both the species and the individual" (Forsberg, 2011, p. 354). Arguably, the regard for the nonhuman animal's natural needs and instincts, except for when the duties of the "animal keeper" are mentioned is telling of the power relationship within the text. A power dynamic exists when legislation is written to protect "the animal" but does not discuss the instinctual will to live or the system in which does not allot for liberation. However, existing power relations within the NAWA was not Forsberg's research goal and therefore is yet to be fully explored.

2.6.1 CAS in Critical theory

As Cynthia Enloe states concisely in the title of her piece finding international connections through examining relationships between various actors via their stories, "The Mundane Matters" (Enloe, 2011). While Enloe focused in *The Mundane Matters* on women in the workforce in multinational factories and how that was connected to an international power dynamic, a similar critical lens can be used toward examining the decisions made around food purchasing decisions. In this day and age, consumer decisions are not merely based upon one thing or another. Supply and demand, marketing, product labeling, ethics, etc. are all factors that may encourage consumption practices and ultimately production practices. Pig production practices have had a long and evolving history. Production practices in any industry can come under scrutiny, but the

production practices of living beings for the purpose of selling their body for parts is under a special kind of scrutiny.

Carol Adams, feminist writer and animal rights activist, paints the picture of a political cartoon in the *New Yorker* by Robert Mankoff called ‘The Birth of a Vegetarian’: where “a man is sitting in front of a slab of meat, looking startled because the sound “moo” is emanating from the steak” (Adams, 2009, p. 48). In response to the cartoon she states, “of course, the nonhuman’s death is not in our face; only the postmortem state of a nonhuman’s corpse is. We do not see our meat eating as contact with another animal because it has been renamed as contact with food” (Adams, p. 48). This could arguably come as part of the “meat paradox” (Kunst & Hohle, p. 758) which occurs when a human enjoys the taste of animal flesh, but does not want to inflict harm onto animals. The distance created by humans between these two could be because of an effort, “to keep the moo away from the meat,”(Adams, p. 48) because, “to keep something from being seen as having been someone” (Adams, p. 48) both creates the human/animal dichotomy as well as secures its survival as a culturally accepted norm.

Helena Pedersen (2010) in describing the relationship between animals and humans she found in courses that were part of an official school curriculum and how she found there was a hidden curriculum in the schools invested. The hidden curriculum enforced norms of the “meat and dairy production and consumption, commodification of animals and human-animal relations, and various forms of human-animal boundary work” as a few examples (p.18). These enforced norms continue to be present as power dynamics are habituated through the construction and reconstruction of mainstream conceptualization of humans and nonhuman animals.

CAS, while being a builder of bridges between academia and activism, has laid out clear principles in which may address this issue of conceptualizing nonhuman animals. One of the ten principles of CAS is the dissection of dichotomies that exist in mainstream norm culture surrounding the conceptualization of animals. See *Appendix A*. This research is intended as a tool for understanding an alternative narrative to the practice of using animals in agriculture, while also bringing underlying assumptions in the status quo about nonhuman animals. The illumination is not meant to be merely a light used in which to show problems and remain in endless discourse about them. The illumination of the mainstream conceptualization of animals in this way is meant to destabilize the status quo, but in a way that offers a new way forward. This tool may be used both to inform legislation, to extend the lens of critical IR theory to consider the concept of animal

liberation, and to bridge understanding between the average consumer and the practice and norm culture of animal-based agriculture and animal-based products.

2.6.2 CAS and Constructivism

Constructivism and critical theory (specifically, critical animal studies) are two lenses in which are most useful to empower change for those most marginalized. Not only because they allow the focus to be on the stories not necessarily shared by the most powerful as they share how reality is for them, but also because they allow more incorporation of philosophy and norm challenging. At the end of the day, humans are the ones with the ability to put others in captivity. This ability or circumstance does not equate to justified domination if the alternative narrative is heard and empathized with. Humans have tremendous power over nonhuman animals with legislation and machinery behind them, but ableism and other anthropocentric justifications work only in systems where the unchallenged norms are kept in place.

Constructivism places emphasis on the meaning, expectations and rules that individuals and societies create, and in turn are able to be challenged. One construct in particular can be a source of meaning, expectations and rules: hierarchies. Hierarchies are both a symptom of and a tool used to maintain the representation. Nicholas Onuf, who coined the term constructivism, wrote, “The practical solution is to start with rules and show how rules make agents and institutions what they are in relation to each other. Then we can show how rules make rule and being ruled, a universal social experience” (Onuf, 2013, p. 8). If the rules are that nonhuman animals are inherently different from humans, that creates a chain of agents and institutions that stand acting in support of the rule. Agents and institutions in the entertainment, education, the food industry, etc. become linked in that they use animals in a particular way, distinguishable from the rules that are in place amongst humans. Those industries and concepts are especially difficult to challenge when supported they are supported by legislation. The normative rules became the rule of order, and the system supports itself.

Constructivist theory offers a theoretical background acknowledging that we create, or construct, the world around us. We give objects, words, etc. their meaning because these objects and words, etc. do not have meaning necessarily in themselves. Based on societal and cultural norms, the particular meaning may differ amongst people. The same could be said for the relationship between humans and nonhuman animals. The way in which humans amongst

themselves or with humans with nonhuman animals construct their relationship is being tested and reconstructed through natural progression of norms. The acceptance that there are differences in construction of meaning in regard to the meaning of nonhuman animals around the world is plausible final understanding until a critical lens is used to further breakdown the systemic inequality that exists in the creation of the meaning.

Though constructivist theory looks at norms and rules, the constructivist methodology has not been used to look at issues of liberation not because it cannot but because constructivism typically does not typically look at the power dynamic between humans and nonhumans. In that sense, it is helpful to pair constructivism with a focus that allows for zeroing in. A problem with construction and deconstruction is that often times we can still be limited by our own assumptions. A place where CAS is able to branch off of Constructivism is in how it zeroes in on dichotomies which are a subset of the rules and expectations from a normative standpoint. An example of this problem is the failure of scholars to address the human/animal dichotomy (Best S. , 2009, p. 16).

The failure of critical theorists to problematize the norms around the human/animal dichotomy only serves to neglect a very crucial detail: “animal includes all sentient beings, including humans” and that “animal liberation cannot be properly formulated and enacted apart from human liberation, and vice versa” (Best S. , 2009, p. 15). This failure of course affects the outcome of IR research and affects the shaping of the realm of international relations. By situating human versus animal as some sort of opposite and therefore deserving of different extents of freedom and life, scholars, politicians, lobbyists and the average person alike “fail to see that the human/animal opposition underpins oppositions between reason/emotions, thought/body, men/women, white/black, and Western/non-Western” (Best S. , 2009, p. 16). Studying legislation with constructivism may well help us to understand how an idea has come to be, but it stops short at providing a clear message forward. CAS is a critical human studies, and analyses how the discourse of the human has been constituted in dualistic, speciesist, racist, patriarchal, and imperialist terms” because “in addition that species survival is dependent upon a flourishing environment and global ecology, and thus animal, human, and Earth liberation are inseparably intertwined in the politics of —total liberation.” (Best S. , 2009, p. 15). Any legislation that normalizes the dichotomy of humans and animals, and then categorizes further into the species as to whether that specific species deserves freedom, just serves as a tool in the continuance of violence

It is for this reason that dichotomies must be examined in order to progress as a more just planet. While we give meaning to what is around us, and historically have done so in unjust and oppressive ways, we know from history that we are able to change meanings over the course of time and liberate the oppressed. The concept of justice alone is a construct that has been progressively worked with. Awareness of one's societal norms is part of the process of progress and development and the norms that surround the construct of farm animals is a norm that is in need of reevaluating. Hence looking at societal norms as part of Norwegian development within the NAWA as part of the overarching concepts of justice and equality.

Marthe Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink illustrate the path that a concept follows as it gains traction, shifts into being an accepted norm, and then has potential to become accepted on the international platform. "There is a general agreement on the definition of a norm as a standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity, but a number of related conceptual issues still cause confusion and debate" (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998, p. 891). Norms have a "life cycle" (p. 895) that goes through three stages. The first stage being "norm emergence" where perhaps in the case of animal rights in Norway, we can look toward norm entrepreneurs (or those with organizational platforms that promote the norm) such as Dyrevernalliansen (English translation: "the animal welfare alliance") that has played a crucial role in the rights and welfare of animals in Norway through campaigns and organized protest. By relating to the suffering of animals, they were able to persuade the public to adopt changes to the norm of how animals had been treated and conceptualized. The norm, if taken in by the state and put into legislation has a chance at transitioning into the second stage: the "norm cascade" (p.898). Within the "norm cascade", states go from upholding legislation to upholding and protecting their legitimacy and reputation. This is because of internal pressure. If the time is right and other states have adopted similar legislation, it is more likely that that internal pressure will become also external (international) pressure. That means if everyone else is doing it, it is beneficial to jump on board and do the same and not be the state that is known to deny rights to animals. This pressure creates the cascade and creates a domino effect in which a norm is picked up on and institutionalized in one state after another. The third and final stage of the norm is "internalization" which simply means that the norm has been so meshed in with the practices of day to day, the norm has become second nature (p.898). In this stage, the concept of welfare can be viewed as second nature. However, second nature is rarely permanent as norms, like waves, will shift with the tides of time. The same is so for the evolution

of animal-norms. The NAWA and its representation of welfare are only the current tide and any inconsistencies in the representation of welfare, on paper or in practice, will inevitably continue to be shaped with the inclusion of critical theories and other philosophical approaches.

2.7 Nonhuman animals, anti-cruelty and philosophy

International pressure has the ability to create change. Peter Singer, a well-known moral (utilitarian) philosopher in the animal liberation community spoke of this use of international pressure on the meat industry in regard to the meat industry and anti-cruelty toward chickens in egg production,

Swiss egg producers now allow their hens the opportunity to scratch on a floor covered with straw or other organic material, and to lay their eggs in a sheltered, soft-floored nesting box. With the Swiss having shown that change is possible, opposition to the cage mounted throughout Europe, and the European Union, covering fifteen member states, has now agreed to phase out the standard bare wire cage altogether. By 2012, European egg producers will be required to allow at least 750 square centimeters, or 120 square inches, per bird-by comparison, the current average in the U.S. egg industry is about 50 square inches-and give their hens access to a perch and a nesting box in which to lay their eggs. If they still want to keep their hens in cages, the cages will have to be much larger, to allow for these additional features. Many producers will find it more economical to switch to a quite different form of housing in which hens are free to roam, either indoors in a large barn that has perches, litter to scratch in and nesting boxes, or with access to an outdoor range. (Singer, 2002, p. x).

Singer goes about the meat industry, with a focus on cows and calves, and how international pressure over the norms of an industry is able to bring about a change in practices,

Veal calves, deliberately kept anemic, deprived of straw for bedding, and confined in individual crates so narrow that they cannot even turn around, are probably the most miserable of all farm animals. That system of keeping calves had already been banned in Britain when I revised the text of this book for the 1990 edition. Now the European Union has decided that it must go from all its member nations by 2007. Confining pregnant sows in individual crates was banned in Britain in 1998, and will be banned in the European Union from 2013, except for the first four weeks of pregnancy (Singer, 2002, p. x).

Exposing the treatment and (legal) realities in which nonhuman “farm” animals experience has tended to lead to results as seen above which are a shift in welfare legislation. While the treatment may be better in the short run and social change most definitely occurs in the overall conceptualization of proper treatment of nonhuman animals, the result is still the same. The nonhuman “farm” animals are still kept on farms, still bred and killed. The issue is reminiscent of slavery and the fight that was to not only see value in someone based upon something other than the value they bring to the table from labor. But as evidence from slavery of humans, which still occurs even in modern time, the fight for liberation seems yet to have fought its final battle with what oppression has been derived of.

Jeremy Bentham, philosopher of the 17-1800’s and founder of modern utilitarianism, asked, “why haven’t they [nonhuman animals] been attended to as fully as the interests of human creatures (allowance made for differences of sensibility? (Bentham, 1970, p. 143). A very good question indeed in which Bentham famously follows up with, “the question is not Can they reason? or Can they talk? but Can they suffer?” (Bentham, p. 144). However, Bentham also supported meat eating on the basis that,

there is very good reason why we should be allowed to eat such non-human animals as we like to eat: we are the better for it, and they are never the worse. They have none of those long-protracted anticipations of future misery that we have; and the death they suffer at our hands usually is and always could be speedier and thus less painful than what would await them in the inevitable course of nature (Bentham, p. 143).

This comes off as quite the let down for scholars hoping to see liberation as the solution to suffering of animals. The welfare approach was meant to alleviate consumer concerns over practices involving nonhuman animals of certain species while still remaining the privilege to pay for their death.

2.8 Limitations to justice in international relations

Mainstream theoretical understandings in IR, by posing limiting questions, tend not see or opt to neglect the perspective of a particular set of species of nonhuman animal. The realist perspective for example has “the idea that equals should be treated equally and unequals unequally”, showing that justice from this perspective, “does not, and cannot, play a central role

in the competitive world of international politics” as positioned by Linklater in a piece discussing the realms of justice. “From that standpoint, what is true of states is just as true of the relations between individuals and groups within world society” (Linklater, 1999, p. 473). This system, or these realms, further divides the haves from the have-nots and is upheld by posing questions in which limit the ability to value the perspective of the have nots. For example, the case of animalkind. In this case specifically, nonhuman animals’ justice simply does not fit in to the competitive world that is human politics. Even less, nonhuman animals do not have rights like humans do with Human Rights. And as we know, unfortunately even within Human Rights, violations occur. Evidence of some truth to the realist perspective. However, what the realist perspective does not question are the other variables that create an understanding of the reality we live in and how we collectively not only have ability, but continuously alter it with the decisions based on norms and norms based on decisions. This illuminates great agency in the effort toward social justice.

Critical theory is gaining popularity amongst scholars whom seek to form an understanding of the power dynamics which create an environment of systemic suffering, negatively affecting some over others. Critical theory efforts are important as investigators for routes to justice. CAS would note that if commonality in the justification of oppressed groups, it would be crucial to investigate that route for the protection of animalkind. “No contemporary account of order and justice in international relations will be complete unless it addresses the issue of justice between different species” (Linklater, 1999, p. 476). Therefore, CAS fits within IR as it is a part of Critical Theory. Both CAS and Critical Theory relate to power dynamics with a focus on emancipation. The difference being that CAS extends this scope of emancipation.

Some of the struggles faced by nonhuman animals have been addressed more critically in IR through a legal lens, following the rules and norms within regions. A collection titled **Animal Law and Welfare - International Perspectives**, edited by animal law and ethics scholar Deborah Cao and animal law and property law scholar Steven White, which has focused on nonhuman animals within a legal and IR perspectives. Some of which take a similar tone to the nature of this thesis such as **Animal Protection Under Israeli Law** by Yossi Wolfson or **Animal Protection Law in Australia: Bound by History, Or Regulatory Capture and the Welfare of Farm Animals** by Jed Goodfellow. One important fact to consider when thinking about the relationship humans have with nonhuman animals is that there is no international consensus on the treatment

of animals, so a focus on states as cases in international relations has made sense. The state is the construct that facilitates norms on a systemic level. David Favre suggests the creation and implementation of an international treaty that would put onto paper what expectations exist in the relationship between humans and their nonhuman neighbors (Favre, 2016). However, what this treaty would ultimately do, as welfare based legislation typically does, applies a bandage to struggles instead of addressing the root of the problem which is in the normative conceptualization of categorizing and hierarchy creation. We must assess our solutions to the issues of animal welfare by examining our welfare norms for inconsistencies and dichotomies. We can not change what we do not acknowledge. While research into state level laws and international laws on the betterment of quality and protection of life in regard to nonhuman animals is most certainly important, it must too be evaluated through a critical lens to investigate the fundamental norms in which allow the oppressive nature of the human/nonhuman animal relationship. Therefore this thesis pursues this critical agenda by studying the Norwegian Animal Welfare Act.

2.8.1 Animal rights, nonhuman animal research in Norway

Most research on Norwegian animal welfare norms, especially in regard to animals used on farms, has been in support of the meat industry. Meaning, the norms of animal agriculture are not being challenged within the research on Norwegian animal welfare norms, thus bringing about a sense of intrigue at the inclusion of CAS research on Norwegian animal welfare norms of interest as it arguably has not been done. An article on broiler chicken welfare in Norway states, “All farms belonged to the same cooperative, and functioned in accordance with Norwegian animal welfare legislation governing poultry production” (BenSassi, et al., 2019, p. 4), thus confirming in practice precisely what was meant to happen with welfare legislation. The NAWA is perceived as working to measure the degree of welfare nonhuman animals receive based on what the researcher sees, based upon a set of rules the NAWA sets out. The same research states that, the “farm owners gave their consent to participate in the research, participation was voluntary, and no personal details were collected” and that “because no experimental manipulations were made and observations were non-invasive, the study did not require approval of animal use by the Norwegian Food Safety Authority” (BenSassi, et al., 2019, p. 4) which further shows areas of interest for critical theoretical perspectives. Alas, this proves difficult given the nature of the power relations in the Norwegian food system. The conceptualization of certain nonhuman animals as food is deeply ingrained in

the Norwegian system. The very welfare of the chickens is trusted to be managed by a food department of government. The chicken is referred to not as a species that deserves respect and protection due to its care being under humans, but as a broiler chicken which means the species is bred and raised for the purpose of the meat industry.

Another article which sought to look at the welfare standards in hunting in Norway stated from the onset that “Shooting is an important tool for managing terrestrial wildlife populations worldwide” (Stokke, et al., 2018, p. 1) and that in order to quantitatively assess animal welfare, they “apply a variety of factors to model flight distance (distance travelled by an animal after bullet impact) and incapacitation from the moment of bullet impact. These factors include body mass, allometric and isometric scaling, comparative physiology, wound ballistics and linear kinematics” (Stokke, et al., 2018, p. 1). While this research was not on animals used on farms as the majority of this thesis relates to, it does show the limitations of progress within a welfare-based system that allows and promotes the categorization of certain species as essentially killable. As long as the same questions keep getting asked, in regard to whether X-act causes Y-animal harm without any further pressing into the concept of speciesism, oppression and liberation, the global political systems will continue to see the same results again and again in various forms of marginalization.

2.9 Concluding thoughts

Key points of this chapter are that the conceptualization over the relationship and duties with animals outside of our own species has changed over time. This relationship conceptualization informs the analysis of this research that the norm regarding treatment and expectations of other species may be modified. Welfare is but one version of the way animal protection can manifest as. However, there are different versions of what protection looks like and what type of protection is ensured for who. Challenging such an internationally established norm proves difficult even in the realm of academia, let alone the industries that create economic and normative relations internationally.

Chapter 3. What are the interests in the international regarding nonhuman animals

The purpose of **Chapter 3** is to analyze the different interests at stake in the international in regard to the conceptualization of nonhuman animals in order to answer **RQ 3, “How is the NAWA situated within a global context?”**. Norway and the NAWA represent one of many states globally with legislation and norms supporting a concept of animal welfare, animal agriculture and a meat industry. **Section 3.1** looks at how the market is changing in regard to meat-alternatives, depicting variables that affect norms supporting the global political economy. **Section 3.2** looks at the economic responsibilities the meat industry takes on for human society as this informs the analysis stakes involved in challenging food norms for meat markets. **Section 3.3** looks at food norm and animal norm contestation in Norway which eludes to the international scope of organized food norm and animal norm contestation and is followed by **Section 3.3.1** which looks at this organized contestation from both Norwegian based and International animal rights organizations involved in Norway. **Section 3.4** examines another way, outside of the ethics of nonhuman animal use, that animal food norm contestations are being made in Norway and internationally through a focus on environmental protection. **Section 3.5** shows alternative means of conceptualizing the relationship between humans and nonhuman animals in the international by applying the concept of sovereignty and citizenship which has in IR been applied only to humans.

3.1 A changing market

The market is changing in regard to the use of nonhuman animals for food. For those that consume meat and animal products, there are options to purchase products with welfare relevant certifications such as “free-range”, “cage-free”, “grass-fed” or “local products”. For those that do not consume meat and animal products, vegetarian and vegan products are available. In Norway, vegetarian and vegan alternatives to meat has been gaining popularity accompanied by a global trend in the demand for products based on plant protein (Gonera & Milford, 2018). The trend in demand is also exhibited “in 2016, in Denmark and Germany, the market for meat substitutes showed an annual growth of between 15-20% and in the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK 5-10%”

(Tzviva, Negro, Kalfagianni, & Hekkert, 2020, p. 218). These alternatives to meat are plant-based products (meat-free protein alternatives, without animal-biproduct like milk products or egg products), vegan products (meat-free, without animal-biproducts, not created in a way that uses animals in any way for testing, etc.), and vegetarian products (meat-free, may include animal-biproducts like cheese, eggs, milk). One article showed that 1 percent of Norwegians are vegan, and 3 percent are vegetarians and that Norwegian grocery stores are experiencing a "vegetarian wave", while Coop reports that sales of vegetarian and vegan products from their own series have increased by 40 percent since last year. And Rema 1000 has a strong growth in vegan food, of approx. 70 per cent from last year to date this year" (Skreiberg, 2018). What this means is there is a rising demand for non-nonhuman animal based products in Norway.

3.2 Responsibility of the meat industry

3.2.1 Welfare responsibility

The need for NAWA 2010 was because "major structural changes in Norwegian livestock farming" had occurred between 2008 (the time the bill was proposed) and 1974 (the current animal welfare law at the time the new proposition was being made). These structural changes were said to not be regulated by the "material provisions of the law", referring to the extent of coverage and protection the 1974 Act was able to provide. The need for this coverage was because the use of animals had increased in the time period. Evidence of this increase is that though there was "less livestock farming", the "herd size has increased" (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009, p. 3). The proposition was also to include new species, "such as ostrich and deer have become part of Norwegian livestock farming" (p. 3). Other industries using animals have also grown, for example, "fish farming has developed into a large industry, and the number of fish in trials is considerable today" (p. 3). The proposition also mentions that "the number of family and hobby animals (including sports animals) has increased, and we have received several new forms of holding of family and hobby animals" (p. 3), implying an increasing desire to use animals in one way or another. The proposition also stated that because of these "new uses", "there has...been a clear need for closer regulation... and a more comprehensive law" (p. 3). The system is organized so that The Norwegian Food Safety Authority ultimately has the responsibility for nonhuman animals on farms and determines matters over well-being of nonhuman animals such

as cows, pigs, sheep and chickens. The emphasis here is that the power involving nonhuman animal lives on farms is in the hands of a food authority. Signifying a deep conceptualization of nonhuman animals as food. What this does is further put power, responsibility and authority into a specific set of groups hands.

3.2.2 Economic responsibility of meat industry

While cruelty against animals had been illegal in Norway since 1842, it was not until 1935 that an act of protection of animals was put into place. On 1 January 2010, The Norwegian Animal Welfare Act was taken into effect (Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7). This act replaced its predecessor, The Norwegian Animal Protection Act No. 73 from 20. December 1974 and meant was to de-objectify nonhuman animals by including the concept intrinsic value. In theory, this set the precedent that nonhuman animals have inherent value, not based on the extent of value humans get from their bodies in life or their death. The implementation of animal welfare legislation made Norway, “one of the most progressive countries in this area” (Forsberg, 2011, p. 352). The process of reconceptualizing nonhuman animals in the world was clearly already underway. Norway was then and continues to be one of the most progressive countries in the world (Social Progress Index: Executive Summary, 2019). However, the scope of this progressiveness pertaining to the conceptualization of nonhuman animals in Norway remains to be seen as norms around food and meat continue to be constructed.

Though criticisms exist of the meat norms, there are economic benefits to them. Meat provides both income and sustenance. The Norwegian meat industry providing both jobs and food through an agricultural cooperative, Nortura, which is “a joint venture owned by 18,300 egg and meat producers who supply their raw materials and are active owners with rights” (Nortura, n.d.) and Tine SA is “Norway's largest producer, distributor and exporter of dairy products with 11,400 members (owners) and 9,000 cooperative farms” (Tine, n.d.). Both Tine and Nortura aim is to maintain domestic production without need to import meat and dairy as “Norwegian agriculture mainly covers the domestic demand for milk and milk products, pig meat, poultry and eggs” (Tine, n.d.). “Agriculture must produce safe and healthy food of high quality in the light of consumer preferences, and produce public goods such as viable districts, a broad range of environmental and cultural benefits, and secure long-term food production” showing an awareness in Norwegian agricultural production of the relationship between the norms of consumers and a necessity to

produce in a manner that is positive for the environment and culture (Tine, n.d.). “Norwegian farmers produce 80-90 per cent of the national demand for beef and sheep meat. The national market share for grain and potatoes is approximately 60 per cent. Only 25 percent of the demand for vegetables, fruits and berries is produced in Norway” (Tine, n.d.) showing that at least at this point in time, Norway is not relying on foreign imports of meat as it provides for itself. Because plant-based products are made of plants, this may prove problematic for the Norwegian market currently as it supplies only a quarter of the produce demand in the country.

Economic situations could arguably face challenges if the entire meat industry was put to an immediate end without transitional provisions. This is also the case for food norms around the consumption of dog meat during the Yulin Festival because production of meat is lucrative interwoven into culture (Brown, 2018). While the species of meat is not the same as in Norway, nor a part of the normative culture of Norway as this research predominantly focuses on, the Yulin Festival and dog meat consumption presents an interesting comparison. The festival, though providing incomes for the people of Yulin China has drawn international criticism from animal advocates in response to the 10,000-15,000 dogs purchased, killed and eaten (Brown, 2018, p. 194). What this challenge of food norms represents in the case of Yulin is an inconsistency in advocacy on behalf of some animals over others as practices within the international continue to consume the meat of other species. If activists who find the norms of eating dogs and cats unethical, “were to fully confront what happens behind closed doors in trucks and at slaughterhouses in their own countries (where they will also find animals crammed into small spaces, in distress, cowering, whimpering, shrieking, violence, lots of blood, guts, etc.), they might also wish for the whole process to stop” (Brown, 2018, p. 204). While international pressure has been shown to affect the outcome of legislation and rights, “concerned critics of Yulin need to confront and accept their moral role in the journey of sentient (and sometimes intelligent) animals from cage to plate and put to one side their visceral feelings surrounding the slaughter and consumption of a kin animal” (Brown, 2018, p. 204). Going one step further, a deeper analysis into the economic repercussions of changing industry norms as though CAS supports this economic change, the socio and economic factors that uphold industries may leave new norms, rules and practices do not adequately fill the void.

3.3 Animal Rights Movement and Norway

An article in Aftenposten, Norway's largest newspaper, challenged the norms around nonhuman animals and meat consumption by highlighting four films found on widely available Netflix (Skreiberg, 2018). Among the films was *Okja* which was also labeled by The New York Times as one of the top 10 influential films of the decade (Manohla & Scott, 2019). Other films listed in the Aftenposten article included *Cowspiracy*, *Forks Over Knives* and *Vegucated*. All of which have made an attempt on the big screen to counter either traditional conceptualizations of the relationships between humans and nonhuman animals, challenge the efficacy of industrial farming and capitalism or test the effects of meat and dairy consumption on the human body or on the environment.

The Aftenposten article clarifies the identity of actively not consuming meat and animal bi-products by stating, "a vegan does not eat meat, fish or animal products such as milk, eggs or honey, nor does he use animal clothing or cosmetics" (Skreiberg, 2018). The term "vegan" is important to be defined as it has undergone a process of conceptualization within the vegan community, but remains to be confused by the general public from time to time with vegetarian, or plant-based. The confusion over what is vegan and what is plant-based has been seen to be debated within online vegan forums. The general idea is that plant-based is a diet is just that, a diet. This diet does not eat animal or animal bi-products. However, eating a plant-based diet does not necessarily mean that a person would actively avoid purchasing products that were tested on animals, for example. The delineation from what is plant-based and what is vegan is that veganism is a lifestyle that incorporates research into products and industries with the boycott of animal and animal bi-products. This lifestyle also would boycott any product that has been tested on or used animals. Perhaps more importantly than defining veganism for challenging the food norms of the status quo was the article's interviewing with Norwegians with different backgrounds, but yet a commonality was that they were all vegan or plant-based. In an article in such a large newspaper that both references "animal liberation" as well as shows the normalcy and relatability between the reader and the interviewees, the evidence is clear of at least a curiosity over those that actively challenge the norms around meat consumption as food.

3.3.1 Animal rights movement and animal rights organizations in Norway

Part of the effort to confront the norms around the use, killing and eating of nonhuman animals in Norway is being done by organized groups. Not only are people redirecting their purchases, but there are organized protests challenging animal norms globally. One of these organized protests, the Animal Rights March occurs annually and in 2019, “over 41,000 activists marching in 49 cities across the globe, demanding animal liberation” (The Official Animal Rights March, 2020). There are various animal rights organizations a part of the overall Animal Rights Movement. Many of the animal rights organizations that exist in Norway are international, having active groups across the globe. Direct Action Everywhere (DXE) and The Save Movement (consisting of three parts: Animal Save, Climate Save and Health Save as of 2018 (The Save Movement, n.d.) and Anonymous for the Voiceless (AV) are three active international activist organizations in Norway that have a focus on contesting the norm of exploiting nonhuman animals. The term “exploit” is used in this case because the relationship between the human and the nonhuman is not one of mutual benefit, such as the loving relationship between human and dog for instance. The relationships that DXE, The Save Movement and AV focus on are those that exist within the meat, dairy, clothing, entertainment and research industry.

The Norwegian DXE is perhaps most active in Oslo, though has several operating chapters throughout Norway including Innlandet, Bergen and Stavanger. Identifying as a group that “engage(s) in creative non-violent direct action to confront speciesism” (Direct Action Everywhere, 2020). DXE does this by participating in “disruptive demonstrations inside or outside restaurants, grocery stores, animal labs, zoos or other places that promote species violence. It may also include brochure or tabling, creative street theater, open rescues or anything else in accordance with our organizational principles. It can even mean confronting friends and family members as they engage in behaviors that normalize animal exploitation” (Direct Action Everywhere Norway, 2020). A small criticism that perhaps a CAS perspective would take on the language the group uses is in the use of “the animals” in “We aim to do exceptional work for the animals” or in “we are all striving to serve the animals and the movement” (Direct Action Everywhere, 2020). It can be inferred that “the animals” refers to the nonhuman animals used and killed. Arguably, the use of “the animals” can potentially prolong the human/animal dichotomy used to justify the difference in valuing and treatment of nonhuman animals. It also can be said that it is used to illustrate a responsibility of humans for animal-kind, but the focus is most certainly on the nonhuman animals.

DXE however is quite advanced in its organization as it lays out a 40 year plan in which it will challenge the animal-based food norms from building a strong grassroots level, to 2050 when “species equality goes before the Supreme or Constitutional Courts of one or more countries” and finally to 2055 when “a Constitutional Bill of Animal Rights passes in one or more states or countries” (Direct Action Everywhere, 2018). The goals are informed by drawing on by other social justice efforts perhaps a bit of IR in the sense that their goals arguably show an awareness of the progression of an international norm and the actors one can draw on in order to facilitate the growth.

The Save Movement is another international organization active in Norway. The Save Movement was founded in Toronto and is comprised of chapters around the world (The Save Movement, n.d.). In Norway, there are nine chapters: Bergen Animal Save, Ditch Dairy SAVE Lives Trondheim, Innlandet Animal Save (in Hamar), Kristiansand Animal Save, Oslo Animal Save, Stavanger Animal Save, Tonsberg Animal Save and Trondheim Animal Save (The Save Movement, 2020). As previously mentioned, The Save Movement has three parts, on nonhuman animals, climate and health. Each of these “place a focus on the individuality of the animals. Animals are persons, not property” (The Save Movement, n.d.). The name “Save Movement” is not because direct rescues are made, but because The Save Movement asks not “for better slaughterhouses; we are demanding they be closed” (The Save Movement, n.d.). The organizations “mission is to hold vigils at every slaughterhouse and to bear witness to every exploited animal” (The Save Movement, n.d.). These vigils are carried out by gathering outside of a slaughterhouse and asking the trucks that hold animals in them to stop momentarily. Water is then offered to the animals on the truck by the activists as a last gesture before their slaughter and footage is typically gathered so as to raise awareness about the individuals who were on the truck and ultimately unloaded into the slaughter facility (Harris, 2017). The Save Movement collectively addresses the issue of food security and food norms by calling upon “the community, the government and the private sector [to] make healthy vegan foods physically available and affordable everywhere” (The Save Movement, n.d.). Accessibility both to information and vegan foods so that there is a clear option omnivores can opt for when switching away from animal-based products and the practices and side effects that go alongside it.

Anonymous for the Voiceless too is an international organization active in Norway. AV was founded in Australia, with several chapters throughout the world. In Norway, AV has two

active chapters (Tromsø and Bergen). AV “specializes in educating the public on animal torture and abuse and fostering highly effective activism groups worldwide. We hold an abolitionist stance against all forms of animal exploitation and promote a clear vegan message” (Anonymous for the Voiceless, n.d.). This education is done by conducting “Cube of Truths” which consist of a “cube team” and an “outreach team” which uses high quality footage to resonate with the public (Anonymous for the Voiceless, n.d.).

All three international organizations address the language used in which we conceptualize nonhuman animals. This reclassification, or reconceptualization, is a strategy to dismantle the human/animal dichotomy which delivers unequal treatment to those that are unequal. DXE demands that “animals [be] given status as legal persons” which is an important construct to identify in order for progress to be made on behalf of nonhuman animals (Direct Action Everywhere, 2018). The Save Movement also attempts to address the human/animal dichotomy by reclassifying “animals” as “persons” which attempts levels the species playingfield in conceptualization (The Save Movement, n.d.). Anonymous for the Voiceless addresses on speciesism by relating the struggles of nonhuman animals to the human audience so that “justice for our fellow earthlings” and relaying a message that all are welcome to join that respect “our choice to focus 100% on non-human animal rights” (Anonymous for the Voiceless, n.d.). While the language addressing the dichotomy between humans and animals in AV is strong, CAS may argue that the position, at least in the language presented on the AV webpage, is potentially limiting by not engaging with other social justice movements as the dichotomies that underpin one tend to be used in various ways across oppression. With that being said, the statement of focus on nonhuman animals alone does not deter the progress of justice necessarily, but it may prolong the addressment of the core issues that keep the marginalized marginalized in systems of oppression. It is of course not one organizations job to focus on everything all at once as that would be a grand task, but as CAS would argue, it is important to dismantle the speciesist norms that support the human/animal dichotomy and in order to maximize the results in social change, the fundamental links amongst oppressed groups must be witnessed.

NOAH, an activist group based in Oslo has been active in the Animal Rights Movement for getting better treatment for nonhuman animals. NOAH takes a slightly different approach to animal rights as they work both with grassroots activism as well as participating “in various officially appointed consultative groups and committees related to animal welfare, and has one

member on the Norwegian Council for Animal Ethics” (Noah for Dyrs Rettigheter, n.d.). Indeed, NOAH has been crucial in the development of welfare legislation in Norway. Noah too addresses the human/animal dichotomy when stating, “Human being’s kinship with other animals is fundamental. Like us, other animals want to live and to develop. They want to experience joy and avoid pain. NOAH works for a society that respects all animals- a society in which the power to exploit does not give the right to exploit” (Noah for Dyrs Rettigheter, n.d.). The use of the “like us, other animals...” shows an awareness of the commonality amongst the different species. NOAH has been also critical in the shutting down of fur farms. After protests and lobbying to dismantle the fur industry since the early 1990s, a monumental decision was made by the Norwegian government that fur farms will be phased out by 2025 (NOAH pels ut, n.d.). One issue CAS would potentially take up with NOAH is the focus on saving nonhuman animal lives in the food industry by working together with the food industry system. The issue here is that power continues to be confirmed in that the fate of nonhuman animals such as cows, pigs, and chickens are in the hands of the food industry. Another route could be to of course attempt at dismantling the system, but the route taken from the periphery inward was to engage with the existing system for better welfare at this point, not question speciesism itself. However, the tactics used by animal rights organizations will not be broken down in this research to the extent that will empirically measure the level of impact one act of activism has over another. The strategies that focus on the treatment of others and their “welfare” is of high significance, of course, but the issue taken up in this research seeks to go past measuring welfare in order to address the core issues that uphold the system of nonhuman animal exploitation and ultimately oppression on a grand scale.

NAPA, The Norwegian Animal Protection Alliance, had a big hand in the creation of the NAWA welfare guidelines. “Through cooperation with a major supermarket chain, transformed a large proportion of the Norwegian chicken production. Animal welfare is improved through the use of a healthier breed” (A transformation of Norwegian chicken production, 2018). The organization has had a large effect on the welfare of nonhuman animals. The organization, similar to NOAH, sees the door for change for animals’ long term is opening up for better welfare.

The Animal Welfare Alliance is working to turn Norwegian agriculture in a more animal-friendly direction. Meat consumption must decrease, and you as a consumer must be given the opportunity to choose food from animals with better animal welfare...By supporting our work, you are helping to create a better future for the animals that need it most (Dyrevernalliansen, n.d.)

A CAS position take issue with this sentiment because while the organization name is to protect animals and the organization does acknowledge that meat eating must decrease for the nonhuman animals, the focus still economically supports the same system that kills them. While perhaps the strategy taken by NAPA is beneficial in the overall challenging of meat norms, the norms surrounding systemic killing of animals while also being “animal friendly” presents challenges to the concept of welfare.

3.4 Animal-based food norm contestation for the environment

International organizations, such as the UN, have been engaged with the contestation of global food norms on the basis of “climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems” (Summary for Policymakers. In: Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems, 2019). The *Aftenposten* “Veganbølge mot strømmen” article also referred to the international scope of a plant-based diet, referring to the UN in 2010 which presented “a report calling for a global dietary shift towards more plant-based food, on the grounds that it is necessary to prevent the worst consequences of future climate change and famine,” and that “2016 was the UN's International Year for Legume Growth, for health, environmental and sustainability reasons” (Skreiberg, 2018). The report, in contrast to what CAS would argue for purposes of liberation, focuses on the sustainability benefits and refers to plant-based by reporting, “balanced diets, featuring plant-based foods, such as those based on coarse grains, legumes, fruits and vegetables, nuts and seeds, and animal-sourced food produced in resilient, sustainable and low-GHG emission systems, present major opportunities for adaptation and mitigation while generating significant co-benefits in terms of human health (high confidence)” (Arneeth & al, 2019, p. 24).

Similarly, the EAT-Lancet Commission in of Oslo challenged meat as food norms by suggesting that the way to fight climate change can be best done by switching to plant-based agriculture (Willett & al., 2019). The EAT-Lancet Report details real changes to implement in order to save the planet from further degradation. The EAT-Lancet Report focuses on human health, agriculture, political science and environmental sustainability. Albeit, not on animal

liberation. Climate change in nature is a global issue and requires global attention. Because the EAT-Lancet Report approaches the issue with regard to these other applicable fields, both for policy makers as well as the average consumer, the practicality of it being bridged with CAS makes perfect sense. Though the EAT report does not challenge the language of the human/animal dichotomy directly, it does so by calling for a halt to animal agriculture. This in itself is a monumental call to action to alleviate oppressive practices that are costing lives. The report acknowledges the multi-level issue and delivers a multi-level solution in a way that does not marginalize the reader but includes the reader in the process. This is right up CAS's alley if the goal is to liberate the masses from animal agriculture, which is inclusive of the species in the ecosystems that are affected by agricultural practices, including humans.

A main plea of the EAT-Lancet Report is to dramatically shift agricultural practices and consumption habits. Two major points within the report are that, 1) "Transformation to healthy diets from sustainable food systems is necessary to achieve the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement," and 2), "scientific targets for healthy diets and sustainable food production are needed to guide a Great Food Transformation" (Willett & al., 2019). In layman's terms, this means that food is important for our health and at the rate that our population is expanding, the way that we are currently eating is simply not working for our and our planet's health. In order to feed everyone, without continuing to take from the earth, what cannot be or cannot be easily replaced and without running the current system into the ground to the point of no return, the EAT report lays out a comprehensive plan to switching from an animal-focused agriculture plan to a plant-based agriculture plan. There is also another version of the report that was made specifically for policy makers which is a crucial step in moving forward if focus continues to be on the current systems legislative power to impact norms.

This, though perhaps would be seen as building a bridge with an ally in CAS could also be seen as an issue as CAS comes forthright in its support of both bridging allies in movements as such, but also supports, "economic sabotage and high-pressure direct action tactics" on animal using industries (Best S. , 2009, p. 25). Whether CAS scholars as a whole could come to a consensus on whether the EAT Report, or any other report calling to reduce meat production and switch to plant-based agriculture, it is uncertain as one cannot speak for all. Though drastically lowering the amount of animals used for meat world wide would be a win for further animal deaths, it does not come out and directly address any issue with killing animals itself. The report remains

environmentally focused, not on animal welfare and not on animal liberation. This is probably because, “in the developed world there has lately been a trend towards more consumption of plant-based foods, most likely driven by an increased concern for both personal health and the planet. This trend has also reached Norway, and it is therefore important to build up relevant knowledge according to new market demands, particularly since meeting this demand can benefit both public health and the environment” (Gonera & Milford, 2018, p. 2). Intersectionality and bridge building, for CAS scholars internationally, will continue to be important as the attempt continues to be made to challenge the norms around meat consumption.

3.5 Animal liberation and governance

Nonhuman animals, through have been born into a particular state and will live their lives in that state, do not have any of the same rights to citizenship as humans do. A first response to this statement may well be that this is because they cannot vote. But perhaps equality does not mean that different species need the exact same rights. Nonhuman animals do not have the capacity cast a vote in the same way that humans do. That is not to say that nonhuman animals’ interests to live out their life, without domination, should not be taken into the normative practices of modern society. So often in states, we will see welfare legislation claiming to consider the interests of nonhuman animals (or at least, their desire to avoid pain and disease). Welfare legislation internationally, but specifically the West, tends to of course take the welfarist view that “animal interests are acknowledged as morally significant yet systemically subordinated to human interests” (Svärd, 2013, p. 189). The issue in this for CAS scholars and animal rights progressives is that welfare legislation “places moral limits on how we may use animals, but there is no question that we *may* use them” (Svärd, 2013, p. 189). Lastly, “welfarism may be suited to curb some forms of violence to animals, but it is wholly ineffective when it comes to protecting animal well-being-- not to mention animal lives---against the pressures exerted by corporate profit imperatives and consumer habits” (Svärd, 2013, pp. 189-190). So, perhaps citizenship theory, backed by a critical animal studies perspective, may be a tool used as the norms surrounding meat culture continue to be challenged.

This would of course change the way in which sovereignty is used and extend the spectrum of those expected to be protected under it. This would also mean that the governments political

and economic ties with agriculture would need to undergo a radical change. It is difficult to say what will happen in the future, but it is clear the stakes are high politically for a transformation of food norms internationally when it comes to the use of nonhuman animals. The interests of an industry are in part dependent on the values of the demographic the industry is providing for. The interests of an industry also play into and are played into by the interests of the state. If a state has a reputation for taking a certain role as promoter of equality, it is curious to know the interests at play and the reasons to either extend or withhold equality of others.

3.6 Concluding thoughts

The key takeaways this chapter are that there are considerable economic and cultural interests that support this human/animal binary. Social obstacles such as income and identity perceptions exist and play a roll into the support and challenge of the human/animal binary. The CAS principles, found in *Appendix A*, “openly supports and examines controversial radical politics and strategies used in all kinds of social justice movements, such as those that involve economic sabotage from boycotts to direct action toward the goal of peace” (Best S. , Nocella, Kahn, Gigliotti, & Kemmerer, 2007, pp. 4-5) which signifies a support of these economic disruption and is evident as part of call to action to end the meat industry. Whether or not this goal is realizable or not, food norm change involving nonhuman animals is happening which is also found in the Norwegian context.

Chapter 4. Inconsistencies in the NAWA

The purpose of **Chapter 4** is to answer **RQ 2**, “**What inconsistencies exist within the NAWA itself?**” and how these inconsistencies appear in language of The Act according to a CAS perspective. By conducting a close critical reading of the law itself, this chapter may in turn answer an overarching question of the extent to which the NAWA is able to improve the rights of nonhuman animals through a critical animal studies perspective. **Section 4.1** will address the support of killing under the umbrella of “good welfare”. **Section 4.2** will take a similar approach but examine the support of breeding as part of “good welfare”. These two sections will inform the basis on which animal agriculture is able to exist, which is based upon production from conception to slaughter. Lastly, **Section 4.3** will look at the power dynamics of actors involved in the NAWA the creation of welfare standards in Norway. This section helps to inform the underlying human/animal dichotomy.

4.1 Killing and the NAWA

It is important to understand that definitions of welfare vary both across time and amongst scholars, and that the use of such definitions tend to strengthen or challenge the norms that support the human/animal dichotomy. In mainstream conceptualization of nonhuman animals and their relationship to humans, nonhuman animals tend to be viewed as different and while deserving of good treatment, it is still okay to control and kill them. “A common moral view in Norway today is that one should be able to keep and kill animals for important human considerations,” (such as food) while pressing that the issue for “most people” is that “animals should not be subjected to arbitrary, thoughtless or aimless killing” (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009, p. 3). Good welfare is meant to be delivered up to the point where the animal is no longer alive, and Norway has operationalized the concept of welfare in legislation through such language as not inflicting unnecessary suffering onto an animal because they have intrinsic value. This intrinsic value therefore means that unnecessary suffering and harm unto them would be evidence of a failure to uphold the duties relevant to the relationship between “animal” and the “animal keeper”.

Special responsibility is on those individuals who "own" animals. For those that do not necessarily own animals or have particular relationship to the animal, they still have a duty to protect the animal "on the basis of their conditions and the specific situation" (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009, p. 1). The normative standpoint within the discourse is that animal husbandry still exists, and it is in the best interest of animals to clarify the rights of animals in this new act. Especially as it pertains to their welfare, so the treatment of nonhuman animals is not left up for interpretation. While the language may be clear, the underlying messages are always able to be up for interpretation as this duty to protect is situated beside the concept of liberation.

To protect the welfare of nonhuman animals, the NAWA states three crucial points,

1. Killing of animals, and handling in connection with the killing, shall take place having regard to the animals' welfare. Anyone using equipment for stunning or killing shall ensure that it is suitable for the purpose and maintained.”,
2. Animals which are owned or in any way kept by people must be stunned before being killed. The stunning method shall ensure loss of consciousness which lasts from the killing starts until death occurs. The requirement for stunning before killing does not apply if the animal is killed using a method which provides immediate unconsciousness. After the killing of the animal it shall be ensured that the animal is dead”, and
3. Animals shall not be killed as an independent form of entertainment or competition ((Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7).

The NAWA act addresses minimizing the level of suffering experienced by a nonhuman animal. However, it does *not* speak toward the concept of necessity to kill, the concept of natural life span, natural death or the impact on welfare that the industry of killing animals for food has on those animals, the environment, or people. The text assumes that humans killing animals for food is just the way reality is. Critical Animal Studies seeks to challenge that construct of reality by offering a new conceptualization of the relationship between humans and nonhuman animals, thus implement a change in the continuum of systemic violence against the marginalized. Though it is acknowledged that the 2010 Act is meant to be a better protectant of nonhuman animals than acts before it, it arguably has only fogged the view of their marginalized and oppressed position. Legislation of this nature is like a stamp in time, depicting the rationalization of the majority.

The normative structure that supports the control of nonhuman animal lives from conception to the time and place of their death will continue unchallenged as long as the

dichotomies and limitations within the legislation are not examined. Intrinsic value assumes the object or being in question has value independent of the way it/they are used or what it/they are. Arguably, as the NAWA currently sits, nonhuman animals are perceived as having instrumental value and not intrinsic value at all. As mentioned briefly before in this essay, instrumental value is the measurement of value that an object/being has which is based upon the end that the object/being meets. In the case for nonhuman animals, the end that the being meets is meat. In theory, if there is potential to have less cruelty for animals, that would seemingly be a goal that the Norway would seek to address based upon the concept of “intrinsic value” alone. However, as it stands, killing an animal for certain purposes seems to override this respect of their intrinsic value.

Though the NAWA asserts that animals have intrinsic value and that their value is not based on their “usable value for man” (Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7) their intrinsic value is not seemingly valuable enough to have the right to live out their natural life. “Animals shall be treated well and be protected from danger of unnecessary stress and strains” (Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7), but what “well” is in this case includes the actual taking of life. This is again problematic when the crime apparently suiting a death sentence that they are guilty of is being born a species. And even then, the guilt of someone would not legally justify taking their life in Norway as the death penalty has been illegal, constitutionally, under article 93,

Every human being has the right to life. No one can be sentenced to death. No one should be subjected to torture or other inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. No one should be held in slavery or forced labor. The state authorities must protect the right to life and fight torture, slavery, forced labor and other forms of inhuman or degrading treatment. (The Constitution of the Kingdom of Norway, 2020)

This act of degrading treatment perhaps is referring to the treatment nonhuman animals receive. With that being said, if welfare legislation truly was meant to ensure the welfare of nonhuman animals because they have intrinsic value, “the state authorities must protect the right to life and fight torture, slavery, forced labor and other forms of inhuman or degrading treatment.” As evolution of other norms, the basis on which welfare legislation sits must continue to be challenged as speciesism is the separating factor that keeps this type of protection and justice from reaching nonhuman animals.

As part of the treatment applied to nonhuman animals and not to humans, section §4. Duty to help emphasizes the duty of individuals to help animals who are “sick”, “injured” or “helpless” (Norwegian Animal Welfare Act, 2011). It is interesting however that it is perfectly within reason to render a nonhuman animal helpless with anesthesia in order to injure them by taking their life. The human/animal dichotomy here is that certain humans are allowed to inflict violence against the nonhuman animals who have been raised to supposedly trust their “care taker”. Section 5, §5. Duty to alert, states the duty to alert the authorities or animal owner in cases of “mistreatment” and “serious neglect” (Norwegian Animal Welfare Act, 2011), but mistreatment here seems to be a misunderstanding rooted in the human/animal dichotomy. Mistreatment from a CAS perspective would not only refer to lacking food or lacking shelter. Mistreatment would most certainly include killing. Or, if we were to use a term more used for humans, murder.

In section 11, §11. Transportation, attention is paid to making sure that the animals that are transported, to slaughter for example, are done so in a way that puts the “least possible strain” on them (Norwegian Animal Welfare Act, 2011). This is done “with regard to the safety of the animals” but that could certainly be debated upon seeing that they are being sent to their death. In this scenario, humans have the authority to regard for “the animals’ specific character”, which could be loosely interpreted as the animals’ species. While animals may be fit for the travel ride to the slaughterhouse, they are not fit to live out their life. With hopes of not being too repetitive, I will simply assert that this would be a grotesque method of managing humans and their wellbeing, let alone cats or dogs. The issue comes down to speciesism.

In section 12, §12. Killing of animals, it is curious how there can be legislation both for “intrinsic value” of “animals”, but at the same time such thorough methods on how to kill them. Which I suppose is the entire premise of this thesis and in itself why the human/animal dichotomy is so important to discuss. Though it is perhaps natural as humans to categorize the world around us in order to give our world meaning, focusing on, “how constructions of the world, and the people and places within it, make particular policies seem natural and therefore legitimate,” (Hansen, 2017, p. 160) can help make sense of the debate over the future of meat. If it is normatively unacceptable to inflict harm onto an animal, or even only “unnecessary harm” as the NAWA states which assumingly leaves room for self defense, how is it also normatively acceptable to slaughter the old, young, sick and healthy? Much of which has been thoroughly documented in reports on how to distract animals from the cite or smell of blood what caliber bolt

is required to go through the various thicknesses of skulls. Acts like the Norwegian Welfare Act show that suffering is intended to be kept to a minimum.

The NAWA has ruled that the killing of animals “shall take place having regard to the animals’ welfare” (Norwegian Animal Welfare Act, 2011). The regulations on the killing of animals, as published in 2013 by the Norwegian Ministry of Trade and Fisheries and Ministry of Agriculture and Food, state that, “Forskriften skal fremme forsvarlig dyrevelferd ved avliving av dyr,” (Forskrift om avliving av dyr, 2013 issue 1), meaning the purpose of the publication of the regulations are to, “promote proper animal welfare when killing animals”. On Nortura’s webpage, citing NAWA standards,

At the Nortura slaughterhouses, chicken, turkey and pig are anesthetized with CO₂ gas, cattle with a bolt gun to the forehead, and lambs with electricity via electrodes on each side of the head. Immediately after anesthesia, the animal is hung upside down and killed by stabbing with a knife in the main artery, causing the blood to drain (Nortura, n.d.).

If this was not rooted in speciesism, it would be argued that any species could replace the word “animals” or any one of the nonhuman animals mentioned throughout the legislation. The regulations cover a range of topics from the requirement that pigs must be grouped “with at least two animals” when being lowered into the gas chamber and that “there should be sufficient lighting so that the pigs can see each other and the surroundings until they are anesthetized” (Forskrift om avliving av dyr, 2013 issue 1).

The declaration of intrinsic value is made in contrast to what would be instrumental value in §3. General requirement regarding the treatment of animals. As stated before, intrinsic value was something that animal protection groups insisted upon for the New Act. While this is certainly a victory for animals of all kinds, humans included, to be acknowledged for their intrinsic value “irrespective of the usable value they may have for man” (Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7), a CAS perspective would argue that instrumental value is something always at play in the use of animals in animal agriculture.

While it is unclear what definition of intrinsic value the NAWA attempts to adhere to, with further reading into the legislation and surrounding discourse, it is highly debatable whether nonhuman animals used on farms are considered to have “intrinsic value”. They are not referred

to as individuals but as a species that will undergo certain treatment as a means to an end (i.e. breeding, castration, maceration, bleeding, etc.). The point being that while all animals, “mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish, decapods, squid, octopi and honey bees” according to the NAWA are said to have intrinsic value, in reality I think that is not the case. While some protections are certainly made for animals as a rule, their value is overwhelmingly placed on what they are able to give humans. For nonhuman animals used on farms, their value is ultimately based on the end “product” that comes from their ultimate slaughter. Arguably, if all animals had intrinsic value, then welfare protection legislation would protect them as they are. There would be no need for regulations on how to kill farm animals because intrinsic value would witness their worth not based on how their bodies can be cut apart and sold.

4.2 Breeding and the NAWA

The proper way to breed animals for animal agriculture, with regard to their welfare under the current conceptualized regulations, is at the core of how the human/animal dichotomy is continued over time. The ability to reproduce is a basic part of life and typically is up to the individuals involved for procreation. Even in the wild, it is atypical to find another species forcing procreation onto another species. Human are the only species to take complete control over another species in such a way that controls their basic desires as such. The NAWA states that,

- Breeding shall encourage characteristics which give robust animals which function well and have good health. Reproduction, including through methods of gene technology, shall not be carried out in such a way that it:
- a. changes genes in such a way that they influence the animals’ physical or mental functions in a negative way, or passes on such genes,
 - b. reduces the animals’ ability to practise natural behaviour, or
 - c. stimulates general ethical reactions (Lov om dyrevelferd, 2009 issue 7).

Though the concept of “intrinsic value” being added to legislation in regard to nonhuman animals is of course a leap forward for the process of animal rights as at least in writing, it shows a de-objectification of them. However, while these three rules on breeding are meant to protect the welfare of the nonhuman animals well being and “intrinsic value”, the norm supporting artificial insemination of another species for means of killing them seems to go against this very sentiment.

Section 14, §14. Specific prohibitions, protects animals by prohibiting their abandonment, especially while in “helpless condition” which would most certainly require medical assistance to be called upon. This section also prohibits “sexual interaction” with the nonhuman animals and the carrying out of “sexual activities with animals”. The scope of what “sexual activities with animals” covers seemingly does not cover the sexual stimulation of animals, collection of semen, and insemination of eggs done by humans as part of animal agriculture.

Sexual activity with nonhuman animals is prohibited as it goes against the normative understanding for what good welfare entails. It would be bad welfare because of course the nonhuman animal has no ability to consent and that type of activity amongst different species ignites a general anger culturally. To prevent against this, sexual activity with nonhuman animals was explicitly made illegal in the NAWA as it was not prohibited explicitly in previous legislation. While this may be perceived as a victory for the treatment of nonhuman animals, as the concept of consent is beneficial for humans to take on in their relationship with the rest of animalkind, there is no such protection from artificial insemination done by humans onto nonhuman animals.

4.3 Power dynamics in the creation of the NAWA

When the NAWA was being proposed, it was suggested the “by including respect for animals in the intention of the Act, the Act is seen to encourage welfare and respect for the sake of the animal’s themselves” (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009). This suggestion was made as part of “significant developments in the knowledge regarding animals’ abilities and needs, combined with a desire from society that animals shall be treated in an ethical way” (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009). Arguably the most important addition to the NAWA for animal welfare activists has been, “the recognition that animals have an intrinsic value in addition to a useable value” (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009). Here is where an issue begins because the compromise in welfare legislation is that there is still the obvious useable value. While useable value may be of practical use in the general understanding of the world, useable value, or instrumental value, of nonhuman animals secures a power dynamic that ensures a specific outcome.

The “significant developments in the knowledge” that the proposition for the NAWA refers to was gathered at least in part by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food and The Ministry of

Fisheries and Coastal Affairs' effort in sending out a draft of the animal welfare legislation to receive feedback from the below groups (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009, p. 1). As Proposition. 15 (2008-2009) states, "animal welfare issues are often composed of both health-related and social aspects in addition to the animal welfare aspects" (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009, p. 2). Because of this complexity, they urge a collective effort between "all parties involved" which in this case include health professionals, animal welfare authorities and agriculture's own organized network" (p. 2).

For the purpose of showing the power dynamic within the creation of the Act, the representation of nonhuman animal interests has been laid out and categorized based upon the interests of the group. While the categorization of these groups could be debated upon to a degree because of potential overlaps in interests, they have been categorized for the sake of this research to highlight the main interests of the individual groups and use color to visualize the power imbalance. See *Table 1*.

In regard to the numbers in representation alone, the number groups involved in (nonhuman animal-based) food or in general use of nonhuman animals outnumber animal rights or animal liberation groups. The lens that both believes in animal agriculture as well as a system of authority that can be trusted, according to the creators of the NAWA. This is not surprising as "one should be able to keep and kill animals for important human considerations" (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009) is an important part of the Act. If an issue in the conditions and/or specific situation of the animal in question is found, the general idea is that the person should notify the owner or public authority and that is enough to bring about better conditions and remedy the specific situation. There is also a "general duty" introduced in Proposition. # 15 (2008-2009) that if animals are suffering, the Food Safety Authority (Mattilsynet) or the police must be notified. The streamlining of power narrows who will be drawn in as legitimate "animal welfare authorities" in the foreseeable future.

Amongst the groups, "the proposal to promote a new law on animal welfare has received widespread support" and that "many believe that the proposal is in good agreement with the principles in the animal welfare report. In general, the consultation bodies are positive that the law should be based on scientific knowledge, while some are critical to the use of ethics as a legal concept" (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009, p. 11). The response of these

groups is representative of a lens, or normative standing, of Norwegian society at this particular time. This lens is bound to change to some degree as time goes on and norms progress.

One major roadblock for challenging these norms for animal rights and liberation groups has been the capabilities approach as mentioned previously in this thesis. The capabilities approach meaning that those that are capable of feeling the same things are treated differently than those that cannot. For the groups that collaborated to create the welfare parameters of the NAWA,

It is natural to assume that animals can sense and feel, for example, hunger, fear, pain, satisfaction, joy and rage. Whether animals perceive pain such as humans has been central to the question of whether humans have moral obligations to animals. Pain, like other emotions, is subjective and therefore cannot be measured directly in humans or animals (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare, 2009, p. 3).

First, humans are a part of the animal kingdom. Classified as: kingdom Animalia, subkingdom Eumetazoa, symmetry group Bilateria, embryonic subgroup Deuterostomia, phylum Chordata, subphylum Craniata,, skeletal group Vertebrata, mouth development group Gnathostoma, embryonic membrane group Amniota, skull group Synapsida, class Mammalia, fetal development group placental (Eutheria), order Primates, family Hominidae, genus *Homo*, and species *Homo sapiens sapiens* Linnaeus (Mozley, 2004). Secondly, if someone has intrinsic value, it would seem alarming to support their life being ended prematurely for the taste and convenience of others. It is well known that the majority of animalkind will defend themselves when presented with fear of death and it is evident as shown in any slaughter footage that nonhuman animals will try to avoid being killed. Though empathizing with the experiences of nonhuman animals is natural, hence the inclusion of welfare in legislation, it is as if the option to not kill nonhuman animals is completely off the table.

There is also a power dynamic at play in that “animal owners” have a duty to protect them from predators and other hazards. This is especially relevant to animal husbandry where animals must be able to graze if welfare standards are to be met. However, the language of the NAWA proposition behind this is phrased in a way that emphasizes a safety net for traders more so than a protection of lives. It is important for the sake of this research to point to who this safety net is for because it is not necessarily a proposition to save lives of animals, but to protect the predictability of trade of meat and dairy products for farmers. The proposition sought to protect farmers by giving “the animal owner a right to financial compensation" (Proposal for a new Act concerning animal

welfare, 2009, p. 2). This is a version of property insurance, not life insurance. Similar to how people may opt to purchase property insurance, if damage is done and is beyond repair, a financial sum may be allotted to the owner. This is seemingly different from life insurance however which is taken out on oneself and allots a certain sum of money to designated receiver of that money. In this case, it is proposed that an owner of an individual already has a policy to the investment in the individual. The owner must do what they can to protect the individual from being killed by someone else (a wolf for example), but in the case of the individual being killed by someone else, the investment will still be returned financially. In turn, the individual's value is protected, but not the individual.

The Act states its purpose is “to promote good animal welfare and respect for animals” and demands that “animals shall be treated well and be protected from danger of unnecessary stress and strains”. Though this act may be perceived as an upgrade in comparison to previous versions of anti-cruelty legislation in Norway, the concept of “intrinsic value” is a matter on which to build upon and not defining practices and norms in stone and anything less than liberation under intrinsic value is not a win for nonhuman animals. While humans are mammals and the NAWA does in fact cover the welfare of mammals, the welfare act clearly does not pertain to them. The only reason for this would be that humans are considered different from [other] “animals” and for that reason, they deserve a drastically different chance at life. Section 17, §17. Trading etc. in animal products, discusses the trading of “animal products”. This of course refers to the buying and selling of milk secretions (from cows and goats that have recently given birth) and the buying and selling of the flesh of slaughtered cows, chickens, pigs, etc. The term “animal products” is used but does not mean all animal products. As humans are also animals, the switch in conceptualization from animal to product is problematic.

The normative standpoint that promoting good welfare and respect for animals within animal husbandry and §1. Intention of the NAWA neglects a crucial dichotomy that exists only to reinforce the foundations of many oppression not only in regard to speciesism but sexism, racism and other “violence-based ideologies, considered as components of global systems of domination” (Best, Nocella, Kahn, Gigliotti, & Kemmerer, 2007). The issue that this thesis specifically addresses is the extent to which the NAWA is able to improve the rights of nonhuman animals through a critical animal studies perspective.

A critical look at the NAWA would point to the fact that it does not protect animals from harm as it stands now. Because it pins humans and animals as two separate entities, when in fact humans are animals and the dichotomy is operationalized so that one is legally and normatively acceptable to enslave and kill. Welfare, based on markers such as the animal in question being free from disease, is able to cope with the environment they are kept in (and other markers in the NAWA) is insufficient in the overall welfare of nonhuman animals. The Norwegian Animal Welfare Act, like other states welfare acts, seem to draw a clear line between humans and “animals” while not acknowledging that humans are animals. Because humans are animals, it is interesting to break down the human/animal dichotomy within “animal” welfare legislation. It seems normatively accepted that both human rights and animal rights exist and that the groups are legally deserving of two entirely separate standards of protection. Given that humans are mammals and that the NAWA specifically covers mammals as presented in §2. Scope of NAWA, the term “human” should be able to be replace the term “animal” throughout the text. But of course, that is not the case because a human/animal dichotomy exists.

4.4 Concluding thoughts

The human/animal dichotomy is perhaps ultimately the root of the divide between welfarists and liberationists in animal rights theory and therefore at the root of the limitations of any true welfare legislation or norm. Animal husbandry in itself has “provided the conceptual template and social practice whereby humans begin to clearly distinguish between “human rationality” and “animal irrationality” (Best S. , 2009, p. 17). This is important to recognize for the bigger picture of oppression because, “if we examine more deeply the basis on which our opposition to discrimination on grounds of race or sex ultimately rests, we will see that we would be on shaky ground if we were to demand equality for blacks, women, and other groups of oppressed humans while denying equal consideration to nonhumans” (Singer, 2002, p. 3). The failure to see the oppression of the human/animal dichotomy turns a blind eye toward a bloody and polluted trail.

Though pig production in Norway may not seem inherently international, especially since Norway is not especially known for its pig meat export, we know if we follow critical theories that even the most routine of actions can be international. By deconstructing the NAWA, a dilemma

for the human/animal is found which speaks to the limitations of animal welfare legislation. Welfare in this case means that suffering is kept to a minimum and when an animal is to be killed, or is being handled (in farming, transport, breeding, etc.) in connection to killing the animal, this must be done with “regard to the animals’ welfare”. The concept of suffering here is quite interesting. It can be interpreted that suffering in this case means that animals are to be kept from being aware that they will be killed, in turn reducing the level of fear in the animal. However, this conceptualization of animals are limited as it does not represent acts toward humans, whom are also animals. Suffering for nonhuman animals is not normatively acceptable as part of the NAWA, but their slaughter is simply not a part of this conceptualization of unnecessary suffering.

Chapter 5. Norwegian animal agricultural practices and nonhuman animal experiences

In **Chapter 5**, the practices that uphold and are create the human/animal dichotomy will be explored through the concepts of “*welfare*”, “intrinsic value” and “unnecessary suffering” in order to answer **RQ 3**, “**How is the concept of welfare according to the NAWA fulfilled in animal agricultural practices according to a CAS perspective?**”. **Section 5.1** examines the practices of breeding nonhuman animals for food in Norway as it relates to the continuance of the meat industry through (re)production. **Section 5.2** examines the practices of slaughter of nonhuman animals for food as part analysis of the experiences of nonhuman animals in comparison to the concept of “intrinsic value”. **Section 5.3** offers concluding thoughts over the chapter.

5.1 Production practices: breeding

One example of bad welfare practices found in Norway was in Rogaland which some have referred to as an “overproduction crisis” at the Rogaland production facility (Morsund, 2017). The over-production of pigs in Norway had been reported on frequently in Norwegian news. Nationen, a popular farming newssource, titled one article, “Grisekrise: 75.000 griser henger på lager” or in English, “Pig crisis: 75,000 pigs hang in the warehouse” (Aase, 2018). Below this shocking number is a photo of seemingly endless pigs, hanging by hooks, without heads or arms, and their bodies have been sliced from end to end (Aase, 2018). The crisis reported was not because 75,000 pigs were killed, but because 75,000 was too many killed at one time and the meat from their bodies was unable to be sold, hence creating an overproduction emergency.

A CAS perspective would emphasize that the concept of “overproduction” alone is of issue. “Overproduction” implies that too much of a product has been produced in comparison to the amount able to seell, but “overproduction”, when regarding to the nonhuman animal “products” ommits the act of mass insemination of females it took in order to produce the piglets for the eventual purpose of being slaughtered and sold for parts. During the crisis, the overproduction problem source and who was to blame seemed to change depending on which actor was talking,

whether it was a regulation problem or a fault in planning. One actor that did not get a say in the crisis were the 75,000 pigs that had their lives cut short. Not acknowledged was the fact that “overproduction” is the outcome for humans due to the intense overhaul of another species reproductive capabilities. This fact tends to be overlooked when assuming the legitimacy of the human/animal dichotomy.

Evidence of the issues of this dichotomy in welfare legislation is that breeding is not done for the welfare of the nonhuman animals used on farms. It is a matter of survival of production. When discussing production of pigs in Norway, one source notes that the “Norwegian Landrace is the leading breed of swine in Norway,” and that,

The mean weaned piglets of the Norwegian Landrace pig breed for each litter is 9 to 8, two to three times a year. These pigs are capable of attaining a body weight of 220lbs (100kg) within 142 days after their birth. The average weight of the male Norwegian Landrace Pig at slaughter is 350-375lbs (160-170kg). The Norwegian Landrace Pig breed full grown has an average to big-sized body. The Norwegian Landrace Pig average mature weight of the sow is 450-600lbs (204 to 272kg), and the average weight of the boar is 500-700lbs (226-318kg) (The Pig Site, n.d.).

The breeding of animals for farms is based on creating benefits from their ultimate slaughter and sale from their bodies. Their weight is an indicator of how much money can be expected upon a sale of their meat. Similarly to how meat is purchased at the grocery store deli and it is first weighed. But the truth of the matter is, breeding purposely changes the genetic makeup of nonhuman animals so that they are more predictable for the purpose they are being bred for. For example, “Norwegian red cattle, "kombikua" weigh 200 kg more than their predecessors, graze less varied and require more energy both in pasture and in the form of feed. (Henriksen Bogstad & Martinsen, 2019). In turn, the weight of the slaughtered body is compared with the amount of work and money taken to raise the cow to slaughtering age. The matter is merely a business decision while trying to adhere to the (welfare) laws of the business industry.

This is an issue from even a welfare perspective because, ““effective” breeding of pigs, chickens and turkeys has created animals with bodies from which they get diseases of living,” and is in violation of “Section 25 of the Animal Welfare Act” (Henriksen Bogstad & Martinsen, 2019). However, CAS would argue that relying on welfare alone to fight this battle of mistreatment would

simply leave the door open for further mistreatments to come because as the Act even states in section 25 that animals with genetics that are not suitable shall not be used in breeding (Norwegian Animal Welfare Act, 2011). The prohibition of breeding in this case is only because breeding of such individuals will not ultimately suit the purpose of the meat industry. Arguably, the prohibition is therefore not because of any “intrinsic value” as the welfare act asserts it is based upon.

Yet, the whole point of animal husbandry is to profit and provide food through means of raising animals. This in itself seems to point away from “intrinsic value” and more toward “instrumental value”, meaning that nonhuman animals’ on farms value is not intrinsic but based upon the end that they meet. To produce at a rate that is fitting to the demand, the amount of product available does not magically appear. According to Animalia, one of the groups involved in the process creating the NAWA,

It is important that the heifers are of the appropriate age and are large enough for insemination. The best thing is that the heifers are inseminated when they are 14-16 months old and have a breast size of 165-170 cm. This corresponds to a living weight of approx. 400 kg. It is important that the heifers are in the middle range (3.0-3.75) for insemination (Animalia, 2019).

The process of choosing a male, taking their semen (sometimes by hand), and then timing the females ovulation cycle in order to efficiently impregnate her via artificial insemination (also by means of placing one hand inside of her rectum for stimulation at the same time using the another hand and inserting the semen into the vagina). Geno, one of the groups included in the process of the NAWA creation, says that the “insemination of cows and heifers is carried out by inseminators. These are either veterinarians (contracted jobs), seminar technicians (employed by Geno) or owner inseminators (producers who inseminate in their own herd)” (Geno, 2020). They explain that,

The semen collection starts by the bull wearing a protective apron to prevent contamination from decorating and other bulls. Then, the bull is trimmed in the bin so that it is stimulated before withdrawal. When the bull is stimulated, it rides on a so-called phantom where it releases semen. The semen is collected in an artificial vagina (Geno, 2015).

Further information on the process can be found by taking an insemination course provided by Geno and Norwegian University of Environmental and Life Sciences (NMBU). After the course is taken, certification to inseminate is given by the Norwegian Food Safety Authority (Mattilsynet) after passing an exam (Geno, 2016). This type of training and certification further points to an issue of systemically supporting the sexual dominion over another species.

5.2 Production practices; slaughterhouse

Slaughterhouse practices in Norway are readily accessible for the public to read within the Regulations on the Killing of Animals (Forskrift om avliving av dyr, 2013 issue 1). However, though the rules are accessible, the practices in reality in the slaughterhouse tend to be far removed from the public eye. This is both due to the physical distance between consumer and slaughterhouse, as well the distance created by veiling industry practices in security. The lack of transparency from the slaughterhouse has led to undercover investigations by activists. Because the industry is securitized and protected in a web of complex cultural norms, undercover footage often tends to be the only viable way to see the industry from the inside for outside parties. An example of such undercover footage was a documentary by activist Norun Haugen titled, *Griseindustriens Hemmeligheter*, recently broadcasted on NRK, a popular Norwegian news, tv and radio station, (Waagen, 2019).

Matprat, “the communication concept of the Information Office for Eggs and Meat, and a proud ambassador for the raw materials from Norwegian agriculture” (Matprat, n.d.) published a video on the slaughter of pigs as part of a series of videos on Norwegian farming. The farmers in the video admit that there are always “mixed feelings” when the truck comes to take the selection of pigs to slaughter (Matprat, n.d.). I would argue that these mixed feelings come both from the “meat paradox” as mentioned previously in this essay and most importantly because of the tension that exists in the human/animal dichotomy.

What the videos from the meat industry in Norway tend not to show to the public is the actual process of slaughter. It is important for the subject matter of this research to look at the regulations, which are in line with the normative framework of welfare in NAWA. For instance,

the regulations on the killing of pigs is meant to take into consideration of the specific needs of the species.

The human/animal dichotomy is ever present in such regulations. The power dynamic is presented in the decision that these pigs will not have any chance at life. Or for birds of the poultry industry which “may be hung after the legs prior to stunning” (Forskrift om avliving av dyr, 2013 issue 1, p. 3). The process from stunning to killing is laid out in precise manner. Electric stunning and a bolt to the brain by firearm is considered anesthesia, which is of course not the method of anesthesia most people would prefer before going into surgery. The fact is, the nonhuman animals are not being sent to an operation but to the end of their life. This process of anesthesia has been fine tuned. “If animals are anesthetized individually, the electrical device must provide a light signal during the time the current passes through the brain of the animal” and “the current between electrodes should be at least 2.5 amps for cattle older than six months and 0.3 amps for rabbits” (Forskrift om avliving av dyr, 2013 issue 1, p. 3). The dynamic for some to decide who is able to be killed at six months of age is powerful. Even the male day-old chicks, because they are not needed in the production of food, cannot escape the fate of the human/animal dichotomy. “Day-old chicks that should not be put into production must be killed before they are 24 hours old. If live embryos that do not hatch in normal time should be killed, it should occur no later than 24 hours after normal hatching time” (Forskrift om avliving av dyr, 2013 issue 1, p. 5) After the anesthesia process is done, “bleeding should be done by cutting through both carotid arteries or the main blood vessels from which they expire” and “poultry bleeding should be ensured by cutting the head of the animals using sharp tools” (Forskrift om avliving av dyr, 2013 issue 1, p. 4)

5.3 Concluding thoughts

The sense of “intrinsic value” that the NAWA rules have expressed is not lived up to within the regulations on how to kill. Any intrinsic value that the NAWA eludes to is overshadowed by the practices the NAWA supports as per a CAS perspective. On top of that, the practices toward “animals” in this case could most certainly not be applied toward all animals (namely humans) as they would be challenged on the basis of the norms regarding what is “humane”. The NAWA in this case is inadequate at the protection of animals as it overlooks the nonhuman animal as an individual. The protections as per the duty to help animals in need seems to define help through a

limited lens as the reasons for helping seem limited to a space that still encourages a human/animal dichotomy and the farming of nonhuman individuals. Ideas such as a right to a life free from fear of slaughter, from generations in “production”, and from gender- and species-based exploitation are not represented in the practices of animal agriculture.

The NAWA and the regulations on how to breed “animals” into existence, how to transport “animals” to their death, and how to kill “animals” humanely does not illustrate the reality that is the nonhuman animal’s experiences which is ultimately an international dilemma as the case of Norway is not inherently unique, especially in western practices. This Welfare Act does not question the process of artificial insemination, birth and separation, the concept of trucks transporting a selection of animals, the concept of a slaughterhouse. Indeed, its practices show a near disconnect by humans with the experiences of other members of animalkind.

Chapter 6. Conclusion

A disconnect by humans with the experiences of other members of animalkind is both problematic for the conceptualization of welfare as well as a conceptualization of empathy in general toward marginalized groups. If animals have intrinsic worth, based not on what they are able to provide for man as per the normative stance of the NAWA, the experiences of individuals within animal agriculture who have had their reproductive capabilities overruled by another species for the purpose of taking their lives has been a gross violation of their intrinsic worth.

The fact that the insemination process is not considered a sexual act in itself is indication of the human/animal dichotomy. While doctors may help other humans with fertility issues with other routes of insemination processes outside of intercourse, this scenario happens with consenting parties. And though it may not need to be said, the child and parents are not then used for their body parts. This is not to say that the act is in any way sexual for the farmer doing the act, but the principle of bodily autonomy here is clearly not something at play. The individual (she), does not get a choice or the opportunity to escape the farmers advancement, and whatever offspring she will grow inside of her are most certainly not hers as they are separated from their mothers so that their mothers may “be milked”. If the shoe were on the other foot and a human’s child were taken away in order for the woman to be milked, without any choice, and have that milk be sold and distributed around the nation, that would be an issue as per cultural norms in regarding our own species. The concept of bodily autonomy is a matter of Human Rights, and while humans are animals and Animal Rights exist, the human/animal binary justifies entirely separate systemic practices.

The concept of “speciesism” leads to very different definitions of welfare and ultimately disagreement amongst those seeking the protection of animals. While the intentions of the NAWA may very well have been good in theory for the groups involved, the practices toward nonhuman animals who have been genetically put in a dependent position and therefore needing the care of humans are in need of reevaluation on the basis of cruelty. Profiting globally from the death of millions of innocent individuals, sentenced to death based solely because they are different from “us” only serves to continue a continuum of violence as it offers a plausible justification for the violent marginalization of “others”.

With consideration of the norm cycle and the layered difficulty there is in creating social change, challenging the status quo of the affairs of states is no easy feat. The questioning of normative values associated with the meat and dairy industry have indeed brought about changes in standards, laws, and perceptions toward animals in many parts of the world, yet the issue has yet to resolve to a place without tension. In truth, perhaps it never will as norms are constantly being shaped and reshaped. Without change in the normative conceptualization of animals, there will continue to be tension on topics that involve the use of, killing of and eating of nonhuman animals as they present limitations to the conceptualizations of justice and liberation.

Because CAS sees correlation between systemically marginalized social justice issues, the issues facing other unjustly marginalized groups must too be acknowledged. Internationally, each state has its own set of rules, norms and practices which comes with unique challenges for each case. This means that international challenge of a norm can lead to a number of other variables. Worth noting, the economic incentives for keeping an industry alive. For future research, a CAS approach to the human/animal dichotomy should be explored within other normative variables that make up economic stability and instability. While liberation is the main goal of CAS, a deeper look at how actors involved in these norms and where these actors are situated amongst each other would prove of practical use in the efforts toward building upon “intrinsic value”. The collection of such research would better situate CAS within international relations.

As the global population grows and capitalist markets exist, the demand for mass amounts of cheap products has presented a challenge in addressing how industries can adapt to sustainable models while both producing a sufficient supply and satisfying consumers demand with regard to welfare and sustainability. The issue of sustainability discourse, though incredibly important for the health and future of the planet and is inclusive in the sense that many ecosystems are sought to be protected within it, ultimately remains anthropocentric. The conversation seems to relate back to the greenhouse gas emission that certain nonhuman animals in agriculture put out into the atmosphere, neglecting the norms that support the actions that lead to the animals being used on farms in the first place.

At any rate, whether for sustainability reasons or for ethical reasons, the norms around food are being challenged from the grassroots level all the way up into IOs, therefore showing the potential for the progression of plant-based norms. The progression of plant-based norms would potentially lead to less animals exploited within agriculture. However, the entry point for food

norm challenging in this example would not necessarily be because of the inherent rights of a nonhuman animal species' intrinsic value. This therefore poses a problem for the goals of CAS seeking to validate nonhuman animals personhood by challenging speciesism. Ultimately for the case of this thesis, whether consumer decisions have been based on animal ethics, the environment or something entirely different is not the purpose of this research. It would however be interesting to apply a CAS perspective on these other variables in order to inform on actor's agency in the overall construction of international meat norms as part of a global practice of marginalization and oppression.

“We are, quite literally, gambling with the future of our planet-for the sake of hamburgers”

(Singer, 2002, pg. 169)

References

- (n.d.). Retrieved from Tine: <https://www.tine.no/english>
- (n.d.). Retrieved from Anonymous for the Voiceless:
<https://www.anonymousforthevoiceless.org/about-us>
- (n.d.). Retrieved from Noah for Dyrs Rettigheter: <https://www.dyrsrettigheter.no/noah/noah-for-animal-rights/>
- (n.d.). Retrieved from NOAH pels ut: <https://pelsut.no/noahs-arbeid/pelsfritt/>
- (n.d.). Retrieved from Matprat: <https://www.matprat.no/om-oss/>
- (n.d.). Retrieved from Nortura: <https://www.nortura.no/tatt-hand-om-av-stolte-fagfolk/pa-slakteriet/>
- (n.d.). Retrieved from Dyrevernalliansen: <https://dyrevern.no/vart-arbeid/landbruksdyr/>
- (n.d.). Retrieved from The Pig Site: <https://thepigsite.com/breeds/norwegian-landrace>
- (2015, September 15). Retrieved from Geno:
<https://www.geno.no/Start/Brunst/Semintjeneste/Produksjon-av-sad/>
- (2016, August 15). Retrieved from Geno:
<https://www.geno.no/Start/Aktiviteter/Kurs/insemineringskurs/grunnkurs--seminteknikere/>
- (2018, September). Retrieved from Direct Action Everywhere:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vRsSeDBvp0Q00kRuXXXBdoMprEe6vTOitveFYosZrbR21vSKRu79SexI5-l3Qe3r_n_sxE-hzrHPMIQ/pub
- (2019). Retrieved from Veganuary: <https://uk.veganuary.com/blog/a-record-breaking-veganuary-2018/>
- (2019, January 24). Retrieved from Animalia:
<https://www.animalia.no/no/Dyr/storfe/fruktbarhet-hos-storfe/>
- (2020, May 15). Retrieved from The World Bank:
<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/disability#:~:text=Results-,One%20billion%20people%2C%20or%2015%25%20of%20the%20world's%20populati, on%2C,million%20people%2C%20experience%20significant%20disabilities.>

- (2020). Retrieved from The Institute for Critical Animal Studies:
<http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/about/>
- (2020). Retrieved from The Official Animal Rights March:
<https://www.theofficialanimalrightsmarch.org/#:~:text=THE%20OFFICIAL%20ANIMAL%20RIGHTS%20MARCH,for%20taking%20the%20event%20online.>
- (2020). Retrieved from Direct Action Everywhere:
<https://www.directactioneverywhere.com/about-us>
- (2020, January 17). Retrieved from Geno:
<https://www.geno.no/Start/Brunst/Semintjeneste/Inseminering/>
- Aase, B. B. (2018, September 5). Lagera av svinekjøtt har blitt rekordstore. *Nationen*, 4-5.
- Adams, C. J. (2009). POST-MEATEATING: . In *Animal Encounters* (pp. 47-72). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Arneeth, A., & al, e. (2019). *Special Report: Special Report on Climate Change and Land*. IPCC.
- Beef*. (2013, December 12). Retrieved from Beef Magazine:
<https://www.beefmagazine.com/blog/it-s-front-burner-issue-what-exactly-transparency-agriculture>
- Beef*. (2015, January 22). Retrieved from Beef Magazine:
<https://www.beefmagazine.com/blog/3-major-beef-industry-issues-demand-quality-transparency>
- BenSassi, N., Vas, J., Vasdall, G., Averos, X., Estevez, I., & Newberry, R. C. (2019). On-farm broiler chicken welfare assessment using transect sampling reflects environmental inputs and production outcomes. *PLoS ONE*, 1-25.
- Bentham, J. (1970). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789). London: ed. by J. H Burns and HLA Hart.
- Best, S. (2009). The rise of critical animal studies: Putting theory into action and animal liberation into higher education. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 7(1), 9-52.
- Best, S., & Nocella, A. (2004). *Terrorists or freedom fighters?: Reflections on the liberation of animals*. Lantern Books.
- Best, S., Nocella, A. J., Kahn, R., Gigliotti, C., & Kemmerer, L. (2007). Introducing Critical Animal Studies. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 5(1), 4-5.
- Bilchitz, D. (2009). Moving beyond arbitrariness: The legal personhood and dignity of non-human animals. *South African Journal on Human Rights*, 25(1), 38-72.

- Brown, H. (2018). Yulin Lychee and Dog Meat Festival: A shift in focus. *Tourism Experiences and Animal Consumption*, 193-207.
- Cole, M., & Morgan, K. (2011). Vegaphobia: derogatory discourses of veganism and the reproduction of speciesism in UK national newspapers 1. *The British Journal of Sociology* 62(1), 134-153.
- Enloe, C. (2011). The mundane matters. *International Political Sociology*, 447-450.
(2017-2018). *ER VELFERDEN FOR SLAKTEGRISEN GOD NOK? Mattilsynets tilsynsprosjekt på slaktegris i Rogaland*. Mattilsynet.
- Favre, D. (2016). An Internatinoal Treaty for Animal Welfare. *Ius Gentium: Comparative Perspectives on Law and Justice*, 87-106.
- Forsberg, E. M. (2011). Inspiring respect for animals through the law? Current development in the Norwegian animal welfare legislation. . *Journal of agricultural and environmental ethics*, 24(4), 351-366.
- Forskrift om avlving av dyr. (2013 issue 1). *Forskrift om avlving av dyr*. Oslo, Norway: Lovdata.
- Gonera, A., & Milford, A. B. (2018). *The plant protein trend in Norway - Market overview and future perspectives*. Tromsø: Nofima.
- (2018). *Growing the Good: The Case for Low-Carbon Transition in the Food Sector*. Changing Markets Foundation.
- Hansen, L. (2017). Poststructuralism. In *Globalization of World Politics* (pp. 159-173). Oxford University Press.
- Henriksen Bogstad, M., & Martinsen, S. (2019, August 29). *Politikerne vil ikke forstå*. Retrieved from Dagsavisen: <https://www.dagsavisen.no/debatt/politikerne-vil-ikke-forsta-1.1575543>
- Jennings, L., Danforth, C., Dodds, P., Pinel, E., & Pope, L. (2019). Exploring Perceptions of Veganism. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.12567.
- Kunst, J. R., & Hohle, S. M. (2016). Meat eaters by dissociation: How we present, prepare and talk about meat increases willingness to eat meat by reducing empathy and disgust. *Appetite*, 758-774.
- Linklater, A. (1999). The evolving sheres of international justice (75)3. *International Affairs*, 473-482.

- Loughnan, S. B. (2012). The Meat Paradox: How Are We Able to Love Animals and Love Eating Animals? *The Inquisitive Mind Italia (1)*, 15-18.
- Lov om dyrevelferd. (2009 issue 7). *Dyrevelferdsloven*. Oslo, Norway: Lovdata. Retrieved from Regjeringen: <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/animal-welfare-act/id571188/#:~:text=The%20intention%20of%20this%20Act,welfare%20and%20respect%20for%20animals.&text=The%20Act%20applies%20to%20conditions,squid%2C%20octopi%20and%20honey%20bees>.
- (2017). *Mattilsynets Arbeid med Dyrevelferd*. Mattilsynet.
- Morsund, G. (2017, December 4). Rystende forhold hos grisebønder avdekket. Norway: NRK.
- Mozley, S. (2004, May 25). *Classification of Humans*. Retrieved from NCSU: <https://projects.ncsu.edu/cals/course/zo150/mozley/humans.html>
- Pedersen, H. (2010). Conceptualizing Animals. In H. Pederson, *Animals in Schools: Processes and Strategies in Human-Animal Education* (pp. 21-31). West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.
- Proposal for a new Act concerning animal welfare*. (2009, May 15). Retrieved from Regjeringen: <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/food-fisheries-and-agriculture/dyr/proposal-for-a-new-act-concerning-animal/id562587/>
- Salomon, D. (2010). From Marginal Cases to Linked Oppressions: Reframing the Conflict between the Autistic Pride and Animal Rights Movements. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 47-72.
- Singer, P. (2002). *Animal Liberation*. New York: Ecco.
- Skreiberg, C. (2018, November 11). Veganbølge mot strømmen. Oslo, Norway: Aftenposten.
- (2019). *Social Progress Index: Executive Summary*. Social Progress Imperative.
- Statista. (2019). *Number of slaughtered cattle in Norway in selected years from 1996 to 2018*. Animalia.
- Statista. (2019). *Number of slaughtered pigs in Norway in selected years from 1996 to 2018*. Animalia.
- Statista. (2019). *Number of slaughtered poultry in Norway in selected years from 2012 to 2018*. Animalia.
- Stokke, S., Arnemo, J. M., Brainerd, S., Söderberg, A., Kraabøl, M., & Ytrehus, B. (2018). Defning animal welfare standards in hunting: body mass determines thresholds for incapacitation time and fight distance. *Scientific Reports*, 1-13.

Svärd, P.-A. (2013). Animal National Liberation? *Journal of Animal Ethics Vol. 3, No. 2*, 188-200.

The Constitution of the Kingdom of Norway. (2020, 05 14). Oslo, Norway: Lovdata.

Tzviva, M., Negro, S., Kalfagianni, A., & Hekkert, M. (2020). Understanding the protein transition: The rise of plant-based meat substitutes. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 217-231.

Waagen, O. (Director). (2019). *Griseindustriens hemmeligheter* [Motion Picture].

Willett, W., & al., e. (2019). *Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems*. The Lancet Commissions. Retrieved from EAT: <https://eatforum.org/>

Tables

Table 1. Organizational interests of actors involved in giving feedback on the NAWA draft

Organizations, departments or general groups whose mission's primary purpose is the protection of animals without a focus on the use of animals.		
Foreningen for hundeomplussering	Dyrevernalliansen	Dyrebeskyttelsen Sandefjord/Larvik
Foreningen for omplussering av dyr (FOD)	Dyrebeskyttelsen Norge	NOAH – for dyrs rettigheter (NOAH)
Foreningen for omplussering av dyr i Trondheim	Dyrebeskyttelsen for Oslo og omegn	
Organizations, departments or general groups whose mission's primary purpose is the ethics surrounding the use of animals, but still uses animals.		
Rådet for dyreetikk (RDE)		
Organizations, departments or general groups whose mission's primary purpose is the protection of animal's health but may use animals for some purposes.		
Norges veterinærhøgskole (NVH)		
Veterinærinstituttet (VI)		
Veterinærmedisinsk rettsråd		
Organizations, departments or general groups whose mission's primary purpose is the protection of the environment but may support using of animals		
Direktoratet for naturforvaltning,	Villmarksliv	Natur og ungdom
Statens forurensningstilsyn (SFT)	Miljøpartiet De Grønne	Norges
Norges Skogeierforbund	WWF Verdens naturfond	miljøvernforbund
Norges naturvernforbund	Miljøstiftelsen Bellona	Greenpeace Norge
Organizations, departments or general groups whose primary focus is the use of animals for general consumption (food or entertainment) of humans, whether through the meat and dairy industry, fishing industry or entertainment.		
Fiskeridirektoratet	Norsk Fjør felag	Norsk Kanin
Nasjonalt institutt for ernærings- og sjømatforskning (NIFES)	Norsk hjorteavlforening	Det Norske
Mattilsynet	Norsk Kjøttfeavlslag	Travelskap
NILF	Norsk Sau- og geitagslag (NSG)	Norges Fjordhestlag
Norske Reindriftssamers Landsforbund (NRL)	Norsk Pelsdyragslag	Norsk Fjordhestsenter
Reindriftsforvaltningen	Norsvin	Norsk hestesenter
Statkorn	Norske Strutseoppdretteres forening	Norsk Hesteeierforbund
VESO	Nortura BA	Norsk
Sintef Fiskeri og havbruk	Prior	Islandshestforening
Vitenskapskomiteen for mattrygghet	FHL	Norsk Jockeyklubb
Animalia	FHL – Havbruk	Norges rytterforbund
Norges Bondelag (NB)	Norges Fiskarlag	Norges
	Norges Kystfiskarlag	Naturvernforbund
	Norske Fiskeoppdrettsutstyreprodusenters Landsforening	Norges Jeger- og Fiskerforbund (NJFF)

Norsk Bonde- og Småbrukarlag (NBS)	Norske sjømatbedrifters landsforening	Norsk Herpetologisk Forening
Debio	Brønnbåteiernes forening	Norsk Rasefjærfe
Fagsenteret for fjørfe	Fiskehelseforeningen, v/ NIF	Forbund
Geno	Norges råfisklag	Norsk Atferdsgruppe for selskapsdyr
Gilde Norge BA	Tine BA	Norges zoohandlers bransjeforening
Helsetjenesten for storfe	Zoologisk museum	Norske
TINE Norske Meierier	Kristiansand Dyrepark ASA	Tropefuglforeningers Landsforbund
Helsetjenesten for svin ved Animalia	Norske lakseelver	Norsk akvarieforbund
Helsetjenesten for sau ved Animalia	Norsk innlandsfiskelag	
Helsetjenesten for geit	Norges grunneigar og sjølaksefiskarlag	
KOORIMP	Kultiveringsanleggenes forening	
Kjøttindustriens fellesforening	Stiftelsen Norsk sjømatsenter	
Kjøtt- og fjørfebransjens Landsforbund	Norges Hundekjørerforbund	
KSL Matmerk	Norsk Huskattforening	
Zoobransjens Etikuttvalg	Norsk Kennelklubb	
Norsk rasedueforening	Løiten Angora	
Den Norske Veterinærforening (DNV)		
Den norske lægeforening		
Norsk Landbrukssamvirke		
Organizations, departments, or general groups that do not have a primary focus on animals but may have secondary focus on animal-using groups such as animal based agriculture. Also included in this category are religious groups and others that may have interest in animals for certain activities, rituals or ceremonies.		
Norges Forskningsråd	Det Mosaiske Trossamfund i Oslo (DMT Oslo)	Advokatforeningen
Norske Samers Riksforbund		Norges Juristforbund
Sametinget	Det Mosaiske Trossamfund i Trondheim (DMT Trondheim)	Norsk
Den nasjonale forskningsetiske komité for natur-vitenskap og teknologi (NENT)	Samarbeidsrådet for tros- og livssynssamfund (STL)	Hjelpepleierforbund
Eksportutvalget for fisk	Presteforeningen	Norsk Sykepleierforbund
		Islamsk Råd Norge (IRN)
Organizations, departments or general groups whose primary focus is not on animals but does have a committed part that focuses on using and/or observing animals for the purposes of research and education.		
Havforskningsinstituttet (HI)	Universitetet for miljø- og biovitenskap (UMB)	Norsk polarinstitutt
Institutt for arktisk veterinærmedisin	Universitetet i Bergen	Innovasjon Norge
NINA	Universitetet i Oslo	
NIVA	Norges teknisk- naturvitenskapelige universitet (NTNU)	
Universitetet i Tromsø		
Organizations, departments or general groups that have some management power over animals (for example: wild animals), but do not necessarily have a primary focus on animals		

Departementene
Fylkesmennene
Utmarkskommunenes Sammenslutning

Organizations, departments, or general groups that do not have much (or any) immediate focus on animals.

Forbrukerrådet	Toll- og avgiftsdirektoratet	Haukeland
Forbrukerombudet	Ullevål universitetssykehus	Universitetssykehus
Kommunenes Sentralforbund (KS)	Rikshospitalet HF	Riksadvokaten
Nasjonalt folkehelseinstitutt	Universitetssykehuset Nord-Norge HF	Likestillings- og diskrimineringsombudet (LDO)
Statens helsetilsyn	St. Olavs Hospital	Norsk senter for menneskerettigheter (SMR)

Appendix

Appendix A

1. Pursues interdisciplinary collaborative writing and research in a rich and comprehensive manner that includes perspectives typically ignored by animal studies such as political economy.
2. Rejects pseudo-objective academic analysis by explicitly clarifying its normative values and political commitments, such that there are no positivist illusions whatsoever that theory is disinterested or writing and research is nonpolitical. To support experiential understanding and subjectivity.
3. Eschews narrow academic viewpoints and the debilitating theory-for-theory's sake position in order to link theory to practice, analysis to politics, and the academy to the community.
4. Advances a holistic understanding of the commonality of oppressions, such that speciesism, sexism, racism, ableism, statism, militarism and other hierarchical ideologies and institutions are views as parts of a larger, interlocking, global system of domination.
5. Rejects apolitical, conservative, and liberal positions in order to advance an anti-capitalist, and, more generally, a radical anti-hierarchical politics. This orientation seeks to dismantle all structures of exploitation, domination, oppression, torture, killing, and power in favor of decentralizing and democratizing society at all levels and on a global basis.
6. Rejects reformist, single-issue, nation-based, legislative, strictly animal interest politics in favor of alliances and solidarity with other struggles against oppression and hierarchy.
7. Champions a politics of total liberation which grasps the need for, and the inseparability of, human, nonhuman animal, and Earth liberation and freedom from all in one comprehensive, though diverse, struggle; to quote Martin Luther King Jr.: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere"
8. Deconstructs and reconstructs the socially constructed binary oppositions between human and nonhuman animals, a move basic to mainstream animal studies, but also looks to illuminate related dichotomies between culture and nature, civilization and wilderness and other dominator hierarchies to emphasize the historical limits placed upon humanity, nonhuman animals, cultural/political norms, and the liberation of nature as part of a transformative project that seeks to transcend these limits towards greater freedom, peace, and ecological harmony.
9. Openly supports and examines controversial radical politics and strategies used in all kinds of social justice movements, such as those that involve economic sabotage from boycotts to direct action toward the goal of peace.
10. Seeks to create openings for constructive critical dialogue on issues relevant to Critical Animal Studies across a wide range of academic groups; citizens and grassroots activists; the staffs of policy and social service organizations; and

people in private, public, and non-profit sectors. Through—and only through—new paradigms of Eco pedagogy, bridge building with other social movements, and a solidarity-based alliance politics, it is possible to build the new forms of consciousness, knowledge, and social institutions that are necessary to dissolve the hierarchical society that has enslaved this planet for the last ten thousand years (Best, Nocella, Kahn, Gigliotti, & Kemmerer, 2007, pp. 4-5).



Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet
Noregs miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003
NO-1432 Ås
Norway