

This book was originally published in 2024 via the Lund University Research Portal. At the time of publication, the series webpage was hosted by the Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology at Lund University; it has since been transferred to Open Books Lund University, where the series is now available.

Publisher: *Department of Communication, Lund University*

Text © *the authors, 2024*



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). You are free to share and adapt the material for any purpose, provided that appropriate attribution is given. For the full license terms, see [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Unless otherwise indicated, all images and photographs are excluded from this Creative Commons license. Permission to reuse such material must be obtained from the respective copyright holder.

ISBN 978-91-89874-46-6 (Print)

ISBN 978-91-89874-47-3 (PDF)

This chapter: *Landscapes of Hybrid Activism: 'New Welfarism' Revisited in the Case of the Danish 'Turbo Chicken' Campaign*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37852/oblu.263.c670>

The Lund Critical Animal Studies Collection 1

ISSN: 2004-9609.

The Lund Critical Animal Studies Collection will be found here:

<https://books.lub.lu.se/>

Landscapes of Hybrid Activism: 'New Welfarism' Revisited in the Case of the Danish 'Turbo Chicken' Campaign

Naja Yndal-Olsen

Introduction

A central aspect of Critical Animal Studies (CAS) is how the field actively seeks to link theory to practice and academia to activist communities. There is important knowledge to be shared between academics who write about the lives, rights, and liberation of nonhuman animals and activists who work in more practical ways outside academia. Indeed, research and activism overlap, but generally, the animal rights and liberation movement tends to be divided into a mainly academic or theoretical community and a mainly practical community (Woodhall & da Trindade, 2016). The relationship between these two has not always been without conflict. For example, the strategies of activists and movement organisations have been criticised for being philosophically uninformed, politically regressive, and counterproductive (Aaltola, 2011). Conversely, activists sometimes blame scholars for fiddling while Rome burns and failing to take sufficient action, which is urgently needed.

I have observed that scholarly debates about the suitability of different strategies are often characterised by an absence of activists' experiences. Concerning vegan advocacy, Giraud has highlighted the importance of learning from activists' practical struggles and dilemmas to better understand the tensions and challenges associated with implementing various tactics in practice (Giraud, 2021). Paying

closer attention to activist experiences would likewise be advantageous for analyses of other types of work in which the animal rights and liberation movement engages. This chapter explores activist perspectives on ‘new welfarist’ campaigning, which is common among some animal rights organisations but has been highly debated within academic literature.

The chapter is based on an ongoing research project about Denmark’s animal rights and liberation movement. The empirical data consists of 30 in-depth interviews with key activists from various groupings, two years of internet-based observation, and occasional in-person participatory observation. A sociological framing approach is utilised to explore how the aims and logics of the Turbo Chicken campaign are framed by the activists - with a particular focus on intra-movement framing.

Welfarism, abolitionism, and in between

The Turbo Chicken campaign illustrates a debate, which historically has been at the centre of animal advocacy; the welfare-abolitionist divide. By briefly outlining welfarism and abolitionism in the following, I do not intend to reinforce the already stagnant theoretical conflict by placing the campaign in one of the two “camps”. Instead, I wish to explore how activists navigate and make sense of these tensions in practice.

While advocacy for non-killing and non-harm towards nonhuman animals can be traced back to ancient times of Eastern and Western histories (Szűcs et al., 2012; Phelps, 2007; Pope 2002), the modern Western animal rights and liberation movement arose in the context of the new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s. In this period, a shift from a focus on humaneness and anti-cruelty towards a language of rights and liberation began to develop and formed the foundation for contemporary abolitionist positions. In the context of animal advocacy, ‘abolitionism’ is sometimes used to refer to specific approaches developed by Francione & Charlton (2015) and Wrenn (2017). However, the term covers a broad spectrum of positions against animal exploitation that move beyond the idea of animal welfare. These positions are typically oriented towards either moral rights, legal rights, animal liberation or intersectional human, animal, and ecological liberation.

Some scholars see welfarism and abolitionism as two ends of a continuum, while others conceptualise the positions as fundamentally distinct and competing strings of thought (de Villiers, 2015). Despite shared hopes and struggles, there are signif-

icant differences between the philosophical positions of welfarism and abolitionism concerning nonhuman animals' fundamental rights to their lives and bodies. Welfarism promotes better treatment of nonhuman animals through the implementation of legislation and reformed industry standards that improve selected conditions under which nonhuman animals live and die (Gillespie, 2020). While the fundamental issue of human use and killing of other animals mostly remains unquestioned, welfarism seeks to eliminate "unnecessary suffering", a concept central to contemporary animal welfare legislation. This focus on suffering does not include the disadvantage of death. Thus, the deprivation of future life for nonhuman animals is often not considered harmful as long as their days of life and the moment of killing are without "unnecessary" suffering (Wadiwel, 2009). Welfarism contains the ideal that nonhuman animals should live good lives with some possibilities for practising species-specific behaviours while under human control. In practice, however, animal welfare is typically measured in terms of reduced suffering (Balcombe, 2009). Pleasure, joy, bodily autonomy, sociality, and the preference for continuing life are rarely touched upon within mainstream animal welfare ethics. Contrary to welfarism, abolitionist positions reject instrumentalist conceptualisations of nonhuman animals as resources and means to human ends, thus envisioning a world in which nonhuman animals are not treated as human property and economic commodities in the first place. From abolitionist perspectives, welfarism can be criticised for adopting and reproducing an anthropocentric hierarchy of human superiority, exceptionalism and entitlement. That is, welfarism promotes change but fails to work towards fundamental shifts in the ways in which humans relate to other animals (de Villiers, 2015).

In practice, the welfare-abolitionist divide has been blurred by a tendency among dominant animal rights organisations to promote welfare reform as a sort of 'crisis management' (Taylor, 1999). This tendency was termed "new welfarism" by Francione in 1996 (Francione, 1996). In a US context, he observed how the organisations continued to use a language of rights and liberation but also started to pursue the same legal and industrial reforms as the traditional animal welfare organisations. One reason was that activists felt an urgent need to do something to ease the acute suffering inflicted on billions of their fellow earth beings and did not consider rights and liberational theory to provide sufficient practical guidance. A distinctive characteristic of new welfarism is how its advocates see welfare reform as being causally related to abolition in that they adhere to the notion that the

incremental reduction of suffering on a goal-by-goal basis can lead to rights or liberation in the long run. New welfarists consider welfare reform effective for three reasons: *First*, they represent a realistic compromise, which reduces acute suffering in the short term. *Second*, additional requirements for farming facilities are expected to increase production costs, make end products more expensive, and thus reduce demand. *Third*, welfare campaigns are assumed to sensitise the public to suffering, leading them along the path to abolition (Francione & Garner, 2010).

The Turbo Chicken campaign

The Turbo Chicken campaign is led by two professionalised animal rights organisations. However, the activists involved are not all members of these organisations. They represent a wide range of more or less organised grassroots within the broader animal rights and liberation movement. The term ‘turbo chicken’ was coined to raise awareness of the conditions under which “broilers” of the breed Ross 308 are kept. ‘Turbo’ refers to their extreme growth rate: While they only live for 35 days, they increase in weight from 50 to 2200 grams during this time, which leads to breathing problems, difficulties with walking, and organ failure (The Danish Parliament, 2020). The breeder, the multinational agribusiness Aviagen, praises how “independent producers value the growth rate, feed efficiency and robust performance of the Ross 308” (Aviagen, 2022). The chickens live in a shed without sunlight, up to 40,000 individuals at any one time. Twenty chickens share one square metre (The Danish Veterinary and Food Administration, 2022).



Young chickens in Danish Ross 308 farm.
Photo: Jo-Anne McArtur / We Animals Media, 2017



An injured chicken in a Danish Ross 308 farm. Photo: Jo-Anne McArtur / We Animals Media, 2017

The campaign is connected to the Open Wing Alliance, a transnational coalition of organisations that campaign for corporate “broiler” welfare policies. They estimate that replacing Ross 308 with a breed, which reaches the kill weight within 46 days instead of 35, will reduce growth rate-related suffering. In Denmark, 124 million chickens are “produced” every year, of which the vast majority are of the Ross 308 breed (The Danish Parliament, 2020). The replacement of Ross 308 is seen as a step towards the European Chicken Commitment, which includes a shift to medium-fast growing breeds and, among others, the provision of 2 metres of perches per 1000 chickens, 15 instead of 20 individuals per square metre, and the gassing of chickens before their throats are slit at the conveyor belt (European Chicken Commitment, 2022). Thus, the campaign is focused on incremental welfare reform. At the same time, the two driving organisations consider themselves abolitionist animal rights organisations, which is why I characterise the campaign as new welfarist.

The campaign’s *modus operandi* is to convince one large company chain after another to remove Ross 308 from its product range in order to trigger a domino effect among sellers and producers. Companies are lobbied and pressured through a combination of dialogue and pressure campaigning. A popular tactic is to hold regular protests outside stores, which has involved many activists for several years. In addition, the campaign has included thousands of adshel-posters, full-page insertions in the most prominent newspapers, petitions, and creative celebrations when policy changes are achieved. Regarding campaign results, multiple companies have stopped selling Ross 308, and in 2018, even Denmark’s largest chicken production concern set the goal to phase out Ross 308 within a year (Dahlager, 2020), which I will return to later.

The campaign from a framing perspective

Although new welfarists are not only concerned with eliminating “unnecessary” suffering, they choose a welfarist endeavour as a kind of non-ideal real-world politics. Due to this strategic core of new welfarism, a sociological framing approach can be useful to observe how activists strategically present problems and solutions to the public. From a framing perspective, social movements engage actively in “meaning work”; the struggle over mobilising and counter-mobilising ideas in society. They participate by selecting, omitting, expanding and giving

salience to' (Benford & Snow, 2000) certain aspects of reality. This way, framing functions like a picture frame, bracketing what is "in-frame" and "out-of-frame". Core framing tasks include "diagnostic framing" (identifying the problem and who is to blame), "prognostic framing" (articulating a solution or a plan of attack), and "motivational" framing (providing a rationale for engaging in collective action).

The Turbo Chicken campaign externally presents a classic welfare reform-frame, which implies that the industry can improve its methods of exploiting rather than framing the exploitation as the actual problem. For example, consumers are encouraged to send pre-written emails to companies with the statements¹: "*Tell companies and producers that the chickens deserve better conditions*" and "*The chickens have too little space, and they grow way too fast!*". At protests, signs displaying close-up pictures of a chicken state, "*She deserves a better life*" and "*She cannot keep up with the pressure*". By individualising the chicken, the activists counter-frame the industry's faceless portrayal of "poultry", which is often abstractly referred to in measures of tons or thousands. By referring to her as a female, they also ascribe her individuality contrary to a genderless production unit. Therefore, the problem is diagnosed as the (too) bad treatment of sentient individuals – and the ones to blame are the companies that facilitate their consumption. The prognostic framing presents a plan of attack; to engage in collective or "collectivised"² action that pressures companies to stop selling Ross 308. The motivational framing highlights the effectiveness of the campaign. For example, a campaign website states, "*Use your voice to make a difference for millions of chickens*". Similarly, a press release about campaign achievements is titled "*Revolution in Danish production: Better conditions for 12 million chickens*". Thus, the target groups are ascertained that the campaign makes a significant difference.

Intra-movement framing - welfare improvements on the periphery

Meaning work also occurs internally within social movements as processes of articulating and negotiating "diagnoses" and "prognoses". In the following, I suggest that although the campaign externally illustrates a clear example of new welfarism, the intra-movement framing differs in several aspects from the way new welfarism

¹ Author's emphasis

² See Stetsenko, 2013

was defined nearly thirty years ago. This adjusted framework may represent a new hybrid position within the movement, which is important for scholars to be aware of when analysing activist strategies.

The production capacity argument

When introducing the concept of new welfarism, Francione pointed out that celebrating achieved incremental welfare goals can make consumers feel more comfortable about financing the killing and exploitation of other animals, even though the living (and killing) conditions are not significantly improved in practice (Francione, 1996). As mentioned, he described new welfarism as supported by three presumptions. First and foremost, what I will term, the welfare argument (reducing suffering in the short term), secondly, the price argument (increasing end-product price and reduced demand), and thirdly, the sensitising argument (mobilising public concern). However, I have observed that the welfare argument is largely absent from the intra-movement framing of the campaign. Indeed, the two driving organisations focus on reducing suffering. However, the activists I have interviewed do not consider the welfare improvements significant; they are simply “out-of-frame”. Instead, another crucial rationale, which I will call the “production capacity argument”, has been highlighted by almost every interviewee. Thus, the activists emphasise how the campaign could reduce the total production by targeting the producers on their production capacity, as explained by Christina:

”I’m on the abolitionist side. I have inner conflicts about welfare campaigns, but I know they make a difference. I attended a conference at Danpo (Denmark’s largest chicken production concern, red.) to get insight into what they talk about (...) Due to the huge focus on Turbo Chickens, they have chosen to re-organise from almost 100 % Turbo Chickens (...). Now 80 % of the chickens will be of a slower growing breed. This means, provided that they don’t open more farms, that there will be a 15 % reduction in individuals per year. I think that is worth working for. But I don’t think there is a big difference in terms of the life you have to go through whether you live 35 or 46 days”.

The logic is that if a “batch” of 40,000 chickens must be kept for 11 days longer before it can be replaced by the next batch, fewer individuals will be processed by the facility in a year. In contrast to the external framing, the majority of the activists

do not think in terms of reducing the suffering of living chickens, but rather of reducing suffering by “saving” a calculated number of future individuals from being brought into existence, thereby reducing the total number of individuals exploited and killed by the industry. Some interviewees also consider how prolonging the chickens’ lives may increase suffering despite slightly reducing health problems. However, most conclude that the production capacity argument outweighs this concern. While the price and sensitising arguments are about reducing consumer demand, the aim of the production capacity argument is to directly reduce supply. Furthermore, I have noted that this way of framing the campaign as a way to disturb the industry resonates broadly within the activist community: Activists who consider themselves pragmatic as well as those who are more idealistic and critical of welfarist tactics seem to approve of this aspect of disturbance. As Mark explains:

“I haven’t participated (in the Turbo Chicken campaign, red.). In the beginning, it was on principle but since then I have come to think that it might be quite good anyway (...). It does not really challenge humans’ views on other animals fundamentally (...). But if such a campaign is successful in harming the industry economically, then I will look at it positively. If it forces them to produce fewer individuals, and it becomes more expensive and difficult for them. Because then we will stand stronger”.

Landscapes of hybrid activism

In scholarly debates, new welfarism has frequently been presented as an opposing or competing solution frame to veganism (see e.g. Torres, 2007; Freeman, 2010; Francione & Garner, 2010). For this reason, it is easy to get the impression of a clear-cut “frame dispute”, which implies that activists are thought to either engage in new welfarist campaigning or the spreading of veganism. However, I have observed how the Turbo Chicken activists also participate in vegan outreach or plant-based lobbying. Veganism, understood as more than just a form of consumption, is clearly at the core of the activists’ collective identity. Some define their veganism in ethical terms, i.e., living without harming or causing suffering to others, while others conceptualise their veganism in more political terms, i.e., engaging in a struggle against species injustice and intertwined oppressions. Activists also talk about how they are aware of opportunities for spreading veganism in their every-

day lives by setting an example, thus viewing their lifestyle as a kind of quiet activism³ or prefigurative politics⁴. In addition, they participate in collective action such as taste-sample hand-outs or vegan protests. There are multiple examples of overlap between activists who attend or support the Turbo Chicken campaign and activists who participate in civil disobedience, such as slaughterhouse blockades. Indeed, the movement consists of a range of groupings, whose attitudes to the campaign varies. However, the terrain of activism is complex and highly characterised by hybrid activists, something which is essential for scholars to consider when analysing movement strategies. All the interviewees bring up the necessity of combining mainstream methods, such as plant-based corporate outreach or welfare initiatives with direct action and vegan outreach. The notion that new welfarist campaigning and vegan outreach cannot meaningfully go hand in hand is non-existent within the sample. Instead, most activists consider certain forms of new welfarist initiatives and anti-speciesist activism to present complementary rather than opposing solution frames.

Frames vary in their restrictiveness or inclusiveness regarding the number of ideas they accommodate. In this case, the intra-movement prognostic framing is surprisingly flexible in the light of much literature on social movements, which tends to put activist types into relatively fixed “boxes”. While the philosophical positions of welfarism and abolitionism may be accurately understood as “oil and water” (de Villiers, 2015), impossible to mix meaningfully, the activists draw the lines in various alternative ways. Not just by placing their activities in the middle of a spectrum of tactics but rather understood within, what I will call, landscapes of hybrid activism: A tangled terrain, in which a considerable number of activists and organisations engage in new welfarist initiatives concurrently with activities such as producing anti-speciesist media content, vegan outreach, civil disobedience, bearing witness, or trespassing in order to document the conditions of farmed animals. This way, most of the activists also complicate the sharp analytical divide between pragmatic and idealistic or radical activists.

³ See Oliver, 2021

⁴ See Verón, 2016

Against ‘humane’ recommendations

New welfarism has been criticised heavily for promoting “humane” exploitation and killing (Francione & Garner, 2010). In this case, however, participating explicitly in “humane washing” is where even the activists who are the most supportive of the Turbo Chicken campaign draw the line. As an example of “boundary framing”, i.e., the task of articulating movement protagonists and antagonists, multiple interviewees disassociate themselves from Denmark’s traditional animal welfare organisation, which recommends consuming alternative chickens to Ross 308. The welfare organisation even has a labelling scheme for animal-derived products called “Recommended by Animal Protection Denmark”, which all the interviewees find outrageous as they view killing and protecting as incompatible. The boundary between explicitly recommending the consumption of nonhuman animals and avoiding doing so is an essential precondition for the activists’ support for the campaign.



Unable to walk. Chicken of the Ross 308 breed. Photo: Stefano Belacchi / Equalia / We Animals Media, 2021

Anti-speciesist single-issue campaigning?

New welfarism takes the form of single-issue campaigns, which have been criticised for being inherently speciesist because they highlight the exploitation of certain nonhuman animals and privilege the species that are already the most favoured. While abolition is advocated for the most popular species, such as dolphins in dolphinariums, less significant reform is advocated for the least favoured species, such as chickens (Wrenn & Johnson, 2015; Wrenn 2016; Francione & Garner 2010). However, the activists make sense of the Turbo Chicken campaign in quite a different way. They tend to view the focus on chickens as an expression of moral consistency in that it focuses on an intervention area where most individuals suffer *regardless* of their species. In their eyes, the campaign is not speciesist due to its lack of liberationist goals and root cause analyses. Instead, it may even be understood as containing anti-speciesist aspects due to its insistence on raising awareness of a neglected species - despite the task being more demanding than petitioning against dog “meat” or elephants in circuses. Therefore, they are not oblivious to speciesist biases but seem to make sense of them differently.

Intra-movement hybridization

Internally, the activists diagnose the problem as the killing, exploitation, and suffering of nonhuman animals as well as ecological degradation due to numerous interconnected societal issues. The plan of attack is to adopt a multifaceted approach including various, sometimes competing, sets of tactics. Despite critical voices, the Turbo Chicken campaign is overall viewed as a legitimate component of such a multifaceted approach. First and foremost, due to what I have called the production capacity argument based on the expectancy of lower “output” as the production capacity decreases and the price argument based on the expectancy of decreased demand – *not* because the activists consider the welfare improvements to be significant. Second, the campaign is seen as one initiative among others, which also include direct action and vegan outreach. Third, the consumption of “humanely” raised chickens is never explicitly promoted. Fourth, the campaign, despite its single-issue approach, creates attention around a less favoured species. Although the external framing makes the campaign appear as a clear example of new welfarism as defined nearly thirty years ago, the intra-movement prognostic

framing suggests that the campaign represents an adjusted position, which, in the eyes of the activists, counters some of the weaknesses of new welfarism. I suggest that this intra-movement prognostic “frame transformation” is the main reason why the Turbo Chicken campaign has gained relatively broad support from the movement’s various groupings, as its logic resonates with a more comprehensive range of activists. This way, the campaign illustrates a development of internal hybridization within the Danish animal rights and liberation movement. While social movement theory normally presents hybridization as something that happens between two movements, this case represents an example of the intra-movement hybridization of positions. Here, activists across the movement’s spectrum of self-identified radicals or idealists and self-identified pragmatists find common ground in the campaign – first and foremost due to the production capacity argument and its logic of affecting industries economically.

Unaddressed problems of new welfarism

Although the campaign avoids some shortfalls of new welfarism, central criticisms remain unaddressed by most interviewees. Multiple CAS researchers have problematised welfarist tactics with abolitionist goals for numerous reasons, among others, for being ineffective by failing to address systemic root causes of oppression. According to critics, prioritising an incremental single-issue approach to reducing acute suffering can be visualised as constantly cutting off small twigs from a tree. New twigs and even large branches will eventually regrow if the soil, roots or at least trunk are not targeted. Wrenn (2017) elaborates on this analogy, in which the soil represents the capitalist economic mode of production, which legitimises social structures of exploitation and oppression, while the trunk illustrates speciesism with its roots in naturalised oppressive social relationships. She stresses that pruning a tree can make it grow stronger because the weak parts are continuously removed. Thus, attempts at resistance are often co-opted by capitalist industries. Celebrating minor welfare improvements can strengthen the industries’ images and give the public the impression that welfare issues are being addressed sufficiently. This way, improved welfare standards are also used to facilitate the ongoing use of nonhuman animals (Bourke, 2009). An example of a new twig growing from the tree could be Denmark’s largest chicken production concern, setting a goal of phasing out Ross 308 but concurrently presenting a plan to in-

crease its production of “welfare chickens” by 10-15 million per year. I understand the term “welfare chicken” as the enterprise’s counter-framing of the “turbo chicken”. The term refers to medium-fast growing breeds of which most chickens live under slightly better conditions than the Ross 308 (Danpo, 2022). In 2023, the concern indefinitely postponed the phase-out of their Turbo Chicken production (Schousboe, 2023). As welfarism does not initiate a fundamental shift in the ways humans relate to other animals, it has been suggested that the interim adoption of new welfarist strategies in pursuing future goals of rights or liberation is an unfortunate privileging of the present, which leads to the postponement of the necessary struggle for justice (de Villiers, 2015).

Effectiveness and “voluntary compulsion”

Most of the interviewees, who have participated in the Turbo Chicken campaign, prefer more uncompromising forms of activism, in which they feel true to their values. Nevertheless, they take part in new welfarist initiatives due to their assumed effectiveness. As expressed by Sarah:

“When you know that by getting this company on board, we will save an additional two million lives this year, when the numbers speak for it, then it makes sense to work this way. But when what you really want is total liberation tomorrow, it is a bit tough to focus on these tiny steps”.

Similarly, Daniel finds this kind of pragmatism “*necessary but emotionally exhausting*”, while Sandra calls it “*hard work that needs to be done*”. Thus, an additional dynamic seems to play a role in the overall support for the campaign, namely a sort of “voluntary compulsion” based on a widespread narrative of the effectiveness of this type of action. There also exists a dynamic, in which new activists start out idealistically but gradually become more attuned to rationales of effectivity. The activists who are the most supportive of the campaign often highlight how the approaches considered pragmatic have proven to be effective. However, what constitutes effectiveness and how it could be understood and measured in various ways is not a common topic of debate within the movement. Nevertheless, a few interviewees mention how they have considered potential biases. For example, Thomas:

“Organisations promoting the pragmatic approach also have an interest in this promotion (...) They are financed by their members, and they also get a lot of support from American funds. They are tied to the need to show results”.

This reasoning touches upon a dilemma of professionalised social movement organisations (SMOs): The interest in setting short-term measurable goals to establish a good track record and articulating this way of working as being the most effective. The dynamics of professionalisation leading to the prioritisation of tactics that support organisational longevity and fundraising have been problematised by Wrenn (2016; 2019), who also points out that the “non-profit industrial complex”⁵ puts organisations under a tremendous pressure to achieve victories and hide failures in order to prove their worth to funders. The mainstreaming of the organisations and their status as charities approved by the state to receive donations make it disadvantageous for them to appear too radical. Continuous highlighting of the achievements of short-term welfarist goals tends to naturalise the tactics’ effectiveness as common sense within the movement (Wrenn 2016). This may also be understood in a broader societal context of neoliberal ideas about effectiveness and efficiency in which all efforts must pay off in quantifiable measures within relatively short-term projects.

I have noted that the activists, who consider themselves more idealistic or radical, often motivate their assumed non-pragmatic activities by personal preferences, rather than competing interpretations of what constitutes effectiveness. For example, Mark:

“I think sometimes there is a tendency to talk disproportionately much about suffering. And not about humans’ attitudes towards other animals. The structures in which the oppression is embedded (...). Maybe I just have a preference for working with the aspect of humans’ fundamental views on other animals”.

This way, the movement may lack a language for evaluating goals, measures, and effectiveness from a grassroots perspective rather than premised on the logics of charities and nonprofits. It should be noted that many evaluations of nonhuman animal advocacy are conducted by professionalised movement organisations them-

⁵ See INCITE! 2017

selves or by initiatives such as Animal Charity Evaluators, which base their evaluations on a welfarist position, seeking to reduce suffering within existing systems, rather than evaluating potentials to foster systemic change. Academic research could contribute valuably to activist communities by conducting additional evaluations of effectiveness, such as further comparisons with tactics adopted by other social justice movements, whether historical or contemporary. Likewise, studies of different target groups' responses to actions that involve measures to achieve goals beyond reducing suffering would be insightful. Other aims, such as recruiting new activists through activism or developing action repertoires psychologically sustainable for the activists themselves are also relevant to discuss in relation to effectiveness. The activists can play an important role in the "translation" of such analyses into hands-on initiatives possible to implement in practice. Some activists have historically criticised rights and liberation-based theory for lacking sufficient practical guidance. Therefore, it would be advantageous for researchers to seek out and foster spaces for activist and scholarly knowledge exchange. Here, participatory action research, which seeks to initiate change by including field participants as co-researchers, could be a promising path.

Conclusion

Although the Turbo Chicken campaign could have caused disputes within the animal rights and liberation movement due to its highly 'new welfarist' approach, it has gained relatively broad support across the movement's various groupings. Two reasons for this have been suggested. First, an intra-movement frame transformation has created a hybrid position, which differs in certain aspects from the way 'new welfarism' was defined nearly 30 years ago. This position places welfare improvements in the periphery and acknowledges that such achievements are often insignificant in themselves. Instead, another crucial rationale plays a central role, namely the "production capacity argument" about targeting the producers on their production capacity through improved industry standards. In addition, most of the activists consider certain forms of new welfarist campaigning and anti-speciesist vegan outreach to be complementary rather than opposing solution frames. Instead of viewing the movement as sharply divided between new welfarist and abolitionist tactics, the activists draw the lines in alternative ways. Not just by placing their activities in the middle of a spectrum of tactics, but rather understood

within “landscapes of hybrid activism”: A tangled terrain where a considerable number of activists and organisations engage in new welfarist initiatives concurrently with numerous forms of more uncompromising activism. The second reason for the overall support of the campaign is a sort of “voluntary compulsion” based on a widespread narrative of the effectiveness of this type of action. However, what constitutes effectiveness and how it could be understood and measured in various ways is not a common topic of debate within the movement. Future academic research could contribute valuably to activist communities by conducting further evaluations of effectiveness from a grassroots perspective rather than premised on the logics of charities and nonprofits.

References

- Aaltola, E. (2011). The Philosophy behind the Movement: Animal Studies versus Animal Rights. *Society & Animals*, 19, 391-404.
- Aviagen (2022). *Ross 308*. <https://en.aviagen.com/brands/ross/products/ross-308>. Retrieved on August 19th 2022.
- Balcombe, J. (2009). Animal pleasure and its moral significance. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. Vol 118, issue 3-4.
- Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, (26), 611-639.
- Bourke, D. (2009). The Use and Misuse of “Rights Talk” by the Animal Rights Movement. In Sankoff, P. & White S. (Ed.) *Animal Law in Australasia: A New Dialogue*, Federation Press.
- Dahlager (2020). ”Største sejr for dyrevelfærden”: Danpo dropper turbokyllingen. In *Politiken*. <https://politiken.dk/forbrugogliv/forbrug/art7749838/Danpo-dropper-turbokyllingen> Retrieved on August 19th 2022.
- Danpo (2022). *Velfærdsprincipper*. <https://www.dedanskefamiliegaarde.dk/velfærdsprincipper>. Retrieved on August 19th 2022.
- de Villiers, J. (2015). Animal rights theory, animal welfarism and the ‘new welfarist’ amalgamation: A critical perspective. *Southern African Public Law*, 30(2), 406-433.
- Dombrowski, D. (1984). *The Philosophy of Vegetarianism*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- European Chicken Commitment (2022) <https://welfarecommitments.com/europeletter/>. Retrieved on August 19th 2022.
- Francione, G. & Charlton, A. (2015). *Animal Rights: The Abolitionist Approach*. Exemplar Press.
- Francione, G. & Garner, R. (2010). *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* Columbia University Press.
- Francione, G. (1996). *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement*. Temple University Press.
- Freeman, C. P. (2010). Framing Animal Rights in the “Go Veg” Campaigns of U.S. Animal Rights Organizations. *Society & Animals*, 18, 163-182.

- Gillespie, K. (2020) Animal Welfare. In Kobayashi, A. (Ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*.
- Giraud, E. H. (2021). *Veganism. Politics, Practice, and Theory*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- INCITE! (2017). *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Duke University Press.
- Oliver, C. (2021). *Veganism, archives, and animals. Geographies of a multispecies world*. Routledge.
- Phelps, N. (2007) *The Longest Struggle. Animal Advocacy from Pythagoras to PETA*. Lantern Publishing & Media.
- Pope, G. U. (2002 [1886]). *TIRUKKURAL. English Translation and Commentary*. Projekt Madurai.
- Schousboe, P. (2023): Trist: Tempoet for udfasning af turbokyllinger sættes ned. Dyrenes Beskyttelse: <https://www.dyrenesbeskyttelse.dk/artikler/trist-tempoet-udfasning-af-turbokyllinger-saettes-ned>. Retrieved on June 13th 2024.
- Stetsenko, A. (2013). The Challenge of Individuality in Cultural-Historical Activity Theory: “Collectividal” Dialectics from a Transformative Activist Stance. In *Outlines – Critical Practice Studies*, vol. 20, issue 2.
- Szűcs, E. et al. (2012). Animal Welfare in Different Human Cultures, Traditions and Religious Faiths. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, vol. 25, issue 1.
- Taylor, N. (1999). Whither rights? Animal rights and the rise of new welfarism. *Animal Issues*, vol. 3, issue 1, pp. 27-42.
- The Danish Parliament (2020). *Bemærkninger til forslaget. Forslag til folketingsbeslutning om at udfase produktion af turbokyllinger (Ross 308)*. Folketingstidende Tillæg 1A. Beslutningsforslag nr. B 17.
- The Danish Veterinary and Food Administration (2022) *Kyllingekød*. <https://www.foedevarestyrelsen.dk/Leksikon/Sider/Kyllingekod.aspx> Retrieved on August 19th 2022.
- Torres, B. (2007). *Making a killing. The Political Economy of Animal Rights*. AK Press.
- Véron, O. (2016). (Extra)ordinary Activism: Veganism and the Shaping of Hemeratopias. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 36(11/12), 756-773.
- Woodhall, A. & da Trindade, G. G. (2016). Saving Nonhumans: Drawing the Threads of a Movement Together. In Woodhall, A. & da Trindade, G. G. (Ed.), *Intervention or Protest: Acting for nonhuman Animals*. Vernon Press.
- Wadiwel, D. J. (2009). The War Against Animals. Domination, Law and Sovereignty. *Griffith Law Review*, vol. 18, issue 2, pp. 283-297.
- Wrenn, C. L. (2016). *A Rational Approach to Animal Rights. Extensions in Abolitionist Theory*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wrenn, C. L. & Johnson, R. (2015). A Critique of Single-issue Campaigning and the Importance of Comprehensive Abolitionist Vegan Advocacy. *Food, Culture & Society*, vol. 16, issue 4.
- Wrenn, C. L. (2019). *Piecemeal Protest: Animal Rights in the Age of Nonprofits*. University of Michigan Press.