

*Bachelor Thesis*

**Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare**

**Comparing advocacy strategies of respective social movement organizations in Germany**

Name:	Sebastian Dolfen
Subject:	Political Science
Institution:	Freie Universität Berlin: Fachbereich Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften Otto-Suhr-Institut
First examiner:	Dr. Ulla Pape
Second examiner:	Dr. Andreas Hofmann
Potential degree:	Bachelor of Arts (B.A.)
Semester:	6. Semester
Citation Style	Cite Them Right 10 <sup>th</sup> edition – Harvard
Words:	6499 (excluding bibliography)

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Social movements and social movement organizations .....	2
3. Theoretical differences between animal welfare and animal rights .....	3
3.1. Historical outline and ideological approaches .....	3
3.2. Characteristics of the animal welfare and animal rights movement .....	5
4. Advocacy strategies .....	8
4.1. The theoretical concept of advocacy .....	8
4.2. Ideology as a potential driver of distinctive advocacy strategies .....	9
5. Comparative case study .....	11
5.1. The cases .....	11
5.2. Document analysis .....	13
5.3. Discussion .....	16
6. Conclusion .....	18
Bibliography .....	20

## 1. Introduction

In a public poll in 2014, 43% of the respondents stated that they would be willing to pay higher prices to raise animal welfare in livestock farming in Germany (TNS Emnid, 2015). Another study from 2020 highlights that around 40% of the consumers consider species-appropriate treatment in animal agriculture as an essential buying criterium (statista.de, 2020). Furthermore, the number of vegetarians in Germany increased by 23% to 6.5 million people between 2016 and 2020 (Janson, 2021). Those numbers underline the growing importance of animal welfare and species-appropriate treatment in livestock farming in the German public discourse. All parties of the German Bundestag mention animal welfare and animal protection in their election manifesto for the federal election 2021. The CDU/CSU, for instance, wants to continuously promote innovation in animal agriculture through investments to enhance animal welfare in Germany (CDU / CSU, 2021). The Green party highlights the issues of livestock farming, in which animals are bred for industrial performance. The party wants to promote livestock farming, where fewer animals are held under better circumstances and higher animal protection standards (BÜNDNIS 90 / DIE GRÜNEN, 2021).

Besides political parties, nonprofit organizations actively shape the political agenda and engage in the public discourse around animal protection. The landscape of animal welfare and animal rights associations in Germany is diverse. The focus-topics of the various organizations range from farm animals, domestic animals and wild animals (Schulz, 2019). Furthermore, the organizations use different advocacy activities, which attempt to influence institutional elites and public policy in line with the organization's goals (Jenkins, 1987). Advocacy can include lobbying, public campaigns, public protests, or direct collaboration with policymakers (Almog-Bar, 2017). One way to cluster the variety of organizations is to analyze their ideological approach. Organizations can be ascribed to the animal welfare or the animal rights movement. Although both are animal advocacy movements and try to pursue animal interests in human society, they are ideologically distinct (Roscher, 2012). The paper's primary focus is to compare advocacy strategies of animal rights and animal welfare organizations in Germany, which leads to the following research question: Does the ideological distinction between animal rights and animal welfare lead to different advocacy strategies of respective social movement organizations?

The paper divides into four parts. The first part elaborates on literature around social movement theory to introduce important definitions and derive a structural frame that can cluster theoretical findings around social movement organizations. The next chapter provides a historical outline and an overview of the philosophical debate around animal welfare and animal rights. Consequently, ideological differences between the animal rights and animal welfare movements are being discussed. Key characteristics of each distinction are deductively derived from literature and clustered by applying the frame from social movement theory. The third part of the paper elaborates on the theoretical concept of advocacy. It introduces a definition and derives categories that can analyze the advocacy strategies of social movement organizations. Furthermore, it conceptually connects advocacy theory with ideologically distinctive animal welfare and animal rights characteristics to derive working hypotheses. The third part of the paper conducts a comparative case study of four German cases: 'PROVIEH e.V.', 'VIER PFOTEN', 'PETA Deutschland e.V.' and 'Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V.'. All cases are being characterized as animal rights or animal welfare by applying the specific movement attributes. To compare the advocacy strategies of both organizations, a qualitative document analysis of publically available material using the advocacy analysis categories is conducted. Based on the qualitative case study, the research question and the working hypotheses are discussed. Finally, a critical reflection of the findings is part of the discussion.

## 2. Social movements and social movement organizations

Before describing the ideological distinction between animal rights and animal welfare, the theoretical concept of a social movement and a social movement organization needs to be introduced. Snow et al. define social movements as "collectivities acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional or organizational channels for the purpose of challenging or defending extant authority" (Snow, Soule and Kriesi, 2004: 11). Scott and Marshall also highlight the importance of collective action in social movements, which usually intends to challenge grievances in an existing society (Scott and Marshall, 2009). According to Gillan's definition of social movements, collective action includes individuals, informal organizations, and formal organizations that share an identity (Gillan, 2019). Diana emphasizes that shared collective identity is the driving factor of leading an informal network into a political or cultural conflict, ultimately shaping a social movement (Diani, 1992). In summary, social movements comprise

individuals and organizations engaging in collective action based on a shared identity to challenge or maintain a status quo in an existing society.

According to Rohlinger and Gentile, social actors initially become involved in a social movement due to frustration, with which they cannot cope independently (Rohlinger and Gentile, 2017). Hence they have to organize themselves purposefully to collectively pursue a common goal (Scott and Marshall, 2009). McCarthy and Zald emphasize the importance of organizations within social movements. According to them, a social movement organization “is a complex, or formal, organization which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement those goals” (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1218). Rohlinger and Gentile determine a frame to analyze a social movement. First, the underlying conditions of the movement's emergence have to be discussed. Secondly, the movement's participants and reasons for participation are subjects of interest. Finally, the specific targets and their intended consequences must be analyzed (Rohlinger and Gentile, 2017).

### 3. Theoretical differences between animal welfare and animal rights

#### 3.1. Historical outline and ideological approaches

The following chapter first provides a short historical outline to give an idea of the roots of both movements. Afterward, a brief overview of the philosophical debate between welfarist theory and the theory of animal rights lays the foundation to describe the ideological distinction between the animal welfare and the animal rights movement.

First organized animal protection efforts were made in Great Britain in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The British ‘Act for prevention of cruel and improper treatment of cattle’ was the earliest law favoring animal welfare. Consequently, the first animal welfare association was founded in 1824 in Great Britain, called ‘Society for prevention of cruelty to animals’ (Uvarov, 1985). This led to the foundation of animal welfare associations in Germany, such as the organization ‘Vaterländischer Verein zur Verhütung von Tierquälerei’ (Roscher, 2012). The first German animal rights organization, called ‘Bund für radikale Ethik’, established itself in 1907 (Brucker, 2009). Nevertheless, animal rights were only discussed in small intellectual groups. In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, organizations tried to lobby for solutions to problems around livestock farming internationally

(Roscher, 2012). However, the Second World War pushed the issues around animal protection to the periphery of western discourses (De Villiers, 2017). Afterward, several animal welfare associations were founded in Germany in the 1970s (Roscher, 2012). Furthermore, new philosophical approaches, such as Peter Singer's utilitarian theory<sup>1</sup> and Tom Regan's 'Theory of animal rights' led to the emergence of the animal rights movement in the 1980s. The upcoming animal rights movement caused tension in the animal welfare movement, which had almost wholly focused on companion animals, simultaneously neglecting rights to farm animals (De Villiers, 2017). Internationally, the animal rights movement partially radicalized itself through militant groups, such as the 'Animal Liberation Front', which carried out acts of sabotage. As a reaction to such tendencies, the organization 'Deutscher Tierschutzbund', Germany's most prominent animal welfare representative, distanced itself from the animal rights movement. In 1994, the world's most prominent animal rights organization 'PETA', initially founded in the United States, started to engage in Germany (Roscher, 2012).

Animal welfare is based on utilitarian philosophy in favor of animal's interests. The first philosophical approaches, which were used in animal welfare, were introduced by John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham. In Mill's philosophy, "[...] the rightness or wrongness of an act [is] depended on the goodness or badness of its consequences" (De Villiers, 2017: 416). Frey argues that Mill's approach evaluates an act by assessing the consequent increase or reduction of welfare imposed on all beings influenced by the act. Nevertheless, Mill did not specifically mention animals as beings, which should be taken into consideration (Frey, 2011). According to Singer, Jeremy Bentham's stance on utilitarianism had a more significant impact on animal welfare. Bentham argued that the ability to suffer is crucial for the moral consideration of an act (Singer, 1990). Peter Singer was the first philosopher who specifically included animals in utilitarian thinking. He states that the ethical review of actions should take the interests of all sentient beings into account. In consequence, Singer's approach intentionally includes beings without human intellectual capacity (Singer, 1993). When transferring Singer's

---

<sup>1</sup> Although 'Preference utilitarianism' is based on the philosophical approach of utilitarian theory, which originally set the ideological foundations for the animal welfare movement, Peter Singer's work played an important role in the foundation of the animal rights movement (De Villiers, 2017). This is due to the fact, that Singer specifically focuses on the cruelties imposed on animals in livestock farming (Frey, 2011).

utilitarian approach into the animal welfare sphere, Frey States, practices like industrial livestock farming cannot be considered morally consistent, as they produce considerable pain to animals. However, Singer's argument does not neglect the utilization of animals in cases of appropriate traditional farming, which ultimately gives humans the moral permission to utilize animals (Frey, 2011). In consequence, only animal rights "[...] can serve to block appeals to the human collective good from overriding the interests of animals [...]" (Frey, 2011: 5). Villiers argues that animal rightists do not comply with utilitarian thinking, as they require moral rights for animals as a considerable requirement of evaluating the rightness of an act (De Villiers, 2017). The most influential animal rightist work was published by Tom Regan, who argues that animals are 'subject of life' like human beings, as humans and animals share "[...] physical pleasures and pain [...]" and psychological states, such as "[...] fear and contentment, anger and loneliness, frustration and satisfaction [...]" (Regan, 2001: 42-43). Other animal rightists, such as Chartier, argue in favor of legal animal rights, referring to animals' moral rights (Chartier, 2010). Villiers highlights that the main difference between the animal welfarist and the animal rightist approach is that rightists claim for animals to possess moral rights. Such a claim cannot be harmonized with the property status of animals in human societies, which is not fundamentally challenged by welfarist philosophers (De Villiers, 2017).

### 3.2. Characteristics of the animal welfare and animal rights movement

The animal welfare and the animal rights movement both share that they advocate for animals' interests, as animals do not have the intellectual capacity to pursue their individual preferences in human society. In consequence, human beings have to become representatives (Wrenn, 2012). Furthermore, Francione highlights that both movements claim to be working towards ending all animal exploitation in human society (Francione, 1996). Therefore, both movements can be described as animal advocacy movements. The highly altruistic concerns of animal advocacy movements might result in disincentives for humans to participate. However, the collective identity humans gain from participating in an animal advocacy movement overturns human self-interest. According to Gaarder, animal advocacy activists experience higher self-confidence and strengthened purposeful lives (Gaarder, 2008). Nevertheless, the previous chapter has emphasized that, although the distinction between both movements seems to be blurry

from a mainstream perspective, fundamental differences in the ideological approaches of the movements exist. Therefore, the following paragraph outlines a specific definition of the ideological approach of each movement, the factors of the movement's emergence, a description of the movement's participants, and each movement's respective targets and goals.

Francione describes animal welfare as a mainstream western movement, which tries to regulate animal exploitation in human societies (Francione, 1996). Animal welfare is an anthropocentric movement that puts human interests in animals over animals' interests (Roscher, 2012). According to the 'American Veterinary Medical Association', the animal welfare movement seeks to encompass "all aspects of animal well-being, including proper housing, management, disease prevention and treatment, responsible care, humane handling, and, when necessary, humane euthanasia" (Animal Welfare Council, no date). Due to societal grievances, such as the brutalities imposed on animals, the movement emerged as a social change movement seeking to alter humans' perception of how to treat animals (worldanimal.net, no date). In summary, the animal welfare movement can be defined as a mainstream social change movement based on an anthropocentric utilitarian approach trying to regulate animal exploitation in favor of animal interests. Roscher describes that animal welfare activists tend to focus on animals in the immediate environment of human beings (Roscher, 2012). Various participating organizations exist. Some pursue compassionate welfare activities, whereas others foster real social change (worldanimal.net, no date). The clear focus of the animal welfare movement has been on reform towards implementing legislation that improves the lives of animals (De Villiers, 2017). Francione emphasizes that the animal welfare movement strictly framed the abolition of animal exploitation, simultaneously maintaining the property status of animals. Nevertheless, the animal welfare movement does want to limit the rights of animal property owners. However, it does determine human interests over animals as more significant if they are assessed as more important as the animal's interests (Francione, 1996). The main goal of the movement is to improve the treatment of animals in human interaction. Consequently, welfarist reforms push for proper care and management guidelines in entertainment, industry, and sport (Animal Welfare Council, no date). Munro adds that the animal



welfare movement is usually characterized as moderate trying to leverage legal tactics to foster societal change (Munro, 2012).

On the other hand, De Villiers describes animal rights as a philosophy in which animals should be part of the community of rights holders (De Villiers, 2017). According to Regan, the animal rights movement rejects animals' utilization and seeks radical shifts in the relationship between animals and humans (Regan, 1983). Most importantly, the animal rights movement characterizes itself by the deconstruction of species barriers, which impose moral assessment resulting in inappropriate actions concerning animals in human society (Roscher, 2012). Historically, the animal rights movement grew out of the animal welfare movement. Hence, the movement also emerged as a social change movement seeking to change human's perception of animals radically. In summary, the animal rights movement defines itself by a "deontological ethic that grants nonhuman animals the right to privacy and freedom from human intrusion, seeking an end to domestication, enslavement, exploitation, and property [...]" (Freeman, 2010: 4). Animal rights activists usually represent a vegan lifestyle, which characterizes them as more radical than animal welfare activists from a mainstream perspective. Less radical activists do not assess human interests as standardly more important the animal interests (Roscher, 2012). Francione emphasizes that the goals of the animal rights movement cannot only be achieved by reform, as pursuing them entails the complete rejection of exploitative institutional practices (Francione, 1996). The movement's primary goals are to abolish animal utilization in science, animal agriculture, sport, hunting, and entertainment (Regan, 1983). Such efforts come with a consequential extension of animal rights and, subsequently, veganism as the only appropriate way of living (Roscher, 2012). Munro describes the animal rights movement as radical, using disruptive legal actions to promote fundamental societal changes (Munro, 2012). In summary, the animal welfare and the animal rights movement try to pursue societal changes in the interest of animals in human society by applying different ideological approaches. The following table provides an overview of each movement's key characteristics.

Category	Animal Welfare Movement	Animal Rights Movement
Ideological approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate mainstream social movement with an anthropocentric ideological approach to regulate animal exploitation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Radical social movement fighting for animal rights to end all forms of animal exploitation</li> </ul>
Emergence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emerged as a social change movement due to grievances in how humans treat and perceive animals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grew out of the animal welfare movement (also as a social change movement)</li> </ul>
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inspired by a collective identity that overturns self-interest</li> <li>Focus on animals in the direct environment to humans</li> <li>Organizations range from pursuing welfare activities to fostering social change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inspired by a collective identity that overturns self-interest</li> <li>Primarily represent a vegan lifestyle or do not perceive human interests as standardly more critical than animal's interest</li> </ul>
Movement Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislation that improves the lives of animals while maintaining the property status of animals</li> <li>Promoting principles on proper care concerning animals in entertainment, industry, and sport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete rejection of exploitative institutional practices → abolish utilization of animals in science, industry, sport, etc.</li> <li>Extension of legislative rights to animals</li> <li>Promoting veganism</li> </ul>

Figure 1: Characteristics of the animal welfare and animal rights movement

(Own depiction)

## 4. Advocacy strategies

### 4.1. The theoretical concept of advocacy

The following chapter defines the concept of advocacy by explicitly referring to nonprofit advocacy. Social movement organizations are usually nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, the chapter introduces categories to analyze the advocacy strategy of a social movement organization. A brought definition of advocacy is provided by Hopkins, who states that the term embraces every act, which intends to plead for or against a cause, ultimately promoting a position (Hopkins, 1992). Boris and Mosher-Williams emphasize the political aspect of advocacy by defining it as “[...] the term generally used to describe efforts to influence public policy” (Boris and Mosher-Williams, 1998: 488). Furthermore, Jenkins refers to nonprofit organizations, thus defining advocacy as “[...]”

any attempt to influence the decisions of an institutional elite on behalf of a collective interest” (Jenkins, 1987: 297). In summary, advocacy is an umbrella term, which comprises activities trying to convey an organization's political position to influence institutional decision-making bodies. Almog-Bar states that advocacy activities are usually pivotal for organizations representing disadvantaged groups in society to pursue societal change. Consequently, social movement organizations perceive advocacy activities as necessary instruments to help foster societal change within the organization’s environment. Furthermore, advocacy activities allow an organization to engage with its constituency, as they publically promote the organization's positions (Almog-Bar, 2017).

Mosley emphasizes that organizations should consider their advocacy strategies carefully to promote themselves in society. She categorizes advocacy activities in insider and outsider tactics. On the one hand, insider advocacy refers to activities that intend to change policy through direct exchange ‘inside the system’ with policymakers or institutions. That can embrace lobbying, direct collaboration, or participation in policy consultation (Mosley, 2012). Usually, insider activities are more effective in influencing public policy, as it allows an organization to actively recommend possible changes through direct access to decision making bodies (Almog-Bar, 2017). On the other hand, outsider activities “[...] refer to extra-institutional tactics that emphasize working outside the system, such as public education, mass media, protests, boycotts, and demonstrations” (Almog-Bar, 2017: 415). In summary, insider advocacy strategies aim to influence decision-makers directly, whereas outsider advocacy strategies aim to mobilize, change public opinion to create pressure, and expose grievances in public policy (Dür and Mateo, 2013). The outlined differentiation between insider and outsider advocacy strategies can serve as the basis for comparing different organizations' advocacy strategies.

#### 4.2. Ideology as a potential driver of distinctive advocacy strategies

The following chapter derives a conceptual connection between the ideologically dependent goals of animal advocacy organizations and the theoretical intentions behind choosing insider or outsider activities. As described in the previous chapters, animal welfare and animal rights have distinctive ideological backgrounds. In consequence,

respective organizations pursue different organizational goals in the interest of animals. On the one hand, animal rights organizations are characterized by an ideology that aims to abolish all forms of animal exploitation, which comes with complete rejection of all existing institutional practices of animal utilization in human society (Regan, 1983; Freeman, 2010). On the other hand, animal welfare organizations are part of a moderate social movement characterized by an ideology that seeks to regulate animal exploitation without questioning the superiority of humans over animals (Francione, 1996). Animal rights organizations are often perceived as radical from a mainstream perspective, hence complicating insider advocacy activities, such as direct collaboration with policymakers (Munro, 2012). Furthermore, animal rights organizations reject to reform existing institutional practices from inside the system. In contrast, animal welfare organizations are more in line with existing institutional systems due to their moderate anthropocentric ideology (Francione, 1996). Therefore, the paper postulates that animal welfare organizations rather tend to leverage insider activities to actively engage with policymakers to foster societal reforms in line with their organizational goals compared to animal rights organizations. This context leads to the first hypothesis:

***H1: Animal welfare organizations use more insider activities than animal rights organizations.***

In contrast, animal rights organizations reject all exploitative institutional practices, which leads to the assumption that the organizations need to pressure existing institutions from outside the system by changing public opinion and mobilizing new constituencies. Therefore, the paper supposes that animal rights organizations rather tend to pursue outsider activities to create momentum for fundamental societal changes in line with their organizational goals. This context leads to the second hypothesis:

***H2: Animal rights organizations tend to focus on outsider advocacy activities primarily.***

## 5. Comparative case study

### 5.1. The cases

The following chapter introduces the four German cases, which are the subject of the comparative case study: 'PROVIEH e.V.', 'VIER PFOTEN', 'PETA Deutschland e.V.' and 'Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V.'. All cases will be assigned either to the animal welfare or the animal rights movement based on the specific characteristics of the respective movements.

PROVIEH e.V. (PROVIEH) was founded in 1973 in Kiel. The organization claims to be Germany's most experienced animal welfare organization for farm animals (PROVIEH e.V., no date d). According to PROVIEH, the organization fights for proper care and against torturous holding conditions of animals in livestock farming, as they perceive animals as intelligent and sentient beings. PROVIEH states to advocate for all farm animals, ultimately supporting natural and sustainable agriculture in which animals are a respected part. The organization's primary goal is to enhance the keeping conditions in livestock farming to adapt them to the animal's needs. Furthermore, the organization claims to work realistically step-by-step towards its goals (PROVIEH e.V., no date b). PROVIEH can be assigned to the animal welfare movement, as they focus on reforming animal agriculture by regulating livestock farming in favor of animal interests. Although they perceive farm animals as sentient and intelligent, PROVIEH has an anthropocentric view of animal agriculture. They do not fundamentally question the property status of animals and human superiority. Furthermore, the organization can be characterized as moderate, as they state to foster animal welfare by uniting vegans, vegetarians, and omnivores. In addition, the organization wants to mediate between consumers, retail, politics, and farmers to advocate for animal's interests (PROVIEH e.V., no date d).

VIER PFOTEN was founded in 1988 in Vienna. The German organization is based in Hamburg. VIER PFOTEN is one of the most prominent animal welfare organizations globally, with subsidiaries in 16 countries. The organization's vision is a world in which humans and animals encounter each other with respect and compassion. The focus of VIER PFOTEN is on all animals that suffer under human influence, including domestic animals, farm animals, and wild animals (Schulz, 2019). Furthermore, the organization advocates for the humane treatment of all animals (VIER PFOTEN, 2020b). The goal of

the organization is to enhance the living conditions of animals under human influence gradually. They raise awareness and give concrete recommendations for reform on a legislation level. VIER PFOTEN states that a social consensus to achieve changes towards improved animal welfare in human society is of necessity. Hence, the organization works together with partners in science and the economy. Furthermore, VIER PFOTEN claims to try changing people's consumption behavior (VIER PFOTEN, 2019). Therefore, the organization can be characterized as an animal welfare organization, as VIER PFOTEN represents a step-by-step reformist approach to enhance animal welfare in human society. Furthermore, the organization highlights the importance of social consensus, which can be defined as a moderate mainstream strategy.

PETA Deutschland e.V. (PETA Deutschland) was founded in 1993 and partners with various other PETA organizations worldwide. According to PETA Deutschland, the organization works in the tradition of a social liberation movement to end speciesism, which causes discrimination and exploitation of animals justified by human superiority over animal species. PETA Deutschland tries to actively expose animal cruelty and fights for the end of animal utilization by fostering the establishment of animal rights (PETA Deutschland e.V., no date d). The organization's focus areas range from industrial livestock farming, animal testing, hunting, fishing to the fur industry (Hindemith, 2017). Furthermore, the organization actively supports veganism as an appropriate way of life (PETA Deutschland e.V., no date e). Therefore, PETA Deutschland can be assigned to the animal rights movement, as the organization rejects all forms of animal exploitation, ultimately pursuing the goal to abolish animal utilization in human societies. Furthermore, PETA Deutschland deconstructs the property status of animals by pushing for the broad establishment of animal rights and a vegan lifestyle.

Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V. (Deutsches Tierschutzbüro) was founded in 2013 in Sankt Augustin. Today the organization's main office is located in Berlin (Schulz, 2019). The organization envisions a world in which all living creatures are respected residing in their natural habitats. Furthermore, they pursue a scenario in which animals have the same rights and freedoms as human beings. The organization's focus areas are on industrial livestock farming and the fur industry. According to Deutsches Tierschutzbüro, those industries are responsible for the majority of cruelties committed to animals. Consequently, the organization primarily speaks up for farm animals. The organizational

goals are to expose animal cruelties and inform the public about the suffering of animals in animal agriculture (Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V., 2020). Furthermore, they claim to fight for the establishment of animal rights, as legislative rights would secure animals most sustainably. In addition, the organization supports a plant-based vegan diet, in which animals are no longer subject to exploitation and torturous living conditions. The organization claims to characterize itself as an animal rights organization (Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V., 2020). Deutsches Tierschutzbüro exhibits the typical characteristics connected to the animal rights movement. By pursuing the establishment of animal rights, the organization rejects the property status of animals. Furthermore, Deutsches Tierschutzbüro fights against all forms of animal exploitation, ultimately neglecting any utilization of animals in human society.

In summary, all four cases depict organizations that advocate for animal interests in human societies. PROVIEH and VIER PFOTEN are cases characterized as animal welfare organizations, whereas PETA Deutschland and Deutsches Tierschutzbüro are organizations belonging to the animal rights movement.

## 5.2. Document analysis

The following chapter contains the main findings of the document analysis, which elaborates on the advocacy activities of the 4 cases. Text samples of available information on the organization's websites and the latest annual reports serve as documents for the analysis. In case of PROVIEH, PETA Deutschland and Deutsches Tierschutzbüro the latest annual reports refer to 2020. The most recent annual report of the organization VIER PFOTEN refers to 2019. The findings concerning the advocacy activities of each organization are clustered using the analysis categories: insider advocacy activities and outsider advocacy activities. The guiding questions of the analysis are: How does the organization itself describe its activities? What are the most prominent advocacy activities of each organization?

The primary work at PROVIEH is done by experts and specialists in animal welfare (PROVIEH e.V., 2020). The subject experts focus on the following insider activities of the organization. PROVIEH seeks an open dialogue with representatives of agricultural businesses to foster advisory work to strengthen animal interests within the industry. The organization is part of agrarian committees, such as governmental working groups

or consulting committees (PROVIEH e.V., no date a). Furthermore, the organization actively engages in political decision-making on a national and state level in Germany. Experts of PROVIEH are part of the federal animal protection commission, which directly influences the ministry of food and agriculture in terms of new legislation. In addition, PROVIEH releases position papers addressing them directly to governmental institutions. Experts of the organization actively lobby through personal consultations with decision-makers in the context of political events. Finally, the organization is in an alliance with other animal welfare organizations, called 'Bündnis für Tierschutzpolitik'. The coalition forms an institution to bundle the voices of animal welfare organizations on a political stage, as it also publishes political position papers and seeks consultation with decision-makers (PROVIEH e.V., no date c). In terms of outsider activities, the organization releases information material distributed to the public to encourage more conscious consumption. Furthermore, PROVIEH organizes events and gives presentations to the public (PROVIEH e.V., no date a). Regular press releases inform citizens about urgent topics or ongoing legislation (PROVIEH e.V., no date c). Another essential part of the organization's work is public campaigns referring to specific issues, such as the 'Lasst die Sau raus'-campaign, which seeks to abolish pigsties in which pigs are kept in livestock farming. Such activities include public demonstrations, such as a demo on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of July in front of the German federal council (PRO Vieh e.V., 2021). PROVIEH claims that their political efforts, in which they actively engage in policy-making, and their public efforts, in which they inform the public, are the most important pillars of the organization's work (PROVIEH e.V., 2020).

VIER PFOTEN emphasizes the importance of social consensus to foster societal change. Hence, the organization actively engages in several insider advocacy activities such as lobbying on a national and international level. They claim to work with experts in medicine, agriculture, biology, and law to argue with representatives of industry and politics towards constructive solutions in animal welfare. For instance, the organization was part of the world climate conference in Madrid in 2019, where they pursued lobby activities and issued a position paper (VIER PFOTEN, 2019). Like PROVIEH, the organization VIER PFOTEN is part of the alliance, called 'Bündnis für Tierschutzpolitik' (Bündnis für Tierschutzpolitik, no date). Finally, the organization established a seal of approval called 'VIER PFOTEN Gütesiegel', marking products that follow specific animal



welfare standards (VIER PFOTEN, 2019). The organization's outsider advocacy activities primarily focus on public campaigns to inform citizens about grievances around animal cruelty in human society. Part of the public campaigns is several online petitions. As of September 2021, VIER PFOTEN has 19 running online petitions concerning several animal welfare topics (VIER PFOTEN, no date). Furthermore, the organization supports public citizen initiatives such as the European initiative 'End the cage age', which demands abolishing caging in livestock farming. VIER PFOTEN was able to raise over 350,000 signatures (VIER PFOTEN, 2019). Finally, the voluntary activists of the organizations participate in public demonstrations, such as the demo for animal welfare and sustainable agriculture in January 2020 (VIER PFOTEN, 2020a).

The animal rights organization PETA Deutschland employs various experts in the field of animal rights, which are actively engaged in insider advocacy activities. They consult politicians to foster progress towards more animal rights on the German national and state level. Furthermore, experts participate at the 'PETA Tierrechtskonferenz', a political forum to stimulate discourse around animal cruelty and animal exploitation in human societies. The organization is also part of 'PETA International Science Consortium', which various governmental institutions in Europe approved to discuss alternatives for animal testing. In addition, PETA Deutschland actively consults multiple businesses in the fashion-, food-, and car-industry to promote and introduce animal-friendly products (PETA Deutschland e.V., no date d). In 2020, PETA Deutschland pursued over 50 companies to introduce a seal of approval called 'PETA approved vegan', which marks animal cruelty-free products. On the other side, PETA sets a clear focus on outsider advocacy activities to apply pressure on political decision-makers and business representatives. For example, in 2020, various celebrities were part of a media campaign that depicted humans as livestock farming victims. Furthermore, PETA uses multiple media channels, such as TV, print, and radio to expose animal cruelties to the public. Postings on PETA Deutschland's Facebook account, which has over 600.000 followers, reached around 14 million people per month in 2020. Furthermore, PETA Deutschland's website had over 19 million clicks (PETA Deutschland e.V., 2020). As of September 2020, the organization has 60 running online petitions concerning various topics, such as a petition to grant fundamental animal rights directly addressed to the German Bundestag (PETA Deutschland e.V., no date a, no date c). Another big part of

the organization's outsider activities is public protest. In activists networks, PETA Deutschland has over 20,000 activists in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland that pursue public protests around various topics (PETA Deutschland e.V., no date b). Furthermore, PETA Deutschland provides information material around the vegan lifestyle on their website (PETA Deutschland e.V., 2020, no date e). Finally, the law department of the organization issues hundreds of criminal charges in animal cruelty cases every year (PETA Deutschland e.V., no date d).

The animal rights organization Deutsches Tierschutzbüro only uses outsider advocacy activities. Their main focus in 2020 was on undercover research to uncover cruelties in the livestock farming industry. They produce pictures and video material to inform citizens about torturous conditions in animal agriculture. The organization spreads the material via several media channels, including TV, print, radio, and social media. In 2020 Deutsches Tierschutzbüro issued over 2,000 stories which had a total reach of 680 million. Other outsider activities include public protest campaigns and online petitions, such as protests against the fur retailer 'Breuninger'. Over 68,000 signatures were collected which urged the retailer to abolish fur (Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V., 2020). Furthermore, Deutsches Tierschutzbüro provides info material for animal rights activism and outreach on their website. They actively urge people to participate in animal rights activism by joining an activism network. Via the network, they promote protests and demonstrations regularly (Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V., no date a). In addition, Deutsches Tierschutzbüro supports changing people's diets through their own vegan starter program (Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V., no date b). Finally, the organization has issued several criminal animal cruelty charges, such as a case against a slaughterhouse in Oldenburg, to encourage political change and push retailers towards distancing themselves from torturous conditions in the livestock farming industry. (Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V., 2020).

### 5.3. Discussion

To discuss the research question 'Does the ideological distinction between animal rights and animal welfare leads to different advocacy strategies of respective social movement organizations?' the following chapter elaborates on the two working hypotheses considering the findings of the document analyses. According to H1, animal welfare

organizations use more insider advocacy activities than animal rights organizations due to a moderate anthropocentric position. The examined animal welfare organizations highlight the importance of insider advocacy strategies. Both organizations employ experts in animal welfare and are well connected in the political and industrial environment. PROVIEH and VIER PFOTEN perceive it as essential to seek open dialogue and consensus with all parties involved in animal welfare, which clearly emphasizes the reformist approach of the animal welfare movement. Furthermore, the organizations work in various committees which are directly connected to political decision-makers. In the case of PROVIEH, the organization even has a direct link to the ministry of food and agriculture. In addition, the animal welfare alliance, in which both examined organizations participate, underlines their insider advocacy efforts. Compared to the contested animal rights cases, animal welfare organizations pursue more insider activities. However, PETA Deutschland also follows various insider activities. Although PETA Deutschland exhibits an abolitionist perspective on animal utilization, the animal rights organization does not reject consulting politicians and industrial stakeholders. Furthermore, the organization has a strong voice in various industries, as their seal of approval has been adopted by 50 different companies. The second animal rights case Deutsches Tierschutzbüro does not foster any insider advocacy activities on the other site.

H2 states that animal rights organizations primarily focus on outsider advocacy activities, as they want to pressure political institutions from outside the system. Both animal rights organizations clearly focus on outsider advocacy activities to expose cruelties to the public via various media channels, campaigns, and public protests. PETA Deutschland and Deutsches Tierschutzbüro aim to spread their messages to a broad constituency, as the organizations specifically mention how many people receive their content. Furthermore, both organizations actively call their audience to protest via their activist networks. The amount of online petitions PETA runs underlines the importance of outsider activities for the organization. Although PETA Deutschland performs insider activities, the organization's primary focus is on public campaigns. The animal welfare organizations PROVIEH and VIER PFOTEN pursue outsider activities, highlighting the importance of their campaigns and voluntary work on public events.

In summary, the examined animal welfare and animal rights organizations differ regarding their respective advocacy strategies. Whereas the animal welfare organizations have a balanced approach embracing insider and outsider activities, the animal rights organizations have a clear focus on outsider advocacy activities. In consequence, the qualitative comparative case study indicates that the distinctive ideologies of both movements lead to different advocacy strategies of animal welfare and animal rights organizations. However, other variables such as the organization's size and level of professionalization could explain why PETA Deutschland pursues insider advocacy activities on a recognizable level. Furthermore, the comparative case study findings are only based on data, which the examined organizations provided. Hence, the importance of how the organizations frame their work has to be taken into consideration. Data by third parties could underline the correlation between ideology and the type of advocacy strategies an animal advocacy organization pursues. Furthermore, to generalize the findings of the comparative case study, more cases need to be examined.

## 6. Conclusion

The paper compared advocacy strategies of animal welfare and animal rights organizations in Germany by conducting a comparative case study with 4 organizations. First, the animal welfare movement is a moderate movement with an anthropocentric approach, seeking to reform existing policies to enhance animal welfare. On the other hand, the animal rights movement has a more radical approach, which includes fighting for animal rights to abolish the exploitation of animals in human society ultimately. Secondly, the theoretical concept of advocacy was introduced, which differentiates between insider and outsider advocacy activities. Thirdly, based on the theoretical differences between animal welfare and animal rights, the 4 cases have been allocated to a specific movement. Finally, their advocacy strategies have been examined, applying the categories of insider and outsider activities.

The case study results indicate that the advocacy strategies of animal rights and animal welfare organizations are different due to distinctive ideological approaches. Animal welfare organizations pursue a balanced mix between insider and outsider activities, including lobbying efforts and direct collaboration with policymakers, and public

campaigns. Most importantly, they highlight the importance of a constructive discourse to reform policies to enhance animal welfare. Animal rights organizations primarily focus on outsider activities to reach as many people as possible via media campaigns and public protest, ultimately pressuring political decision-makers outside the system. The case study can be taken as a starting point to further elaborate on the implications of ideological differences between the advocacy strategies of movement organizations. Animal advocacy movements depict a perfect example, as both movements intend to change society for comparative purposes. A quantitative analysis is needed to strengthen further or invalidate the argument that ideological distinction correlates with different advocacy strategies in animal welfare and animal rights.

## Bibliography

- Almog-Bar, M. (2017) 'Insider Status and Outsider Tactics: Advocacy Tactics of Human Service Nonprofits in the Age of New Public Governance', *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 8(4), pp. 411–428. doi:10.1515/npf-2017-0020.
- Animal Welfare Council (no date) 'Welfare vs. Rights | Animal Welfare Council'. Available at: [https://www.animalwelfarecouncil.org/?page\\_id=16](https://www.animalwelfarecouncil.org/?page_id=16) (Accessed: 15 May 2021).
- Boris, E. and Mosher-Williams, R. (1998) 'Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations: Assessing the Definitions, Classifications, and Data', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(4), pp. 488–506. doi:10.1177/0899764098274006.
- Brucker, R. (2009) 'Tierrechte und Friedensbewegung', in Branth, D. and Mauch, C. (eds) *Tierische Geschichte - Die Beziehung von Mensch und Tier in der Kultur der Moderne*. 1st edn. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, pp. 268–285.
- BÜNDNIS 90 / DIE GRÜNEN (2021) *Bundestagswahlprogramm 2021*. Parteiprogramm. Berlin, p. 272. Available at: [https://cms.gruene.de/uploads/documents/Wahlprogramm-DIE-GRUENEN-Bundestagswahl-2021\\_barrierefrei.pdf](https://cms.gruene.de/uploads/documents/Wahlprogramm-DIE-GRUENEN-Bundestagswahl-2021_barrierefrei.pdf) (Accessed: 1 September 2021).
- Bündnis für Tierschutzpolitik (no date) 'Bündnis für Tierschutzpolitik'. Available at: <https://www.buendnis-fuer-tierschutzpolitik.de/> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).
- CDU / CSU (2021) *Das Programm für Stabilität und Erneuerung*. Parteiprogramm, p. 140. Available at: <https://www.csu.de/common/download/Regierungsprogramm.pdf>.
- Chartier, G. (2010) 'Natural Law and Animal Rights', *Canadian Journal of Law & Jurisprudence*, 23(1), pp. 33–46. doi:10.1017/S084182090000480X.
- De Villiers, J.-H. (2017) 'Animal Rights Theory, Animal Welfarism and the "New Welfarist" Amalgamation: A Critical Perspective', *Southern African Public Law*, 30, p. 406. doi:10.25159/2522-6800/3587.
- Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V. (2020) *Tätigkeitsbericht 2020*. Annual Report 6. Berlin: Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V., p. 44.
- Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V. (no date a) 'Aktiv werden für Tierrechte', *Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V.* Available at: <https://www.tierschutzbuero.de/aktiv-werden/> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).
- Deutsches Tierschutzbüro e.V. (no date b) 'Twenty4VEGAN - Vegan geht immer!' Available at: <https://twenty4vegan.de/> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).
- Diani, M. (1992) 'The Concept of Social Movement', *The Sociological Review*, 40(1), pp. 1–25. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.1992.tb02943.x.
- Dür, A. and Mateo, G. (2013) 'Gaining access or going public? Interest group strategies in five European countries', *European Journal of Political Research*, 52(5), pp. 660–686. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12012.
- Francione, G.L. (1996) *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement*. Temple University Press. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt14bs8gb> (Accessed: 1 July 2021).

- Freeman, C. (2010) 'Framing Animal Rights in the "Go Veg" Campaigns of U.S. Animal Rights Organizations', *Society and Animals*, 18, pp. 163–182. doi:10.1163/156853010X492015.
- Frey, R.G. (2011) *Utilitarianism and Animals*, *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Ethics*. Available at: <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195371963.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780195371963-e-7> (Accessed: 9 September 2021).
- Gaarder, E. (2008) 'Risk & Reward: The Impact of Animal Rights Activism on Women', *Society & Animals*, 16(1), pp. 1–22. doi:10.1163/156853008X269863.
- Gillan, K. (2019) 'Social Movements, Protest, and Practices of Social Change', in Ritzer, G. and Murphy, W.W. (eds) *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Sociology*. 1st edn. Wiley, pp. 301–318. doi:10.1002/9781119429333.ch18.
- Hindemith, H. (2017) 'Die großen Tierschutzorganisationen: Dafür stehen sie', *DeineTierwelt Magazin*, 30 October. Available at: <https://www.deine-tierwelt.de/magazin/tierschutzorganisationen/> (Accessed: 16 September 2021).
- Hopkins, B.R. (1992) *Charity, advocacy, and the law*. New York: Wiley (Nonprofit law, finance, and management series).
- Janson, M. (2021) *Rund 8 Millionen Deutsche essen kein Fleisch*, *Statista Infografiken*. Available at: <https://de.statista.com/infografik/24000/anzahl-der-vegetarier-und-veganer-in-deutschland/> (Accessed: 1 September 2021).
- Jenkins, J. (1987) 'Nonprofit organizations and political advocacy', in Powell, W.W. (ed.) *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McCarthy, J.D. and Zald, M.N. (1977) 'Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory', *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), pp. 1212–1241.
- Mosley, J.E. (2012) 'Keeping the Lights On: How Government Funding Concerns Drive the Advocacy Agendas of Nonprofit Homeless Service Providers', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(4), pp. 841–866. doi:10.1093/jopart/mus003.
- Munro, L. (2012) 'The Animal Rights Movement in Theory and Practice: A Review of the Sociological Literature', *Sociology Compass*, 6(2), pp. 166–181. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00440.x>.
- PETA Deutschland e.V. (2020) *Jahresbericht 2020*. Annual Report. Stuttgart: PETA Deutschland e.V., p. 16.
- PETA Deutschland e.V. (no date a) *Aktionsaufrufe*, *PETA Deutschland e.V.* Available at: <https://www.peta.de/aktiv/aktionsaufrufe/> (Accessed: 18 September 2021).
- PETA Deutschland e.V. (no date b) *Aktivennetzwerk und Streetteam – jetzt auf der Straße aktiv werden!*, *PETA Deutschland e.V.* Available at: <https://www.peta.de/aktiv/aktivennetzwerk-streetteam/> (Accessed: 18 September 2021).
- PETA Deutschland e.V. (no date c) *Grundrechte für Tiere – eine Kampagne von PETA Deutschland e.V.*, *PETA Deutschland e.V.* Available at: <https://www.peta.de/kampagnen/grundrechte-fuer-tiere/> (Accessed: 18 September 2021).
- PETA Deutschland e.V. (no date d) *Über PETA*, *PETA Deutschland e.V.* Available at: <https://www.peta.de/ueberpeta/> (Accessed: 15 September 2021).

PETA Deutschland e.V. (no date e) *Vegan Leben. Für die Tiere, Für die Umwelt*, PETA Deutschland e.V. Available at: <https://www.peta.de/lifestyle/> (Accessed: 16 September 2021).

PRO Vieh e.V. (2021) 'Lasst die Sau raus | PROVIEH'. Available at: <https://www.provieh.de/unsere-arbeit/kampagnen/lasst-die-sau-raus/> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).

PROVIEH e.V. (2020) *Jahresbericht 2020*. Annual Report. Kiel: PROVIEH e.V., p. 22.

PROVIEH e.V. (no date a) 'Fachliche Arbeit'. Available at: <https://www.provieh.de/unsere-arbeit/fachliche-arbeit/> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).

PROVIEH e.V. (no date b) 'Leitbild'. Available at: <https://www.provieh.de/ueber-uns/leitbild/> (Accessed: 15 September 2021).

PROVIEH e.V. (no date c) 'Politische Arbeit'. Available at: <https://www.provieh.de/unsere-arbeit/politische-arbeit/> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).

PROVIEH e.V. (no date d) *Über PROVIEH*. Available at: <https://www.provieh.de/> (Accessed: 15 September 2021).

Regan, T. (1983) *The case for animal rights*. 1. ed. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Regan, T. (2001) *Defending Animal Rights*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Rohlinger, D. and Gentile, H. (2017) 'Sociological Understandings of Social Movements: A North American Perspective', in, pp. 9–32. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-57648-0\_2.

Roscher, M. (2012) *Tierschutz- und Tierrechtsbewegung - ein historischer Abriss | APuZ, bpb.de*. Available at: <https://www.bpb.de/apuz/75820/tierschutz-und-tierrechtsbewegung-ein-historischer-abriss> (Accessed: 1 April 2021).

Schulz, C. (2019) 'Tierschutzorganisationen in Deutschland und weltweit', *CareElite*, 25 October. Available at: <https://www.careelite.de/tierschutzorganisationen-vergleich/> (Accessed: 5 September 2021).

Scott, J. and Marshall, G. (2009) 'social movements', in *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford University Press. Available at: <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199533008.001.0001/acref-9780199533008-e-2148> (Accessed: 8 September 2021).

Singer, P. (1990) *Animal Liberation*. New rev. ed. New York: Avon Books.

Singer, P. (1993) *Practical ethics*. 2. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. and Kriesi, H. (2004) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. 1st edn. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. doi:10.1002/9780470999103.

statista.de (2020) *Artgerechte Tierhaltung als Kaufkriterium in Deutschland 2020*, Statista. Available at: <https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/181355/umfrage/artgerechte-tierhaltung-als-kaufkriterium/> (Accessed: 1 September 2021).

TNS Emnid (2015) *BMEL-Umfrage Ergebnisbericht*. Bielefeld: Bundesministerium für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft, p. 20. Available at: <https://www.inform.de/fileadmin/Dokumente/PDF/TNS-Emnid-Umfrage-2014-Verbraucherverhalten.pdf>.



Uvarov, O. (1985) 'Research with animals: requirement, responsibility, welfare', *Laboratory Animals*, 19(1), pp. 51–75. doi:10.1258/002367785780890640.

VIER PFOTEN (2019) *Jahresbericht 2019*. Annual Report. Hamburg: VIER PFOTEN - Stiftung für Tierschutz, p. 47.

VIER PFOTEN (2020a) *Großdemo für eine tierfreundlichere und nachhaltigere Landwirtschaft, VIER PFOTEN Stiftung für Tierschutz in Deutschland*. Available at: <https://www.vier-pfoten.de/kampagnen-themen/themen/nutztiere/wir-haben-es-satt> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).

VIER PFOTEN (2020b) *Über VIER PFOTEN, VIER PFOTEN Stiftung für Tierschutz in Deutschland*. Available at: <https://www.vier-pfoten.de/ueber-uns/vier-pfoten> (Accessed: 16 September 2021).

VIER PFOTEN (no date) *Petitionen, VIER PFOTEN Stiftung für Tierschutz in Deutschland*. Available at: <https://www.vier-pfoten.de/helfen/petitionen> (Accessed: 17 September 2021).

worldanimal.net (no date) *The Animal Welfare Movement*. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-805247-1.00030-7.

Wrenn, C.L. (2012) 'Applying Social Movement Theory to Nonhuman Rights Mobilization and the Importance of Faction Hierarchies', 5(3), p. 19.