‘WE ARE ALL ANIMALS’: THE EMERGENCE OF THE GRASSROOTS NONHUMAN ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN İSTANBUL

by

SILVIA ILONKA WOLF

Submitted to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

SABANCI UNIVERSITY
AUGUST 2015

"We Are All Animals": the Emergence of the Grassroots Nonhuman Animal Rights Movement in Istanbul

APPROVED BY:

Ayşe Öncü
(Thesis Supervisor) .....

Ayşe Gül Altınay .....

Sezai Ozan Zeybek .....

DATE OF APPROVAL: 05.08.2015

ABSTRACT

‘WE ARE ALL ANIMALS’: THE EMERGENCE OF THE GRASSROOTS NONHUMAN ANIMAL RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN İSTANBUL

Silvia Ilonka Wolf

Turkish Studies, M.A. Thesis, 2015

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Öncü

Keywords: nonhuman animal rights movement, veganism, conversion, activism, alliance politics

Within merely a few years time a radical nonhuman animal rights movement with an explicitly vegan character has appeared on the activist scene in Istanbul and in other locations in Turkey. This thesis looks into some of its characteristics. How does a carnist turn into a nonhuman animal rights activist; what are the patterns that characterize the transition to a vegan lifestyle and recruitment into the animal rights movement? And what do these findings imply for the collective action frames that vegan missionaries in Istanbul employ to convert and recruit new people? Generally internal divisions within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul are based on differences regarding collective action frames, which lead activists to apply certain tactics and reject others. I suggest that the relatively late emergence of the animal rights movement in Turkey has enabled activists to look critically at what has gone wrong in the animal rights movement elsewhere. The critical perspective by animal rights activists in Turkey has led to the movement’s radical character and the concern on the part of activists to apply the “right” tactics. This also explains the high degree of awareness regarding other forms of discrimination than speciesism, such as sexism, heterosexism, racism, nationalism, and misanthropy. Nevertheless, internal frame disputes reveal that work remains to be done when it comes to avoiding other forms of discrimination within the movement. Critical intersectional voices are on the rise; pushing the movement for further self-improvement.

ÖZET

‘HEPİMİZ HAYVANIZ’: TABANLI İNSAN OLMAYAN HAYVAN HAKLARI HAREKETİNİN ORTAYA ÇIKIŞI

Silvia Ilonka Wolf

Türkiye Çalışmaları, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2015

Tez Danışması: Doç. Dr. Ayşe Öncü

Anahtar Sözcükler: insan olmayan hayvan hakları, veganizm, dönüşme, aktivizm, ittifak siyaseti

Sadece birkaç yıl içerisinde, özellikle vegan bir karaktere sahip radikal bir insan olmayan hayvan hakları hareketi İstanbul’un aktivist ortamında ve Türkiye’nin diğer bölgelerinde ortaya çıktı. Bu tez hareketin bazı özelliklerini incelemektedir. Bir karnist nasıl insan olmayan hayvan hakları aktivistine dönüşür; vegan yaşam tarzına ve hayvan hakları hareketine dahil olma sürecini niteleyen biçimler nelerdir? Bu bulgular İstanbul’daki vegan misyonerlerin harekete yeni insanlar katmak için uyguladıkları kolektif eylem planları hakkında ne ifade eder? Genellikle İstanbul’daki insan olmayan hayvan hakları hareketi içerisindeki fikir ayrılıkları kolektif eylem planları üzerinden şekillenmekte ve bu durum bazı aktivistlerin belli taktiklere yönelirken diğerlerini reddetmesine yol açmaktadır. Benim görüşüm, Türkiye’deki hayvan hakları hareketinin göreceli olarak geç ortaya çıkışı aktivistlerin eleştirel bir bakış açısıylaş diğer bölgelerdeki hayvan hakları hareketlerinin hatalarını incelemelerine olanak tanımıştır. Türkiye’deki hayvan hakları aktivistlerinin eleştirel bakışı hareketin radikal bir yapıya bürünmesine ve “doğru” taktikleri uygulama konusunda daha dikkatli olmalarına neden olmuştur. Bu durum aynı zamanda türcülük dışındaki cinsiyetçilik, eşcinsel ayrımcılığı, ırkçılık, milliyetçilik, misantrofi gibi diğer ayrımcılık formlarına dair yüksek farkındalığı da açıklamaktadır. Bununla birlikte, hareket içi planlardaki anlaşmazlıklar hareket içindeki diğer ayrımcılık formlarından kaçınmak için hala yapılması gerekenler olduğunu ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Çevreler arası eleştirel sesler yükseliştedir ve hareketi gelişme adına ileriye götürmektedir.

I dedicate this thesis to my beloved parents. To my father, Andre Wolf, who is physically not with us on Earth anymore but whom I always carry in my heart. And to my mother, Eva Zsuzsanna Tuboly, whose unconditional support and presence I deeply appreciate and enjoy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the two years that I spent at Sabancı University I have learned much more than I could imagine. I thank Sabancı University for this life-changing opportunity: for offering me a scholarship that enabled me to live for free at the campus, for the travel grant when I participated on the ASCA (Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis) workshop 2015, and for giving me the wonderful experience of being a teaching assistant in SPS (Humanity and Society). SPS truly broadened my horizons and I often recall Metin Kunt's and Saygın Salgırlı's inspiring lectures about world history. Another professor that I am highly indebted to is Halil Berktay. I thank him for every single lecture that he gave and for everything else that he has helped me with. His passion for history, his infinite knowledge on so many topics, and his exceptional teaching skills will always be an example for me. I thank Ersin Kalaycıoğlu for introducing me to Turkish Politics and for indirectly motivating me (through the final paper for the course) to participate on the WOCMES (World Congress for Middle Eastern Studies) 2014 in Ankara. I am grateful to Banu Karaca who encouraged me to write about the nonhuman animal rights movement in Turkey. Also Leyla Neyzi, whose passion for and dedication to sociological research I so admire, has greatly inspired and motivated me.

Of all the professors at Sabancı University I owe the most to Ayşe Öncü, my thesis supervisor. Her expertise in sociological research, her clever insights, and her endless enthusiasm have been invaluable for me. Without her this thesis would not have been written. I thank her deeply for introducing me to sociology in a practical way. She taught me things that I could not have discovered just through books. I also want to thank Ayşe Gül Altınay and Ozan Zeybek for reading and commenting on my thesis. Their insightful feedback and suggestions regarding my research will certainly guide me in my journey to a PhD position.

The staff of the journal Interface has also greatly contributed to this thesis. I thank them, and in particular Laurence Cox, for giving me a chance to publish my paper. Moreover, the comments that I received on the draft version did not only enable me to significantly improve that paper, they also guided me through the research for my thesis. I am forever thankful for this assistance and encouragement.

I would like to express my gratitude to ASCA (Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis) for letting me participate on their 2015 workshop themed 'Politics of Attachment'. There I met Eva Meijer, who gave me useful comments on my paper. Besides, by reading Eva's impressive work on human-animal relations (and also thanks to her suggestions and things she shared with me) I came across academic sources that have highly influenced my thesis. I would like to thank her for that. Special thanks to Priscilla Andrea Alamos Concha for letting me present my paper in her panel at WOCMES 2014 in Ankara. Not only did she give me an amazing opportunity, she also

encouraged me a lot in my academic ambitions. And even though we spent very little time together, I found in her a wonderful friend.

I sincerely thank Oğuzhan Çolak for helping me in the final days of the thesis with transcriptions and translations. Without his punctual work my thesis would have been left unfinished and incomplete. I thank Emine Arı for helping me with standardization issues and Ali Alipour for helping with style-related issues.

From the bottom of my heart I want to thank all the wonderful friends that I have met in Sabancı for supporting me, for having been on this Sabancı journey together, or for just being there. In particular Sona Khachatryan with whom I have numerous times shared my enthusiasm for Sabancı's education. Sona, thank you for helping me with translations from Turkish (I hope one day my Turkish will be as good as yours!) and thesis standardization issues. Thank you for always believing in me and for encouraging me to think outside the box and to push the limits of what I thought was possible. But most of all thank you for being the wonderful person you are and for having been part of my Sabancı time. It would not have been the same without you. My dear friend Sultan Toprak: thank you for the fun cooperation as my teaching assistantship partner in my first year of study. How I miss those times. And Aslı Unan, I really enjoyed our working together in my second year of study. Thanks for everything. Laleh Eskandarian, I am so grateful that we became roommates. Thank you for your friendship and for the delicious Iranian rice cakes and other dishes. You introduced me to a whole new world. Handan Balkan, we started at Sabancı together and I am so happy to know you. It was fun to pass through all the different stages together. Thanks for your friendship and for helping me out with Turkish when I needed help. Robert Alan Elliot, your enthusiasm for history and languages along with your ambition and positive energy truly inspire me. It was great to work with you during the summer semester for SPS. Thanks for all the good times; your company has certainly contributed to a joyful final semester at Sabancı. Serkan Ilaslaner, thank you for all the interesting conversations and for giving me useful suggestions for one of my thesis chapters. Without your advice that chapter may have failed. I would like to thank other Sabancı friends too, among them Kübra Iyiiş, Fahad Sohrab Yousafzai, Marloes Cornelissen, and Bahar Imaanlou, for bringing color to the campus (and other people whom I met here and whom I do not all mention by name, thank you all!). I also want to thank Kübra for being so kind to translate my abstract to Turkish. I thank my office mates Sevdenur Köse and Merve Beydemir for their pleasant company. I wish I could have spent more time with all of you but even though the time we spent was limited, it is nice to know you. Also my nonhuman Sabancılı friends deserve to be mentioned, especially Zeki for accompanying me in the office time and time again. And Zeynep the dog, you could manage to put a smile on my face even in the darkest moments.

This thesis would have been impossible without the enthusiastic cooperation of many nonhuman animal rights activists and other vegans in Turkey. All the people who participated on the interviews or who helped me with my research in any other kind of way: thank you so much. I do hope that I represented your contributions in an accurate

way. In case any misrepresentation or misanalysis has occurred, please forgive me. Entering your world has been an amazing experience. I thank you all for being so kind to share valuable information with me. Connections with some of you have extended beyond research for my thesis; thank you for the great times and for your loving friendship.

I would like to thank my friends and relatives in the Netherlands, Belgium, and other countries for supporting me, (many of whom I will not mention by name here but to whom I am nevertheless very thankful), in particular Adrianne Francisca Waldt, Patricia Dreier-Gligoor, and Viviane Langner. Despite the distance between us, your support has nevertheless contributed to this thesis, as well. Special thanks to my aunt Ineke Wolf. If it was not for her financial support I would have never even began this study. I am deeply grateful for her faith in me and for her never-ending encouragement and enthusiasm.

I express gratitude to my partner, Ammar Younus, who from the beginning has always supported my study dream, even thought it meant I had to move far away. The same goes for my mother, Eva Zsuzsanna Tuboly, whose support goes beyond words and who means the world to me. I thank her for always being willing to listen to or read my work and to talk about my study interests and anything else. I also thank her for letting me live in her house for months when I was in the Netherlands and for all the years of support on so many different levels. I thank my brother Imre Wolf and his girlfriend Khrizel Ann Abilero for their loving brother/sisterhood. I thank my dog Fiedel, who is not on Earth anymore but whose loving companionship I cherish every day. I thank my father, Andre Wolf, for passing on his love for history to me, for believing in me, inspiring me and encouraging me. Even though you had to leave us on Earth, you have never really left us. Thank you for everything.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Prologue: The birth of a new movement in Istanbul

It was in May 2010 that I had my first encounter with the city of Istanbul. As an ethical vegan with nonhuman animal rights close to my heart I began a discovery of the animal rights scene in this metropolitan city. I ate out in a few vegetarian restaurants, I met several vegetarians through the travel website Couchsurfing and I volunteered for the nongovernmental organization HAYTAP (Hayvan Hakları Federasyonu, Animal Rights Federation): the only animal rights organization that I found through online searching at the time. I did develop some dubious thoughts about HAYTAP, since the few employees and volunteers that I met of this organization were not vegetarians. They were vehemently protecting dogs while eating animal species they considered edible such as cows. In this period I was also a frequent customer at a little organic shop that sold vegan foods. The owner of this shop was the only vegan that I met in Istanbul during my first visit.

When I moved from Amsterdam to Istanbul in the fall of 2013 things seemed to have become quite different. Some of my friends who were previously vegetarian had become vegan, small grassroots nonhuman animal rights groups with an explicitly vegan character were mushrooming and regularly organizing street protests,[1] and vegan festivals were not uncommon. I even came across the letters 'Vegan Ol!' (Go Vegan!) painted on a public wall. And in September 2013 the first Turkish book about veganism, written by Zülal Kalkandelen and Cem Başkent, was published.[2] It was a pleasure to witness these developments. I was also relieved to find that the little shop with the vegan owner, Ecolife, still existed. However, something interesting had happened: while the shop still had the same owner its name was no longer Ecolife; it was now Vegan Dükkan (Vegan Shop). It seemed as if in between the periods that I visited Istanbul a vegan revolution had taken place in the city; a vegan revolution that had forever changed activist consciousness in Istanbul's effervescent streets and squares.

[1] Later I found out that one of the groups, Freedom to Earth, was in fact established in 2010 (perhaps after my visit to Istanbul). Vegan Collective was also found around that time.
[2] Veganizm: Ahlakı, Siyaseti ve Mücadelesi. (Veganism: its Ethics, its Politics and it Struggle). For more information on this book see: http://propagandayayinlari.net/vegan.html.

But what had really happened in those few years? What had led to the emergence of a seemingly vibrant nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul? And how can we make sense of this movement? These are among the questions that I seek to answer through this thesis. After having spent a few months in the field and having spoken with various activists I can reflect on my first visit to Istanbul as a time in which the seeds of the animal rights movement were being planted in Turkey. As I am writing this thesis, anno 2015, those seeds have grown into a young tree, still small yet full of energy, determined and intending to keep growing. The tree has become diverse with different branches, some of them heading in their own preferred directions. But in its essence, all these branches still belong to the same tree. The tree is a metaphor for how I see the animal rights movement in Istanbul. This thesis aims to give an accurate account on how this social movement is developing in all its plurality. I hope to shed light on how it constructs a culture of resistance and how it attempts to make the invisible – that is: oppression of nonhumans by humans – visible.

The Nonhuman Animal Rights Movement in Perspective
Veganism, carnism, and speciesism

Social movements and subcultures are products of the society in which they emerge. Activists define themselves in relation to what they are not. An ethical vegan for example defines him or herself as someone who – contrary to most people – views nonhuman animals as persons instead of resources and therefore refuses to use them. For this reason we need to understand how individuals who are part of a social movement or a subculture relate to society. A critical, reflexive approach regarding the dominant cultural habits and ideologies is necessary to see these dynamics. When we do this it appears that the question 'why do people become vegan?' can be turned around into the questions: 'why do most people use nonhuman animals? More specifically, why do they consume nonhumans and their products?'[34]

[3] There are of course other ways than consumption that humans use other animals. Entertainment purposes (zoos, circusses) is another example. But here I am going specifically into the food aspect because it is the type of use which is defended and taken for granted the most.
[4] Here I am not asking why humans started using other animals thousands of years ago, but I am asking why they still use nonhumans today, in an age where everything is questioned.

The questioning of meat consumption was already asked in the first century BCE by the Greek essayist Plutarch in his ”De esu carnium” (On eating meat) where he commented on Pythagoras’ ethical vegetarianism (Desaulniers and Gibert, 2013). In this essay Plutarch pointed out the inconsistencies and false beliefs around meat consumption, i.e. the assumptions that it is “necessary” and “natural”, which he then refutes (ibid). Animal rights advocate Peter Singer, too, argued for a questioning of not only our eating habits but also our thoughts and language that underpin that habit (ibid). They are all symptoms of a deeply entrenched ideology. In 2001 Melanie Joy coined the word ‘carnism’ to denote this ‘invisible ideology that conditions us to eat certain animals’. Joy points out that eating nonhumans is a choice and that choices always stem from beliefs. She also argues that carnism is both a dominant and a violent ideology and that it runs counter to core human values such as compassion, justice, and authenticity.[56]

To justify their engagement in nonhuman animal exploitation people have developed defense mechanisms. Joy refers to this as the ‘three N’s’: the assumptions that eating other animals is (a) normal, (b) natural, and (c) necessary. These myths have become institutionalized and consequently internalized by many. Socialization into this system already begins in childhood. It often prevents young children from making the switch to a vegetarian or vegan diet when they intuitively make the connection between meat and animals. Once a child has been socialized into carnism it becomes a “habitualized action” (Pallotta 2005, 142). This means that ‘a comfortable familiarity occurs and the matter is no longer, in most cases, questioned or even consciously chosen; the choice has been made to seem inevitable by successful socialization’ (ibid).[7]

Carnism can be seen as a sub-ideology of the larger ideology of speciesism.[8] Speciesism, a term that was coined by Richard Ryder in the 1970s and popularized by Peter Singer, is a discriminative ideology based on species membership. It is ‘the ideology in which we place animals or species in a moral hierarchy, with humans at the

[5] Joy, 2014: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0VrZPBskpg
[6] In the nonhuman animal rights community in Istanbul Joy’s notion of carnism (in Turkish *karnizm*) has already become a common concept and part of their linguistic repertoire.

[7] In chapter one we will see that myths regarding the consumption of flesh and animal products usually challenge vegan animal rights activists in their switch to their new lifestyle, as well as in their interaction with mainstream society, friends, and family.
[8] Mahalodotcom. (2011, September 8). *Difference Between Carnism and Specism with Melanie Joy*. Retrieved June 25, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=meTtKAXplko.

top' (ibid). Speciesism legitimizes the use and the systematic exploitation of nonhuman animals by human animals. Carnism and speciesism are of course not the only hierarchical ideologies in society that are taken for granted. When it comes to systems of oppression, privileged social groups often have a hard time admitting to it, if they recognize it at all. Just like speciesism, social structures like patriarchy and white privilege are usually sustained by unawareness of it. Bob Torres (2007) compares awareness-raising about these issues to 'trying to explain water to a fish'. Most people on the planet today enjoy the species privilege on a daily basis but relatively few people are aware that engaging in this system of power and hierarchy is in fact a choice. Looking at human-animal relations critically reveals that as human animals we dominate other animals and we tend to normalize this domination. We force them into producing for us and thereby deny their right to freedom, sovereignty, and even their right to live (Torres 2007).

Just like carnism and speciesism are ideologies, so is ethical veganism. Carnism and speciesism are the dominant ideologies within society while veganism 'represents an alternative ideology and lifestyle' (Hamilton 1993, cited in McDonald 2000, 3). A vegan is 'a person who avoids using and consuming animals and animal products for any purpose, including food, clothing, and entertainment'.[9] This definition reveals very clearly that veganism is more than just a diet and that it 'encompasses all aspects of daily living' (Stepaniak 1998, cited in McDonald 2000, 3).[10] Many of the choices that we make in our daily lives, including our eating habits, are determined by the culture we grow up in. Whether we eat nonhumans and their reproductive excrements is one such example. Most of us that live in the world today are socialized into eating flesh, dairy and eggs, but some of us make the choice at some point in our lives, to give up on these products for ethical reasons. How many people have adopted ethical veganism is difficult to say; statistic data on vegans is still very limited. However, it is easy to see that at this point in history the vegan ideology and lifestyle is adhered to by only a small minority of the world population. A survey from the year 2007 estimated that around 0.3 percent of UK-citizens was vegan at that time. Research on vegans in the United

[9] Pamphlet: 'Respecting animals means going vegan', http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/media/links/p216/pamphlet.pdf, 27 June 2015.

[10] This thesis focuses on ethical veganism because ethics is what motivates nonhuman animal rights activists to adopt a vegan lifestyle. However, there are also people who choose a vegan lifestyle for environmental reasons, human rights (in relation to the unequal division of food and the large quantities of food that is needed to produce animal flesh and animal products), health reasons, or spiritual reasons. Thus, the vegans that I interviewed for this thesis are part of a larger "universe" of veganism.

States, published on the same website, suggests that vegans make up around 1 percent of the US population.[11] There is no data yet on the amount of vegans in Turkey.

Animal rights / animal liberation activist does not equal "animal lover"!

Activists use different terms to refer to the nonhuman animal rights movement. This has largely to do with the different philosophies and the factionalism that arose out of that. Using one common name to refer to all of these groups and activists inevitably brings about controversies. Some of the activists that I have studied in Turkey use the terms "animal rights" and some use "animal liberation". Movement outsiders however, particularly the media, commonly use the term "animal lovers" (hayvansever), a rather misleading term which is disliked by many of the activists themselves. One of my interviewees, M. Keser (a pseudonym), thinks that "animal loving" has no effect politically. Moreover, as he points out in his presentations about speciesism, this label misrepresents the movement. Keser argues:

> Why would an animal rights activist call himself or herself as lover? Imagine a disabled rights activist is called disabled lover or feminists as women lovers. Funny but this degrades the movement. Love belongs to our hearts but it is relative. Animals already have rights, lover or non-lover all must respect. We try to give them back their stolen rights. Even hunters claim that they are animal lovers. So loving animals is loving unconditional ownership and superiority, privilege to kill when wished.

Keser's critique relates to a problem that has to do with framing the animal rights movement. It illustrates that using the term animal lovers is not only a misconception but that it can even be risky to attribute love to the plight of nonhuman animal rights. Loving nonhuman animals can be subject to many different interpretations. People can claim to love their dog yet justify eating other animals because they have not known that animal personally. Or they can justify the choice to eat cows, pigs, and chickens because these animals do not look "cute and lovable". It is a lot more consistent and persuasive to frame the cause of nonhuman animal rights as a problem of justice rather than as something as arbitrary as love.

[11] 'Vegan Research Panel: Vegan Statistics', www.imaner.net/panel/statistics.htm, accessed 27 June 2015.

The reason that this concept of hayvansever has influenced the public identity of nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey has to do with the history of the movement. Getting organized with the aim of helping nonhumans started out as a concern for stray animals, mainly cats and dogs.[12] These people called themselves hayvansever. Up until this day self-defining animal lovers who focus mostly on cats and dogs still exist but are not among the people that this study focuses on.[13] The majority of animal lovers are not vegan and many are not even vegetarian. The biggest organization that appeals to animal lovers is the nongovernmental organization HAYTAP (Hayvan Hakları Federasyonu, Animal Rights Federation). HAYTAP presents itself as an "animal rights" organization. "Animal rights" suggests that the organization has adopted a clear anti-speciesist stance. In reality however, most of its campaigns focus on stray animals and horses. Besides, its policies generally reflect a welfare-oriented, reformist approach instead of an abolition-oriented rights-based approach. Efe, one of the activists that I spoke with explained that the appropriation of the term animal rights by HAYTAP has decreased the popularity of this concept among grassroots nonhuman animal rights activists and is the reason they prefer to say "animal liberation" instead. When I asked Gülce (one of the nonhuman animal rights activists that I have interviewed) which term would be the most suitable to describe the animal rights movement in Istanbul she gave the following answer:

> If I were to write about the movement in Turkey, I would say, it was 'animal rights' first, then it turned to 'animal liberation', now it's getting back to 'animal rights'.
> For a very long time, the term 'animal rights' is only used for the rights of cats and dogs. When it started to be realised that there are lots of animals suffering because of humans, the term 'animal rights' is rejected and animal people started to use the term 'animal liberation', which was taken from Peter Singer. The thing is, Peter Singer is not a vegan and he promotes 'happy' exploitation. And now vegans are getting the term 'animal rights' back from the narrow area it pointed for a long time, and expand it to all animals. That's why it's better to use the term 'animal rights' for the movement in Turkey, because many of the animal people are vegan, as it is required to be (cited in Wolf 2015, 43).

[12] This is not unique to Turkey. The nonhuman animal rights movement also started that way in Britain.
[13] To avoid generalization it must be said that sometimes these identities do overlap. There are vegans who call themselves hayvansever. They are usually people who are not very attached to a specific animal rights philosophy. Sometimes they are embedded in hayvansever groups or networks. Such groups occasionally have joint demonstrations with animal rights groups, for example when the campaign involves stray animals or horses. One of my interviewees told me that the majority of hayvansever is female and older. He remarks that, while their approach differs from animal rights or animal liberation, their labor is nonetheless very important. They put a lot of effort in feeding stray animals and countering officials.

For the sake of this thesis I will use the term nonhuman animal rights movement[14] or animal rights movement when I write about the movement that I have studied in Istanbul. It must be said however that many activists still use the term animal liberation.[15] This is not only because of HAYTAP's appropriation of it; it has to do with the fact that the vegan anarchist philosophy and the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) became popular in Turkey; these factions both speak about "animal liberation".[16]

Moderate versus radical

As Gülce mentions, animal liberation is not a favorable term because of the association with Peter Singer. Singer is a nonhuman animal rights philosopher from Australia. In 1975 he published his book Animal Liberation in which he proposed a utilitarian approach to animal ethics. His work became the philosophical foundation for much of the present-day (mainstream) animal rights movement, to the extent that he is sometimes called 'the father of the animal rights movement'. The rejection of Peter Singer's approach by most animal rights activists in Turkey and the reference that Gülce makes to "happy exploitation" cannot be understood without being familiar with the animal welfare versus the animal rights division. While animal welfare aims at improving the treatment and thereby reducing the suffering of nonhumans, animal rights holds that slavery of nonhumans should be abolished altogether. What makes it confusing however is that much of the modern animal rights organizations see the reform of animal use as a tool to eventually achieve abolition of animal use. This framework and perspective is called "new welfarism" by activists who see it as ineffective.[17]

The welfarist framework has become the dominant discourse within the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement globally. Although large, professionalized mainstream organizations have the power to shape the movement's agenda and public perceptions (Wrenn, 2015) the last few decades have seen an upsurge in radical animal

[14] I often use "nonhuman animals" instead of "animals" in order to avoid a speciesist language that denies the fact that humans are an animal species as well.
[15] In chapter two when I describe the collective action frames the reason for this will be more clear.
[16] There are also many who use both animal rights and animal liberation interchangeably. Other popular terms that I heard activists in Turkey use are more general concepts such as "animal movement" and "animal people" (meaning: the activists). Another common term is the "vegan movement".
[17] The term "new welfarism" was coined by Gary Francione. In chapter two I will discuss this topic further. Yates calls Singer's utilitarian approach 'a radical version of welfarism'. For more information about see Roger Yates: httkp://roger.rbgi.net/singer%20regan%20francione.html.

rights facions, as well. David Naguib Pellow (2014) suggests that the emergence of these radical factions can partially be traced back to activists being frustrated with the mainstream animal rights movement.[18] This frustration is caused by the mainstream movement's 'lack of awareness of and commitment to anti-oppression politics, an embrace of state-centric and market-oriented "solutions", and a rejection of aggressive direct action tactics' (Pellow 2014, 4). Furthermore, because of its compromising attitudes the mainstream movement tends to promote reductionist alternatives to veganism, such as decreasing one's meat consumption, buying flesh and products from animals that have supposedly been treated 'humanely', and in some cases a vegetarian lifestyle. Instead of framing veganism as an ethical necessity for animal rights these organizations have taken over the media's depiction of veganism as unnecessary, difficult, and extreme.

Radical nonhuman animal rights groups in Turkey

In Turkey it is HAYTAP that represents this moderate stream of the animal rights movement. The groups and activists that I study, on the other hand, can be categorized as radical animal rights factions. In popular discourse radicalism has attained negative connotations and it is often mistakenly confused with extremism (Dominick, 1997). However, what a radical style of approach really means is seeking out the root of a problem instead of making concessions (ibid, Pellow). In the case of the nonhuman animal rights movement this means employing discourses, frames, and tactics that aim at abolition of animal use, not regulation. From 2010 onwards radical nonhuman animal rights groups have emerged in Istanbul and in other Turkish cities and towns. These groups have arisen only very recently after the establishment of HAYTAP in 2008. I believe that this is the reason that radical animal rights activists in Turkey do not face the same hegemonic exclusion as their American and European counterparts. The latter have to deal with powerful, institutionalized mainstream animal rights organizations that have been around for decades, while the former do not[19]. The nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul is highly self-critical in character, continually seeking self-improvement. Activists attempt to engage in tactics that are effective, authentic, and not

[18] His study includes the environmental movement, where a similar development has been observed.
[19] There have of course been small local grassroots animal welfare organizations for much longer that are now all fused in HAYTAP, but these organizations have focused more on protecting and sheltering stray animals than on monopolizing the public opinion with regard to nonhuman animal rights.

contradictory to their goals. Past mistakes made by the animal rights movement in Europe and the United States are to be avoided. Turkey's animal rights movement started late but, as we will see, this may have proved to be a huge advantage with regard to its character, and not the least with regard to the spread of veganism in the country.

Literature review and possible contributions

The recent decade has witnessed an increase in studies on the nonhuman animal rights movement. Despite this relative abundance in studies, the quality of the literature is still rather limited in my experience. The main problem that I find in these studies is that many of them tend to generalize the nonhuman animal rights movement, which seems to be caused by their focus on mainstream organizations. Important differences between moderate and radical animal rights factions are often ignored or taken for granted. Fortunately there are exceptions to this. The articles of Corey Lee Wrenn have been particularly helpful for me to understand more about the fallacies of the mainstream movement while it also provided a good analysis of the abolitionist vegan perspective, a faction whose influence is on the rise in Istanbul. Garrett M. Broad's article "Vegans for Vick: Dogfighting, Intersectional Politics and the Limits of Mainstream Discourse", Emily Gaarder's work on gender and the animal rights movement, and Bob Torres' book Making a Killing: the Political Economy of Animal Rights (2007) also employ a critical perspective toward the movement and its tactics. Likewise, Will Kymlicka's and Sue Donaldson's articles provide innovative analysis of why the animal rights movement has thus far failed to make any impact on the larger Left. While all these scholarly works are very helpful, most of them are aimed at making suggestions for the animal rights movement to improve itself (hence their criticism toward the mainstream organizations and their tactics) rather than giving a detailed analysis of radical grassroots activism. David Naguib Pellow's Total Liberation: the Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement (2014), however, focuses on the activism of radical factions in the United States that have adopted the anarchist total liberation framework, many of whom support the underground Animal Liberation Front (ALF) method. It is one of the few academic works known to me, in addition to Steven Best's and Anthony Nocella's work, which represent the ALF in a favorable way. This is in stark contrast to many studies, that have taken over the state's, the media's and the

mainstream movement's labeling of ALF's property destruction methods as terrorism. The more critical researchers who comment negatively on ALF, such as Wrenn and Torres among others, refrain from using the terrorist label and provide valid arguments why they are opposed to this type of direct action.[20]

A second critique that I have toward the literature on the nonhuman animal rights movement is in terms of their limited geographical scope. Nearly all of the studies deal with the movement in the Anglophone countries, mostly the United States and Britain. I have come across a few articles that write about the movement in other Western-European countries, for example France and Sweden. Scholarly publications on the animal rights movement in other geographies than the Anglophone countries and Western-Europe are by my knowledge very limited or practically non-existent. [21] This has partially to do with the fact that the modern animal rights movement in "Western" countries has a much longer history. But the 'belatedness' of other geographies raises an interesting question: what have newly emerging nonhuman animal rights movements in other parts of the world learned from mistakes made in the countries where the movement first arose? This is one of the central questions in this thesis.

A weakness of my research is that, partially due to the one-sided literature, I lack insight on the significance of radical grassroots movements in other countries than Turkey. This makes it difficult to make comparisons, which is why in this study I can only compare between countries to a certain degree. With regard to some points I can only make assumptions.[22] I hope that the future will bring a more rich literature on nonhuman animal rights activism of all streams in different parts of the world. This thesis is an initial attempt to fill that gap.

It must also be said that the existing literature on the animal rights movement has been more than sufficient when it comes to chapter two, where I describe the process of

[20] A reason why scholars may be reluctant to investigating ALF activists may be self-censorship as various academics who have written about ALF activism and who refused giving confidential information to state authorities have been targeted. There are even those who have been imprisoned. See David Naguib Pellow (*Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement*, 2014) for more information on this.

[21] I have encountered one article that describes the animal rights movement in China. There could of course be studies that I do not know about, also there may be very good studies about the nonhuman animal rights movement in general that I have missed. This is possible because I did the research in a limited time span.

[22] While the aim of this thesis is not to compare between different countries, it is nonetheless interesting to comment on it, especially because the nonhuman animal rights philosophies that are popular in Turkey originate from other countries.

individuals becoming nonhuman animal rights activists. Here I mostly rely on Nicolle Pallotta's PhD dissertation (2005) about animal rights activists and on Barbara McDonald's research (2000) of vegans. Furthermore, Elizabeth Cherry's innovative analysis on veganism and social networks (2006) has been enlightening, as well.

Methodology

Where I come from: background and preliminary perspective

Every researcher starts their research with a certain "baggage" in terms of background experience, knowledge and culture which influences his or her perspective on the topic to be studied. During my teenage years I was a member (and occasionally volunteer) of various nonhuman animal rights organizations in the Netherlands. In addition to that, it was my internship and work experiences with animal rights organizations in the Netherlands and Belgium respectively after university graduation that had formed my ideas of the animal rights philosophy and activism. These were mainstream organizations as I was not familiar with radical groups. When I started observing the movement in Turkey I found out that the animal rights environment I had been "educated in" all those years is highly "new welfarist" and may not be as effective as I had always thought it was. In conversation with the activists in Istanbul I started to hear and adopt alternative perspectives on nonhuman animal rights activism.

One of the changes in my mentality concerned veganism. Veganism being the baseline of nonhuman animal rights activism may seem self-evident, but it is not the same everywhere. My journey to veganism was a long one and one that included regression. I remember very well the day that I received a letter from the Dutch branch of the famous animal rights organization PETA[23] in 1995. In PETA's recruitment letter, which was sent to random addresses in the country, it was described how nonhuman animals were suffering every day in the intensive livestock industry. How they could not even turn around in their small cages, never saw daylight, and how they were eventually slaughtered after their life-long imprisonment. The solution was also offered, i.e. to stop eating nonhuman animals (besides donating money to PETA). That day, at the age of 13, I decided to become a vegetarian by gradually erasing meat from my diet. And so I

[23] People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) was founded in the United States in 1980 and has grown into one of the biggest nonhuman animal rights organizations worldwide.

did. It would take another thirteen years before I would find out the arguments for veganism. In the animal rights organizations where I worked vegetarians were the majority and vegans merely a minority. A pure vegan lifestyle was seen as an ideal position but it was not the norm, let alone that it was seen as a requirement.[24] I became vegan in 2010, shortly after my animal rights work. However, the social implications of being a vegan in a nonvegan society led me to take on eating cheese and eggs[25] again in 2012. And it was not until I carried out the fieldwork for this thesis in the fall of 2014 that I effectively began to question that choice. If it was not for the explicit support for veganism in the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul, if it was not for their reason-based advocacy, I would still have been a vegetarian today. The activists have successfully spurred my re-conversion to veganism.

The research

My thesis focuses on the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. I have chosen to limit myself to this particular geographical location for practical reasons. In reality however, the movement does not operate only within the confines of Istanbul. Groups such as the ones that I have observed have arisen in other Turkish cities as well, especially in Ankara and Izmir but also in smaller cities and towns.[26] Animal rights activists in Istanbul maintain close ties with activists in these other cities. They often organize joint actions and campaigns. They also interact with one another in order to develop ideas and to bring about discussions.

The research for this thesis encompasses ethnographic interviews, attending and observing formal and informal meetings (protests, vegan potlucks, celebration days, football matches and other activities), in addition to textual analysis. The textual analysis is based on websites, articles and other materials produced by nonhuman animal rights activists. The groups whose materials and activities are included in this research are: Yeryüzüne Özgürlük Derneği (YÖD)[27], Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket

[24] Vegetarianism however was a requirement to become an employee for this organization.
[25] And other nonvegan food such as cookies and cakes that contain dairy and eggs.

[26] As of July 2015, there are Facebook groups that represent radical nonhuman animal rights activists in Konya, Southern Cyprus, Balıkesir, Edirne, Kocaeli, and Diyarbakır among others.
[27] The English translation is Freedom to Earth Association. From now on I will refer to this organization as Freedom to Earth.

(AVH)[28], Bağımsız Hayvan Özgürlüğü Aktivistleri (BHÖA)[29], Zulmü Görüntüle[30], Vegan Kolektif[31], Vegan Özgürlük Hareketi (VÖH)[32], Hayvanlara Özgürlük Partisi (HÖP)[33], Vegan Mutfak[34], Vegan & Vejetaryenler Derneği Türkiye (TVD)[35], Veganspor[36], Veganoloji[37], Vegan Türkiye[38], Vegan & Vejetaryen Kulübü Türkiye[39] and Bağımsız Doğa-Hayvan Aktivistler (BADOHA).[40] Besides, there are numerous Facebook pages set up by animal rights activists that I also included in the research. However, I must emphasize that most of the textual analysis is based on materials from Freedom to Earth and Abolitionist Vegan Movement. This choice was easily made because these are among the most active groups and they also offered the most materials.

Another weakness of this thesis, in addition to the lack of information on radical groups abroad, is that I did not study the public perception of nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey. The discourses that I analyze in this research are discourses that are prominent within the grassroots nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul and, partially, in other social justice movements in the country that they cooperate with and in alternative leftist media[41]; these positions do not usually circulate in the mainstream media. I also have not made an analysis of "animal lovers" discourses on nonhuman animal issues, apart from a few comments that my interviewees give on HAYTAP. My impression is that the more welfare-oriented approaches and favor for companion species have highly influenced the mainstream media. This is of course not surprising as these positions are part of the mainstream culture and adhered to by a much larger part of the population.

[28] The English translation is Abolitionist Vegan Movement, previously known as Diren Vegan (Vegan Resist). From now on I will refer to this organization as Abolitionist Vegan Movement.
[29] The English translation is Independent Animal Liberation Activists. From now on I will refer to this group as Independent Animal Liberation Activists.
[30]. The English translation is Display Cruelty.
[31] The English translation is Vegan Collective.
[32] The English translation is Vegan Liberation Movement, which from now on I will be using.
[33] The English translation is Liberation to the Animals Party, which from now on I will be using.
[34] The English translation is Vegan Kitchen.
[35] The English translation is Vegan and Vegetarian Association Turkey.
[36] The English translation is Vegansport which from now on I will be using.
[37] Veganoloji is currently only active online but its founders plan to start offline activism in the near future.
[38] The English translation is Vegan Turkey.
[39] The English translation is Vegan & Vegetarian Club Turkey.

[40] The English translation is which from now on I will be using.
[41] Examples are Bianet, Sosyal Savaş (Social War), and Yeşil Gazete (Green Newspapers).

The ethnographic in-depth interviews[42] I carried out between October and December 2014 with fifteen individuals who are involved in ethical veganism or nonhuman animal rights activism.[43] Thirteen of these people were at the time of the interview actively involved in nonhuman animal rights advocacy. Fourteen are vegans and one is vegetarian. One of the vegans is currently not active anymore for nonhuman animal rights but was in the past. Another participant has an activist background in other social justice movements and now runs a vegan restaurant in Istanbul, with which he is preoccupied every day. In addition to these people, I also corresponded with another nonhuman animal rights activist in May 2014. The participants who requested anonymity are given a pseudonym. Other participants preferred to be in this thesis with their real names. Thirteen of the interviews were carried out face-to-face and one on Skype. Because we ran out of time during some of the interviews, additional information on the part of the interviewee was given later through e-mail or Facebook correspondence.

Recruiting the participants was an easy task. I met most of them when I attended events organized by nonhuman animal rights organizations. Some of the participants are active for a specific nonhuman animal rights group. Five are independent activists; they join events organized by different groups and they do not associate themselves with any group in particular. The mean age is of the participants is 31.2 and the median age is 28.5.[44] The oldest participant is 48, the youngest 17. Five are currently university students. One is still in secondary school. All except one of my interlocutors were vegan at the time of the interview. One of them is a vegetarian and, at the time of the interview, he had no plans to make the switch to veganism. I deliberately choose to include a vegetarian in the ethnographic fieldwork. Although it is a controversial issue, vegetarians are part of the movement as well, albeit as a minority.

Class, education, ethnic affiliations and political background

[42] Nine of these interviews were done in English, five in Turkish and one partially in English partiallly in Turkish.
[43] Again I would like to emphasize that the vegans that I studied for this thesis are indviduals who became vegan because they support nonhuman animal rights. However, there is probably a significant amount of people in Turkey and elsewhere who were drawn into veganism for other reasons than animal rights. Different motivations for veganism can overlap; they are not mutually exclusive. While the activists that I studied are most probably also aware of these other motivations (i.e. environment, health, poverty), their primary motivation with regard to veganism is the rights of nonhumans, which is reflected in their personal stories and in their activist discourses.
[44] The activist I corresponded with in May 2014 is not included in this data, neither is the vegan restaurant owner.

Two of the participants identify themselves as Kurdish. Another participant told me that she is of Jewish descent. Most of my interviewees seem to have a middle class background and have gone to university. One person does not fit this picture: he has received education until middle school and he now works with textile. Other professions practiced among the participants are: music teacher, call center employee, bank employee, content and community manager at a digital advertisement agency, and vegan restaurant owner (entrepreneur), among others. During one of the meetings that I attended activists (other than the ones that I interviewed) introduced themselves in a group. They spoke about their background (class background, profession, political background), about how they got into nonhuman animal rights and about their ideas regarding animal rights tactics. Although there were a few exceptions most people came from a middle class family, as was the case with my participants. Besides, almost all of them had a leftist background. One activist told that, contrary to most people who were present, he has a 'radical Islamist' background. He explained this in the following way:

> It doesn't have anything to do with Hizbullah or another radical Islamic movement. It was different in my youth years. Our radicalism is on the area that we believe in God without any limits, that is how we are radicals. In that time we were also against violence. Because Mohammed also did the same. I learned that nature is valuable from Mohammed's ideas. Once I discovered some problems in Islam I was left with nature and being against violence. The more I learned about anarchism, the more I became an anarchist.

Gender ratio

Seven of the fourteen activists that I interviewed identified as female, seven identified as male. When it comes to the gender ratio within the movement the following question crosses my mind: to what extent is the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul representative of the global nonhuman animal rights movement? Statistics suggest that women constitute 68-80 percent of the animal rights movement or report an approximate 3:1 percent female/male ratio (Jasper and Poulsen 1995; Lowe and Ginsberg 2002, Gaarder 2011).[45] However, Pellow (2014) writes of his ethnographical research on radical nonhuman animal rights activists: 'sixty-nine interviewees identified as men, and thirty-one identified as women, a reflection of the fact that many of these

[45] My own experiences with animal rights organizations in Belgium and the Netherlands strongly resemble the figures. When I started working for an organization in Belgium only two out of the approximately ten employees were male.

organizations are male-dominated' (Pellow 2014, xiv). While Pellow does not specify what he means with 'these organizations' my assumption is that he speaks about radical animal rights organizations in particular, not animal rights organizations in general. This suggests an interesting point: that the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement may be characterized by the predominance of women whereas the radical animal rights movement may have more male adherents. Unfortunately no studies have been carried out yet that research this distinction. Moreover, data on the gender ratio of animal rights activists in Turkey is lacking completely. The impression that I got from my observations is that the female-male ratio among the movement in Istanbul is somewhat equal but I cannot affirm this with numbers.[46]

Organization of this thesis

The presentation of my research findings starts in chapter one with an analysis of the participants' journey toward becoming a nonhuman animal rights activist. What patterns can be discerned in the process of conversion to a vegetarian or vegan lifestyle[47] and recruitment into the movement? Looking at the catalytic experiences that triggered these individuals into a concern for animal rights I evaluate the role of emotion and cognition in this process. I also delve into the social implications of being a vegan. What are the post-conversion difficulties that vegans encounter and how do they deal with that? And what implications may this have for political activism?

Chapter two introduces the nonhuman animal rights philosophies that are influential within the movement in Istanbul: the abolitionist approach and vegan anarchism. Based on case studies of protests organized by the movement I show how these philosophies are put into practice on the Turkish activist scene. The basic set of collective action frames that groups and activists adhere to are then discussed. This is where some of the frame disputes between different grassroots animal rights factions in Istanbul come into the picture. We will encounter important questions such as: 'should issue-specific campaigns and campaigns that involve depictions of suffering be counted as new welfarist tactics?' and 'can "positive violence"[48] for the sake of nonhuman animals be

[46] The topic of gender and the nonhuman animal rights movement will be further discussed in chapter three.
[47] As we will see, conversion to veganism is often preceded by conversion to vegetarianism.
[48] I.e. breaking into nonhuman animal exploiters and safing animals, sabotage and property destruction.

justified?' To what extent are these discussions merely reflections of what is happening on a transnational level? And, contrary to that, what aspects are typically local about it?

The analysis of disagreements over collective action frames will be continued in chapter three. The disputes that are discussed here deal with issues other than nonhuman animal rights; more specifically, they revolve around the questions: 'how to raise awareness about hierarchical power structures other than speciesism, for example racism, sexism, and heterosexism?' and 'what tactics should the animal rights movement adopt to avoid perpetuating these other forms of discrimination?' Besides the discourses, I investigate how nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul engage in alliance politics with other social justice movements in practice and whether they are successful in this. We will see what role the Gezi Park protests may have played in these relations.

In chapter four I look at the functions of new communication technology. How is the internet used by nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul? Do they agree about the usefulness of new social media? Or is its legitimacy challenged by the critical approach toward science and technology on the part of vegan anarchists? A few more case studies illustrate whether materials produced online reflect the collective action frames discussed in chapter three and four. And how do offline and online activities help construct a vegan collective identity? Or will we discover that, rather than one collective identity, different collective identities predominate within this movement?

Finally, in the concluding chapter I will sum up the main findings of this thesis. What does the analysis of the conversion-recruitment process imply for the collective action frames that activists adhere to? Furthermore, I will consider the role of factionalism in the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. Is factionalism a detriment or can it be an advantage? What promises does this movement have for the future of nonhuman animal rights activism in the country? What can animal rights movements elsewhere in the world learn from this movement? And how is there still room for improvement? A main thyeme in this chapter is to look at the typically local aspects of the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. Despite all the transnational links and similarities with their counterparts in other countries, what is unique about the animal rights movement in Istanbul, and in Turkey at large?

CHAPTER 1

FROM CARNIST TO NONHUMAN ANIMAL RIGHTS ACTIVIST

If you are vegan you have this wrong impression that you know all about animal rights but of course you don't. It's like you apply to some education. Veganism is the application. You become a vegan activist after all this education. (Gülce Özen Gürkan, Abolitionist Vegan Movement)

The emergence of a social movement starts with individuals who become aware of the problem and – sooner or later - devote themselves to the cause. For a social movement it is crucial to know the ways to recruit new activists effectively. In this chapter I therefore explore the process of becoming a nonhuman animal rights activist. But what mobilizes people into activism is not the only interesting question for the animal rights movement; since commitment to animal rights includes lifestyle changes, looking at the factors that lead someone to adopt veganism[49] is also a crucial matter. I will make use of existing literature on these processes. At the same time, I will evaluate how previous studies of vegans and animal rights activists relate to my own findings of activists in Istanbul based on ethnographic interviews and fieldwork.

1.1. Conversion-recruitment

How should the process of becoming a vegan animal rights activist be conceptualized? What sociological concepts are useful in understanding this process? While nonhuman animal rights activism is still relatively understudied various attempts to theorize it have already been made. Edward Baily (1997) introduced the concept of "implicit religion", which Kerstin Jacobsson applies to animal rights activism. In addition, Jacobsson uses the term "secular religion". Baily suggests that the defining characteristics of implicit religion are 'commitment', 'an integrated focus' of one's life and 'intensive concerns with external effects' (Baily 1997, cited in Jacobsson 2014, 310). Nicole Pallotta (2005)

[49] Or vegetarianism, which is often a transitionary stage.

defines the process of becoming an animal rights activist as "conversion-recruitment". The double component refers to two stages inherent in the process. The first stage, conversion, is the consciousness shift that happens in the person's mind. It could be seen as a personal revolution. This is when the person accepts the principle of nonhuman animal rights. How speciesism manifests in society and in every-day life is recognized and consciously opposed. It is accompanied by a change in lifestyle; i.e. becoming a vegetarian or vegan (Pallotta 2005). I suggest that conversion in the case of ethical veganism can also be conceptualized as 'awakening' because it involves becoming aware of the power relations between human and nonhuman animals that are usually invisible or taken for granted.[50]

There are of course many ethical vegetarians and vegans who are not politically active and never will be. Those who do become active for a nonhuman animal rights social movement enter a next stage. They are recruited into the social movement on an organized, collective level. Pallotta writes the following about the conversion-recruitment process: 'In the case of the animal rights movement these two concepts are so intimately intertwined that it makes sense to think of them as one compound concept. Conversion is a necessary prerequisite for recruitment to take place, and recruitment is the end result of what we have seen can be a lengthy conversion process for animal rights activists' (Pallotta 2005, 249).

Pallotta also makes the distinction between lifestyle activism (becoming vegan or vegetarian) and political activism (active participation in a social movement organization). The lifestyle activism stage is directed at personal change; the object of change is the self (Pallotta 2005). The person commits to not eating nonhuman animals and/or not using nonhuman animals in his or her daily life. When one has reached the political activism stage the object of change is extended to include society (ibid). Now, the person attempts to make other people aware of speciesism and nonhuman animal rights. The goal is to convince people to change their lifestyle into a nonspeciesist one, as well. Activities may also be directed at protesting industries that engage in exploitation of nonhumans. Or it may be directed at the government in pursuit of legal change in favor of nonhuman animal rights. Sometimes an action is devoted to

[50] Since "awakening" is also associated with religion and spirituality this term is actually very close to "conversion". But it must be noted that the term "religion" is a contested term within the nonhuman animal rights movement. In chapter two we will see that some vegan anarchists problematize that vegan outreach activism runs the risk of becoming too dogmatic, of becoming like a religion.

liberating individual nonhuman animals held in captivity. Whichever type of activity is preferred, generally the nonhuman animal rights activist tries to bring about long-term cultural and institutional change regarding the way humans treat nonhumans. The ultimate goal is the acknowledgement of nonhumans as moral persons, so that their right to be free is granted. An ethical vegan who is not an activist wants to reach that same goal, but is not capable of or not willing to invest his or her free time into that. This is why Pallotta notes that lifestyle activism may be seen as "passive" and political activism as "active" resistance. Kim Socha has invoked de Cleyre's concept of "negative direct action" with regard to ethical veganism. Negative direct action was defined by de Cleyre as 'the refusal to participate in commonly accepted cultural practices' whereupon Socha points out that living as an ethical vegan falls into that category, as well.[51]

Conversion into ethical veganism is a process of de-socialization from the dominant speciesist, carnist ideology, culture and praxis on the one hand and of re-socialization into an alternative, ethical vegan worldview and praxis on the other hand. Conversion in general is accompanied by a process of alternation: 'a near-total transformation of self' (Pallotta 2005, 191). It permeates all aspects of daily life and has profound social implications, as well. We will first have a look at how this process is brought about.

1.2. Emotion and cognition

Emotions play a huge role in mobilization for social movements (Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2001, cited in Wrenn 2012). This is true for all social movements (Wrenn) but researchers have noted that for the nonhuman animal rights movement this seems even more significant (DeCoux 2009, cited in Wrenn 2012). A popular assumption about nonhuman animal rights activists, which has led to stereotyping and stigmatization, is that they are "overly emotional" and "irrational".[52]

[51] Socha 2014, http://speciesandclass.com/2014/07/07/beyond-vegan-cheeze-anarchism-animal-liberation-and-the-commodity-fetish/.

[52] Fuelled by the large amount of female activists this has led to a gendered and negative stereotyping. The predominance of women in the movement contributes to the popular belief that nonhuman animal rights activists are primarily driven by emotion.[52] In a society that celebrates rationality, which is seen as a masculine trait, this is a recipe for stigmatization. I will go deeper into the gendered perception of animal rights activists in chapter four.

But what role do emotions actually play in the conversion-recruitment process of vegan nonhuman animal rights activists? And how do they relate to rationality? Barbara McDonald, who did an ethnographic research about vegans argues that the decision to become vegan is usually characterized by an interaction between emotion and cognition (McDonald 2000, 9). She concludes that these aspects are mutually supportive and should both be recognized (ibid, 19). Nevertheless, the extent to which emotion and logic played a role in people's conversion differed among her participants. While emotion guided the learning process for some, for others the guiding was provided by logic (ibid). In my research I explored these arguments through a set of in-debt interviews. What I found largely corresponded with McDonald's study: both emotion and rationality are equally important. These psychological aspects are never completely separated, either; emotion and cognition influence one another.[53] However, the specific turning points that caused people to become concerned about nonhuman animals can be perceived by them as primarily emotional or cognitive in character. The mutually supportive role of emotion and cognition was nicely summarized by one of the vegan animal rights activists that I spoke with in Istanbul. We were talking about her conversion process. When I asked her why she became a vegetarian[54] nineteen years ago, she answered: 'I have a brain and feelings. So I became a vegetarian.'

1.3. Moral shocks as catalytic experiences

I have interpreted my findings according to three main commonalities: (1) catalytic experiences, (2) a period of questioning and research, and (3) empathy extension from one group of beings to (all) nonhuman animals.

The first commonality I borrow from McDonald's research. She defines a catalytic experience as 'the experience that introduced the participant to some aspect of animal cruelty, and resulted in repression or becoming oriented' (McDonald 2000, 6). The sociological studies on vegans and animal rights activists suggest that some have experienced not one but a series of catalytic experiences before they changed their lifestyle (McDonalds 2000, Pallotta 2005). Catalytic experiences are sometimes

[53] Randall Collins noted that 'values are cognitions fused with emotion' (Collins, cited in Munro 2005, 183). Melucci (1996) wrote: 'There is no cognition without feeling and no meaning without emotion' (cited in Jordon 2004, 91).
[54] Later she became vegan.

predominantly emotional, even traumatizing, in nature. A useful concept to use here is the one of "moral shocks". Moral shocks serve as powerful incentives to draw people into activism. Jasper and Poulsen (1995) argue that moral shocks are the turning points where the recruitment of strangers often begins. They clarify that these turning points occur 'when an event or situation raises such a sense of outrage in people that they become inclined toward political action, even in the absence of a network of contacts. These are usually public events, unexpected and highly publicized, but they can also be the experiences of individuals (…). Those who have been shocked often search out for political organizations' (Jasper and Poulsen 1995, 498).

Moral shocks can serve as a trigger for people to become interested in vegetarianism or veganism. This is what Pallotta refers to when she writes about the conversion or lifestyle activism stage, which usually precedes the recruitment or political activism stage. In my case study only one person had entered the world of activism before going vegetarian and then vegan. All other participants first went through the lifestyle activism stage of at least vegetarianism before they joined a political organization.[55]

Seven of the fourteen activists that I interviewed described one or more of their catalytic experiences as an incident that affected them on a deeply emotional level, which we refer to as moral shock. One type of a moral shock with regard to nonhuman animals is what Pallotta calls "meat epiphany" and what Amato and Patridge (1989) called "meat insight experience" (Pallotta 2005). A meat epiphany occurs when a person, whether child or adult, makes the connection between flesh and nonhuman animals. When they suddenly understand that the piece of meat on their plate was once a living being they feel disturbed (ibid). One of my interlocutors reported having had such an experience when he was a child. Yalım tells:

> I've always been sentimental about this subject, also when I was little. I remember a few scenes from when I went to a fish restaurant with my family. I saw some fish who were torn apart from the water and they were struggling in order to breath. It must have affected me negatively because I still remember it. Two or three weeks ago my mom told me a story that how she at the time convinced me to use animal products. She told me that the animals screamed: 'Yalım should eat us!' So she confessed how she brainwashed me.

[55] This applies mainly to vegetarianism. A pure vegan lifestyle was sometimes adopted only after joining a movement organization.

Parents whose children refuse to eat nonhuman animals and/or nonhuman animal products usually 'squash the impulse' of their child (ibid). To successfully socialize the child into carnism they are likely to make use of the myths that support that ideology, i.e. that eating animals is normal, natural, and necessary. Alternatively they may invent other myths, as Yalım's mother did when she tried to convince her son that the animals wanted to be eaten by him.

A similar memory came from Siren. When she was about eight years old Siren witnessed the slaughtering of sheep for the Islamic sacrifice feast[56] by her relatives. She felt repulsed by what she saw. From that moment on Siren refused eating lamb. She remembers shouting to her grandparents: 'If you slaughter animals I will slaughter you!' The grief that she felt for the animals and the connection between meat and animals that she became aware of made her gradually become a vegetarian and later a vegan. Her meat insight experiences caused a lot of fighting with her mother who was initially opposed to Siren's refusal to eating animal flesh. Nowadays her mother supports vegetarianism and has even reduced her own meat consumption. The memories of the slaughtered animals for the sacrifice feast continue to upset Siren. She says: 'I tell my family and friends not to tell me "İyi bayramlar" (happy feast). I also don't say "İyi bayramlar" to them. Because it's not my bayram; it's my nightmare.'

Moral shocks usually evoke emotions such as sadness, anger, shame, and guilt. When I asked M. Keser about his journey to veganism he said that he has had a "special eye" for animals all his life. When he was a child he was interested in how nonhuman animals live. He also tried to respect their lives. He recalls one childhood memory in particular:

> For example one time in our house there was a small ant on the carpet. I was watching it. I didn't want to hurt it but just try to play with it. And with something like credit cards I was trying to block its way and somehow it died, with my card. Then I felt so sad and I somehow, like, I forgot the English word but I was respecting its death. So already in my childhood I was feeling sympathy for the animals.

Keser remarks that becoming vegan involves the realization that you are guilty of having done unethical things to nonhuman animals in the past and thus you tend to feel shame. He says:

[56] In Turkish *kurban bayram.*

> We (Freedom to Earth activists) always criticize being proud of veganism. Yes we defend veganism but we are not proud of it. Because actually being vegan is an absolution. It's like you check your past and you see that, kind of, you are a sinner. You did many wrong things towards animals. So you should be, if you are vegan, you should be like sad because we feel like 'oh I was wrong for twenty years' you know. So it's not something to be proud of, it's something like shame. Even though, not shame about now but shame about your past.

Keser's explanation shows how emotion and cognition reinforce each other. The cognitive understanding that a vegan has about the slavery of animals evokes feelings of guilt and shame when he or she thinks of having used nonhuman animals in the past. McDonald writes about this interaction between emotion and cognition in her research of vegans: 'cognition typically manifested recognition of the power relationship between human and nonhuman animals and was fed by negative emotions' (McDonald 2000, 9). While moral shocks such as the ones that I described have a deep emotional effect on the people who undergo them these experiences also bring about rational processes. In other words, intense emotional reactions usually include a cognitive interpretation (ibid, 9). Cognitive interpretations, in turn, evoke emotional reactions. Therefore, an emotional experience is not entirely absent of logic, and a rational experience is not entirely absent of emotion. Asking whether the awakening to a nonhuman animal rights consciousness in someone is originally caused by emotion or cognition is the same as asking: 'which came first, the chicken or the egg?' What we can distinguish, however, is whether a person has experienced his or her conversion or awakening process as primarily emotional in nature or primarily cognitive in nature. However, we must also realize that memories are distorted to a degree, especially if a lot of time has passed since the conversion. A person may have experienced a highly emotional catalytic experience at first but may remember it as primarily cognitive after having learned the rational arguments for nonhuman animal rights.

1.4. Rational considerations as catalytic experiences

Ahmet had a catalytic experience in childhood that can be characterized as primarily cognitive. Along his path came a book that introduced him to vegetarianism. It explained clearly what vegetarianism and veganism is. From that day on Ahmet wanted to become a vegetarian. Ahmet tells that because his family was not open to deviance he

had to postpone his vegetarianism until the time he started going to university. When that time arrived he had forgotten about it at first. One day he visited a book fair where he bought some anarchist magazines. On one of the magazine's cover there was a photo of dead cats thrown in a barrel. They were victims of the municipality's policy towards stray animals. This photo reminded him that he had wanted to become a vegetarian all along. The incident at the book fair was a catalytic experience in itself that brought back the memory of the earlier catalytic experience from his childhood.

The above examples show that the consciousness shift often begins in childhood. When a desire to stop eating animals is not supported by the parents, the child has to repress it or postpone it. In the case of Ahmet this was a conscious decision; as a child he rationally decided that he wanted to become a vegetarian. He remembered it as a young adult and having more autonomy over his lifestyle he could finally make it to fruition. However, it can also be a more subconscious process. M. Keser thinks that the sympathy he felt for nonhuman animals in his childhood, including the memory of the ant, influenced him and contributed to questioning meat consumption at a later age:

> Being vegetarian or vegan didn't start until I am 21 years old. And when I'm 21 I was eating so much hamburgers, meat burgers and other kind of meaty stuff. But I started to question myself about what am I eating, what's the story behind it. Are they really fair to animals? These kind of questions. But this kind of questioning really depends on the person I think. Some people might decide on one day to go vegan or to be activist for the animal cause. Some people's transformation might go on for years. My questioning, yes, on a deep level it was continuing for years, but the real questioning took like two weeks, something like that. So I began to watch more video's on line. So basic research like meat industry, inside farms, the fur video's, whatever. A couple of research and several video's affected me and like a final push was, the final kick came from Earthlings.[57] you know the documentary. Ok I watched it, although I couldn't watch it entirely because it's too violent, for one time. For the first time. Nevertheless I watched it by skipping some parts. And in the end, overnight, I decided to quit meat and eggs altogether. But not the milk in the first place. So in 2009 when I was 21 I went vegetarian.

[57] Earthlings is a documentary film that exposes the reality of nonhuman animal industries. It contains a lot of shocking footages.

1.5. The questioning / research period

The tendency to question humanity's relation to animals like Keser did is a common pattern among my interlocutors. Every participant went through a period of research. McDonald calls this the phase of 'becoming oriented', which includes 'the intention to learn more, make a decision, or do both' (McDonald 2000, 6). I will refer to it as 'the questioning and research period'. It is a period of learning and is usually accompanied by 'reading, thinking, talking, and becoming involved in animal rights or vegetarian-related activities' (ibid, 12).

As was the case with M. Keser, many individuals make the decision to become vegetarian or vegan during or after a period of researching. But the lifestyle change can also precede that period. Two of my interviewees went vegan overnight. They experienced a moral shock and made the decision directly. The moral shock did not only affect them deeply on an emotional level but also made them cognitively convinced about the necessity of ethical veganism.

For both Serhat and Gülce the moral shock was an incident that confronted them with cruelty against nonhuman animals. Serhat, who was fifteen years old at the time, accidentally came across a Youtube video about animal slaughtering. He has been a vegan ever since that day. For Gülce it was the documentary film Earthlings that marked the radical turning point. Gülce narrates:

> I didn't want to be part of the system anymore and I decided to go vegan at that moment. And it was like, I thought about that, cried all night and the next morning I was vegan I can say because I did everything to not do the steps, just directly went vegan and I remembered that morning. I looked at the fridge and it was full of some animal products and I gave it to my neighbors, which I really wouldn't do now. Because if you give this animal products to anybody else it means saying them as 'I still see them as some stuff to consume' so it shouldn't be like that. But I was just trying to get rid of any animal product and I did.

Both Serhat and Gülce began their research period after already having become vegan. Even though the shocking images of animal suffering exposed in Earthlings convinced Gülce immediately, she soon found out about the necessity of learning as much as possible about the animal rights philosophy. She points to the risk of skipping that critical learning process:

> If you don't know the theory, if you don't know why all these happened and how can we stop this, if you don't have any idea of that it's very easy for you to engage with all the welfarist movements, which is lasting for 200 years (...) It was all about how you use animals and it was nothing about the fact of you are using animals. And many of the animal movements are rooting from this welfarist theory now. (...) And if you don't want to engage with all that stuff which are really not useful for animals you have to believe in going vegan and its ethical necessity and you should believe in how important spreading veganism is.

For Gülce and many other Turkish vegans the critical period of questioning and research began in Gezi Park. During the Gezi Protests of June 2013 Gülce and some of her friends organized a vegan food booth in the park.[58] This public vegan kitchen lasted fifteen days. They met a lot of people who were vegan or who considered going vegan. Together they started organizing weekly vegan forums in the name of Diren Vegan (Vegan Resist). They discussed the theory, thought about it, read extensively, and translated many things. Gülce concludes: 'After a very long process of going deep in this theory, now we can call ourselves "abolitionists".'

So far I have shown examples of people who had a catalytic experience or a series of catalytic experiences first, whether primarily emotional or primarily cognitive in nature, which was then followed by the questioning and research period. Interestingly enough, one of my interviewees had it reversed. For Süheyla going to university was a point when she started to think critically. Süheyla explains:

> I became vegetarian when I was 19, I was studying science and it got me thinking. If i am studying science I should question everything. I wanted to search about it so I wanted to have my own opinions, not from others. I wanted to think from my own brain so I search about it, like do we have to eat meat and stuff so I saw that there was [sic] vegetarians and vegans and stuff and I became vegetarian.

However, the main thing that really got Süheyla interested in nonhuman animal rights activism was an incident that occurred four year later, with the birth of her dogs. Süheyla tells: 'they were born in our neighbourhood which is kind of a military place so a closed place. (...) And we were feeding them. I loved them because we were feeding them from the start.' But after three months her neighbors started to complain about the dogs. They threatened to kill them. Süheyla and her family decided to bring the dogs to

[58] In chapter three I will discuss what this has meant for the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul as a whole and how it has contributed to alliances with other social movements.

a safe place. She marks this moment as a major turning point in her process of becoming an activist:

> When you become one with them you can see their pain. You can see they are living things. Actually they are like humans. To me they are human too. When we were moving one of my dogs, he was kind of big so we had to use a car. We had to put him in the backyard of the car, I was with him so he would not get scared. I was hugging him. And I saw in his eyes that he was going to get alone like we were rejecting him. He was like that and he was so sad and actually I saw every human emotion in his eyes. They don't have to talk or do something. They don't have to have a language, a humanic language. They are already talking with us but humans are the ones who don't understand or don't listen so it made me a big shock after their giving birth and stuff because I seriously saw another perspective of life. Actually I saw the life. After that I became an activist.

The period of questioning and research brought Süheyla to the lifestyle activism stage (vegetarianism). The experience with her dog four years later, which affected her emotionally and to which she refers as a 'shock', was the trigger to enter the political activism stage.

Each person who commits him/herself to the lifestyle change of vegetarianism or veganism undergoes a process of de-socialization. De-socialization involves questioning the 'dominant norms, values and behaviors' regarding other animals (Pallotta 2005, 20). Thus, most of the de-socialization occurs during the questioning and research period, whether the lifestyle transition has already been made or not yet. Along with de-socialization comes the radical identity shift, also described as conversion or re-socialization (ibid). De-socialization and re-socialization are two sides of the same coin. Once the old set of norms, values, and beliefs are left behind, they are replaced with a different set of ideas. The ethical vegetarian or vegan adopts a new worldview, 'represented by a belief in the equality between human and nonhuman animals' (McDonald 2000, 7).

De-socialization and re-socialization do not only concern ethical beliefs, norms, and values. Besides the philosophical aspect there is a practical aspect, as well. McDonald points out that learning how to live a vegetarian or a vegan lifestyle is also part of the package. Issues such as 'how to cook vegan food, how to order food in restaurants and how to read ingredient labels' are all crucial things to learn by anyone who commits to nonhuman animal rights (ibid).

Detaching oneself from the myths of carnism can be challenging, too. An individual may already be convinced about the ethical necessity of the lifestyle change but may still be anxious about his or her health. This is especially so if the person is not embedded yet in vegan social networks. Gülce recalls the first period after going vegan:

> At those times I really didn't know any other vegans in Turkey and it was like that for a couple of months and I was just very concerned about my health. I was doing really okay but I had all these myths, you know, in my mind and this protein and calcium and stuff and I ate a lot and a lot and I gained ten kilo's in six months. But, you know, I never thought of giving up.

1.6. "Empathy extension" from one group to other groups

We saw earlier that Süheyla's personal connection with the dogs seemed to have spontaneously awakened the urge to become politically active for nonhumans. Not just for dogs but for all nonhuman animals. We can assume that her earlier questioning of meat consumption and going vegetarian may already have made her more receptive of a deep concern for nonhuman animal rights. Her research at the age of nineteen started with a concern for those animals that are usually eaten by humans. Thus, at that time she already did not make a distinction between "companion" species and other animal species. But what matters here with regard to her becoming an activist is that Süheyla was mobilized into the animal rights movement after having had an emotional bond with a nonhuman animal.

This is not uncommon among nonhuman animal rights activists. Cuomo and Gruen (1998) found that 'positive, consciously intimate attachments with animals ought to be taken seriously as relationships with radical political implications' (cited in Gaarder 2011, 68). For many people empathy for nonhuman animals starts with "companion species and is then extended to animal species used for consumption. Among my participants there are four other people who reported a personal relation or affinity with one or more animals.[59] In two of these cases the animals in question were stray animals, mostly dogs and cats. In the other two cases the participants had one or more dogs as companion animals in their childhood.

[59] I am not counting M. Keser, because his grief about the ant stemmed from a concern for all nonhuman animals in general. Besides, the connection he had with the ant only lasted a few moments, he did not establish a deep personal bond over a long period of time with the animal.

In the beginning of this chapter I mentioned that only one participant had been politically active for nonhuman animals before changing anything about his lifestyle. Metin Kılıç's pre-vegetarian/vegan activism began twenty years ago and was restricted to the protection of stray animals. It included taking care of the animals and protest participation, among other things. After four years of being active he realized that many more animal species are suffering. Upon gaining this awareness he became vegetarian. Ten years later he made the switch to veganism. Similar is Dicle's case. Her transition to vegetarianism also emerged from affinity with and care for stray animals.

Siren is currently living with her three dogs, one cat, and one human biological son. When people ask her how many children she has her answer is 'five'. The first time she established a deep emotional bond with a nonhuman animal was in her childhood with her dog. Müğe Can (a pseudonym) also grew up having an affinity with dogs, which she shared with her mother. She extended the empathy she felt for her dogs to all other animal species. She became a vegetarian thirty two years ago when she was fourteen years old. When her mother was still alive Müğe Can talked with her about the moral inconsistency of treating some animals as family members but eating others. Müğe Can:

> Because my mother died I was vegetarian. My mother loved dogs a lot. She also loved my dogs a lot. One day she was eating chicken chops. I said to my mom: "you're eating the bones of the dogs, when you eat chicken you eat the bones of Shaki and Arnin". My mom was shocked, she said: "what? No! I can't eat them, they are my grandchildren!" I said: "but you eat them mom. There is no difference. Whether you eat the bones of the dogs or a chicken bone." And then she stopped eating meat altogether, she became vegetarian. She really respected it.[60]

In these examples we see that prior to the conversion process the individuals explicitly felt empathy for a being or for a group of beings, which in this case were mostly 'companion' species or stray animals. This empathy was then extended to include all other animal species. In McDonald's study most of the people that she interviewed had also felt affection for nonhuman animals before they became vegan. The reason that some animal species were excluded from this affection was due to not seeing the

[60] 'Annem ölmeden once vejeteryan yapmıstım. Çünkü köpeklerime çok düskün aşırı seviyor köpekleri. Benim köpeklerim de çok seviyor. Anneme şey dedim: "bunların butlarını yiyorsun, sen tavuklarını yerken Shaki ve Arninin butlarını yemis oluyorsun". annem şoka girdin: "ne? Hayır! yiyemem, onlar benim torunlarım" filan dedi. "ama yiyorsun anne" dedim "fark etmiyor. Ha köpeklerin budunu yemissin ha tavuk budunu" ve oylelikle hiç bir daha et türü şey yememeye başladı, vejeteryan oldu. O çok saygı duydu.'

connection between the animals kept as pets and the animals used for food, as McDonald points out (McDonald 2000, 8).

Affinity with nonhuman animals can play a role in the empathy extension to other groups but this is not necessarily so. Empathy can also be extended from human groups to nonhuman groups. What we often see then is that a person is already involved with other social movements before gaining interest in nonhuman animal rights.[61] This was the case with Çağdaş. His journey to vegetarianism and animal rights activism began at a restaurant in Istanbul. He was already active for civil rights, women's rights, immigrants' rights, and LGBTQ rights, when one day he happened to walk in at the vegetarian restaurant Govinda. One of the restaurant's employee's began to talk with him about nonhuman animal rights. Although Çağdaş was not convinced at first, he decided to find out more about the topic. He came across the campaign and movement Etsiz Pazartesi (Meatless Monday)[62]. The more he thought about it, the more he saw the connection between nonhuman animal rights and other 'rights'. Eventually he came to the conclusion that: 'for me it (becoming a vegetarian) is not a big change but for the being it's his/her life. It's not a big deal for me but for him/her it is'.[63]

Among the participants of my ethnographic in-depth interviews there are two people with a prior activist background. Besides this, I had e-mail correspondence with a vegan animal rights activist in May 2014 who was an anti-war activist and environmentalist before turning to animal rights activism. The same is true for the vegan restaurant owner whom I interviewed in December 2014.[64]

[61] Pallotta (2005) uses the concepts of the 'victimization schema' to refer to people who had a general orientation toward victimization and justice before they became concerned about nonhuman animal rights, the 'animal schema' to refer to people who already had a sensitivity to nonhumans before becoming an animal rights activist and the 'victimization-animal' schema to refer to people who had a combination of both.

[62] Meatless Monday originates from the US and became a global movement since 2003. Its aim is to encourage people to reduce their consumption of nonhuman animal flesh. More information can be found here: http://www.meatlessmonday.com/about-us/history/

[63] 'Benim için çok bir şey değiştirmıyor ama o canlının hayatı. Benim icin onemli degil, onun icin onemli.'

[64] In chapter three the relation between the nonhuman animal rights movement and other social movements will be further discussed.

1.7. From vegetarian to vegan

Earlier we saw the role that "meat epiphanies" played in some people's journey to vegetarianism. But what about nonhuman animal products other than flesh? Can there be "milk epiphanies", "egg epiphanies", or "honey epiphanies"? Dicle, one of the activists whom I mentioned earlier, points out that 'to know why we have to be vegetarian is easy but when it comes to milk...'

Understanding the connection between meat and nonhuman animals is indeed a lot easier than seeing how consuming animal products is a violation of rights. What makes it even more difficult is that milk, eggs, and honey are often "hidden" ingredients of a variety of products, such as cookies, cakes, and other snacks. This is why learning to read ingredient labels is such an important part of the re-socialization process for new vegans. There is also the social stigmatization associated with veganism. Veganism is often branded as "extreme" and even "crazy". Vegetarianism, on the other hand, has already entered mainstream society to a certain degree.

Considering these barriers it becomes clear that information and knowledge is crucial in the process of becoming a vegan. McDonald found that 'veganism was more often a rational decision, especially if it had been preceded by a vegetarian lifestyle' (McDonald 2000, 19). My ethnographic data suggests a similar pattern with regard to the latter part of her observation. Most participants went first vegetarian after their initial catalytic experiences, of which many were moral shocks, and became vegan once they had gained more profound knowledge on nonhuman animal rights. Only three people became vegan directly. However, the catalytic experiences of these "overnight-vegans" did have a strong emotional impact. They had all been confronted with shocking videos about nonhuman animal suffering. For two of them this was the documentary Earthlings; a film that exposes the cruelty against nonhuman animals in all kinds of industries. But at the same time these materials had provided them with the information they needed to consider veganism; the videos included footage that displayed the dairy and egg industry. Now that they knew the reality of these industries there was no turning back.

However, for most of my interviewees it took more time to acquire information about veganism and its ethical necessity. I observe several main patterns that characterize the transition from vegetarianism to veganism: (1) active research about nonhuman animal rights, (2) having joined the nonhuman animal rights movement, and (3) being gradually convinced about veganism. These patterns are in line with the argument that ideologies are adopted through processes of education and socialization (Portes 1971, Wood and Hughes 1984, cited in Oliver and Johnston 2000). This is usually not something that happens all at once; rather, 'the process of education takes time and involves social structures and social networks' (Oliver and Johnston 2000, 10).

In the third case participants said that they gradually realized the realities of the milk industry and other industries that are involved with nonhuman animal products. They did not specify how they realized this but it is likely that being a vegetarian made them more receptive to information about it. It usually happened over the course of many years. Müğe Can for example had been a vegetarian for twenty eight years when she became vegan.

The first pattern, doing extensive research, is often preceded by contact with a vegan or a conversation about veganism. This was the case with Selin (a pseudonym), who was living in Israel at the time. Selin's first catalytic experience was an accidental encounter on Facebook with a video of a famous speech by animal rights advocate Gary Yourofsky. She did not watch it immediately but put it in her "bookmarks". When she watched it at a later point she was determined to stop eating animals. She became a vegetarian, even though the video itself was actually about veganism. Selin: 'Apparently I didn't comprehend it. I thought that if I stop eating meat it's okay.' She explains how veganism caught her attention seven months later:

> I was looking for something, you know 'kevenir tohumu', hemp seeds. (…) So I contacted the Facebook group of the Turkish Vegetarian Association. I was asking and someone said: 'you know what, these kind of fancy stuff, superfoods stuff, maybe vegans might know it. There was a group on Facebook called 'Vegan Bebek' (Vegan Baby) for people who are vegan and people who are raising vegan children. (…) I introduced myself to the group and maybe it's not a good presentation of this but these people were really strict and not nice vegans. You know that there are some vegans who are really strict and who try to impose on you and fight with you and who are really, like misanthropes, they don't like people, you know? So there were like these people mostly. And they were like mostly judging me, like 'why are you still vegetarian, don't you know

> how they behave like in the dairy industry and egg industry?' I was like, I didn't know![65]

Selin thinks that if they had approached her in a more friendly and understanding way it would have been easier. She recalls that it was like a 'struggle and fight'. According to Selin everyone has their own journey and veganism cannot be forced. 'But', she tells, 'people don't understand, there are people who don't care about the journey. They say:"okay you know what, the animals are dying, to hell with your journey!"' Despite these conflicts Selin spent the following month actively researching about the topic, while also continuing to have discussions with the vegans she met through Facebook. After one month she decided to become vegan with her 'own free will'.

It is often through conversations with others that vegetarians are being confronted with moral inconsistencies and then start thinking about it. But this does not necessarily have to come from vegans. Ironically, Yalım's conversion to veganism initially started with a discussion he had on the internet with an ex-vegetarian who had gone back to carnism:

> There was a recommended Youtube video on my page on my laptop. In that video there was a woman who is ex-vegetarian and she was arguing why it's unhealthy and how being vegetarian was unsustainable for her. And then my friends commented on that video. I also told my views. I told what the woman tells is bullshit. Later in that discussion she told me that I still use yoghurt and other milk products and so she asked me: 'what do you think they are coming from?' And then I realized that I don't know anything about it and felt pretty stupid. And I don't remember exactly how the discussion went on but in one moment I told her that perhaps I will be vegan in the future. And then I was just about to return for a month to Turkey. And in that period I emotionally rejected to do decent research about that topic. Because I didn't feel myself emotionally strong to oppose my family (…) cause I live with them. But then after one month, again after I returned to Germany, one evening I did some research on the topic. I read what ethical vegans say. I read some pro/contra arguments, for and against veganism. And I watched some discussions and some videos. That night I was convinced. Since then I'm a vegan.

Yalım refers to his 'emotional rejection' to do research about veganism. This tendency corresponds with McDonald's observation of "repression". Some of her vegan interviewees had heard about cruelty against nonhumans but repressed the information for some time. Later, when another catalytic experience took place, the memory resurfaced and people would start acting on it (McDonald 2000, 19). This is why it is sometimes a series of incidents, not a single one, that lets a person to become vegetarian or vegan. McDonald's study suggests an interesting explanation of why people who are

[65] Misanthropic behavior on the part of vegans is further discussed in chapter three.

confronted with injustices against nonhuman animals may not change their lifestyles at all. There could be many individuals who keep repressing the information and the negative emotions that it arose in them (McDonald). As one of my interviewees, Earthlings Dünyalı, remarks: 'If you watch Earthlings you cannot eat meat, drink milk for a couple of days, even if you're not going to be a vegan in the end.' In other words, people may be in shock for a short period and then repress the knowledge and emotional reaction after all.

The second pattern is particularly interesting because for these people the transition to veganism overlapped with the transition to the political activism stage. What appears to be decisive here is the social aspect of contact with the movement. Two participants told me that they were already convinced about veganism before reaching out to animal rights groups. As ethical vegetarians they knew that eventually they wanted to become vegan. Nevertheless, joining the movement provided the social support that encouraged them to take that further step. Süheyla was in fact living mainly as a vegan during her vegetarian years. She bought very few animal products, for example jumpers made out of wool and milk powder. She feared that her parents would 'freak out' if she would declare herself as a vegan; thus she did not have the courage to go 'all the way'. When she met vegan people in September 2014 she finally felt comfortable about being completely vegan.

This supports the argument that social networks are significant for (potential) vegans. In her text 'Veganism as a Cultural Movement' Elizabeth Cherry compares a group of vegans that are part of a vegan subculture to a group of vegans that are not. The people that were embedded in a vegan subculture maintained a stricter vegan lifestyle than the ones who had no connections with other vegans (Cherry 2006). Pallotta, too, emphasizes that people often made the transition to veganism once they were 'in a situation where they were socially surrounded by vegans' (Pallotta 2005, 165). She observes that 'in these cases, the person may have been thinking about going vegan or even begun trying to eliminate animal products from their diet, but it is the sudden impact of the social influence that causes them to turn the corner and make the commitment to become a full time vegan' (ibid).

1.8. If the step to veganism is not made

Pallotta uses the term "total converts" to refer to people 'who accept the basic tenets of animal rights ideology, of which veganism is the ideal-typical representation' (Pallotta 2005, 44). But what about those who not go 'all the way' to veganism and stick to vegetarianism instead? Pallotta writes about this that 'there are many others at any given time who are at various stages of converting, either progressing toward the ideal of veganism or remaining at one or another intermediate stage, which means they may embrace one or more principles of animal rights but reject others' (Pallotta 2005, 44). She points out that there is not one proto-type of these "partial converts"; some people may be vegetarians, other people may continue to eat meat but be opposed to using nonhuman animals for entertainment purposes such as circuses and zoos. An individual's support for nonhuman animal rights may thus be single-issue oriented. The reasons why some activists do not go 'all the way' may be very diverse, as well. [66] Among my participants there is one vegetarian nonhuman animal rights activist. During the interview I asked Çağdaş whether he plans to make the transition to veganism. It was not the first time that this question was posed to him. I heard another activist ask him the very same question one time during the weekly vegan potluck. His answer was the same as during the interview: 'no'. He explains why:

> They (vegans) fool themselves. Even when they grow plants in the field they stimulate the growth with sprays to grow it and to keep insects away from it. And then insects die for example. To what extent is that plant vegan then? Or we produce solid waste. We take a shower, use shampoo, soap or other things. Those are all going through the sewage. Fifty types of animals live in the sewage. To what extent is shower gel vegan then? (…) Or the phones and computers that we use, they all contain animal products. I'm not vegan. But I am nonetheless a defender of the vegan ethic. The vegan ethic is the best, the most right and the most reliable one. But no one can be 100% vegan. But if you say this to vegan activists they become very aggressive and upset. They can behave so angrily that there are times that I don't want to discuss with them. And sometimes vegans act more angrily to vegetarians than to meat eaters. They don't say anything to meat eaters but they attack vegetarians. But it is necessary

[66] As I wrote in the introduction chapter in many 'Western' mainstream nonhuman animal rights environments veganism is seen as admirable but not as an absolute requirement. It can be expected, then, that activists who are operating in those activist environments do not get strong incentives to become a pure vegan. Likewise, we can assume that this is quite different for activists in the current Turkish nonhuman animal rights movement because, as I have pointed out, veganism is much more perceived as an ethical necessity there.

> to defend the vegan ethic, that is something good and of course better than the vegetarian ethic, it is something necessary.[67]

Çağdaş' has a pragmatic approach towards the application of nonhuman animal rights activism in daily life. His approach is premised upon the assumption that even if one wishes to, it is impossible to make ethical vegan choices all the time. This argument is reminiscent of what an activist of Freedom to Earth Association, himself a vegan, says in the presentations that he occasionally gives at universities:

> A friend of mine asked whether I want everyone here to start to become like me. No I don't want that. I am not self-righteous. Think nearly all of us in this world, wandering around thinking "I am right, this guy is wrong, I am correct, this woman is false." If all of us were right, the world would be a right place. Although I am vegan myself, I don't believe my practice is the best way; I just know that everyone should reconsider how they involve in systematic violence or oppression against any other. The aim here is to make people rethink their prejudices and come to their own conclusions by their own internet genuine researches.

Together with some other vegan and vegetarian nonhuman animal rights activists this person wrote the "Restless Vegans Manifesto". The manifesto says that '"Animal liberation = veganism"' may not be a correct hypothesis for each and every situation. Going vegan is not a peak, an end-point for animal liberation; it could only be the first step. People who choose direct action, save many animals from torture by taking imprisonment risk but rarely consume some animal products belong to animal liberation movement as well' (Restless Vegans Manifesto 2013, 4).

But many activists in the movement do not agree with that point of view. The Abolitionist Vegans, who have organized themselves in Abolitionist Vegan Movement follow the teachings of Gary Francione. They hold that nonhuman animal rights

[67] 'Kendilerini kandırıyorlar çünkü bitki yetişirken bile o bitki yetiştirirken bile o tarlada oluyor, üzerine spraylerle onun büyümesi sağlanıyor, böcekleri uzaklaştırıyor. Ve o zaman o böcekler öylüyor mesela. O zaman o bitki ne kadar vegan? Ya da biz katı atık üretiyoruz, shower yapıyoruz, şampuan, işte, sabun ya da başka bir şey. Bunlar hepsi kanalizasyona gidiyor. Kanalisasyonda elli tür hayvan yaşıyor. O zaman duş jeli ne kadar vegan? (...) Ya da kullandığımız telefonlar, bilgisayar, hepsinin icinde hayvansal şeyler var. Vegan değilim. Ama vegan etik savunucusuyum, vegan etik en doğrusu, en güveniliri, en olması gerekeni , ama yüz de yüz kimse vegan olamaz. Yüz de yüz vegan değil bir şey yok. Ama vegan aktivistler bunu ifade ederken çok asabiler, çok sinirliler. Angry. Ve çok sinirli davrandıkları için ben onlardan dinlemek istemiyorum o saatte. Çok sinirli oluyorlar. Ve bazen veganlar vejetaryenların daha çok üstüne geliyor et yiyenlerden. Et yiyorsan bir şey demiyorlar ama vejetaryensan saldırıyorlar. Ben de onların yuzde yuz vegan olamayacaklarını soyluyorum. Ama vegan etik savunması gereken, doğru olan şey. Ve vejetaryen etikten tabiki daha doğrudur, olması gereken odur.'

activism should always be vegan-based. Gülce Özen Gürkan, one of the founders and an active member of Abolitionist Vegan Movement, argues that:

> For a long time vegetarianism was seen as an ethical position. But it's not. If you're vegetarian this means that, yes you think about animals, but you are still using animals and in any of the animal products you use you are just declaring that 'it's okay for me to use animals'. This is the problem.

The Abolitionist Vegans find it highly problematic as well as inconsistent that some of the nonhuman animal rights groups in Turkey allow vegetarians to be part of the group or movement. But some others see it as an opportunity to recruit more people into veganism. Earthlings Dünyalı, an independent activist and former member of Independent Animal Liberation Activists and Vegansport, generally supports the allowance of vegetarians in the movement. However, if someone would say that vegetarianism is enough and that it is impossible to become vegan he would not accept that. Earthlings Dünyalı:

> I know some people who became vegan after becoming vegetarian. It's good to help them make the connection. If they're with us there are more chances that they become vegan. If we don't accept them, if you push them away, I don't think it will be easier for them to become vegan. Some need some help, some have questions. There are many things that they ask. For us it should be our responsibility to provide that support for them and help them become vegan.

Whether or not to allow vegetarians to be part of the movement is a question that relates to issues of framing. In chapter two I will come back to this, when I discuss the different ideologies and frames used by the groups and activists, which includes disputes over framing.

1.9. Freeganism: beyond veganism

For many of the nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul lifestyle activism goes beyond veganism. This is especially so for the ones who identify as anarchists. They try to live their daily lives outside of capitalist institutions and consumerist behavior for as much as they can. M. Keser came by bicycle for our interview in the European side of Istanbul. For him this is the primary way of traveling in the city, even long distances. Seeing a cyclist in Istanbul's crowded center with its hilly landscape is quite a rarity. Keser tells that many people asked him how he can live like this but for him it is not a

huge effort. It is part of his freegan lifestyle. From 2014 onward he and his fellow animal rights activists are engaged in Food not Bombs activism. On a weekly basis they prepare and eat free meals together. They go to grocery stores and ask for free foods which are about to be thrown away. Keser explains:

> We're against participating in the system. We're against buying food, buying clothes because what we defend is: we can find many things without pay. Because so much things in this capitalist world are wasted, just wasted without any second thought, you know. (...) So this is symbolic example but every week we call people: please do your freeganism for yourself too. This is symbolic but you can take this to your life as an example and you can find your food free. You can find your clothes free. You can ask your friends, you can ask your neighbourhood, you can do swap markets, you can create political places where you can swap your goods. (…) If we are a growing group of people who are against consumerism then we can harm the industry. Even if you don't harm the industry, even if you are so small, so this is also something because it means in our personal lives there is no room for consumerism. (…) We try to grow the freegan culture in Istanbul.

Dicle also tells that she supports an anti-industrial, nonconsumerist lifestyle. She does not shop for food, shoes and clothes but uses those that are discarded by others or that she finds in the garbage. Sometimes when she is looking for food she finds nonhuman animal flesh. Because she is a vegan she does not eat the flesh herself. Instead she gives it to hungry stray animals, letting them also benefit from her freeganism.

1.10. Social implications of being a vegan

Earlier in the chapter we saw that being embedded in a social network that is supportive of veganism enhances commitment to veganism (Cherry, 2006). The reserve is also true: because of the social implications of being a vegetarian or a vegan in a nonvegan society people tend to seek out networks with likeminded others (Shapiro 1994, Pallotta 2005). Pallotta notes that individuals who undergo a radical identity shift, such as vegans, yet continue to live in a culturally mainstream environment experience a degree of estrangement from friends and family. This estrangement tends to be more severe when one is not embedded in a social network of like-minded individuals. Seeking connections with other vegans and animal rights activists thus becomes a desire for many.

Many of my interviewees remarked that life became easier for them once they got to know other vegans by joining the nonhuman animal rights movement and many made the step to commit to veganism fully once they had joined. Some of my interlocutors have a vegan partner. They point out that this makes the vegan lifestyle a lot easier, as they live together as vegans. It is more challenging for some of the younger activists who still live with their parents. For these youngsters a transition to a vegan lifestyle often invites conflict. In order to avoid conflict some young people postpone their vegetarianism or veganism, as we saw with Süheyla's case. Yalım, too, stayed within the normative carnist lifestyle of his family as long as he lived with them. For eight or nine years he did not buy meat outside the home while continuing to eat it at the family table. Earlier we saw that Ahmet had postponed his vegetarianism until he became a student. Since he finally lived independently from his family he decided that 'now I can declare my vegetarianism'. It was a process that he divided into steps. Ahmet: 'For a couple of months I continued to eat fish. I believe that the most difficult thing of becoming a vegan or vegetarian is to confront with people and telling them. So I thought of doing it step by step so it would be easier with my family at the table and stuff.' His parents still comment negatively on it now and then. His friends are more open to deviating opinions and lifestyles but other people's reactions were harsh at times. Ahmet recalls:

> I worked in a tourism agency. We were always going to hotels and eating with different people constantly. And it was, you know, open buffet so you can take anything you want. This one month was a bit hard for me because I was always meeting new people and among all this variety of meat and other things my plate was different. Physically you can see it. So this one month was very difficult because I had to tell it again and again to everybody. (…) Also it was mainly men so you know the sexist approach also came into topic, as jokes you know. (…) In every aspect veganism was being questioned and attacked, and there was no fundament to their critiques.

Serhat has also experienced these kinds of negative reactions. He is seventeen years old and still in high-school. He has been a vegan since the age of fifteen. His family is not very happy with his choice to refrain from consuming nonhuman animals and their products. 'My mother is angry with me about it', he tells. Then he smiles. 'But she always makes vegan food for me anyway'. He notes that his ethnic Kurdish background makes it even harder for him, because, as he says, 'Kurdish people usually eat a lot of meat'. Serhat is often the target of negative reactions or what he calls 'propaganda'. Things like 'if you don't eat meat, if you don't drink milk you will die'. To avoid

discussions he sometimes says that he has an allergy to meat and animal products. Coming from a religiously conservative family, discussions are religion-based at times. According to the dominant interpretation of Abrahamic religions, including Islam, nonhuman animal were created to serve humans. When his relatives try to make him believe that eating animals is an obligation in Islam Serhat finds it very difficılt to defend his position. Sometimes he responds in the following way: 'if your religion commends to kill animals, my religion commends to kill humans, should I then kill humans? No.'[68]

Vegan teenagers and adolescents who still live with their parents often do not have the possibility yet to live with or around people that share their ethical beliefs. As we have seen, this can be a challenge if the family resists their choice to be vegetarian or vegan. When vegans are not dependent on their families anymore former ties are sometimes weakened or severely damaged because of the vegan lifestyle. Müğe Can's relationship with her sister for instance is extremely strained since she became a vegan. While her mother had always respected her lifestyle, her sister did not. Müğe Can tells:

> My sister, because her husband is a doctor, she never respected our lifestyle. She bothers me in all kinds of ways. When I have a headache she says "it's because you are vegan". When I switched from vegetarian to vegan they directly told me: "We should make a doctor's appointment, we will take you to a psychiatrist." Why? "Because you have psychological problems. You are not behaving normally." They were saying things like that. They were really treating it as a craziness.[69]

Relationships with former friends are also difficult, Muğe Can says. Even when some friends accept Müğe Can's and her husband's vegan lifestyle, it remains challenging to eat a meal together:

> It's certainly something asocial. We cannot be together with carnists. We don't want that because if there's kebab next to us, we can't do that. We don't tolerate that. We are disturbed. And they are disturbed by our position. We disturb their conscience. They say a popular idiom: "we only eat meat from the sacrifice feast until the next sacrifice feast". We find this very disturbing. Because it's is something very legitimized, exploiting animals is normalized. That's why we

[68]' Senin dinin hayvanları öldürmeyi emrediyor diye öldürüyorsan, benim dinim de insanları öldürmeyi emrediyor, öldürmem mi gerek?'

[69] 'Ama ablamlar enişem doktor oldunu için böyle hiç bir zaman saygı duymadı bizim yaşantımıza. Her şekilde rahatsız etti. Başım ağrıyor "işte vegansın". Vejetaryenlikten veganlığa gecince direk şey dediler bana: "doktordan randevu alıcağız, psikiyatrise götüreceğiz". Niye? "Senin ruh sağlığın bozuldu. Normal davranmıyorsun artık" filan dediler. Resmen bunu delilikle bağdaşlaştırdılar.'

> don't meet with the others. We only meet up with our vegan friends, we prefer it that way.[70]

Müğe Can's remark suggests that it is not always the pressure or ridiculing by nonvegans that makes the relationships strained. Reluctance to be confronted with meat and animal products on the part of vegans is likewise a common problem. But the degree of respect and understanding by nonvegans probably has a significant effect on the relationships. For Selin eating out with nonvegan friends and relatives is not a big problem. She admits that not everybody is as thoughtful and the majority decides where to eat, but it is still doable because she can bring food from home or eat before the dinner. Besides, vegan dishes are not very hard to find in Turkey as there is çiğköfte[71], kumpir[72], and other things. All of her friends have been respectful towards her veganism and she has not found it necessary to break with any of them.

Süheyla was less lucky with regard to receiving understanding from some of her former friends. When she went to eat out with them they were not very thoughtful about her veganism, which inclined her to move away from them. She is now mostly hanging out with vegan friends, whom she found through vegan and animal rights groups on Facebook. According to Süheyla finding like-minded people is very important for vegan animal rights activists. She thinks that this is especially so for Turkish vegans because 'in Turkey veganism is not very well known yet'. She suggests: 'If you are vegan or vegetarian in Istanbul you should find people. This vegan Istanbul group (Facebook) is very beautiful for me. I met lots of people. They gave me energy'.

After having actively spent three months within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul I observe that there is a high degree of social interaction between many of the vegans that I have met, most of whom but not all are simultaneously activists. The nature of the relations usually moves beyond activism and has a strong social and intimate character. Many activists and other vegans meet each other on a weekly basis or more. There is even a group of about twenty vegan animal rights friends that consider

[70] 'Kesinlikle asosyalis. Çünkü kimselerle beraber artık olamıyoruz. Karnistlerle beraber olamıyoruz, mutlu olamıyoruz. Biz istemiyoruz çünkü yanımızda kebab mesela, şey yapamıyoruz. Toler edemiyoryuz. Onlar da bizden rahatsız oluyorlar. İşte bizim duruşumuzdan rahatsız oluyorlar. Vicdanlarına rahatsız ediyoruz. Son modasında şey diyorlar: "ancak kurbandan kurbana et yiyoruz" filan diye. O söylem bile bize çok irite ediyor. Çok rahatsızlık veriyor. Çünkü çok meşrulaştırılmış, artık hayvan sömürmek meşru bir şey, çok normal bir şey. Onun için biz başkalarıyla görüşemiyoruz. Yalnızca bu vegan arkadaşlarla birlikte oluyoruz, öyle mutlu oluyoruz.'

[71] *Çiğköfte* is a dish based on bulghur. Traditionally people made it with raw meat but due to that being unhygienic only the vegetarian/vegan version can be sold in public.
[72] *Kumpir* is a dish based on potatoes.

living together in an apartment in Istanbul's city-center on the European side. Metin Kılıç, the founder of Vegan Freedom Movement and more recently the Freedom to Animals Party, is one of them. A longer term plan of Metin and his fellow-activists is to establish a vegan eco-village in the coastal district of Silivri, where they will live together with stray animals and rescued animals. As long as that project has not been realized yet, living together in a flat around Taksim square will suffice, according to Metin.

In one activist anecdote that I came across the social aspect seemed to overshadow the cause. Siren tells me that the mother of her son's friend used to be a "passive housewife". Siren thought it would be good for her to get outside the home and become active. She managed one time to motivate this woman to join Siren to a protest. Surprisingly, the woman became an activist herself since that time. Siren concludes: 'sometimes you have to push people'.

1.11. "Sites of mission"

The social implications of living as a vegan in a carnist society is one of the reasons why physical spaces of assembly are highly important for people who care about nonhuman animal rights. The need to connect with like-minded others is not unique to nonhuman animal rights activists. For ethical vegans there is however a very practical aspect to the need to connect with other vegans which is not the case for all social movements: food. Food connects ethical vegans with each other on a very practical level. Thus, for ethical vegans physical proximity may matter more than for most other social movement activists. Some activists disapprove of an emphasis on food, as we will see in chapter two, but it cannot be denied that food is an important potential for connection, mobilization, and even conversion and recruitment.

In the fall of 2014 weekly vegan potlucks took place in vegan restaurant Community Kitchen in the European side of Istanbul. A certain amount of people would bring home-made vegan dishes to the restaurant. Anyone was welcome to join and eat for free. The impact of such gatherings should not be underestimated. I have seen some people joining in on the vegan potlucks, becoming embedded in social networks and

gradually participating on protest events. Not everyone starts being engaged in activism of course; there are people who only want to socially connect with other vegans. Nevertheless, for many ethical vegans becoming embedded in social networks with other vegans is the starting point from where animal rights activism begins. David Naguib Pellow identifies the vegan potluck as a 'small but pervasive community building practice in earth and animal liberation activist networks' (Pellow 2014, 250). Sometimes there are nonvegans present at the potlucks.

I suggest the term "sites of mission" to describe the physical spaces used by the nonhuman animal rights movement: Sites of mission are places where the nonhuman animal rights philosophy and along with it – ethical veganism - is propagated. The objects of outreach are primarily extra-movement actors, in other words, those who are not yet converted to ethical veganism. The concept of sites of mission came up in my mind during an interview that I had with Seyit, a vegan restaurant owner in Istanbul. This ethical vegan told me about how he decided to open a vegan restaurant. He remarks that while veganism is increasing among the population finding vegan food outside is still difficult. This is why he had the wish to open a vegan restaurant. Seyit tells me that in the beginning he offered vegetarian dishes such as cheese and yoghurt. But that did not last long. After one week he decided to eliminate all nonvegan ingredients. This decision is in line with the aim of the restaurant, as Seyit explains:

> The aim of Mahatma restaurant is to have this mission to introduce veganism to the people and to tell them about it. To awaken a question mark in people's minds. (…) Many people heard what veganism means for the first time when they came here. Then they maybe started to like it. This is the kind of mission we have. That is our primary aim. That is what we are trying to do. When it comes to profit, of course we have to earn something to sustain it. But we want to do these things at the same time. That's why I didn't want to stay vegetarian. If we were a vegetarian restaurant we would perhaps have more customers. But to be vegan is important, to be completely nonviolent and nonexploitative is important. We say this also to the customers. This is a place of mission and we are missionaries, we are vegan missionaries. (…) Vegetarian restaurants have become a bit of a trend; there are nonvegetarians and nonvegans who are owning vegetarian restaurants. They are looking more for profits. We don't look at it that way. This as for us a lifestyle; it's a space for activism and form of struggle, political place.[73]

[73] 'Buranın yani Mahatma'nın amacı, vegan misyonu tanıtmak aslında veganlığı insanlara anlatmak, tanıtmak,onların kafasında bir soru işareti uyandırmak çünkü çoğu insan ilk defa burada duydu vegan ne demek, burada belki bir sempatisi olusmaya başladı. Böyle bir misyonumuz amacımız var. Temel amacımız bu, bunu yaymaya çalışıyoruz. Ticari olarak tabiki kendini çevirmesi gerekiyor, dondurmesi gerekiyor. Ama bunu beraber yapsın istiyorum bu yüzden de vejetaryan kalmak istemedim. Vejeteryan olsaydım daha fazla müsterim olacaktı belki daha çok olacaktı

Mahatma restaurant is a small sized restaurant in the Kadıköy district, Istanbul's center on the Anatolian side. It is located at a corner, at the junction of three relatively quiet streets. Pedestrians will not easily pass by this corner without laying their eyes on the colorful restaurant. The window is decorated with a 'vegan nutrition wall chart' with tips about how to get all necessary vitamins and minerals from plant-based foods.

Seyit tells that Mahatma is not only visited by ethical vegans; it also attracts people who are concerned about eating healthy and good quality food. Customers trust that in Mahatma restaurant the dishes do not contain any 'unreliable' ingredients. Seyit clarifies where this need emanates from: 'In a city like Istanbul you never know what you eat. They can make you eat anything. Things like roasted meat, mixed. For example this is a Muslim country but sometimes there can be even pork in a dish, without anyone knowing it.'[74]

Like Mahatma restaurant Community Kitchen is a site of mission. Up until the summer of 2015 these two are the only vegan restaurants in Istanbul. Thus, they fulfill an important role for the nonhuman animal rights movement as well as for nonactivist vegans. The vegan food booth in Gezi park was also a site of mission. Throughout the thesis we will see other examples of locations used by vegan missionaries for spreading veganism and alternative ways of living.[75]

1.12. Different understandings of "activist"

The overlapping of activism and social activities implies that some vegans occasionally engage in activism but would not label themselves as an activist. During one of the vegan potlucks organized by nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul I asked a person, who only recently started to join social events within the movement, whether I could interview him for my thesis. I told him my thesis was about nonhuman animal

---

ama vejeteryan olması önemli degil, vegan olması, tamamen sömürüsüz, şiddetsiz olması önemliydi. Zaten gelenlere de bunu söyluyoruz burası bir misyon mekani biz de misyoneriz. Vejeteryan restorantlar biraz trend oldu. Kendisi vegan ya da vejeteryan olmayıp, vegeteryan restoran işleten insanlar var. Onlar daha çok ticari bakıyorlar bu işe. Biz ticari bakmıyoruz, bu bizim yaşam tarzımız. Bir eylem alanı, Bir mücadele biçimi, politik bir mekan.'

[74] 'İstanbul gibi bir sehirde her seyi yiyebilirsiniz. Her seyi yedirebilirler size, rosto falan karıştırıp. Mesela burası Müslüman bir ülke, ama bir zamanlar en cok domuz etinin yenildiği ülkeydi kimse bilmeden domuz eti yiyordu.'

[75] Another example is the Food not Bombs event, which goes even beyond veganism. As a *freegan* event Food not Bombs offers an example of leading a nonconsumerist lifestyle outside of capitalist institutions. Also weekly informational street stalls about veganism are organized by Abolitonist Vegan Movement.

rights activists. His answer was: 'But I'm not an activist. I'm just a vegan. Neither am I planning to become an activist'. Two months later I saw him at a street protest. As far as I know he still does not consider himself an "activist". I received the same answer, about not being an activist, when I asked the organizer of the "Vegan Festival" the same question. At the Vegan Festival this woman announced that she will organize weekly vegan cooking lessons while showing films about nonhuman animal rights. This sounded quite "activist" to me but she had apparently a different understanding about activism.

I have been using Pallotta's term lifestyle activism as opposed to political activism to make sense of becoming a vegetarian or a vegan as a step in one's commitment to nonhuman animal rights. Pallotta emphasizes the interwovenness between these two types of activism. As is clear from the above examples this conceptualization does not imply that all ethical vegetarians and vegans who are not (yet) in a movement organization refer to themselves as (lifestyle) "activists". Political activism is also not an unequivocal term. Not every nonhuman animal rights activist that I have met adheres to the same meaning of activism in general. Pallotta refers to political activism as being part of a social movement organization. But there are also other activities that some consider as political activism. This is why I would like to raise the question: when do the individuals self-identify as an activist? To understand how these self-identifications work in reality it is important to note that being active for the movement is not something static and fixed. It is true that some people are devoting their life to the movement; they spend a great many hours each week on activism. But there are also those for whom activism takes place less regularly. And there are those for whom activism consists mainly of activities on the internet. In the literature activism on the internet is sometimes called "clicktivism". One of my participants refers to it as "Facebook activism". Selin tells about her first years as a vegan:

> I was not much of an activist. I mean I was a "Facebook activist" but it's not so, you know, such an activism. (…) I would constantly put a lot a lot a lot of graphics and information. About the ethical side, about the health side, about the environmental side, I would share a lot of stuff. I'm not doing it anymore because it's, sometimes it comes to me in phases like sometimes I have like period I'm always sharing and you know, putting stuff in people's eyes, just for them to see. And sometimes I'm like you know I have a lot of stuff to do in my life. I'm already vegan anyway so enough with it. I have something to deal with, you know my health and what am I doing in life and everything so I just put it

> aside. So the last year I'm less of an activist on Facebook. (…) I became more activist here (in Turkey)[76] because I met with a lot of friends.

Selin's last sentence affirms the argument that social network embeddedness is positively correlated with activism. Activism can be digital in nature but it is considered as 'less activist' than for instance street protests.[77] A person's engagement in activism can come in phases, depending on how much time and energy they can invest in it. But for many of the participants political activism does not only significantly affect their life, it is their life. It gives a sense of purpose. Many are saying that it makes them happy. There is also a sense of responsibility; they see it as their duty to contribute to a better world. It seems that the feelings of happiness and responsibility reinforce each other. Süheyla narrates:

> Everybody has rights from birth. And when I say everybody I don't mean just humans. If society, the government or someone else doesn't give their rights I will stand up for it. Actually I don't see a point of living; just earning money, have a family, give birth, okay do that, that's fine, that's very beautiful, but what are you doing for others? What's the point? People are so into themselves. We should do something for others too. Especially we have the obligation to do something for animals because we are killing and raping them from almost the start of humanity's history. We did lots of fucked up things to them. So we have the obligation to do something right for them now. We can't just ignore it, say 'it's not my problem'. Because I seriously feel like it's my own problem and I don't see the difference that a cow's problem is not my problem. It is my problem. Because I am human, I have a language that people can understand. (…) If someone speaks up for me, for LGBT, for woman, it makes me happy. For example when a white man speaks for a black woman it's a very nice thing. It's one of the fundamental things to be human. It's why I'm doing it. It's the main thing in my opinion. And it makes me very happy.

When I ask Süheyla how much time she spends on activism she suddenly comes to realize that she spends a great many hours in the activist scene. However, she does not see it as a sacrifice; activism has become about 'being herself'. Whenever there is a protest related to nonhuman animal rights, women's rights, LGBTQ rights, climate change, she goes there. If there is something to read about the topics she reads it and if there is something that she can do, she tries to do it.[78]

The sense of responsibility is something that all of the activists that I interviewed share. Gülce is an artist; she composes music, plays music, and sings. Since she started being

[76] Selin usually lives in Israel. In 2014 she spent eight months in Istanbul.
[77] In chapter four I will go deepter into online activism.
[78] This could be signing a petition for example.

active in the movement, little time remains for her hobby and passion. Her involvement in music is now largely limited to teaching music to children, out of which she makes a living. Gülce tells how activism impacts the choices she makes in her life: 'I build my life on gaining money to survive. I wanted to spend the rest of my time on composing music but the activism takes all of my time. But I have this responsibility of spreading this abolitionist idea or bringing these abolitionist ideas to this geography'. At the same time Gülce is using her artistic skills as a resource for the movement. She has made songs that propagate veganism and the abolitionist approach.[79]

As appears from Süheyla's comment, it is often not just about standing up for nonhuman animals. It is also about seeing the connection between different causes and standing up for 'rights' in general, whether it concerns humans, nonhumans, or the earth.[80] Sometimes activists belong to a disadvantaged social group themselves. About half of them are women. Some men and women do not comply with society's gender normative model[81]. There are also those that belong to ethnic or religious minority groups, such as Kurds or Alevi's. Çağdaş is vegetarian, bi-sexual, and Alevi. Each of these identity categories contribute to his sense of being an activist:

> My life is activist life. In Turkey generally people are Sunni. I am not Sunni, I am Alevi. In Turkey many people are heterosexual, I am bi-sexual. In Turkey many people are meat eaters, but I am not. So my life is totally activist. If I eat rice and say I am a vegetarian, it's an activist thing for me. If I make love with my boyfriend it's an activist thing also. If I say I'm an Alevi it's an activist thing.

Çağdaş' definition of "activist" suggests that the boundary between an activist and a nonactivist can be blurry. For him "activist" is something that you are, not something that you do. This goes even beyond lifestyle activism because becoming a vegetarian was his choice but having been born into an Alevi family and being bi-sexual was not.

1.13. Becoming "politically active"

[79] These activities will be further analyzed in chapter four.
[80] Being an active supporter of different social movements, like Süheyla, is quite common for nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul. In chapter four I will go deeper into that to reveal the interconnectedness between the nonhuman animal rights movement and other movements. In this chapter however I focus on how the participants relate to the identity of 'activist' in general and veganism in particular, what it means to them, and how it affects their personal lives.
[81] For example LGBTQ or trans- individuals.

For the sake of this thesis, let us broadly define "political activism" as being actively part of the nonhuman animal rights movement. This means participating on organized activities, whether it is a street protest, liberating individual captive animals, giving a lecture on nonhuman animal rights or a vegan outreach event.[82]

All of my interlocutors had felt the need or the urgency at some point in their lives to do more for nonhuman animals than just changing their lifestyle. I have identified four main patterns that characterize their transition to political activism. As we have seen, two of the activists were already involved with activism or voluntary work for nonhumans when they became vegetarians. There is of course a significant difference between their previous activist work and what they do currently. Their pre-conversion activism was centered on stray animals, mainly dogs and cats. Their post-conversion activism is much broader in scope; it considers all animal species as moral persons and thus it is accompanied by vegan advocacy. I call this pattern the 'overlapping pattern' because lifestyle change occurred within the stage of political activism.

The second pattern concerns people who become politically active after already having adapted their lifestyle for many years. Let us refer to this as the 'long term pattern'. Two of my participants had followed this pattern. Müğe Can turned a vegan four years ago after having been a vegetarian for twenty eight years. It occurred only recently that she started to engage in political activism. She and her vegan husband met with other vegans at the anti-industrial football club Vegansport (Veganspor). There they became gradually familiar with activism. The week before the interview took place Muğe Can had her first street protest and she plans to have more:

> We met activism and in fact being a vegan is not enough. We need people who will protect animal rights because everyone in the whole world just defends human rights. They defend leucaemian children, they say no to violence against women, they say no to everything but there's no one who protects animals. There are just a handful of people. So to perceive veganism just as a diet like we did in the past, it's not like that. It is necessary to give attention to animal liberation because animals are the world's most disadvantaged, the most suffering from injustices and the most abused group.[83]

[82] An activist does not necessarily have to be a member of one specific nonhuman animal rights group, although many of them are.

[83] 'Aktivizmle tanıştık hakkaten veganlık yetmiyor, şimdi hayvanların haklarını koruyacak insanın olması gerekiyor çünkü bütün dünyada herkes insan haklarını koruyor, işte losemili , çocukları koruyor, kadına şiddet hayır diyor, her şeye hayır diyor ama hayvanları koruyan hiç kimse yok. Beş on kişiden ibaret. Hani sadece veganla diyet olarak bizim de eskiden yaptımız gibi sadece bir vegan beslenme diyet gibi algılıyoruz, halbuki degil. Tamamen hayvan

Most common among my interviewees was a period of one to a few years between the start of their lifestyle activism and becoming engaged in political activism. Five people had this "short term" pattern. The in between period was on average 2.1 years. Some joined already existing groups, others established their own groups.

Lastly, there is what I call the "abrupt pattern"; i.e. a person becomes vegetarian or vegan and immediately or within a timeframe of less than a few months seeks a political organization that they then join. This is what M. Keser did. While ceasing to eat nonhumans was an important step for him it did not feel satisfactory. Keser explains: 'At the same time I felt like changing my diet is not something big for animals that are being suffered. So I should be in the ground, I should be on political scene, I should defend their rights publicly. So I started to search for Turkish organization that are defending animal rights.'

Some people directly found an organization that that they felt comfortable with. Not all of them had been actively searching for it. One month after Serhat's overnight conversion from carnist to vegan he accidentally saw a protest by a nonhuman animal rights group. He immediately realized that he wanted to participate. He approached the activists and joined the group. Since that day he is regularly active with this group. For some others, reaching the political organization that fits with their worldview was a journey in itself. Note that some of them became activists between 2009 and 2012, a time when the grassroots nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul was still in its infancy. Starting with activism was for many also a stage in which they gained intellectual and practical knowledge about the different nonhuman animal rights philosophies, frames, and tactics. Some activists started at one group and ended up establishing their own group or joining another group.

1.14. "Horizontal" organizing

Much of the dissatisfaction stemmed from hierarchical structures in organizations. Earthlings Dünyalı tells how this went for him. In his initial activism stage he got to

özgürlüğüne agırlık vermek gerekiyor çünkü dünyada en ezilen halk, en zor durumda, en adaletsizliğe uğrayan halk hayvanlar.'

know one of the activists that had established a grassroots nonhuman animal rights group. Earthlings Dünyalı felt attracted to the campaigns organized by this man. He also met many like-minded activists there. He joined this group but after a few protests he got disappointed by the lack of consensus-based decision making.

> For me the group's decision is very important. For him it should be his decision or not. So he's saying that, so far he listens to a lot of people, and he did a lot of wrong things and he says that 'from now on it's my decision, I am the chief'. It's not suitable for me. I told him straight. I said that 'I cannot do it with you, I'm going to leave your herd movement and I'll go myself alone'. And with my leaving ten more people left him. We became together and we created Bağımsız Hayvan Özgürlüğü Aktivistleri.[84]

The tendency to oppose hierarchical organizational structures strongly prevails among the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. Hierarchy is seen as the problem that caused all the forms of discrimination in society including speciesism. Besides, the most influential philosophies among the movement, i.e. vegan anarchism and the abolitionist approach, both have a bottom-up approach to activism. Horizontal, consensus-based politics is 'part of the heritage of anarchism' (Vaneigem 1983, Gerbaudo 2012). Francione has expressed to other abolitionist vegans that 'we don't need organizations'. In an article on his Facebook page he has written: The emerging rights/abolitionist movement is a grassroots phenomenon. But that is a good thing. Paradigm shifts are usually not brought about by corporate charities.' About leadership he has stated: 'Everyone of us can be a 'leader'. If we are to succeed, every one of us must be a leader, an important force for change. Every one of us has the ability to affect and influence the lives of others' (Francione 2007, cited in Wrenn 2012, 28).

[84] While Independent Animal Liberation Activists still exists as a group Earthlings Dünyalı, along with some others, has left this group too based on some disagreements and has gone "independent".

The anti-hierarchical position is reflected in the grassroots character of the nonhuman animal rights groups.[85] Decisions are made based on consensus. M. Keser tells how this works for Freedom to Earth:

> We do not have leader or whatever. (...) Actually we don't even like to say democratic cause in democracy you vote but we don't use voting. We use consensus thing so if one people are really against it we will be working on it you know, something like this. On paper, since we are an official organization, on paper we have a president but it's really symbolic we laugh at that. We say, you know, it's not real.

M. Keser started his animal rights activism with HAYTAP in 2009. Because he wanted to become politically active for animals he had searched for an organization by typing "animal rights" (hayvan hakları) on Google. What appeared first was HAYTAP. He now regrets that he ever joined the organization. He clarifies: 'This organization is actually really welfarist and pretty elitisist and what else. Many people supporting it also really have nationalistic values and whatever. It's not really my thing but I thought this is the only good and solid and big organization in Turkey so I made activism with them for like two years.' In the end Keser had a quarrel with the organization over a welfarist campaign. HAYTAP handed out an award to the mayor of Istanbul because of the man's promise to help improve the welfare of carriage horses on the Princes islands. Keser explains: 'Normally this man, the mayor was being protested because like any other municipality he was running animal shelters but in those shelters many puppies and dogs are killed sometimes and some footage came out on internet. It revealed many bloody scenes and whatever, just to reduce the number of dogs they were killing, like regularly. So really around the time of protest they somehow ignorently or you know, really tragically they awarded the mayor in support of animal rights.'

As a critical thinker Keser asked HAYTAP two questions: 'why did you award this mayor?' and 'why did you not ask us?' (the members of HAYTAP). He criticized that the organization refrained from running the process 'democratically and all together'. The reaction from HAYTAP's leaders was that they 'cannot ask every member' and that they awarded the mayor with the intention to positively motivate the man so he would be inclined to do more for nonhuman animals. Keser felt angry and he refused to

[85] The only example of relatively authoritarian procedures that I heard of is Earthlings Dünyalı's story about the group that he originally joined. The group in question is the only one I have seen so far where a person positions himself as a leader. The other groups avoid such language altogether.

be part of HAYTAP any longer. But his activsm did not end there. The award incident had introduced him to another organization. Keser recalls:

> I saw that on the award day a little group like five or six young people protested this award ceremony. So now I searched who are those guys. So those guys exist in Turkey too and I found out that this is Freedom to Earth that I am now in. So I e-mailed them and I said: 'I want to join you because I'm now sick of Animal Rights Federation of Turkey. I want to join to a more radical approach, who stick to animal liberation, not to welfare.

1.15. "Independent" activists

In his study of contemporary social movements[86] Paolo Gerbaudo (2012) observes that activism is characterized by a situation of "disintermediation" where 'stable membership in an organization is substituted for a continuous communicative engagement with the 'movement' at large' (Gerbaudo 2012, 136) and 'individual activists rather than groups are seen as the basic units of the movement' (ibid). In Istanbul groups are central to the movement. Nonetheless, the tendency for disintermediation that Gerbaudo describes is visible even when we look at how people refer to the groups. For example, most of the time activists speak of "abolitionist vegans" and not of the Abolitionist Vegan Movement. I have also heard activists speak of "Gülce and friends".

Another way that disintermediation manifests within the movement is the huge amount of activists in Istanbul who are not part of any group in particular. We could call them "independent" activists.[87] Not being with one group does not imply not having internalized a particular ideology. An independent activist can also have political, ideological attachments. For example an activist may be a committed vegan anarchist yet not be with a vegan anarchist group.[88] There are also those who do not prioritize one ideology over the other. Süheyla for example says:

[86] See *Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism* (2012) in which Gerbaudo studied the Egyptian revolution, Occupy Wallstreet, and the Spanish Indignados.

[87] This term may cause confusion because some of the groups refer to themselves as a group of 'independent' activists. This is the case for Independent Animal Liberation Activists and Independent Animal-Nature Activists. Again we can recognize these names of the groups as a tendency for disintermediation. But I will use the term 'independent' activists here to refer to people who do not affiliate themselves with any particular group.

[88] I have also seen the reserve, for instance activists who are with a vegan anarchist group but who are not anarchists themselves.

> I don't agree with following something religiously. If I associate myself with abolitionist vegans then I have to accept everything Gary Francione says. I am not going to follow a man or woman. I follow my own conscience, brain, my own logic. I read and I stay open minded. (...) I try to learn more but I don't agree with the logic of being in one organization.

Because she wants to stay open to all perspectives Süheyla attends events and meeting from different groups, including the events that are organized by Abolitionist Vegan Society.

Independent activists can contribute greatly to organizing and coordinating between different animal rights groups. Earthlings Dünyalı for instance is one of the central figures when it comes to organizing public protests. Besides organizing, he engages a lot in digitalized animal rights advocacy, through which he influences not only public opinion but also the discourses within the movement. That he is functioning as a central figure also appears from two of my interviewees referring to him when I spoke with them about activism. Müğe Can for example said that she is 'an independent activist with Earthlings Dünyalı'.[89]

1.16. Conclusion

In this chapter I have analyzed the process of becoming a nonhuman animal rights activist. Based on my in-depth interviews with activists in Istanbul I have identified patterns with regard to the lifestyle activism stage and the political activism stage. These findings are affirmative to what had already been written on vegans and animal rights activists. Conversion-recruitment processes are characterized by an interaction between emotions and cognition.[90] Some activists' catalytic experiences were perceived as primarily emotional in nature and some as primarily rational in nature. Whether moral shocks through exposure of nonhuman animal suffering is a necessity for having people converted and recruited for the cause is a controversial debate within the animal rights movement. The fact that a considerable amount of activists was triggered in this way does not necessarily mean that it is the most effective way. It may simply mean that

[89] She called him by his real name but I am using his "activist name" for the sake of anonymity.
[90] In chapter four I will look at positive emotions such as pleasure and how it relates to collective identity construction and expression.

the use of moral shocks is the most common tactic in the movement's repertoire up until today (Wrenn 2013). The fact that some[91] activists' conversion-recruitment was based on rational considerations is a valuable finding for those activists who argue that images and narratives of suffering are detrimental to the cause. Why they are opposed to it will be revealed in chapter two. Furthermore, rationality and learning the arguments that support veganism and nonhuman animal rights is considered highly important by most nonhuman animal rights activists. Not only does this knowledge counter society's stereotypes about animal rights activists as being irrational, it also enables them to convince people more easily of veganism and the animal rights cause. Perhaps even more importantly, as some activists argue, knowledge enables them to apply the "right" tactics instead of the wrong ones.

The desire for many vegans and vegetarians to meet with like-minded others due to alienation from mainstream society is a huge incentive to join the movement. Some people join only for the social contacts and grow into activism gradually. For many others the motivation to join comes from the urge to be politically active for animals but the social aspect is nonetheless often strong; activism and social activities go hand in hand. Thus, the social implications of veganism may have profound consequences for the nonhuman animal rights movement.

[91] Four people explicitly identified their conversion process as based on logic, that is at least two-third of the total amount of actvists that I interviewed.

CHAPTER 2

VEGAN OUTREACH VERSUS "ANIMAL LIBERATON": THE BASIC FRAME DISPUTES

You need to know how important veganism is as an ethical necessity and how important spreading veganism is. (Gülce Özen Gürkan, Abolitionist Vegan Movement)

One day everyone will share recipes of vegan cakes; but recipes to save hens that are imprisoned for their eggs will not come from eating culture (Restless Vegans Manifesto 2013, 9).

In this chapter I will shed light on the activists' ideas of the "right" activism. Understanding what discourses and tactics the activists support or reject goes beyond ideology. It is where collective action frames come into the picture. My analysis of the collective action frames utilized by the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul is based on various sources, ranging from the ethnographic interviews, observation of events as well as the discourses that activists construct through debates and textual materials. Besides, I will use examples of campaigns and common tactics to guide me through this analysis. As we will see throughout this chapter and the next, disagreements over tactics are for a large part a reflection of the debates that are happening on a transnational level and in other geographies, particularly among radical animal rights factions in the United States. Yet, some aspects of the debates are distinctive for the Turkish case.

2.1. Collective action frames

The nonhuman animal rights movement is based on the anti-speciesist ideology: the ideology which holds that beings should not be discriminated against on the basis of their species. According to anti-speciesism nonhuman animals, like human animals, have the right to live and the right to be free from interference and use of any kind. All nonhuman animal rights groups (but not animal welfare groups) adhere to this ideology. However, this does not mean that they frame the cause in exactly identical ways.

Activists and groups may use different frames to convince movement outsiders that the animal rights cause deserves recognition and support.

Simply put, the act of framing is to construct meaning. Social movements make use of collective action framing, which help determine the tactics and repertoires that they apply. Collective action frames can be defined as 'action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization' (Snow and Benford 2000, 614). Collective action framing can be divided into three main elements: (1) diagnostic framing (identifying the problem), (2) prognostic framing (identifying the solution), and (3) motivational framing (mobilizing potential recruits) (Snow and Benford 2000, Munro 2005, Packwood Freeman 2010).[92]

2.2. Animal rights factions in Istanbul: abolitionist vegans and veganarchists

Different factions within a movement usually adhere to distinct frames. The nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul is not isolated from the rest of the world. Because of this most of the dynamics are directly related to the transnational nonhuman animal rights movement. There is a range of nonhuman animal rights philosophers from abroad that are popular and influential among activists in Istanbul. However, the movement factions and philosophies that are the most common on an organized level are: the abolitionist approach and vegan anarchism. It is therefore these philosophies that serve as guidelines for the groups' and individuals' activism.

In Istanbul most activists that adhere to the abolitionist approach are organized in Abolitionist Vegan Movement. The Gezi protests of June 2013 marked the birth of this group which at that time was known as Vegan Resist. The founders of Vegan Resist, Gülce and Efe, went through a period of critically studying nonhuman animal rights philosophies. After a period of reading, thinking and discussing the ethical vegans eventually adopted the abolitionist vegan approach. Vegan Resist then became

[92] Even though frames and ideologies partially overlap, they are not identical (Oliver et al., 2000) The somewhat synonymous use of the concepts of frames and ideologies by scholars who study social movements have led to controversial debates in the social movement literature. Oliver et al. argue that 'framing points to process, while ideology points to content' (ibid, 8). As it applies to social movements they clarify that framing has mostly to do with 'intentional activity of movement entrepreneurs at the organizational level' (ibid). Ideology, on the other hand, encompasses 'the content of whole systems of belief …' (ibid). For more information on this see Oliver et al., 2000.

Abolitionist Vegan Movement. As of October 2014 the Abolitionist Vegan Movement in Istanbul had twelve active members.

The history of the particular animal rights philosophy called the "abolitionist approach" begins in the United States in the 1990s. In 1995 the law scholar Gary Francione published his book Animals, Property, and the Law. It was in this work that he introduced his unorthodox view on nonhuman animal rights. Francione points out that the basic problem with regard to animal rights is the property status of nonhumans. Therefore his approach is based on the number one principle that 'all sentient beings, humans or nonhumans, have one right: the basic right not to be treated as the property of others'[93].

More popular in number among nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul is the vegan anarchist philosophy, also known as veganarchism. Groups with an explicit anarchist outlook are: Freedom to Earth Association, Independent Animal Liberation Activists, Independent Nature Animal Activists, and Display Cruelty. Besides the groups, there are many individual activists who identify with the vegan anarchist ideology.

Veganarchism was introduced by Brian A. Dominick in his pamphlet Animal Liberation and Social Revolution. Like Francione's work it was first published in 1995.[94] The connection between nonhuman animal liberation and a social revolution is central to this approach. Dominick calls for a total revolution, which should rule out all oppression in society. In this perspective, changing the relationship between humans and nonhumans is not enough. It involves a strong critique against all institutions in society that perpetuate the power of a relative minority. Among these institutions is the capitalist system (Dominick, 1997).

Veganarchism acknowledges that speciesism, anthropocentrism, and the domination of nature by humans already existed before capitalism. All power relations, as veganarchists point out, have their root cause in settled agriculture and civilization, of which capitalism is merely a secondary symptom (Pellow 2014, Freedom to Earth manifesto). However, it is noted that late capitalism highly contributed to the large-scale

[93] Francione, Gary L. The Six Principles of the Abolitionist Approach to Animal Rights, : http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/about/the-six-principles-of-the-abolitionist-approach-to-animal-rights/#.VeNfmfmqqko, accessed 27 June 2015.
[94] A revised edition appeared in 1997.

oppression of nonhuman animals, humans, and nature alike. Particularly after the industrial revolution this oppression acquired extreme forms. Mass exploitation of nonhuman animals, de-forestation, pollution, malnutrition, global warming, and big conglomerates taking over the smaller companies are all a result of late capitalism (Freedom to Earth manifesto). Many vegan anarchists speak of "total liberation", a framework 'that sees the exploitation of ecosystems and nonhuman animals as necessarily linked to the inequalities within human society, and that recognizes there can be no liberation of one without the other' (Pellow 2014, 19).

The total liberation frame is reflected in the anarchist groups' outlook and discourses. On the website of Freedom to Earth for example its aim is defined as: 'exposing all violations of rights without discriminating such as against species, race, and gender, and to do all kinds of campaigns in order to prevent those violations, and to have solidarity with those who are the victims of governmental, capitalist or societal dominance'.[95]

2.3. Frames in common: exploitation, slavery, and discrimination

If a social movement's activism is in line with the movement's ends frames will reflect those ends. If there is a gap between the movement's activism on the one hand and its ends on the other hand frames and tactics are likely to be inauthentic. In my view this is the main difference between radical social movement organizations and mainstream social movement organizations. Furthermore, I believe that in no other social movement does the discrepancy between ends and frames occur more than in the global nonhuman animal rights movement. This can be explained by the enormous gap that exists between the animal rights movement and the rest of society. The idea of nonhuman animals as ethical persons is still very strange to the majority of the world's population. In an attempt to close the gap between the movement and the public nonhuman animal rights activists have adapted their frames (and consequently, their tactics) to the extent that their goal of reaching a society absent of speciesism (that is, a society in which nonhumans are not used for human ends anymore) has become largely invisible. It became masked by the discourse of animal welfarism, a discourse that the public could relate to. This is the case with the mainstream animal rights movement in most areas of

[95] http://yeryuzuneozgurluk.org/, accessed 1 April, 2015.

the world today, particularly in the United States, Europe and Australia where a professionalization of animal rights organizations has become the trend. Professional organizations are dependent on financial donations and media attention (Wrenn 2013). It is thus in these organization's interest to attract a large support base, which explains why they reach out to mainstream society. In Turkey the Animal Rights Federation (HAYTAP) exemplifies this phenomenon.

The grassroots nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul however does not fall into that category. An animal welfarist frame is rejected in favor of animal rights. The high degree of authenticity within the movement makes it so that generally the movement's ends inform the frames used for activism to a high degree. Nonetheless, there is still a considerable difference between some of the frames among the groups. Divisions within movements are often caused by disagreement over frames (Benford and Snow 1993, Wrenn 2012). Within the grassroots nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul such disagreements have led to serious diagnostic, prognostic and motivational frame disputes. Despite their disagreements abolitionist vegans and vegan anarchists partially have basic frames in common.

Scholars and activists alike have noted that in order for the nonhuman animal rights movement to reach a state of authenticity the problem should be defined as 'exploitation and slavery not husbandry and cruelty' (Dunayer 2006; Francione 1996; Hall 2006; 2006b; LaVeck 2006a, 2006b, cited in Packwood Freeman 2010, 5). Using the terms exploitation and slavery is the most dominant way of diagnostic framing that the nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul engage in when they define the problem with regard to nonhuman animals.[96] However, some materials and campaigns do involve narratives and depictions of cruelty and suffering. Later in this chapter I will show how this has led to a major frame dispute.

Discrimination is another frame that is utilized frequently by all of the nonhuman animal rights groups in Istanbul. The term speciesism is a core part of the movement's discourses. All of the groups are in essence anti-speciesist which means that they reject discrimination based on species. Anti-speciesism is the basic position that they are

[96] It is in fact one of the things that I found striking about this movement, because in the Netherlands and Belgium I had encountered the 'cruelty' frame a lot more.

premised on. Therefore, they do not regard any animal more important than another.[97] Being anti-speciesist implies acknowledging nonhuman animals as ethical persons instead of regarding them as objects, property, or resources.

To make people aware of speciesism the activists have to discursively deconstruct the human-animal boundary. This alternative paradigm (compared to the dominant paradigm in society) with regard to human-animal relations is reflected in the main principle of the abolitionist approach. The deconstruction of the human-animal boundary is also characteristic of principle number four and five of this philosophy. Principle number 4 argues against the assumption that humans are superior to nonhumans based on their cognitive abilities:

> The abolitionist approach links the moral status of nonhumans with sentience alone and not with any other cognitive characteristic. Sentience is subjective awareness; there is someone who perceives and experiences the world. A sentient being has interests; that is, preferences, wants, or desires. If a being is sentient, then that is necessary and sufficient for the being to have the right not to be used as a means to human ends, which, correlatively, imposes on humans the moral obligation not to use that being as a resource. It is not a matter of "humanely" using that animal. Although less suffering is better than more suffering, no use can be morally justified.[98]

Principle number 5 again rejects the speciesist human-animal boundary and along with this it explicitly rejects other socially constructed boundaries between human groups:

> Just as we reject racism, sexism, ageism, and heterosexism, we reject speciesism. The species of a sentient being is no more reason to deny the protection of this basic right than race, sex, age, or sexual orientation is a reason to deny membership in the human moral community to other humans (ibid).

The vegan anarchist philosophy also tries to deconstruct the human-animal boundary. M. Keser explains Freedom to Earth's approach on this issue:

> Yes we are in the perspective of animal liberation but animal liberation for us is not just animals as we understand. Cause you know we are animals too. Cause you know, Enlightenment taught us that we are not animals. So this was a self-denial. We are trying to deconstruct this mind that we are not animals. Actually we say that this is like denying yourself then, you are a mammal you know. Their doctrines included, like, humanism, which at the first sight it should seem like okay, but humanism included that we are above animals on hierarchy, and

[97] For this reason they are distinct from animal groups that wish to protect only certain species of nonhuman animals such as cats and dogs, that are used as companion species in many areas of the world.
[98] Francione, Gary L. The Six Principles of the Abolitionist Approach to Animal Rights, : http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/about/the-six-principles-of-the-abolitionist-approach-to-animal-rights/#.VeNfmfmqqko, accessed 27 June 2015.

> we have all every right to exploit animals because we can do maths, we can build bridges, we can do buildings, we can do roads, we can do hospitals. A cow cannot do hospitals, cannot do bridges. But just because we calculate better it doesn't give right to I don't know cut a cow or you know kick a cow.

Vegan anarchists also address oppressive terminology and socially constructed dichotomies of 'self' and 'other'. In Freedom to Earth Association's manifesto it is stated that these dichotomies are inherently violent and that they uphold power in society. The manifesto clarifies:

> Self-other, man-nature, human-animal, mind-body, man-woman, white-black, inside-outside, adult-minor, heterosexual-homosexual, civilized-primitive, modern-traditional, beautiful-ugly, educated-ignorant, sane-insane, normal-anormal – are patterns of thinking of the system that has taken the world under its sovereignty. These dichotomies has [sic] made and served as justifications for the domination of the "civilized" white man over the "other" that he has named through these constructed hierarchies.[99]

In the presentation that a speaker from Freedom to Earth regularly gives at universities he reveals other ways how language covers up that we are eating nonhuman animals, making the animal an "absent referent" (Adams 2004):

> To avoid cognitive dissonance, every language has its veils. We do not call their flesh corpse, instead we say meat. Etymologically meat word does not necessarily refer to animals, instead it meant just food. Also words like bacon and ham have no direct connection to their real owner, a pig (presentation 'Speciesism and Animal Rights Violations' by a Freedom to Earth member).

The use of a new vocabulary is essential for the nonhuman animal rights movement. This vocabulary is used internally but also externally. The nonhuman animal rights movement aims at profound cultural and social change. Struggling against oppression involves being aware of oppressive terminology and replacing it with a different one. With slogans such as 'long live the brother and sisterhood of the species', 'we are all animals' and 'freedom to living creatures' nonhuman animal rights activists intend to remove the symbolic boundary between humans and other animal species. In her study of the nonhuman animal rights movement Elizabeth Cherry points out that 'the dismantling of the human-animal boundary is 'simultaneously a goal and a strategy' (Cherry 2010, 455). Highlighting and transgressing the boundary is the strategy; motivating people to rethink the socially constructed boundary is the goal (ibid).

[99] Freedom to Earth Association manifesto, cited in Wolf 2015, 52

On activists' Facebook pages there were other examples of slogans that challenge the human-animal boundary. One person wrote a parody on the Turkish national motto 'how happy is the one who can call himself a Turk.'[100] He changed the motto into: 'how happy is the one who can call himself an animal.'[101] By doing this he criticized both nationalism and speciesism simultaneously.

Nonhuman animal rights activists that play football with the activist football club Vegansport in the anti-industrial Against League (Karşı Lig) found a different way to do this "boundary work". Each player has chosen an animal species name and printed this word on the back of their shirts. The Vegansport activists also promote this in the video in which they introduce their football club. Müğe Can, a member of Vegansport, explains why it is so important for them to use nonhuman animal names:

> We did something different here. They use animal names as swearing words like "dog" and to insult the government they use "dog". They call police "pigs", "dogs", "donkeys". They call someone who works a lot "cow". In Vegansport we gave everyone an animal name in order to change this. I am an ox. The goal keeper is a donkey. Kerem is a dog. There is a bear. The other friends in Against League are not willing to say these words to us. We say: "this is not an insult, it's a compliment". These are not swearing words, for us it's something nice to be called ox, bear, or donkey.[102]

Bringing about cultural change in this way is a difficult job, even outside of mainstream society. The teams that play in Against League are all committed to social justice struggles. Nevertheless, many of them have a hard time understanding the paradigm shift when it comes to nonhuman animal rights.

2.4. Case study: the stray dog campaigns

To jump even more from the theory into the field I will give a few examples of campaigns organized by the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. Looking at some of the actions will reveal the frame differences and disputes.

[100] *Ne mutlu Türküm diyene*.
[101] *Ne mutlu hayvanım diyene.*
[102] 'Burada değişik bir şey yaptık, hayvanlar hakaret malzemesi olarak kullanılıyor ya hani "it, köpek" ve hükümeti aşağılamak için köpek kullanıyor. Polise domuz, kopek, eşek. Işte, çok okuyana inek deniyor. Biz vegan sporda bunu degistirmek icin herkese hayvan isimleri verdik. Bem öküzüm. Işte eşek var, kaleci eşek. Işte Kerem köpek. Ayı var. Karsı Liğin diger arkadaşları bize bu lafları soylemeye dilleri varmıyor. Biz bu bir hakaret değil ki diyoruz bu bir iltifat. Küfür değil, bu bize ökuz denmesi ayı denmesi eşek denmesi güzel bir sey.'

Between three and five March 2015 nonhuman animal rights activists on behalf of eleven different groups protested in front of the Grand Cevahir Hotel in Istanbul's Şişli neighborhood. The reason was a conference on dog population management that was taking place in the hotel. The conference was organized by the International Companion Animal Management (ICAM) coalition in the name of 'animal welfare, animal health and education, zoonotic diseases, and public health'.[103]

The outrage and protest against the ICAM conference is better understood in relation to another protest that happened a month earlier: the protest against Kısırkaya camp for stray animals recently built by the municipality. The authorities euphemistically call this camp the "Kısırkaya Temporary Unclaimed Animal Nursery Center and Living Space with Garden" but nonhuman animal rights activist fear that it will turn into a concentration and segregation center for the city's canine inhabitants. A similar camp is planned in the area of Pendik. The measures are part of urban renewal projects. Neşe Akbaş from Freedom to Earth Association stated in a press release:

> Unlike some European countries and some states in the US, stray animals in animal shelters in Turkey cannot be killed for not being adopted. ICAM tries to change this by emphasizing this as a modern solution for animal population control. But this is no different than mass murder. We are not going to let anyone wash the blood off the governments' and the local administrations' hands in order to deflect public opinion with false and inconsistent claims and to encourage official and public violence against animals. Neither in newly constructed Kısırkaya, nor in pojectized Pendik Animal Concentration Camps.[104]

The campaign against the Kısırkaya camp and the ICAM conference received support from a broad range of NGO's and social movement groups in Turkey. It is not only nonhuman animal rights groups that were mobilized for the cause but also ecology, LGBTQ and human rights groups. Among the grassroots nonhuman animal rights groups that I am studying it was Freedom to Earth Association and Independent Animal Liberation Activists that were actively involved in the organization of this campaign. In the same month another protest related to stray animals was held in front of the Istanbul Azerbaijan Consulate.[105] On this occasion the activists protested the mass killing of stray dogs in Azerbaijan's capital city Baku in preparation for the 2015 European Games. The protestors shouted: 'We are all animals, you can't reduce us by burning!' A

[103] http://www.icam-coalition.org/, accessed 27 June 2015.
[104] Press release on Freedom to Earth's Facebook page.
[105] This protest was reported by newspaper Yeni Akit: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qk6JfonLCUs. Another recording of the event can be watched here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X6FyOzbTqO0

spokesperson from Freedom to Earth was quoted as saying: 'The idea to eradicate stray animals in the name of modern civilization is not just torturing animals but also Azerbaijani people who raise their voice for animals. Many people have been prosecuted and repressed because of peaceful demonstrations'.[106]

2.5. Case Study: the Damien Hirst campaign

As we see from the previous example local protests are often related to dynamics elsewhere in the world. The same is true for the Independent Animal Liberation Activists' first protest in January 2013, shortly after the group was established. A famous artist from England, Damien Hirst, was coming to Istanbul to have the debut solo exhibition of his work. Hirst is notorious for using nonhuman animals in his art pieces. He has made it a habit to kill these animals and stuff them in the name of art. The members of Independent Animal Liberation Activists decided to protest against Hirst's unethical practices in an unconventional way. Instead of holding a traditional protest they visited the exhibition disguised as reporters. By doing interviews they confronted the visitors with the reality of Hirst's art.[107] Earthlings Dünyalı, who was a member of this activist group by that time, tells how their action was received:

> The mayor of Şisli, Mustafa Sarıgül, we interviewed him with camera and he said that he had no idea about this artist. He criticized himself saying that he should have researched it before coming here. And he says that he loves animals – even though he's not a vegan which is a contradiction – he said if he knew it he would not have participated. A lot of newspapers were interested in it. They made an article about it and it was in the news. We have 5000 hits for that video specifically. A lot of famous newspapers were interested in that news.

Many nonhuman animal rights activists think of the Damien Hirst campaign as a successful campaign; the unethical form of art for which nonhumans are used and killed was revealed to people who had previously been unaware of it. The action did not go unnoticed; it received a lot of media attention. The mayor had expressed his regrets about the exhibition. Nevertheless, there are nonhuman animal rights activists who argue that this type of campaign and the protests described earlier do not serve the

[106] Kaos GL, 'Protests in Turkey against Azerbaijan dog massacre', http://www.kaosgl.com/page.php?id=18963, 3 July 2015.

[107] A recording of the event can be watched here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JIUxiJo_rt0

movement. The concern they have with such actions is that these events are oriented towards a specific issue. This, according to them, leads to serious framing problems, inconsistencies and even discrimination.

2.6. Vegan outreach

The abolitionist vegans therefore utilize a different tactic: vegan outreach. The abolitionist approach dictates that activism should always be vegan-based. Principle number three states:

> The abolitionist approach sees abolition as the goal of animal ethics and sees creative, nonviolent vegan advocacy—and not welfare reform—as the means to that end. The abolitionist approach regards veganism as the moral baseline and maintains that we cannot draw a morally coherent distinction between flesh and other animal products, such as dairy or eggs, or between animal foods and the use of animals for clothing or other products.[108]

Educating people about ethical veganism and about the abolitionist approach is at the core of the Abolitionist Vegan Movement. The abolitionist vegans in Istanbul organize "Vegan Activism Days" (Vegan Eylem Günü) every other week. The Vegan Activism Days take place interchangeably in the Kadıköy district and in the Bakırköy district of the city. The activists set up a street stall on a square where there are a lot of passersby. They have a banner hanging on their neck that says: 'I am vegan. You can ask me questions'.[109] People who are interested approach them and ask the questions they have about veganism. Gülce tells that many people have misunderstandings about vegans or heard negative things about them. This makes people curious to know more and it is an opportunity for the activists to clear up those misunderstandings. Along with the verbal vegan advocacy the activists hand out leaflets with information. The abolitionist vegans' advocacy is more than just about veganism. Informing people about the abolitionist approach is an essential part of their activism. According to Gülce people do not only have misunderstandings about veganism but are also confused because of the tactics used by other groups. Therefore she believes it is never too early to speak to

[108] Francione, Gary L. The Six Principles of the Abolitionist Approach to Animal Rights, : http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/about/the-six-principles-of-the-abolitionist-approach-to-animal-rights/#.VeNfmfmqqko, accessed 27 June 2015.
[109] In Turkish: *Veganım. Soru sorabilirsiniz.*

nonvegans about all the other issues that abolitionist vegans criticize about the animal rights movement.

Francione's abolitionist approach has received severe opposition by mainstream nonhuman animal rights organizations in Europe and the United States that label an uncompromising abolitionist agenda and vegan advocacy as "extremist", "unrealistic", even "utopian". A vegan lifestyle itself is often portrayed as "difficult" and "unnecessary". Negative media depictions and censorship have highly contributed to this stigmatized framing of veganism by the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement (Wrenn 2013). Despite this marginalization, the abolitionist approach has gained a sizable amount of supporters in the past decade (Wrenn 2012). The supporters are mostly small grassroots groups and localized individuals (ibid). The most known organization is the Abolitionist Vegan Society founded by Sarah K. Woodcock in the United States. Other nonhuman animal rights advocates that adhere to the abolitionist approach and that are a source of inspiration for AVH activists in Turkey are the sociologists Corey Lee Wrenn, Bob Torres, David Nibert, and the philosopher Gary Steiner.

2.7. Welfarism and "new welfarism"

The abolitionist vegans in Istanbul have developed a particular political position that is mostly based on abolitionist vegan philosophers from abroad. Part of that position is an extensive critique of frames and tactics used by other nonhuman animal rights groups and activists in Istanbul. The core dispute revolves around what the abolitionist vegans perceive as "new welfarist" tactics but what many of the other activists do not perceive as such.

Francione has coined the term "new welfarism" to refer to organizations that utilize welfarist tactics in order to achieve abolition in the long run. He defines new welfarism as: 'New welfarism is the view that there is a causal relationship between animal welfare reform and abolition in that the former will lead to the latter, and is the best (or

only) way to achieve abolition'.[110] The stance against new welfarism is reflected in principle number two of the abolitionist approach:

> Our recognition of the one basic right means that we must abolish, and not merely regulate, institutionalized animal exploitation—because it assumes that animals are the property of humans. We recognize that we will not abolish overnight the property status of nonhumans, but we will support only those campaigns and positions that explicitly promote the abolitionist agenda. We will not support positions that call for supposedly "improved" regulation of animal exploitation. (ibid)

Francione points out that using welfarist tactics as an attempt to reach abolition is problematic for two reasons. It is problematic morally because advocating for more "humane" forms of nonhuman animal exploitation is no different than campaigning for more "humane" forms of rape or more "humane" forms of human slavery (ibid). From a practical point of view Francione refutes the view that new welfarism will ever lead to the abolition of nonhuman animal slavery. New welfarism, like welfarism, does not challenge nonhumans' property status. Within the new welfarist frame nonhuman animals remain economic commodities and thus continue to be exploited. Moreover, people may be encouraged to consume nonhuman animal flesh and products because they believe that the animals are treated "humanely". Francione refers to the frequent media stories about ex-vegetarians or ex-vegans who converted back to the carnist lifestyle because animal welfare reforms have supposedly led to better treatment of animals (ibid).

Francione argues that nearly all of the mainstream nonhuman animal rights organizations are primarily welfarist; the organizations are unclear about vegan advocacy and they 'tend to collaborate heavily with nonhuman animal exploiters' (Wrenn 2013, 2). New welfarism has become so entrenched in the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement globally that it is difficult for many activists to think outside of this framework. However, the same cannot be said about the nonhuman animal rights activists that I am studying in Istanbul. I have not met even one activist who believes in campaigning for reform. This is why HAYTAP is not taken seriously among grassroots nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey.

[110] Francione, Gary L. The Six Principles of the Abolitionist Approach to Animal Rights, : http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/about/the-six-principles-of-the-abolitionist-approach-to-animal-rights/#.VeNfmfmqqko, accessed 27 June 2015.

Welfarism (in Turkish refahçılık) and new welfarism (yeni refahçılık) may have turned into the most controversial and contested words within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. The activists see welfarism as a dangerous poison that has infiltrated the global mainstream animal rights movement in Europe and the United States. No matter how activists disagree about certain things, they agree about one thing: welfarism is ineffective, detrimental, and hypocritical. Welfarism leads animal rights organizations to commit harmful compromises. Instead of fighting speciesism welfarism serves industries and capitalism. It promotes "happy exploitation". It soothes people's conscience when they buy "humane" nonhuman animal flesh and products.

Despite this general consent among animal rights activists in Turkey the topic has led to a major disagreement. The disagreement centers around what types of actions fall into the category of new welfarism. What tactics and frames may lead to animal welfarist policies, even if they do not intend in doing so?

2.8. Graphic imagery and narratives of suffering

One of the controversial issues with regard to new welfarism is the use of materials that emphasize the animals' suffering. The mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement has always heavily relied on graphic images or videos that display cruelty to nonhuman animals. The aim is to mobilize people's emotions in order to recruit them to the cause. In chapter one we have seen that moral shocks had played a role in the conversion and recruitment of almost half of the activists that I have interviewed. The documentary film Earthlings for example served as a catalyst for many, including for Gülce, who is now against the use of such moral shocks.

During the interview I talked with Gülce about one of her songs that she wrote for the animal rights cause and which was uploaded on Youtube. It was the song with the title Insan ne ayaksın (Human who the hell are you). On the Youtube upload Insan ne ayaksın was accompanied with images depicting nonhuman animal suffering. Gülce told me that she had not uploaded the song herself and that she did not want her song to

be portrayed with that kind of images.[111] Even though she had become vegan overnight after having watched Earthlings she does not recommend exposure to graphic imagery that displays cruelty to animals. Gülce tells:

> It made me traumatized for a month. And I don't think it's necessary for now. We have all the information about the ethical aspects of that so we don't need that traumatic visions. (…) It's about looking at the right perspective to the other's suffering. There is a suffering body there. There's a suffering ethical person there and it's not ethical to make a 'suffering fetish' from that.

Gülce points here to the ethical objection of looking at another person's (including nonhuman animal persons) suffering. But the main reason why many abolitionist vegans are distrustful of the usage of moral shocks is that it may lead to animal welfarism instead of abolition. Francione has argued that graphic depictions of suffering focus on the treatment of nonhuman animals and not on use. Therefore, they can be misinterpreted as an advocacy for reform.

Within the global abolitionist movement support for the usage of graphic images and narratives that focus on suffering is ambiguous. Wrenn has published a research about the usage of graphic imagery among abolitionist groups. Her study is a reaction to DeCoux's publication on the efficacy of moral shocks. DeCoux argues that the abolitionist faction of the nonhuman animal rights movement fails to recruit members because they do not use descriptions or images of suffering effectively (Wrenn 2013). Wrenn notes that the abolitionist faction – as opposed to the welfarist faction – indeed utilizes rational representation of information more than evoking people's emotions. Nevertheless, abolitionist vegans sometimes borrow from welfarist tactics to motivate people into becoming vegan. When they use these tactics the information is generally represented within an abolitionist framework. Out of the twelve groups that Wrenn studied half of them relied on depictions of suffering for their advocacy. Wrenn calls the efficacy of these tactics into question. She finds that contextual constraints possibly complicate the efficacy of moral shocks for vegan outreach. Depictions and narratives of suffering are highly normalized within the welfarist movement. For as long as graphic imagery is primarily associated with welfare reform these depictions could be interpreted as a call for reform (ibid). Welfarism is the dominant discourse in society and within the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement. The negative portrayal

[111] When I looked at the upload six months after the interview, in May 2015, the images of suffering had been replaced more neutral images of nonhuman animals.

of veganism by the media, by the welfarist movement, and by counter-movement forces such as nonhuman animal exploiters is also a major barrier (ibid). A paradigm shift would have to take place and this takes more than moral shocks alone. A paradigm shift can only be brought about if the movement focuses explicitly on criticizing the use of nonhuman animals and not the treatment.

Yalım has been active with an abolitionist vegan group in Germany and now he is an activist for Abolitionist Vegan Movement in Turkey. When I asked him to compare abolitionist vegan activism in these countries based on his experience he replied that, while the group in Germany that he joined was doing quite well too, he has the impression that the activists in Turkey 'care a little bit more about the philosophy, about the ideological issue'. He explains it further:

> An action for example I don't appreciate of that group in Germany is that they sometimes show some videos on the street. They do it in summer cause when it's not too dark outside. Those videos include very violent acts which are used against animals and you feel horrible after have watched the videos. I oppose these kind of acts because it's focused on the violence and pain of animals. And the issue should be that they are regarded as a property and resource. That's one thing I can object. They are making, the group in Germany, some food activism, that I found very positive, that we don't do it here. Well people do it here but in a different way, on Tuesdays in Community Kitchen. People bring their own food. But still it's not a demonstrating because most people are already vegan who go to this event.

Wrenn's research of abolitionist groups in the US and Yalım's experience in Germany and Turkey show that there is no consensus among abolitionist vegan activists globally on using depictions of suffering. The Abolitionist Vegan Movement in Istanbul however is strictly against it. Gülce presented the same argument as Wrenn and Yalım during the interview:

> Actually we don't care that much about that (the suffering) is happening. Because we know that we are using animals and it's all wrong. Even if the treatment was awesome, if they're like in a hotel, that kind of stuff. It was still wrong. It's all about seeing animals as ethical persons and treat them like that. And this means just going vegan and spreading veganism.

Gülce suggests that seeing a shocking documentary such as Earthlings does not guarantee that a person becomes vegan. In her case it did but she knows other people who after seeing the documentary merely went vegetarian or started to consume "happy meat". An emphasis on suffering can thus easily lead to reductionist alternatives instead of veganism.

As I wrote earlier animal rights activists in Istanbul (other than abolitionist vegans) make use sometimes of images and narratives of suffering. Despite their emphasis on abolition (and not regulation) of nonhuman animal slavery, their campaigns do involve narratives of suffering to some extent. Shocking documentaries such as Earthlings are recommended or screened and bloody images of tortured animals are also part and parcel of the groups' and activists' repertoire.

2.9. Issue-specific campaigns and "new welfarism"

Another discussion revolves around issue-specific or species-specific campaigns. Such "single-issue" campaigns are extremely common within the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement. But also among a large part of the grassroots nonhuman animal rights it is common to protest against specific injustices against nonhuman animals. In this context single-issue campaigns are understood as campaigns that 'focus on particular uses of animals, or on particular species' (Francione, cited in Wrenn and Johnson 2013, 653).

In Istanbul almost all nonhuman animal rights groups and activists engage in issue-specific campaigns. The abolitionist vegans are an exception to this; they argue against those types of protest. On a global level not all abolitionist vegans are opposed to issue-specific campaigns under all circumstances. Tom Regan believes that campaigning for legislation that bans specific uses of nonhuman animals can be an effective step toward reaching complete abolition (Wrenn 2013, 3). Francione himself thinks of single-issue campaigns as generally problematic because they can cause confusion. When a protest focuses on a particular case of injustice against animals or on a specific species while it does not at the same time promote ethical veganism this may lead to inconsistencies and misunderstandings. A protest against the production and consumption of fur for instance may get the public to think that wearing a fur coat is worse than drinking a glass of milk. But according to the ethics of animal rights there is no moral distinction between these two acts. They both perpetuate the property status of nonhuman animals. However, Francione does not necessarily reject all single-issue oriented campaigns. He argues that activists who choose to engage in such a campaign must express the non-exploitation goal clearly and explicitly. The aim of the campaign should be abolition,

not reform. Besides, activists should make clear that the particular issue that they protest against is merely a representative of the larger problem of nonhuman animal exploitation. Thus, ethical vegan outreach must be part of the campaign.[112]

Corey Lee Wrenn and Rob Johnson (2013) criticize Francione's relatively flexible position with regard to single-issue campaigns. They argue that 'issue-specific advocacy diverts attention from the root cause of injustice' and thus harms the integrity of the campaign. Besides, they point out that because such campaigns fail to address speciesism as a whole they inevitably exclude other issues and other species. As such, Wrenn and Johnson conclude, these campaigns are ineffective in combating speciesism. Another reason why many abolitionist vegans are opposed to issue-specific campaigning has to do with their argument that these types of actions are open to discrimination.[113]

2.10. "New welfarist" or not?

We have discussed the reasons why the activists belonging to the Abolitonist Vegan Movement label the other groups and activists as "new welfarist". It is a matter of framing and tactics. Nonetheless, the grassroots nonhuman animal rights groups in Istanbul that they criticize do not fit the standard description of what Francione defines as "new welfarist". They do not see welfarism as a way to reach abolitionism. They do not campaign for animal welfare reform. Neither do they cooperate with nonhuman animal exploiters. As I noted earlier animal welfarism is perceived very negatively among animal rights activists in Istanbul, to the extent that "welfarism" may be used as a sort of swearing word. Freedom to Earth Association even protested HAYTAP's problematic cooperation with the municipality. It is clear from their protests that they call for "empty cages" not "bigger cages" like the welfarist movement does. During their protests activists often carry banner with slogans such as 'go vegan' or 'a vegan world is possible'. These banners are present even if the protest is about species that are usually not eaten in Turkey such as stray dogs or animals in zoos.

[112] 'Single-Issue Campaigns in Human & Nonhuman Contexts', http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/single-issue-campaigns-and-in-human-nonhuman-contexts/#.Vd8XTfmqqko, accessed 27 June 2015.
[113] I will explore this topic in chapter three.

However, they utilize certain tactics that are associated with the welfarist movement and that may unintentionally perpetuate welfarism because of the way these tactics are interpreted. These types of campaigning, i.e. issue-specific campaigns and the use of graphic imagery are the main topics of discussion between the abolitionist vegans and the other groups in Istanbul. The other groups do not think of these tactics as new welfarism. Earthlings Dünyalı argues against the claim that protesting in the way they do should be labeled as new welfarist. He says:

> The Abolitionist approach to animal rights tells us that we should not protest. "We should only educate." This may be their approach towards animal rights but protesting does not make a group "new welfarist". Asking for regulation in the name of animal rights, however, does.

Earthlings Dünyalı acknowledges that new welfarism exists and that it is a problem but he does not agree with the view that every group that engages in issue-specific campaigns is new welfarist. The real new welfarist groups according to him are organizations such as PETA and HAYTAP. He criticizes HAYTAP for not promoting veganism as an ethical necessity. In HAYTAP's article "Vejetaryen Olmak İsteyenler İçin Bilgiler[114]" ("Information for people who want to be become vegetarian") vegetarianism is framed as something optional. About vegans it is written that 'this group is described as strict vegetarians who do not eat any animal products (..)'. Earthlings Dünyalı suggests that 'this language and approach HAYTAP uses is very objective and encyclopedia-like and makes HAYTAP, the Animal Rights Federation, look (as if) they do not take stand on the issue'.

HAYTAP's articles are highly characterized by a welfarist discourse. Earthlings Dünyalı refers to an article in which the organization calls for sacrifice animals to be slaughtered in hygienic places instead of on streets and in gardens due to the danger of bird flu. In another article HAYTAP warns for the dangers of intensive nonhuman animal factory farms in relation to the mad cow decease. In this article it is argued that the growth of factory farming industries leads to the extinction of small farmers. Earthlings Dünyalı comments on this as follows: 'If I were a consultant for a small animal farm, I would definitely use HAYTAP's paragraph for promoting my client's business. How pathetic for a federation carrying a name such as "animal rights" and legitimizing the killing of animals' (correspondence with Earthlings Dünyalı).

[114] 'Vejetaryen Olmak Isteyenler Için Bilgiler', http://www.haytap.org/index.php/200908242127/vejetaryen-dunyasi/vejetaryen-olmak-isteyenler-icin-bilgiler, accessed 27 June 2015.

Like many other nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul and around the globe Earthlings Dünyalı does not think of issue-specific campaigns as necessarily perpetuating welfarism. He believes that issue-specific actions are acceptable under two conditions: (a) the campaign should be focused on elimination of animal use and not regulation and (b) the campaign should clearly state that all animal use is unacceptable because animals are sentient beings and not property or resources. In other words, the vegan message should be clear. He argues that if used in these ways "single-issued" actions can serve as a starting point to convey the animal rights position that includes rights for all animal species. Earthlings Dünyalı explains:

> This is not welfarism simply because the message given in that specific campaign is animal rights based; that is: "You cannot consider animals as property and resource and you cannot use them." and not welfare founded. And as long as "a" and "b" is present, it is no more "single-issued".

From Earthlings Dünyalı's comments it appears that the dispute between abolitionist vegans and the other groups may not be centered only on the question whether single-issue campaigns are new welfarist but on the question what can be considered as a "single-issue" campaign.

2.11. A critique of vegan outreach

A similar argument is made by M. Keser. He argues that all campaigns, even "pure" vegan outreach campaigns, can be interpreted as single-issue:

> Even if you say go vegan this is also kind of narrowed-down because go vegan doesn't include like slavery in diamond industry for example, slavery in chocolate industry in which human workers are enslaved. So even if you say go vegan altogether it is narrowed-down. So any kind of campaign somehow will be narrowed or single topic if you look from other eye.

"Single-issue" is thus a contested term within the nonhuman animal rights movement. Animal rights philosopher Steven Best uses the term to refer to the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement's narrow focus on only nonhuman animal issues and its exclusion of other causes. The different uses of single-issue by the abolitionist vegans and the vegan anarchists illustrates that the interpretation of the term is context-dependent. This makes it a "floating signifier". A floating signifier, also known as an empty signifier refers to a signifier that is 'susceptible to multiple and even

contradictory interpretations, suggesting that it does not have a specific meaning itself, but functions primarily as a vehicle for absorbing meanings that viewers want to impose upon it' (Oxford on line dictionary). The different perspectives on what constitutes single-issue is exactly what causes the main dispute among the grassroots nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul. The term new welfarist the way it is used by nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul also falls into that category.

The anarchist activists from Freedom to Earth Association suggest that the discourse within the nonhuman animal rights movement should change from the "plate" to the animals. However, this does not mean that veganism is considered as unimportant. They choose to frame their cause as "fighting slavery" or "fighting for freedom for all beings". M. Keser points out that this message already includes veganism if you think thoroughly about it because 'if you fight slavery all the way to the end of course you will abolish meat for example.'

In November 2013 Keser attended a workshop in Izmir with the title 'Where is animal liberation within veganism?' It was a meeting between individual nonhuman animal rights activists and activists from different nonhuman animal rights groups in Istanbul and Izmir. The exchange resulted in a written work that the participants call the "Restless Vegans Manifesto". On the title page of the manifesto it is stated that:

> This manifesto consists of considerations of some vegan/vegetarian animal liberation activists about the course of veganism. (…) The clauses below were noted with consensus, and open to discussion and suggestions. Continuation of this debate is expected in different cities. The goal here is self-questioning of people who are close to animal liberation discourse and veganism, a change in direction in personal and political sense. In this regard, almost all criticism below includes self-criticism (cited in Wolf 2015, 54).

That veganism has turned into a topic of discussion in this way was triggered by the popularization of veganism in Turkey. The activists that contributed to this piece of writing were induced to discuss veganism critically after they noticed in a local Google trend research that the search of the term "vegan" hit the top while the term "animal liberation" was extremely low (Restless Vegans Manifesto 2013, 2).

M. Keser explains: 'In our opinion all the time saying "go vegan, go vegan" doesn't work because when you say "go vegan" people think it's something about food. When you write "vegan" on Google this is coming. If you write "animal liberation" other images are coming. We want the other images.'

The “Restless Vegans” call for a “second wave” within the nonhuman animal rights movement. The first wave as they see it consisted of ‘building vegetarian and vegan cultures respectively. Ethical rejection of products and services that kills or exploits animals is the only political discourse’ (ibid).

According to these activists there is the danger that the nonhuman animal rights cause is being reduced to veganism. Veganism, in turn, may be degraded to a lifestyle and lose its political rhetoric. They fear that if animal rights activists are just focused on veganism this can easily lead to a narrow perspective that fails to take into account the exploitation caused by capitalism. That the demand for vegan products has led to a niche market operating within the capitalist system is highly troubling for people who hold an anarchist perspective. In the manifesto it is argued that vegans should stay out of the modernist way of life or else they are being inconsistent. Instead, vegans should be criticizing modernism and the Enlightenment vehemently because these philosophical streams are inherently anthropocentric (ibid).

The Restless Vegans suggest that propagandizing consumption practices rather than spreading the anti-oppression theory may be a strategic mistake as well; it may prevent new members from being recruited into the movement. They note that anti-vegan rhetoric in society may also stem from or may be fuelled by misanthropy on the part of vegans. Nonvegans get irritated because they are being called ‘murderers’ by vegans; therefore they react negatively toward veganism. Arrogance and aggression against nonvegans can occur if people ‘play the vegan police’. They fear that if the animal rights movement turns into an institution that preaches what is licit and what is illicit it may become something like a religion. This would be detrimental for a movement that should be “leaderless” and “bibleless” (ibid).

Besides, as the Restless Vegans write, it is naïve to think that the vegan movement is homogeneous when it comes to food practices. There is no consensus on what is vegan and what is not. Orthodoxy then just leads to discussions about whether palm oil for instance is vegan or not. The being vegan of fruits and vegetables that come from industrial agriculture can be called into question, as well. It is possible that they were cultivated by enslaved farmers. And is it acceptable for a vegan to consume chocolate products that were produced under less than satisfactory conditions for “enslaved” workers? The creators of the manifesto argue that vegans should remember that humans

are animals, too, and that human slavery still exists. They also pose the question whether “freegans” and “road killers” should fall under the category of “vegans”. A freegan is someone who gets his or her food external of consumerist practices and instead uses discarded foods. This may include nonvegan products. A road killer is someone who eats meat which comes from nonhuman animals that have been accidentally hit by a vehicle and found dead along roads. Both the freegan and the road killer do not contribute to nonhuman animal slavery; in that sense they might be considered as vegans (ibid).

These arguments are similar to what scholars such as Norm Phelps, and Donaldson and Kymlicka argue: that too much emphasis on personal dietary decisions has led to alienation among other leftist social justice activists. It has fuelled the perception of the nonhuman animal rights movement as a private morality movement instead of a public policy movement (Donaldson and Kymlicka 2015). For them, promoting veganism is indeed a crucial part of nonhuman animal rights activism but presenting it as the baseline or as a prerequisite to be part of the movement is a strategic mistake (ibid).

The Restless Vegans see veganism not as an end-goal but rather as a first step. The activists define “animal liberation” or “anti-oppression” as the theoretical causes that the movement struggles for. Veganism on the other hand is a practical effect within that framework, according to them. They criticize the unfortunate development within the movement that ‘the effect begins to overshadow the cause’. The self-critical activists note that political discourse and identity go hand in hand. If an activist primarily adopts a “vegan identity” instead of an “anti-oppression identity” or an “animal rights activist identity” politics is being defined according to consumerist behavior. Within the former identity the activist remains a “homo-consumericus” and this is a major contradiction according to the Restless Vegans (ibid).

It is in this context that the activists call for a second wave of animal liberation. This second wave as suggested by them is: ‘While maintaining vegan and vegetarian practices, shifting the trajectory of politics from “consume this/not consume that” to the active fight against exploiters such as direct actions to liberate animals or undercover footages to expose slavery conditions’ (ibid).

2.12. ALF: violence or liberation?

The ‘direct actions to liberate animals’ that the Restless Vegans refer to leads us to another major disagreement between abolitionist vegans and many other nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul. This controversial type of direct action is known as the Animal Liberation Front or ALF. The Animal Liberation Front emerged in England in the mid-1970s. The tactics used by this movement are freeing nonhuman animals from cages (in farms, laboratories, pet shops or other places where they are enslaved and used as commodities) and destructing property of nonhuman animal exploiters. The latter tactic aims to damage the exploiter economically.

Internally the ALF is considered primarily as a method, not as an organization. It is a clandestine, decentralized international network that exists all over the world. Activist scholar Steven Best and Anthony Nocella define the ALF as follows: ‘The ALF is any individual or group in any area of the world who at any time decide to strike against animal exploitation in the name of animal rights while following ALF guidelines’ (Best and Nocella 2004, 17). To prevent ALF-activists from being tracked or infiltrated by authorities the activists operate underground within different cells. The different cells are unaware of the identities and activities of other cells which is how they guarantee their safety and survival (ibid).

ALF activists claim that ‘The ALF does not, in any way, condone violence against any animal, human or nonhuman. Any action involving violence is by definition not an ALF-action, any person involved is not an ALF member’ (ibid, 18).

Not all anarchist nonhuman animal rights activists support the ALF method. Some have an ambiguous attitude toward it. Many however see it as a valid and effective tactic. Some merely sympathize with it while others aspire to apply it themselves when they can. The association that the term “animal liberation” has with ALF is why many anarchist nonhuman animal rights activists tend to use “animal liberation” rather than “animal rights”. In this context “animal liberation” could be seen as one part of the overarching animal rights ethics. Best and Nocella note that animal rights is the guiding moral philosophy of the ALF (as opposed to animal welfare). They describe the difference between “animal rights” and “animal liberation” as animal rights often being

‘a legal fight without direct action’ and animal liberation as an ‘immediate confrontation with exploiters’ (ibid, 20).

On 4 October 2014 nonhuman animal rights activists – independent activists and activists from different grassroots groups - organized a public event in Istanbul to protest the slaughter of nonhuman animals for the occasion of the Islamic sacrifice feast. After the street march about thirty of them gathered in the cellar of a cafe that they often use for meetings. Apparently many activists did not know each other yet; one by one they introduced themselves and told what brought them to the nonhuman animal rights movement and what perspectives they hold. A debate of an hour followed. The most common topic talked about during that hour was ALF.

Many – although not all - of the attendants said that they believe there is something that can be called “positive violence”, i.e. using “violent” methods to fight against violence. One activist clarified that for him the slaughterhouse is a source of violence and that fighting against institutions such as slaughterhouses is doing the right thing, even if it requires “violent” means. He said: ‘The real violence is to not stop violence. If you keep quiet that is violence because animals are still being killed. So to stop a slaughterhouse is not violence. It’s stopping violence.’ Some activists point out that ALF is a valid method because every individual animal matters. For this reason, each individual rescue is a gain, even if it does not lead to liberation of all nonhuman animals as a collective.

The ALF is a huge point of discussion between abolitionist vegans and other nonhuman animal rights groups and activists. Francione has condemned the ALF as a violent method which is counterproductive. It is referred to in the sixth principle of the abolitionist approach: ‘We recognize the principle of nonviolence as the guiding principle of the animal rights movement. Violence is the problem; it is not any part of the solution’.[115]

The conflict between abolitionist vegans and other nonhuman animal rights activists over ALF has even led to the rise of conspiracy theories. One activist at the meeting in the café suggested that the abolitionist vegans may be agents of the state. He said:

> My belief about the abolitionists is that they’re not vegans. (...) I believe that they have connections with the state. The state always tries to empty the ideology. For example when a movement is getting popular, once veganism in

[115] Abolitionist approach: http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/, 27 June 2015.

> Turkey became widespread among people the state had to do something about it. That's why I believe that this party is using other vegans to empty the ideology of the animal liberation movement in Turkey. They also use Francione and it's a known fact that he works for the government.

The debate over ALF that takes place within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul happens also elsewhere in the world. Animal liberation philosopher and activist Steven Best frequently speaks about it in his lectures. What people such as Francione, Wrenn, and Sarah K. Woodcock are for abolitionist vegans, such is Steven Best for many anarchist nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul. People within the movement often refer to his writings and videos. In his lecture 'The Paralysis of Pacifism: In Defense of Militant Direct Action and "Violence" for Animal Liberation' which was posted online by the Youtube channel Veggie Channel, Steven Best defends the ALF and refutes the arguments that are used against it. He argues that the vegan and the nonhuman animal rights movement suffer from the "Stockholm syndrome", a phenomenon in which people identify and sympathize with their oppressors. Instead of sympathizing with the victims, i.e. the animals, they behave politely and respectfully toward the exploiters of these animals. They identify sabotage as "violence" because they have internalized the language and the reasoning of the oppressor. They fail to see that they are in a war against a corporate, industrial, military machine worldwide. Best describes pacifism as a dogma, a religion. He points out that in the time of Gandhi's decolonization war against the British pacifism was interpreted and applied differently than it is by nowadays pacifists. In his view it is naïve to think that past liberation movements were absent of force and coercion; that is 'a simplified and falsified perception of history'. Best suggests that today's pacifism, which usually looks like education, should rather be called "passive-ism". This kind of pacifism is 'dogmatic in that it does not allow for any exceptions'. About abolitionist vegans he says: 'And what education means for the Francione camp is blogging to the converted. What education means for the Francione camp is attacking everyone who does not accept your method and means of "doing nothing". So to be an abolitionist in this sense means to do nothing'.[116]

As such, Best calls for a rejection of moral purity and an application of pragmatism, to use those methods that actually work. This requires people to adopt a contextualist

[116] ("The Paralysis of Pacifism: In Defense of Militant Direct Action and "Violence" for Animal Liberation" held by Prof. Steve Best in ex slaughterhouse of Aprilia - Italy - 06 September 2012**,** retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sHDTZniuzyc).

approach; to look at every situation as unique. It also requires people to support pluralism. Instead of solely relying on education, people should 'allow for all the different tactics to exist simultaneously' (ibid). Semantic change would also significantly contribute to an acceptance of the ALF method among animal rights activists and among the public. Instead of adhering to a broad definition of 'violence' Best suggests using the term in a narrower and literal sense: 'to be violent is to intentionally cause physical injury to someone without just cause' (ibid).

Best distinguishes two kinds of arguments that exist within the nonhuman animal rights movement against violence. He calls them the principled argument and the pragmatic argument: (1) it is wrong in principle to use violence and (2) violence is wrong because of the consequences. In the latter view applying the ALF method alienates the public and renders the movement a negative image. Besides, it is believed to be ineffective because the animals that are liberated are immediately replaced (ibid). Opponents of the ALF usually point to the repressive laws that have been enacted by the state against animal liberation "terrorists". Numerous activists in the US have been imprisoned based on the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (AETA) or its predecessor Animal Enterprise Protection Act (AEPA). Terrorism in this context is defined as harming the profits of an industry whose products are primarily based on the use of animals (Pellow 2014, 168). This prohibition goes beyond property destruction and sabotage; even boycotting, picketing, and other ways of protesting are all considered violations if it harms industries that engage in nonhuman animal exploitation. As such, these laws pose a serious threat to all American nonhuman animal rights activists, which is another reason why many activists are opposed to the ALF.

But David Naguib Pellow believes that repression is not caused by these types of direct action. Instead, these actions make the repression more visible. He argues that the state represses nonhuman animal rights activists not because of the physical "damage" (i.e. liberating animals and property destruction) but because of their ideas. He writes: 'The nation, corporations, and media view such activists as "terrorists" because their ideas constitute a threat to the core cultural, legal, political, and economic values embodied in the concept of property; because they threaten the imperative of capitalism and empire to colonize all forms of life; because their rejection of hierarchy threatens a social order rooted in speciesism, white supremacy, classism, and heteropatriarchy; and because, to

a large extent, imposing state repression on any group sends a strong disciplinary message to the general public' (Pellow 2014, 208/209).

The Restless Vegans Manifesto calls ethical vegans to engage in direct actions of nonhuman animal liberation such as sabotage or rescuing animals. To those activists who cannot risk committing such actions it is suggested that they take undercover footage of animal exploitation industries instead. The latter has less ramifications because in Turkey taking undercover footage is not considered terrorism, unlike in the US (Restless Vegans Manifesto 2013, 10). The Restless Vegans emphasize the importance of such actions by noting that 'vegan picknicks in Turkey are on the way to become regular; whereas we do not even have a single footage from a university lab that cuts animals live just next to where we have our picknicks' (ibid).

Despite the fact that many nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul are supportive of ALF, the method is not carried out on a large scale yet in Turkey according to Earthlings Dünyalı. It is happening primarily in pet shops according to him. He once witnessed an "open rescue" during a protest that he organized against the stray animals policy. He was in front of a pet shop arguing through a megaphone that animals are not property and should not be sold. At that moment he saw that a few people with masks on quickly entered the pet shop, rescued one or two dogs and then ran away.

On the website dogahayvanozgurlugu.wordpress.com ALF actions are reported. On 26 September 2014 it was posted that 18 chicks and 18 ducklings were liberated. The animals were put in a small box on the street with the intention to be sold.[117] ALF actions from all over the world are reported on several websites and Facebook pages run by animal rights activists in Turkey, most commonly by Animal Liberation Press Office Turkey. This is a local branch of Animal Liberation Press Office which was first established in the UK in 1991 and soon expanded to the US under the name of North American Animal Liberation Press Office. Its aim is to produce unbiased reports of animal liberation activities, in response to the mainstream media's uncritical reporting of these activities.[118]

[117] https://dogahayvanozgurlugu.wordpress.com/category/ana-sayfa/.
[118] https://animalliberationpressoffice.org/NAALPO/f-a-q-s/#1, accessed 10 July 2015.

2.13. International networks and solidarity

ALF is an international network and although there is no real contact between different local cells because of security measures there is a strong international solidarity. When nonhuman animal rights activists in another country applying the ALF method get arrested protests are being organized in Istanbul in front of the embassy of that particular country. Without personally knowing each other they are all part of a global community dedicated to nonhuman animal liberation. With the rise of media technology, particularly the internet, it is not surprising to see that many protests are transnational in character. Wrenn notes that 'increasingly, transnational networking has become an important resource for nonhuman animal rights advocates, particularly for smaller, radical factions' (Wrenn 2012, 33).

Not only do animal rights activists in Istanbul express their solidarity for their fellow-activists in other countries, they also often carry out the same campaigns. In January 2014 Freedom to Earth and Independent Animal Rights Activists organized a protest against Air France and KLM. These airline companies engage in the transportation of monkeys to laboratories where they are used for experimentations.

Another transnational protest took place On 7 December 2014.[119] A collective protest against nonhuman animal exploitation was organized in different countries around the world. In Istanbul about eighty animal rights activists gathered in the Kadıköy district that day and marched the streets with banners while shouting slogans such as 'fur leather meat, all murder'[120] and 'freedom to humans, animals, and the earth'.[121] They visited the local branches of the fast food restaurants MacDonald's, Burger King, and Kentucky Fried Chicken. A spokesperson held a speech outside of the restaurants explaining why it is unethical to consume nonhuman animals and their products. After the speech the activists entered the restaurants. They showed their banners demonstratively to confront customers who were eating hamburgers, milk shakes and chicken wings.

This transnational action was part of the campaign "It's Not Food, It's Violence" initiated by the international network Direct Action Everywhere (DxE, in Turkish

[119] A recording of this protest can be watched here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iddbeEkuqvk
[120] In Turkish. *Kürk Deri Et, Hepsi Cinayet*.
[121] In Turkish: *İnsana, Hayvana, Yeryüzüne Özgürlük*.

'doğrudan eylem her yerde'). Direct Action Everywhere was established by grassroots activists in the United States in 2013 with the aim to protest against speciesism. In terms of discourse DxE uses similar concepts that are used by both the abolitionist approach and the vegan anarchist faction respectively. The organization argues for the end of the property status of nonhumans. Like vegan anarchists DxE activists use the term "animal liberation" to refer to the abolition of animal use and animal slavery. Their motto is 'until every animal is free'.[122] The tactic that they use is "nonviolent direct action" that confronts society and nonhuman animal exploiters with speciesism. Most of their actions take place in or in front of restaurants and supermarkets that engage in nonhuman animal exploitation. DxE actions have taken place several times in Istanbul and this trend is likely to be continued. These actions, like ALF actions, are reported by Animal Liberation Press Office Turkey.[123]

2.14. Conclusion: focus on exploiters or on consumers?

In this chapter I have introduced the animal rights factions that are active in Istanbul. I have discussed the main disagreements within this movement. The disagreements between the abolitionist vegan faction and the vegan anarchist faction revolves around all three aspects of framing i.e. diagnostic, prognostic and motivational framing. At first sight the diagnosis of the problem seems identical. Both factions address speciesism and the consequences of speciesism, i.e. treating nonhuman animals are resources instead of individuals, as the problem. But when we have a closer look we see that the vegan anarchist faction has a strong emphasis on anti-capitalism and anti-consumerism. Anarchist nonhuman animal rights activists have adopted an overarching diagnostic frame against all forms of oppression. The abolitionist vegan faction's stance on the other hand is that even if capitalism would be abolished speciesism would remain because nonhuman animals would still be considered property. Francione asserts that 'our thinking about animals as property, and the development of animal agriculture, are important factors in the rise of economic systems that have oppressed animals, women, and others. But it was the moral thinking of animals as things that preceded the rise of

[122] In Turkish *Tüm hayvanlar özgür oluncaya dek*.
[123] This engagement in both DxE and ALF by Animal Liberation Press Office seems to be unique to Turkey, as Animal Liberation Press Office branches in other countries do not report DxE actions.

those economic systems' (Francione's Facebook page). Thus, for abolitionist vegans the property status of nonhuman animals is the fundamental problem. For vegan anarchists on the other hand it is oppressive institutions, particularly capitalism, that need to be addressed as a whole.

The difference in diagnostic frames makes it easier to understand the difference in prognostic frames, as well. In terms of prognostic framing the abolitionist vegan faction chooses to focus only or primarily on informing the consumer. Abolitionist vegan activists emphasize the consumer's responsibility with regard to nonhuman animal use. Demand creates supply; therefore by spreading ethical veganism a world that is free of nonhuman animal slavery will eventually come to fruition. In their view institutional change will follow once the majority of the world population adopts the lifestyle changes. Anarchist nonhuman animal rights activists on the other hand focus primarily on the (capitalist) exploiters when it comes to activism. They, too, speak about responsibility of the individual. They believe that eliminating oppression includes ethical veganism. However, in their perspective veganism is not enough to rule out oppression entirely. Because of their anti-capitalist stance they are enthusiastic proponents of cultivating a "do-it-yourself-culture". This explains why many anarchist animal rights activist are simultaneously freegans or try to apply freeganism in their daily lives to some extent.

Meanwhile, there is no consensus within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul on what frames and tactics fall under the category of new welfarism. Neither is there a consensus of what can be considered "single-issue" campaign. In essence, both factions think of each other as being single-issue oriented. Besides, those activists that use depictions of suffering are allegedly engaged in a "suffering fetish" while those activists that focus only on vegan outreach without avoiding consumerism are allegedly engaged in a "food fetish".

The next topic to be discussed has to do with forms of discrimination other than speciesism, i.e. discrimination of disadvantaged human groups. The central questions here are: how to struggle against speciesism while also avoiding the perpetuation of power relations between humans? And how to not alienate people, particularly people who could be potential recruits? This is a huge challenge for nonhuman animal rights activists, since their awareness of speciesism on the one hand and the public stance on

the other hand are miles away from each other. We have seen that there is a conscious tendency among some anarchist activists, for example those of Freedom to Earth, to shy away from criticizing others. When it comes to the topic of the individual's responsibility these activists mostly engage in "self-criticism", which was also the aim of the Restless Vegans Manifesto. M. Keser tells why this is:

> We always think we shouldn't be so much pushy. Otherwise we would be an insider group. Then it's like a couple of crazy people sending messages to each other. It's not working, really, for animals.

For this reason the anarchists' disagreement with the abolitionist vegans with regard to framing veganism is not only a matter of prognostic framing but also of motivational framing. They believe that in order to connect with society and to recruit new people for the cause they should not point the finger too much at individuals who are not (yet) vegan. This strategy has much to do with the urge to create a public identity that society can easily relate to.[124] In the next chapter, where I discuss the relation between the nonhuman animal rights movement and other progressive leftist movements, we will see what frame disputes are caused by the activists' concern for justice and freedom for all humans.

[124] However, unlike most mainstream nonhuman animal rights organizations, these anarchist groups do not label veganism as "extremist" or "difficult". Although their activism is not solely centered on spreading veganism alone, ethical veganism constitutes a significant part of their discourse. Clearly, they do not support welfarist reform. In this respect their frames remain authentic with the ideological stance that nonhuman animals should not be treated as property and resources.

CHAPTER 3

"ORPHAN" OF THE LEFT OR FORENUNNER OF PROGRESSIVE LEFTISM?

Whenever the working class, lgbt individuals, women, Kurds, Turks, Alawites, Zazas, Armenians, Pomaks, Rums and others; people whose language, labor, culture, religious denomination, skin colour, gender, sexual orientation is exploited; they realize that they are in the same boat as

cows in the dairy industry,
chickens in poultry farms,
sheep taken to the slaughterhouse,
stray cats and stray dogs,
snakes who have been skinned,
rhinos whose horn has been ripped off,
trees which have been torn down,
forests which have been burned,
streams which have been hand-cuffed,
rats in a vivisection lab,
fish whose lips were pierced by a hook,
donkeys whose skin is worn down from carrying excess loads,
bulls whose back have been punctured,
raccoons who have been skinned alive,
elephants whose tusks have been ripped off,
bees whose honey is stolen,
orangutans who were forced into prostitution

and they share the same fate because of the policies of the governing power; when they remember that cleavers, gas chambers, shackles, torture chambers, abuse tactics had been once used on them and when they never forget that they might be targeted again, then we can have hope for the nature. Then this struggle will go beyond flags, borders, armies, genders, species, mines and become the struggle for the Mother Earth. This hope has to be not only for humankind, but for all earthlings.

As the saying goes, the world is still on an ox's horn.[125]

Dicle 2014, translated by Özmen Küçükosman[126]

There is a tendency among animal rights activists in Istanbul to connect the nonhuman animal rights cause (and ecology) to other social justice causes. The involvement in

[125] I was told that the expression 'it is still on an ox' horn' means something like 'it is still backward'. The expression dates back to the Ottoman Empire. The representation of the world standing on an ox originates from Islamic sources.
[126] Dicle is one of the activists that I interviewed. She gave me permission to share her writing.

other progressive leftist movements is one of the most striking characteristics within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul that I have noticed. One may argue that it is quite natural for animal rights activists to do so. After all, the movement has leftwing values such as peace, justice, democracy and equality. Besides, its heritage is from the left (Steven Best: "Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century" at the International Animal Rights Conference 2013 in Luxembourg)[127]. However, the current reality is complicated. In this chapter I will explore the reasons why the animal rights movement is so marginalized by the Left. Then I will investigate whether that marginalization is also the case in Istanbul. Does the Turkish case differ from what we see elsewhere in the world? In what ways do animal rights activists engage in alliance politics with other movements? To what extent are they successful in forging bridges? And what has been the role of the Gezi protests in the development of the nonhuman animal rights movement, particularly with regard to alliance politics? Collective action frames appear to play a significant role when it comes to the concern for other social justice causes. We will see that the question 'how to avoid discrimination against disadvantaged groups within the animal rights movement?' has led to major disagreements and frame disputes internally.

3.1. Nonhuman animal rights: left or right?

The association of the nonhuman animal rights movement with the Left is not always accurate.[128] The mainstream animal rights movement has evolved into a movement that is not necessarily aligned "left" or "right" politically (Jordan 2002, Hornick 2004, Pallotta 2005). Pallotta observed conservative activists among her research participants in the United States who bemoaned the fact that the nonhuman animal rights movement is usually associated with leftist causes by the general public. These activists argued that this perception should change in order for the movement to attract a broader

[127] Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pr7Ax_p7ocw

[128] First of all I would like to stress that the term "left" and "right" are not absolute terms. What is considered 'left' or 'right' is dependent on the particular time and location in question. Even in a particular time and location the "Left" is not a homogenous entity. Leftist movements and theories vary greatly from authoritarian doctrines to anarchist non-hierarchical movements. In the context of this research I will use the term "left" in the way that Steven Best chooses to use it in his analysis of alliance politics: "the far radical spectrum of politics" This interpretation is still very heterogeneous but there are common factors such as anti-capitalist and socially progressive.

constituency. To illustrate the dividedness among nonhuman animal rights activists regarding leftist or rightist issues Pallotta uses the example of abortion. Abortion is a controversial issue within the American animal rights movement. For the sake of unity the topic is 'almost universally avoided within the movement' (Pallotta 2005, 48). Other topics on which activists in her research were divided are global or corporate capitalism and to what extent nonhuman animal exploitation should be blamed on this type of capitalism. Steven Best laments that many nonhuman animal rights activists give in their progressive values for not alienating conservatives. He calls this tendency to try to bring people from all kinds of political spectrums into the movement "big ten politics". Norm Phelps made a similar point about animal rights and the left: 'animal rights is inconsistent with the fundamental philosophy of the right. (…) I think it is very important that we consider ourselves a social justice movement among other social justice movements, and that we work very hard to form a unified front with the political left' (cited in Donaldson and Kymlicka 2015, 19).

Bob Torres also observes a shift within the animal rights movement toward the center. Particularly after the 9-11 attacks when neo-conservatism was on the rise there was a desire to reach out to fundamentalist and conservative segments of society. A popular argument on part of nonhuman animal rights activists was that the movement needed to draw in Christian conservatives, neoconservatives, and others from the Right (Torres 2007, 106). Torres himself was even criticized by a fellow-activist for talking about his atheism in public because it may turn off potential Christian recruits (ibid 106, 107). Pallotta adds that activists who fit the ultra-leftist stereotype also exist within the movement and that they usually belong to the anarchist faction. At the time that she carried out her study these type of activists were mostly concentrated in the Pacific Northwest area of the United States (Pallotta, 2005).

Contrary to the animal rights movement described above the movement that I am studying in Istanbul generally has an explicitly leftist character. It is not divided according to leftist / rightist politics. The divisions that exist within the movement are all based on disagreements of how to reach freedom and equality for all beings, including women, LGBTQ individuals, ethnic and religious minorities, the working class, and nature.[129] Since the animal rights movement in Istanbul at the grassroots level

[129] The difference between the movement in Istanbul and the one in the United States lies not only in its grassroots character, I assume, because Pallotta also studied grassroots groups. But the fact that she studied all kinds of animal rights groups and not just radical ones is certainly an influential factor. Perhaps it has something to do with the relatively recent emergence of the animal rights movement in Istanbul. It is not unthinkable that when the nonhuman

is radical in character (as opposed to mainstream) deliberately adapting the frames to attract conservatives would be a highly unlikely move. The majority of the activists are more concerned with being morally consistent than with recruiting people that have diverse views on human rights issues. They emphasize standing up for all oppressed beings. Besides, they are particularly focused on recruiting people from other social justice movements. Whatever future developments in society will bring to the activist scene, at this moment the grassroots nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul should be considered a progressive leftist movement.[130] However, the attempt to bring animal rights more to the center, or to make it more inclusive to a wide variety of political spectrums, is present among a seemingly minority.[131]

3.2. The marginalization of the animal rights movement by the Left

The desire of many American nonhuman animal rights activists to recruit people from the Right may have something to do with the fact that nonhuman animal rights is not taken very seriously by the Left. Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka (2013) have researched why the nonhuman animal rights movement is so marginalized by other progressive leftist movements. They pose the question: 'why is the animal question virtually invisible within the Left?'

Blaire French has called nonhuman animal rights activists "orphans of the Left" (cited in Donaldson and Kymlicka). Despite an existence of the modern animal rights movement for about four decades the movement's discourses have hardly entered the works of leftist and progressive groups in the United States (ibid). Many leftist activists do not take animal rights seriously. Another tendency is to see the animal rights movement as a threat.

---

animal rights cause becomes more acknowledged within the general public in Turkey that this will give rise to the emergence of more "rightist" nonhuman animal rights groups, as well.

[130] Progressive leftism should not be associated with the more mainstream and traditional leftist movements in Turkey, as many of the latter have a hierarchical, Stalinist, militarist, and Kemalist character. The position of the grassroots nonhuman animal rights groups on the other hand is non-hierarchical, anti-militarist, anti-nationalist, and anti-elitist. This character of the movement is affirmed by the presence of many conscientious objectors within the movement. Nevertheless, groups do not always represent each and every activist; therefore there may be individuals that do not comply with the above position.

[131] I will show and discuss an example of this in relation to the Gezi protests later on in this chapter.

Donaldson and Kymlicka give two general social and psychological reasons why the cause of nonhuman animal rights is usually ignored or approached with indifference within other leftist circles. The first has to do with cultural legacies, i.e. the Abrahamic religions that dictate that humans are superior to nonhuman animals.[132] The other reason why most people are reluctant in acknowledging nonhuman animal rights is that it requires personal sacrifices, i.e. committing to a vegan lifestyle (ibid). Shapiro explained this in the following way:

> You have a real problem in the fact that most people not only believe in human supremacy, but they are unwilling to diverge from a status quo that leaves us with quite a lot of privilege… Power seldom yields anything without a demand. And it's very infrequent when groups in power voluntarily give up the power they have over those who are more vulnerable (Shapiro 2010, cited in Pellow 2014, 70).

Interestingly, as Donaldson and Kymlicka illustrate, there are also reasons for marginalizing nonhuman animal rights that are specific for the Left. The first two reasons are respectively (1) fear of displacement and (2) fear of trivialization. The fear of displacement is the concern that devoting time and resources to the nonhuman animal rights cause will come at the expense of time and resources devoted to other struggles such as fighting racism (Donaldson and Kymlicka 2013). The second concern, fear of trivialization, refers to the belief that taking nonhuman animals rights seriously will 'diminish the currency of justice'; there will be no difference anymore between the moral significance of human injustices and nonhuman animal injustices (ibid). Donaldson and Kymlicka rightly point out that these two reasons are arguments based on species narcissism. If personhood of nonhuman animals would be acknowledged the above arguments would not be made. For the anti-speciesist they hold no value because the anti-speciesist recognizes the boundary between human and nonhuman animals as merely a social construct. Contrary to what many leftists like to believe, the sharp distinction between human and nonhuman animals even reinforces the dehumanization of disadvantaged human groups. History has shown that 'belief in human superiority over animals is empirically correlated with, and causally connected to, belief in the superiority of some human groups over others' (ibid, 5).

However, there is another reason why the Left is hesitant in including nonhuman animal rights. This reason, according to Donaldson and Kymlicka, unfortunately contains

[132] An anarchist nonhuman animal rights activist would add the philosophy of humanism to this because it is inherently anthropocentric It can also be argued that humanism and the Enlightenment were also built upon the Abrahamic religions. Even 'Western' secularism did not liberate itself from the Christian-Judaic cultural legacy.

empirical truth. It has to do with the fact that many nonhuman animal rights campaigns are targeting ways of animal use that are practiced by (cultural) minority groups. Nonhuman animal rights advocacy often operates within a "cruelty framework" in which one practice of animal use is deemed worse than another. This way of reasoning is directly connected with the welfarist position. Maneesha Dekha notes that the cruelty framework is based on the perception that using nonhuman animals for human ends is acceptable. She points out that that 'the broader public endorses the principle that humans do have the right to harm and kill animals for our benefit so long as we avoid 'cruel' and 'unnecessary' harm. It is this principle that opens the door to bias, since perceptions of what is cruel or unnecessary are culturally variable' (Dekha, cited in Donaldson and Kymlicka 2013, 7). Thus, such campaigns can easily make these groups seem "uncivilized" and "backward" which in turn can fuel discrimination against these groups.[133]

An interesting example from the United States is a media-controversy at the intersection of animal rights and civil rights. It revolved around the famous football player Michael Vick, a man of colour, who had been imprisoned for having engaged in dog fighting. After he got released he showed remorse for his past and he announced that he wanted to have a dog as a pet. Upon this announcement the mainstream nonhuman animal rights organizations such as PETA and HSUS depicted Vick as cruel and unfit for society. They also argued that he should not be allowed to own a dog (Broad, 2013). Garret M. Broad analyzed the discourses around this case. He notices that there was a 'small but strident portion' of the animal rights community who took on an alternative, intersectional perspective. By commenting on PETA's online article about the case these vegans, in addition to several scholars, ethicists and philosophers, pointed to the failure to take into account Vick's socially disadvantaged position. They also argued that it is inconsistent to deem dog fighting worse than the normalized consumption habits of animal flesh and products. Broad notes that this alternative, antispeciesist and antiracist perspective was expressed by only a minority and is largely absent from the broader public discourse (Broad, 2013).

While these scholars (Dekha, Donaldson and Kymlicka, Broad) do not criticize issue specific campaigns they do suggest that it is time for the nonhuman animal rights movement to adopt a postcolonial and intersectional agenda.

[133] This is one of the main reasons why the abolitionist vegans are opposed to issue-specific campaigns, especially if these campaigns refrain from emphasizing the ethical necessity of veganism

How does all of this apply to the grassroots nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul? Many of the groups do organize annual protests against for instance the slaughter of nonhuman animals for the Islamic sacrifice feast.[134] On the other hand, protestors also express the message of veganism during the march. Besides, they emphasize that it is not a rejection of the religious feast itself. One of their slogans is 'yes to the festival no to sacrifice'[135] [136] In the autumn/winter of 2014 the Vegan Freedom Movement and the Freedom to Animals Party organized a campaign against the killing of turkeys and the cutting down of pine trees for the Christmas, New Year, and Thanksgiving celebration. In a press release they state that 'after our second annual "Yes to Festival No to Sacrifice" demonstration during the Muslim Festival of Sacrifices in Turkey, this will be our first "Yes to Thanksgiving No to Sacrifice" protest.'

These examples show that nonhuman animal rights groups in Istanbul tend not to single out specific practices that belong to only one cultural or religious group, whether minority or majority. Another advantage on part of the nonhuman animal rights groups in Istanbul is the philosophies that they have adopted. Both the abolitionist approach and the vegan anarchist philosophy, the two dominant philosophies within the movement, have a postcolonial perspective. They are explicitly opposed to discrimination against any group.

3.3. Alliance politics in theory

Steven Best speaks about the marginalization of the nonhuman animal rights movement within the Left in his lecture at the International Animal Rights Conference 2013 in Luxembourg. He beliefs that in order for the movement to be more successful and to contribute to humanity it needs to adopt a multifaceted perspective or a 'multiperspectival theory' as he calls it. It needs to look at power and domination from

[134] Although Muslims are not a minority in Turkey, it is not uncommon for the religious segments of society to be stigmatized as "backward" by secularists in the country, whether the secularists in question belong to an elite class or not. Therefore, there is a risk involved in these protests.
[135] In Turkish 'bayrama evet katliama hayır'
[136] Members of Independent Animal Liberation Activist also referred to Islamic sources that are in favor of nonhuman animals rights. For example those sources that dictate that nonhuman animals should be treated with respect and that harming a nonhuman animal will is punishable as much as harming a human.

different perspectives, such as a gender perspective, a race perspective, a class perspective, etc. This multifaceted perspective then has to be translated into political activism through "alliance politics". Alliance politics aims to build bridges across different social movements. This makes a lot of sense according to Best because the different movements have common goals and common enemies. He mentions capitalism as the primary common enemy. The nonhuman animal rights movement has to show to other leftist movements that they have these common values and that the animal movement is not any different with regard to these values but wants to 'extend them to the next level'.[137] This perspective stems from the total liberation frame discussed in the previous chapter.

Alliances between social justice causes such as women's rights, socialism, and environmental justice have already occurred in history, for example the alter- or anti-globalization movement. Best indicates that these social movements are still not inclusive when it comes to the rights of other species. They fail to stand up against all forms of discrimination that exist on planet earth. As such, as long as they do not incorporate nonhuman animal rights in the struggle, they do not align with total liberation. Best points out that 'the left has internalized speciesism and anthropocentrism in a very deep and profound way'. For this reason the Left is characterized by a serious contradiction when it comes to progression and fighting hierarchical domination. As Best concludes 'Leftism is Stalinism toward animals' (ibid).

The problem with the nonhuman animal rights movement on the other hand according to Best is that it is 'too small, too elitist, too lacking in diversity, and too marginalized'. While acknowledging that there are segments of the nonhuman animal rights movement that are 'social, political, and progressive' he criticizes the movement when he argues that 'by and large it seems a safe generalization that animal rights and veganism is a single-issue, mainstream, reformist, typically white elitist kind of agenda and project' (ibid). By being single-issue oriented the nonhuman animal rights movement tends to focus only on veganism and the nonhuman animal rights cause. The movement often does not make the connection with other social movements. Best argues that this allows for contradictions within the movement and the instrumental use of other people's oppressions and histories for the animal rights cause. Many animal rights campaigns

[137] Steven Best: "Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century" at the International Animal Rights Conference 2013 in Luxembourg, retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pr7Ax_p7ocw.

reinforce other forms of discrimination and consequently alienate groups of people. Best call this phenomenon "single-issue myopia". He argues that even abolitionist vegans lack a larger theoretical vision and a larger politics. In his view their activism aims to abolish only one form of oppression: speciesism. Best suggests that instead of just abolishing speciesism and the property status of nonhuman animals we should 'abolish hierarchical domination in every facet' (ibid).

The criticism toward abolitionist vegans for not incorporating other social movement causes seems an inaccurate judgment. The abolitionist approach does problematize other discriminations explicitly. Struggling against all forms of discrimination is a central aim within the abolitionist approach. In principle number five racism, sexism, ageism, and heterosexism are mentioned as other forms of discrimination that are rejected by abolitionist vegans. In 1992 Francione and Regan published their co-written article 'A Movements's Means to Create its Ends'. They address other social justice struggles in the following phrase:

> (....) The philosophy of animal rights is an inclusive philosophy. Rights for nonhumans only make sense if we accept the total inclusion of our human sisters and brothers as full and equal members of the extended human family, without regard to race, sex, economic status, religious persuasion, disability, or sexual preference. Thus the philosophy of animal rights entails far reaching social change. Animal liberation is human liberation' (Francione and Regan 1992, 43, cited in Wolf 2015, 50).

During our interview Gülce clarifies why recognizing other forms of oppression is so important for the movement. She says: 'after being (becoming) abolitionist we started to think about all the discrimination issues in this abolitionist perspective. (...) Now we are struggling against speciesism and this is a discrimination and if we don't stand against the other ones then the notion 'discrimination' will remain and as long as it remains we have no chance to stop speciesism. They are all connected'. Thus, building bridges with other social justice struggles are central to both the vegan anarchist faction and the abolitionist vegan faction.

3.4. "Cosmopolitan" activists and networks

Compared to professional movement organizations grassroots activism is more likely to facilitate cooperation between movements. The absence or unimportance of formal

membership and the fluid nature of the movement enable activists to engage in different causes easily. Considering that there is a strong concern for other leftist struggles by the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul it is not surprising to see that a considerable amount of activists is actively involved in other movements, as well. About one third of the people that I have interviewed are either currently active for one or more other movements or have been active for other movements in the past.

Another interviewee is currently not active for the nonhuman animal rights movement anymore. The turning point came when Ahmet was spending three months in prison after having participated on a 'black bloc' protest with the anarchist animal rights group that he was active for. During that period Ahmet's activism changed course. He recalls:

> While I was there (in prison) I just started to interrogate the anarchist type of organization. And the Kurdish revolution in Syria started to blossom in those days. So I thought why there is a revolution there? And why there is a very libertarian, ecologic, gender-based movement in those lands? Claiming yourself an anarchist you become out of the main thing. So knowing the Kurdish movement, being more closer to it was more important for me.

After his release Ahmet started to become involved in organizations that defend the rights of ethnic Kurds. That became his priority from that time onward up until today; he therefore has no time to invest actively in the animal rights movement these days.

Carroll and Ratner (1996) identify multimovement activists as "cosmopolitan" activists as opposed to "locals" who are involved with only one movement. Cosmopolitan activists are important actors in forging alliances between the nonhuman animal rights movement and other movements. They bring their unique perspectives in all of the movements that they are involved with. This is a major advantage, especially with regard to intersectional identities and intersectional forms of oppression. Gülce tells me in the interview that because all forms of discrimination are connected it is very valuable that people with different backgrounds have joined the Abolitionist Vegan Movement. The organization uses their "cosmopolitan activist" to bring in knowledge and to make other animal rights activists more aware of power structures and forms of discrimination other than speciesism. On 1 November World Vegan Day 2014 the abolitionist vegans organized a range of seminars that dealt with these topics. Various presentations were held about sexism, heterosexism, nationalism and racism within the nonhuman animal rights movement.

It seems that most cosmopolitan nonhuman animal rights activists are active for the women's rights movement, the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Queer (LGBTQ) movement, and the antiwar or antimilitarism movement. Ecology is also a popular matter within the nonhuman animal rights movement. Cosmopolitan activists increase the likelihood that a movement becomes like a platform where different topics are discussed. For example, women's rights, sexism, and heterosexism are frequently discussed topics within the nonhuman animal rights movement. In turn, nonhuman animal rights are – although probably to a much lesser extent - discussed within some women's rights organizations and some LGBTQ organizations or networks.

Gizem is a feminist and a nonhuman animal rights activists. She is at the forefront of debates about sexism and heterosexism within the nonhuman animal rights movement. Being an active member for a women's rights organization in Istanbul, Mor Çatı, Gizem brings her ethical vegan perspective also to the feminist movement. It has been agreed that she will give a presentation about veganism during one of the monthly workshops organized by Mor Çatı. On an informal level she speaks regularly about the topic with her co-feminists. Gizem tells that generally this is received well by the women' rights activists that she works with. They have shown interest in her ethical vegan lifestyle and they react enthusiastically when she brings vegan food to the organization. At this moment there are no other vegans at Mor Çatı. Vegetarianism is slightly more common; there are currently a few vegetarian feminists active for the organization.

On Women's Day 2015 (8 March) vegan feminists in Istanbul, Ankara, İzmir, and Muğla brought nonhuman animal rights and feminism together in their protest against speciesism and sexism. Arguing that the underlying cause of oppression of nonhuman animals and nature is patriarchy the feminists marched for both causes. They shouted slogans such as: 'Freedom to women, animals, and nature'[138] 'here are the vegan feminists'[139], 'It is not worth eating kokoreç[140] to become a cool girl let's eat broccoli and believe in women'[141] 'male-violence growths from slaughterhouses'[142], 'cow's milk

[138] *Kadına, hayvana, doğaya özgürlük.*
[139] *Vegan feministler burada.*
[140] Kokoreç is a Turkish dish which contains nonhuman animal intestines.
[141] *Kafa kız olmak için kokoreç yemeye değmez, Gelin brokoli yiyelim ve kadınlara inanalım.*
[142] *Erkek Şiddeti Mezbahalardan yükseliyor.*

is rape'[143], 'animals are also women'[144], 'Not masculine carnist domination, Queer feminist apprehension'[145], 'Get used to it vegan feminists are everywhere'.[146][147]

Within the LGBTQ movement, too, nonhuman animal rights and ethical veganism seem to be popular topics of discussion. Süheyla's experience is that it is very easy to talk about nonhuman animal rights and about ethical veganism with other 'LGBTQ-people'. She recalls a meeting where there was a lecture about LGBTQ rights; it was as if the topic automatically came up collectively during the informal conversations:

> After the talk everybody was like: "are you vegan? I'm vegan too. Are you vegetarian? Yes I am thinking about it." Because when a group is kind of oppressed like LGBT people they can feel more about other oppressed groups. Like women or animals. So I think LGBT people are more prone to it. More open minded about it. They can understand it. You can just say: "I'm vegan" and they say: "okay I'm going to be vegan too". Generally people wouldn't say that (cited in Wolf 2015, 56).

Süheyla's suggestion about LGBTQ people being inclined to empathize with nonhuman animals is reminiscent of studies that deal with the animal rights movement and gender. Emily Gaarder (2011) studied the possible reasons for the predominance of women in the nonhuman animal rights movement. She found that more than a third of the female animal rights activists that she interviewed correlated the large amount of females in the movement to the oppression of women. This connection has also been made in the literature on animal rights by Charlotte Dunham (1996) and Josephine Donovan (2006). Both noted that women's experiences with their own oppression makes them more sensitive to the suffering of nonhumans (Gaarder 2011). Gaarder refers to this as "empathy based on shared inequities" (Gaarder 2011, 58). By my knowledge there has not appeared a study yet that researches the connection between animal rights activism and being part of a disadvantaged group, other than women. However, taking the shared inequities thesis into consideration this connection could also perhaps be made in relation to other groups that experience oppression, such as people that identify as LGBTQ.

[143] *Hayvan sütü tecavüzdür*.
[144] *Hayvanlar kadınlar da vardır.*
[145] *Eril karnist tahakküm değil, Queer feminist tahayyül.*
[146] *Alışın veganfeministler her yerde.*
[147] '8 Mart'ta vegan feminist de alanlardaydı', http://www.kaosgl.com/sayfa.php?id=18924, 1 July 2015.

The ‘empathy based on shared inequities’ thesis is believed by some to work as an incentive to mobilize people from other social justice movements for the nonhuman animal rights movement. But it is not enough. M. Keser believes that posting articles and news about ‘all kinds of violations’ on their website is crucial for nonhuman animal rights groups to build alliances and prevent isolation. He points out that this is how people from other social movements are attracted and become interested in the nonhuman animal rights movement. Besides, social networks and informal ties between activists from different movements[148] are crucial to get people involved. Part of the strategies of nonhuman animal rights groups is to attend other movements’ protests and invite them to theirs. Keser explains:

> Although we are really small but in Istanbul political struggles somehow go together. We are not isolated. I think this is caused by efforts from both sides because we are befriended, in our personal life we know each other. When there’s an action for transsexual people we also announce it and if we have the opportunity we go there and then we tell like ‘hey you know next week we do an action against leather and fur’. Even if they’re not vegan or vegetarian they think like ok these guys are fighting for transsexual people and they think like animals are somehow exploited and discriminated on a kind of similar level, maybe I might go there and check. So if you sincerely go there and support their cause, sincerely not with the intention that I’m going to convert those guys and go away, then they really come (cited in Wolf 2015, 55).

In the Restless Vegans Manifesto a similar statement is made about alliance politics: ‘It is important that people from animal liberation movement act in unison with other social struggles (such as LGBTQ, ecology, feminism, free kitchens, squats, etc); but the idea should be sincere contribution not recruiting new people for animal cause’ (Restless Vegans Manifesto 2013, 6).

The organization that has shown the highest degree of involvement with the nonhuman animal rights cause is the Ankara-based LGBTQ organization KAOS GL. On their website there is a section called “ecology” (ekoloji). The name of the section suggests that it covers environmental news; however, besides ecology all kinds of articles about nonhuman animal rights are posted. It varies from reports of protests organized by the nonhuman animal rights movement to articles about vegetarianism and veganism. In terms of joint events Freedom to Earth Association and Ecology Collective Association organized a workshop together with KAOS GL in 2012. A speaker from Freedom to

[148] In addition to the work of cosmopolitan activists.

Earth gave a presentation about the connection between meat consumption and heteronormativity. They also announced when the same speaker had translated Carol Adams' 'The Sexual Politics of Meat' into Turkish two years later.

In the autumn of 2014 KAOS GL took its (partial) commitment to nonhuman animal rights a step further; for the occasion of 1 November World Vegan Day it was announced on their website that 'now KAOS GL does not eat meat anymore'. In the announcement the organization declared that meat will no longer be served during meetings. In the article it is explained that besides struggling against heterosexism, other power mechanisms such as speciesism should also be opposed. Part of KAOS GL's struggle against violence is the struggle against nationalism, militarism, ageism, hierarchy, and sexism. A spokesperson for the organization was quoted saying: 'This perception we aim to constantly upgrade and develop, now it is the turn for other species than humans to be liberated all together. We don't eat meat anymore!'[149]

KAOS GL is a significant organization within the LGBTQ movement in Turkey. The organization maintains strong ties with LGBTQ organizations in Istanbul. Their public acknowledgement of speciesism as a power mechanism and a form of oppression can thus be seen as a groundbreaking step forward in the alliance between the nonhuman animal rights movement and the LGBTQ movement in the country.

Does Istanbul differ in this sense from other parts in the world? Some of the findings suggests that indeed it does. M. Keser's experiences in Western Europe, particularly Germany and in England, were not very promising regarding the relation between the nonhuman animal rights movement and other leftist movements. Keser tells:

> I was in Germany for 6 months and I saw that many groups doing activism outside animal rights but for other rights, they are really far from animal rights. But I don't blame just them. Yes, they don't care about animal rights but also animal rights people don't care about other struggles.

Keser thinks that this lack of alliance between the nonhuman animal rights movement and other movements is caused by a lack of alliances between movements in general in these countries:

[149] 'Bu algıyı devamlı yükseltmeye ve geliştirmeyi hedefledik, şimdi sıra insan türünün dışında da birlikte özgürleşmekte. Artık et yemiyoruz!' http://www.kaosgl.com/sayfa.php?id=17840

> It's not just animal cause you know. I was in London at May Day. They have a parade. 10.000 people were marching. I saw only 1 LGBT flag. Whereas in Istanbul on May Day you can see hundreds of LGBT flags. So that shows that it's not just animal cause. Political groups in Europe are somehow distant from each other. I asked him: 'why are you carrying an LGBT flag? You are rare here but it's good.' And he said, he understood what I was saying he said: 'they are far from our cause, we are far from their cause but I want to make it together.'

3.5. Gezi: a turning point?

Keser's observation, along with the examples I gave of other movements' steps to incorporate nonhuman animal rights, suggests that Istanbul is far ahead on Europe and the United States when it comes to the cooperation between social movements. There may be many different reasons for this; animal rights activists effectively engaging in alliance politics being one of them. Another influential factor that should not be left out of this discussion is the Gezi movement which arose in Istanbul in June 2013.

I heard many activists - from abolitionist vegans to vegan anarchists to activists with no attachment to a specific faction - speak about the Gezi event as a turning point for the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. Gülce and Efe wrote about it in their article '"Kafesler Kırılsın: Özgürlük Mücadelesinin Temelleri" (The Cages should be Broken: the Foundations of the Liberation Struggle) which was published in an anarchist journal not long after the Gezi protests. They write that vegan activists were previously seen as "elitist" and as "middle class bourgeois" by other liberation movements. The active involvement of ethical vegans in the Gezi Park protests has changed this perception according to Gülce and Efe.

Perhaps the mass protests were a fruitful opportunity for animal rights activists in Turkey to make their cause visible within the broader activist scene. The Gezi protests were an unprecedented event with regard to alliance politics between social movements in Istanbul and in Turkey at large. People that identified with all kinds of groups - from staunch secularists to 'anticaptalist Muslims' and from Turkish soccer fans to feminists, queer activists, and ethnic Kurds - were present on the streets during those tumultuous weeks of resistance. Aslı Zengin writes of this solidarity: 'In the intermixing of bodies, signs, objects, voices, stories, and emotions, Gezi solidarity renewed existing ties and

spawned new intimacies and affections, giving its participants a "belonging in becoming"'.[150]

The Gezi event opened up dialogues within this heterogeneous movement; misogynist, homophobic, and transphobic language that was used by some protestors was criticized. Workshops were organized to address these discriminative elements. Likewise, ethical vegan activists under the name of Vegan Resist protested the selling of meatballs (köfte) and milk by other protestors. They tried to convince people not to eat those nonhuman animal products. This way the nonhuman animal rights activists attempted to raise awareness about speciesism among other protestors. Efe tells what kind of effect this vegan activism had within the Gezi movement: 'The impact of this was amazing because after this, the left-wing people in Turkey are closer to idea of animal rights and veganism.' Another 'Gezi campaign' that was organized by nonhuman animal rights activists was Freedom to Earth's campaign that addressed the harming of cats and dogs by the police's teargas.[151] A commemoration was held by different groups for all living beings that got killed during the protests. Some animal rights activists were taken into custody during this event.[152]

A spokesperson from Vegan Turkey states in an online interview that 'collective consciousness occurred with Occupy Gezi (Gezi Park Resistance) shows itself also in the vegan movement'.[153] Independent nonhuman animal rights activist Süheyla also thinks of the Gezi protests as an important event in the history of the nonhuman animal rights movement in Turkey. She links it particularly to the increased prominence of veganism. She observes that since the incident ethical veganism has gained more visibility and recognition. Süheyla says:

> It definitely plays a huge role in animals movement. With Gezi incident, vegan groups find a big place to show themselves, their ideas, and now when someone

[150] Massumi 2002, 79, cited in Zengin 2013, http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/407-what-is-queer-about-gezi.
[151] Efe criticizes Freedom to Earth's Gezi campaign for being only focused on some nonhuman animal species: 'I am actually a bit critic about that campaign because in Gezi Park, during the occupy, there were lots of köfte-meatball sellers and we were protesting those and trying to convince people not to eat them. And there were lots of fireworks that has been fired by protesters that harms the birds. Of cource lots of milk used etc. Just to protests the government and not to talk about the animal consumption of the protestors is problematic I think, and reinforces the idea that cats and dogs are more important than the animals that's been used for food.'
[152] [152] Palang Ly. 2015. Vegan Türkiye about intersectional vegan outreach and Nonhuman Animal Rights, published on 28 April, http://simorgh.de/niceswine/, accessed 10 July 2015.

[153] [153] Palang Ly. 2015. Vegan Türkiye about intersectional vegan outreach and Nonhuman Animal Rights, published on 28 April, http://simorgh.de/niceswine/, accessed 10 July 2015.

> says they love animals first thing I think is 'are you a vegan?' and I think this movement effects the general public also. The Gezi incidents were a break point for vegan movement and vegan movement is one of the break points of animal rights.

While there is evidence to say that the Gezi protests have played a huge role in the animal rights movement in Istanbul, this is not to say that every nonhuman animal rights activist experienced Gezi in that way. Metin Kılıç argues that there is also an amount of people who did not support the protests. He explains:

> I participated on the Gezi protests as an individual, but some people participated on the Gezi protests and some did not. Because the vegan movement, veganism, does not just belong to the Left, it does not belong to the Right, it does not belong to democrats, it does not belong to religious people, it does not belong to atheists, it is for everyone. (…) We opened a vegan street stall, made vegan food, with the aim to inform people. We inform people at every place, wherever we go, even when we step into a bus. I participated on Gezi individually, I supported it, but according to me there were many who supported it and some who did not. They say 'we don't want it', that's possible. I don't know, we didn't make a survey about it, how many vegans went and how many didn't. There were those who went and those who did not. But the majority supported it. Because why were we at the Gezi protests? For animal rights. We were there for animal liberation. Because many birds; seagals and pigeons were killed by the gas and weapons, and many dogs and cats went blind. In that struggle many animals were injured. We were against that, that's why we supported the protests.[154]

One of the platforms where nonhuman animal rights activists and people from other movements come together that emerged not long after the Gezi protests[155] is Food not Bombs (Bombaları Karşı Sofralar). This international activist network emerged originally in the United States in the early 1980's after the protest against the Seabrook Nuclear power station in New Hampshire.[156] Turkish activists started to organize Food

[154] 'Gezi eylemlerinde bireysel olarak ben katıldım ama Gezi eylemlerine bazıları katıldı, bazıları katılmamıslar. Çünkü vegan hareket, veganism sadece sola ait değil sağa, demokratlara ait değil dincilere ait değil ateistlere ait değil, herkese ait olduğu için eğer veganlık üzerine konusursak. Orada vegan standlar açtık, vegan yemekler dağıttık bilgilendirme acısından bizim işimiz o. Her yerde bilgilendirme yapıyoruz. Bir otobuse binersek bile orada yanımızdaki kişiyi bilgilendiriyoruz. Gezi'ye ben bireysel olarak katıldım, destekledim. Benim gibi destekleyenler de çok oldu ama desteklemeyenler de oldu. Yani "istemiyoruz" dediler, olabilir bilmiyorum yani biz öyle bir anket yapmadık. Hani kaç vegan gitti kaç vegan gitmedi, gidenler de oldu gitmeyenlere de oldu. Ama çoğunluk destekledi. Çünkü biz, Gezi eylemlerinde nicin oradaydık? Biz hayvan hakları, hayvan özgürlüğü için oradaydık. Çünkü gazlarıyla silahlarıyla çok kuş öldü, cok martı öldü, cok güvercin öldü, kedi köpek kör kaldı. O curcunada, o kavgada bir cok hayvan ezildi, biz ona karşıydık. Biz bunun için destekledik.'

[155] In the spring of 2014.

[156] Food not Bombs developed as a public event where peace activists cook and give food to the homeless. It is based on three principles: (1) the food is always vegan or vegetarian and free to anyone without restriction, (2) there are no headquarters or presidents and consensus is used to make decisions, and (3) Food not Bombs is not a charity but is dedicated to nonviolent direct action to change society and to end poverty. Nowadays Food not Bombs groups exist in an estimated sixty countries all over the world. For more information see: http://foodnotbombs.net/new_site/

not Bombs in 2014. The weekly event takes place every Wednesday in the center on the European side of the city in the Tarlabaşı district. Later the Tarlabaşı events were complemented with Food not Bombs events in the Kadıköy district on Saturdays. The food is collected by going to grocery shops and asking for leftover food that would otherwise be discarded. The food is then cooked together and shared with passerby and people in the neighborhood. It is often combined with a discussion or a lecture on topics such as militarism, capitalism, and speciesism. Activists that belong to Freedom to Earth Association are actively involved in the organization of Food not Bombs Istanbul.[157]

A platform that has directly grown out of the Gezi protests is the anti-industrial football league "Against League" ("Karşı Lig"). Against League describes itself as 'a league against industrial football, racism, nationalism, sexism, and all kinds of hate speech and discrimination'. In an on line interview a football player from one of the teams[158] tells how the network came about:

> Selin: KarşıLig was formed by the involvement of activists groups that already existed before, and people who came together after the Gezi Resistance. After Gezi we started creating different spaces where we could exist such as occupation-houses, city-farms. Then we thought to give soccer a try. We wanted to form a soccer culture where women and men could play together.[159]

Supported by the municipality of the Kadıköy district of Istanbul the teams use the sports fields free of charge. Throughout the year they collect money and donate it to a social project. Not only do the teams consist of mixed genders, they also do not use a referee. In the season of 2014/2015 approximately sixteen teams participated in Against League. Each of these teams identifies with one or more social justice causes. Vegansport (Veganspor), which uses the slogan 'long live the brother and sisterhood of the species!', is the only team that is based on nonhuman animal rights.[160] Animal rights

[157] A similar event was organized on 1 November World Vegan Day 2014 by four groups, i.e. Vegan Freedom Movement, Freedom to the Animals Party, Vegan Kitchen, and Vegan and Vegetarian Association. Nonhuman animal rights activists made vegan food, gathered at a central square in Kadıköy and invited passersby to eat the food with them. They had informed a refugee center that was located nearby in advance. Activists that participated explained that this event permitted them to speak about nonhuman animal rights and veganism while reaching out to the homeless, the poor, and refugees. The event was met with positive reactions from local homeless people who regarded it as a positive initiative.

[158] Selin from Forza Yeldeğirmeni (Forza Windmill).

[159] Gallagher, Erin. 2014. KarşıLeague: A Coed Soccer League with a Message. Revolution News, 23 December 2014. http://revolution-news.com/karsilig-a-coed-soccer-league-with-a-message/, accessed 10 April 2015.

[160] For more information on Vegansport see this introduction video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ingAT7iV13c

appears to be a controversial issue even for the relatively progressive Against Lig teams and its activist players.

Müğe Can and Dicle, both members of Vegansport, tell me that the nonhuman animal rights cause was not accepted directly by the other teams. There was very little awareness and acknowledgement of speciesism.[161] Dicle recalls that the vegan players even experienced discrimination sometimes. People from other teams ridiculed them with reactions such as: 'you don't eat meat and (so) you can't play well'. She tells why the vegans were not taken seriously by the others: 'because they think: "humans are suffering, animal suffering comes second". We also had to deal with patriarchy here, our friends who didn't eat meat were not being listened to, but very soon this ameliorated'.[162]

The Vegansport activists also observe an improvement that took place within Against League with regard to how nonhuman animal rights and veganism are perceived. Dicle tells that in the beginning anti-speciesism was not acknowledged as one of the league's principles and that the word was added after Vegansport got established. Vegansport also influenced Against League's food policies. Dicle explains: 'If there is any kind of celebration, we pay attention that it doesn't include animal exploitation, at least we give a warning about it, otherwise we don't join'.[163]

The gradual acceptance of the nonhuman animal rights cause is also reflected in the use of the footballs. In the beginning only Vegansport was playing with a non-leather vegan ball. The ball policy changed at the end of the 2013 / 2014 season; Against League made a formal announcement of their decision to replace every leather ball with an artificial-leather ball from the 2014 / 2015 season onwards.[164]

The participation of Vegansport on Against League is likely to serve as a catalyst for the status of nonhuman animal rights within other progressive social movements, although on a small scale. In the same on line interview that I referred to earlier the football

[161] In chapter two we saw that the other players had difficulties calling the Vegansport players with their nonhuman animal nicknames.

[162] 'Çünkü onlar, "insanların sorunları var, hayvanların sorunları ikinci planda" diye düşünüyorlar. Ataerkillik burada da oldu, arkadaslarımız et yemedikleri için dikkate alınmadılar ama çok kısa sürede bunun üstesinden gelindi.'

[163] 'Eğer bir şenlik varsa bunun hayvan sömürüsü icermemesine dikkat ediliyor, Biz en azından böyle bir uyarıda bulunuyoruz aksi takdirde biz katılmıyoruz.'

[164] Utku, Murat. 2014. Karşı Lig'dan Muahlif Goller. *Al Jazeera Turkey*, 26 April 2014, http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/al-jazeera-ozel/karsi-ligden-muhalif-goller, accessed 10 April 2015.

player mentions Vegansport when the reporter asked her if the league helped improve dialogue between different groups. Selin is quoted as saying: 'Clearly, new friendships were formed. Each team, and individual helps improve our awareness. For example, Vegansport has informed us about speciesism. We could say that (especially) among the female players a network is formed.'[165]

3.6. Sexism and heteronormativity within the movement

The examples above indicate that there is a high degree of interaction between nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul and activists from other movements. Based on this fact one could assume that animal rights activists are highly aware of power structures in society besides the domination of humans over other animals. One could expect that for instance sexism is a rarity within the movement. But is this really the case? According to Gizem the opposite is true. She observes that 'in the vegan movement manhood is very commonplace. The vegan movement is male-dominated and has a sexist perspective'.[166] She tells me about identity among vegan males, which has taken an interesting turn:

> They equate veganism with manhood. Nonvegan people on the other hand associate meat with manhood. It is vice versa. PETA investigated that women comprise a great part of veganism. So they decided to get men's attention and say that 'veganism develops your manhood. You can be a real man'. The Vegan Feminist Network[167] criticizes this (cited in Wolf 2015, 62).

At first sight the association of veganism with manhood among males seems a very strange phenomenon because, as Gizem mentions, in society at large we are usually confronted with the opposite association. But the history of the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement reveals why it has taken on this peculiar turn.

In the introduction chapter we have seen that studies carried out in the US suggest that the animal rights movement has attracted considerably more females than males. Different theories have been used to explain this relation between gender and nonhuman animal rights activism. One of these explanations is women's own experiences of

[165] Erin Gallagher: http://revolution-news.com/karsilig-a-coed-soccer-league-with-a-message/[165]
[166] With "the vegan movement" Gizem means both the movement globally and the one in Turkey.
[167] The Vegan Feminist Network was established by Abolitionist Vegan women. This community works on fostering an anti-oppression mentality within the animal rights movement.

oppression as I mentioned earlier. Carol Adams' groundbreaking book 'The Sexual Politics of Meat' (1990) has illustrated how meat consumption and patriarchy are related; nonhuman animal flesh serves as a popular metaphor for women's body parts (cited in Gaarder, 2011). Another explanation is gender-role socialization. Since masculinity is associated with strength and emotional distance men may have been more reluctant in getting involved with nonhuman animal rights out of fear of negative stereotyping. For women it is more socially accepted to devote to a cause that is associated with emotions and care than it is for men. The nonhuman animal rights movement has been stereotyped as "feminine", "overly emotional" and "irrational" (Einwohner 2002, Gaarder 2011). These depictions are perceived as negative traits in the patriarchal society in which the movement arose.

Social movements never develop in a vacuum. The collective identity of a movement does not only stem from the movement itself but is also influenced by the environment in which the movement arises. Animal rights activists have responded toward the stigmatization of their movement in ways that led them to internalize a male-dominant perspective. Rachel L. Einwohner (2002) has found that animal rights organizations in the United States strategically tried to increase the visibility of male activists within the movement. Men function as a source of status for the nonhuman animal rights movement (Einwohner 2002, Groves 1995 cited in Munro, Gaarder 2011). This led to the celebration of male leadership and explains why males are often selected as spokespersons. As a consequence, women are 'overrepresented among rank-and-file members, yet underrepresented in leadership positions' (cited in Gaarder 2011, 60).

In this context it is not surprising that the animal rights movement resorted to utilizing discourses that normalize veganism for men. Particularly professional organizations try to recruit from mainstream society to increase financial donations. Patriarchy and heterosexism being the dominant and normative socialization pattern in society this led to campaigns that have a high degree of heteronormativity. Gizem gave a presentation about this topic on 1 November World Vegan Day 2014. She showed some examples of heteronormative images from the animal rights movement. Among these were the book 'A Man's Guide to Vegetarianism - Eating Veggies like a Man'[168], the ad 'Real Men eat tofu' and the ad 'Hunters have no balls – real men don't kill'. The latter advertisement

depicts a half naked man with a gun in his hand. He wears a hunting suit of which the pants are down until his knees. A pink arrow points to the place where his sexual organs are supposed to be and which he lacks. Gizem points out that these kinds of ads are gender-biased and discriminative. She explains:

> There are transmen without a penis and there are transwomen with penis. Penis doesn't define our gender, who we are. (…) It is very discriminative, it is very sexist. It spreads hatred for women. And it is also targeted at trans-identity. (…) The Vegan community unfortunately doesn't get rid of the gender roles. Over this issue they try to promote veganism but it is not rational and it is not sustainable.

Images such as the ones discussed above have been circulating on the Facebook pages of animal rights activists in Turkey. This is why Gizem considers sexism and heterosexism as urgent topics within the movement in Istanbul. She received positive reactions on her presentation. Nevertheless, when she speaks with other vegans about this topic there are many fellow-activists who do not agree; they do not regard the images as sexist or heterosexist. Gizem believes that the people who disagree do so because they are not disadvantaged people themselves. They are heterosexual men and thus they have privileged positions. Patriarchy serves them and so it is not in their interest to criticize this system of power, according to Gizem.

Gizem's criticism toward sexism within the nonhuman animal rights movement makes her a vehement opponent to issue-specific campaigns. Like other abolitionist vegans in Istanbul she emphasizes that issue-specific protests evoke discrimination against disadvantaged groups. She observes that 'single-issue demonstrations are always open to discrimination. Most of the time against women'. The most common examples of campaigns that express a bias against women are anti-fur campaigns and campaigns that protest cosmetics tested on nonhuman animals. Observing one such campaign triggered Gizem to research the topic of sexism within the nonhuman animal rights movement. She found out about a demonstration set up by Lush, a British anti-animal testing cosmetics company. This demonstration staged a performance in which a woman, who took the role of a nonhuman animal that was experimented on, was abused by a man for ten hours. Gizem points out that this demonstration is problematic for two reasons. First of all the woman at the stage represented the abused nonhuman animals. This reveals that the oppression of women and nonhuman animals are correlated. At the same time women are accused of using products that are tested on animals; they are seen as the

main consumers of cosmetics. The same logic applies to anti-fur campaigns: because women are identified as the primary consumers of fur products these campaigns easily perpetuate misogyny.

Sexism within the nonhuman animal rights movement is not just about anti-fur and anti-animal testing advocacy. It is part of a much broader, more structural problem. The biggest animal rights organization worldwide, PETA, has been heavily analyzed and criticized for using female vulnerability as a movement resource (Wrenn 2013). PETA is known for portraying nude or semi-nude female celebrities, including former Playboy models. The organization also had campaigns similar to Lush' campaign described above, featuring women in cages as representing nonhuman animals in captivity (Gaarder 2011). But Wrenn argues that it is not just PETA that objectifies women. Rather, female objectification has become movement normative with the nonhuman animal rights movement. According to Wrenn this phenomenon is related to the professionalization process of the movement. Because professional organizations heavily rely on donations and public support they prioritize resource mobilization over moral consistency. The campaigns in which women are objectified garner attention from men and from the media, which has a positive effect on fundraising. Wrenn suggests that the large amount of female activists may also have facilitated the utilization of this tactic (Wrenn 2013).

While female objectification is related to professionalization as Wrenn points out, the fact that this tactic has become movement normative has huge implications even for grassroots activists within the movement. Grassroots groups or activists do not necessarily escape the influence of sexism. Activists who are part of a grassroots nonhuman animal rights group that is explicitly opposed to sexism and does not engage in sexist campaigns still have access to resources on the internet that come from the global mainstream movement. Animal rights advocacy images and ads that are sexist in character easily circulate around the world via the internet. Ethical vegans who have a relatively limited awareness of power structures other than speciesism may not recognize these images as sexist. This is where the debates about sexism within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul emanate from.

Critical voices within the movement are on the rise and they are not only abolitionist vegans' voices. Independent activist Earthlings Dünyalı[169] criticizes some nonhuman animal rights groups and individuals for posting animal rights advocacy images on Facebook that contain sexist elements. He writes about this in his article 'Hayvan Hareketinde Neden Cinsiyetçiliğe Yer Yok' (Why There Is No Place for Sexism in the Animal Movement). The aim of the images that were posted is to bring about empathy for animals that are exploited for their flesh and milk. But unfortunately the images objectify women's bodies and legitimize male-dominance, as Earthlings Dünyalı points out. In one of the images we see a photo of a nude woman. Being tied up on a grill above a fire she represents a nonhuman animal who is about to be fried for consumption. The other image has apparently been copied from a Spanish animal rights Facebook page. It is a comic that depicts a woman whose breasts are being milked by an angry cow. According to Earthlings Dünyalı these images are unsuitable for promoting veganism because they are permeated with sexism. He points to the inherent contradiction in these images; after all, sexism and speciesism are all about the alleged superiority of one group over another. This makes the images counterproductive.[170] The activist notes that 'the world is filled with millions of human rights defenders that are still using animals' (cited in Wolf 2015, 62). He stresses the importance of not alienating other social justice movements: 'what kind of influence do these images have on the relationship between the animal movement and groups that deal with other struggles ("alliance politics")? (…) In order to establish alliances and to get united with groups that work on liberation struggles a total liberation (liberation of humans, animals, and the earth) is unavoidable' (ibid).

Berk Efe Altınal, the co-founder of Abolitionist Vegan Movement[171], also expressed his disapproval of sexism within the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement:

> The animal rights movement is a disaster when it comes to animal rights. The largest organizations (such as. PeTA, 269Life[172]) are clearly sexist. I am sick of seeing PeTA's sexist ad campaigns. And there is also Gary Yourofsky, which is

[169] Earthlings Dünyalı is his "nickname" on the internet. "Earthlings" (dünyalı in Turkish) refers to the documentary film with the same name in which the suffering and exploitation of nonhumans in industries was revealed through shocking undercover footages.
[170] http://earthlingsdunyali.blogspot.nl/2015/02/hayvan-hareketinde-neden-cinsiyetcilige.html, accessed 1 April 2015.
[171] With whom I corresponded over Facebook in May 2014.
[172] 269Life is an animal rights organization named after a male calf, 269, who was rescued from a slaughter house by animal rights activists in Israel. The 269Life movement gained international support and thereby spread to other countries. Activists in Turkey for example have established the facebook page '269Life Turkey'. The organization has been criticized for its sexist and misantropic campaigns.

> a popular figure among animal right advocates and he thinks that women who wear fur should get raped!! (cited in Wolf 2015, 61).

Efe refers here to a public interview with the popular nonhuman animal rights advocates Gary Yourofsky in which the man was quoted: 'Every woman ensconced in fur should endure a rape so vicious that it scars them forever. While every man entrenched in fur should suffer an anal raping so horrific that they become disemboweled.' This quote does not express a bias toward women in particular; rather, it expresses aggression toward humans who contribute to injustices against nonhuman animals. It can however be interpreted as an expression of misanthropy.

3.7. Misanthropy

Misanthropy, or hatred against the human species, is another point of discussion within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. Hatred toward nonvegans especially has been identified as a major problem by several nonhuman animal rights activists. It is mostly the abolitionist vegans that have opened discussions and written articles about it.

Abolitionist vegans quickly reacted with an article after a Turkish singer had posted a misanthropic statement on Twitter. On 25 April 2015 Leman Sam had reacted to the catastrophic earthquake in Nepal with the tweet: 'Hundreds of animals were slaughtered for a Hindu goddess in Nepal. Would it go without punishment? Thousands of [Nepalese] died today and let their goddess accept [this sacrifice]' (Hürriyet, 26 April 2015). Leman Sam portrays herself as an animal rights activist. She is involved with nonhuman animal rights causes, but she is not affiliated with any of the grassroots nonhuman animal rights groups that I am studying. In their article abolitionist vegans argue that the nonhuman animal rights movement is a movement for justice and peace. Within a movement for justice there should not be racism and misanthropy and within a movement for peace there should not be hate. Therefore, Leman Sam should not be calling herself an animal rights defender (article on the Facebook page of Abolitionist Vegan Movement). The abolitionist vegans point to the fact that the singer's reaction to the Nepalese' treatment of nonhuman animals is a single-issue oriented position. Thus, they conclude, this example illustrates that single-issue campaigns feed racism (ibid).

Many ethical vegans see misanthropy as inconsistent with nonhuman animal rights ethics. The Restless Vegans Manifesto approaches it as follows: 'Since human is an animal, misanthropy for a vegan individual is cognitive dissonance. Instead of hating people, we should clarify that we are against authorities and discriminations' (Restless Vegans Manifesto, 7).

It seems that, on an organized level, nonhuman animal rights groups in Istanbul are explicitly opposed to hatred against any group of beings, including humans. The fact that the groups often post references to issues other than nonhuman animal rights makes this assumption even more plausible. The Facebook pages and websites of Freedom to Earth Association, Independent Animal Liberation Activists, and Display Cruelty are full with articles, images, and statements about human rights-related issues such as workers' rights, the Armenian mass killings of 1915, women's rights, the "Kurdish question", anti-militarism, and LGBTQ rights. It can thus hardly be said that these activists only care about nonhuman animals.

On the other hand we have to keep in mind that many nonhuman animal rights activists feel negative emotion relative to the treatment of nonhuman animals in human societies. In chapter one we have seen that negative emotions such as grief, anger, guilt, and shame often play a role in a person's conversion-recruitment process. Besides, when a person commits to ethical veganism but continues to live in a society that is speciesist the person can feel powerless at times. Being vegan and being involved in activism tends to decrease that feeling of powerlessness; the person feels that he or she is doing something for nonhuman animals and that he or she contributes to a better world. Nevertheless, nonhuman animal rights activists are still confronted with speciesism in their environment and in their daily lives. It is therefore not surprising that many activists may feel disappointed in and even resentful toward humanity. The anger about injustices against nonhuman animals may take the form of misanthropy, or can be interpreted as misanthropy. But where do we draw the line between the expression of anger about injustices against nonhuman animals and actual misanthropy? How to define misanthropy within the context of the nonhuman animal rights movement?

Bob Torres describes "genuine misanthropes" that he met within "the movement" as people 'who either think that humans "get what they deserve", who naively assume that all humans possess the agency to overcome the problems they face, or who think that

animal suffering is qualitatively more important than human suffering' (Torres 2007, 106). He points out that many of these activists do not realize that humans are also still exploited on a large scale. They fail to recognize the 'singular exploitative system' that connects human and nonhuman animal suffering (ibid).

Let the characteristics described by Torres be our definition for misanthropy within the nonhuman animal rights movement. Gary Yourofsky fits this description exactly. He has publicly declared himself a misanthrope. He did this after having received criticism for his racist remarks about Palestinians.[173] In a Youtube video he says:

> I am a misanthrope, not a racist. I hate all human beings. Palestinians and Israelis. All humans are a psychotic scourge to this planet. Whites, blacks, men, women, heterosexuals, homosexuals, Republicans, Democrats. Shit I even hate vegans. But I remain a vegan activist because vegans cause the least amount of harm to the animals and the entire planet (…) I'm sick and tired of humans being put first. Free the cows and the chickens and the pigs and the turkeys and every other creature that has been marginalized, oppressed, enslaved, raped, and murdered by human beings. Then we'll get to the human rights shit. Destroy speciesism first, then destroy racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, and every other –ism will be in reach. Otherwise we're going to live in the same circle of violence for eternity. Until animals are included, in all discussions of equality, to hell with any two-legged oppressed creature, who can't even realize the oppression they are actively taking part in every time they sit down to a meal or buy a pair of shoes. One struggle, one fight, animal liberation, fuck human rights![174]

The scope of this thesis is too limited to draw any conclusions about the extent to which misanthropy exists within the movement in Istanbul. A worrisome fact with regard to misanthropy may be that Gary Yourofsky and 269Life gain considerable support among activists in Turkey. Other examples of misanthropic attitudes on the part of vegans in Turkey we saw in chapter one when Selin told that her initial encounter with vegans was uncomfortable because of their aggression toward her. Çağdaş had similar negative experiences with vegans who angrily accused him of being vegetarian and not vegan. I have observed that some nonhuman animal rights activists explicitly identify themselves as misanthrope. An ethical vegan named herself 'misantrop' (misanthrope) through her Facebook name. One of the activists that I interviewed said that she 'does not like humans' because humans tend to see themselves as superior to other animals and nature. At the same time she is concerned and involved with many human rights issues. This means she recognizes the connection between human and nonhuman

[173] Yourofsky had made the following statement: 'Palestinians are the most psychotic group of people on the planet.'
[174] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pqhUIns86cA

suffering. Besides, dislike and hatred are of course not the same. The same person told me that she and several other activists left one of the nonhuman animal rights groups to become “independent activists” because of a disagreement over another social justice struggle. She and some of her friends wanted to attend the memorial in support of the murdered journalist of Armenian descent, Hrant Dink. Some other activists in the group refused to support this cause, which caused their split.

The issue of misanthropy is frequently discussed within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. According to Efe misanthropy is a pervasive and unfortunate reality within the movement. In a correspondence on Facebook I asked him what his opinion is about the nonhuman animal rights movement in Turkey and he replied:

> The biggest problem I see in animal groups in Turkey is misanthropy. Like a few days ago there was a question on a vegan page asking 'what do you think is the most useful way to stop animal use' and there were lots of answers saying 'we should kill all meat eaters' or 'the human kind must be destroyed'. (...) a few months ago I wrote something about the military coup and death penalties in Egypt as you know there are really terrible human rights issues there and some vegans came and commented on my page and they were arguing that vegans should not promote human rights for those who are consuming animal products and in the Middle East they consume so much animals and so on. I was really shocked to see that someone is really saying that (cited in Wolf 2015, 65).

Gizem is also highly disturbed by misanthropic attitudes within the movement. She sees aggression on the part of vegans toward nonvegans as a major barrier to recruiting more people for the nonhuman animal rights cause. She is convinced that people with these kinds of attitudes are widening the gap between the nonhuman animal rights movement and the rest of society, thereby impeding and harming the movement. Gizem shares her view:

> Vegan people are misanthropic. They see themselves superior as nonvegan people. They always assault them. But they don’t inform people about veganism. How can you be informed about veganism? They weren’t born as a vegan person. They weren’t vegan. Then you become vegan. So we cannot accuse people about why they continue to use animals. Unless we inform them about veganism. Some vegan people want to kill them, threaten them. They harm the vegan movement. Nonvegan people are opposed to us because of them. And they are right I feel threatened by them. Because of my gender I was insulted by

> Öz Diren Vegan.[175] So we have to develop some methods to struggle with them. But we strengthen ourselves because of them.[176]

Considering the high amount of discussions about a wide range of issues and considering the fact that human rights issues play an important role within the movement it is possible that a misanthrope who gets involved with the movement may change his or her attitude over time. This is what the Restless Vegans suggest in their manifesto when they write: 'Some animal liberation activists who at the same time hold some fascist opinions might gradually become anti-fascist through discovering the parallelism between speciesism and other types of discriminations' (Restless Vegans Manifesto 2013, 8). Based on this assumption an individual may end up as an anti-militarist or as a feminist because of being exposed to the dominant discourses within the movement which reach far beyond speciesism alone. Nonetheless, we have to take into account the possible heterogeneity of and the variety of discourses among animal rights activists.

3.8. Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed alliance politics and the collective action frames utilized by the movement regarding other progressive leftist causes. Animal rights activists in Istanbul deeply care about social justice struggles. In this regard there is no difference between abolitionist vegans and vegan anarchists. The difference lies in the answer of how to contribute to other social movement causes and how to bring about alliances between the animal rights movement and these other movements. The general diagnosis of both factions is that all forms of discrimination are connected. This then leads to the prognosis that it is necessary to become aware of all hierarchical power structures that perpetuate discrimination and stand up against these. In terms of motivational framing activists argue that people from other movements can be recruited by eliminating forms of discrimination within the animal rights movement itself. Emphasizing the common oppression that these other groups share with nonhuman animals is also a strategy that

[175] Öz Diren Vegan (Special Vegan Resist) is a facebook page created to mock with the former Diren Vegan activist group (the predecessor of Abolitionist Vegan Movement).
[176] It is not known to me whether the people that Efe and Gizem refer to are independent ethical vegans, independent activists, or whether they affiliate themselves with a particular nonhuman animal rights group.

is used sometimes (but not only as a strategy). Nonhuman animal rights activists argue that cooperation with other movements is needed to collectively struggle against all domination. The (possible) alienation of disadvantaged groups due to discriminative (e.g. sexist, heterosexist, nationalist or racist) discourses and campaigns by the animal rights movement is acknowledged as a huge problem that should be addressed and changed. This leads abolitionist vegans to reject issue-specific campaigns, because these types of campaigns can contain discriminative elements and interpretations. In chapter two we saw that vegan anarchists, on the other hand, believe that vegan outreach campaigns tend to alienate potential recruits because this strategy can be perceived as coercive. Besides, in the Restless Vegans Manifesto it was argued that vegans may develop misanthropic attitudes toward nonvegans when they focus too much on the promotion of veganism.

The response from other social movements to the animal rights activists' attempt to forge alliances seems to be increasingly positive, particularly after the Gezi protests. Within the Gezi movement many different social justice movements interacted with one another, making it an opportunity for alliance politics to happen in practice. This interaction spurred and facilitated the establishment of alliance platforms such as Against League. The vegan food booth in Gezi Park became a space of assembly where many vegans met each other for the first time, where nonvegans considered converting into veganism, and where the animal rights philosophy was intensively discussed and studied.[177] Out of these discussions the abolitionist vegan movement in Turkey was born. Therefore we can say that in addition to people's individual catalytic experiences[178] Gezi - as a collective experience - was also a catalytic event, possibly inciting many into animal rights activism. It also made veganism more known in Turkey.[179]

According to some activists that I spoke with the animal rights movement in Istanbul still has to work hard on eliminating forms of discrimination such as sexism, nationalism and misanthropy among themselves. The transnational connections are sometimes an aid in that development but more often an impediment.[180] The debates that critical activists bring about are likely to contribute to an increased awareness

[177] In chapter one I write more about this, in relation to the conversion-recruitment process.
[178] I have analyzed these individual catalytic experiences in chapter one.
[179] I thank my supervisor Ayşe Öncü for this insight.
[180] It is an impediment particularly when it involves resources that originate from the mainstream animal rights movement.

within the movement on these issues. This is an ongoing process that takes place internally as well as in interaction with the public. All in all, there are reasons to suggest that the animal rights movement in Istanbul is on its way from being an “orphan” of the Left to becoming a forerunner of progressive leftism.

CHAPTER 4

CRAFTING THE COMMUNITY ONLINE AND OFFLINE

Now we are not alone anymore. We are crowded now. There are many on Facebook, Twitter, TV, radio, we can all use this. Through this we are getting organized, every person can meet people with whom they want to work (Metin Kılıç, Vegan Freedom Movement /Freedom to the Animals Party).

Many of us on a personal level we don't like Facebook, we don't like Twitter. Cause it's shallow, it's not political and it's the same patterns with capitalist way of life. (M. Keser, Freedom to Earth Association)

Like most social movements in today's digital age the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul makes use of the internet and social media. Each of the nonhuman animal rights groups in Istanbul has a Facebook page and many have a Twitter account. Most groups and some individuals also maintain a website or a weblog. It is clear that modern communication technologies have offered new tools for activists to bring about cultural and social change. But in what ways and for what functions exactly do animal rights activists employ the internet? How do these online activities and functions relate to offline activism? And what about those activists who argue against technology and against participating in "the system"? In this chapter I attempt to answer these questions based on my ethnographic interviews, field observations, and online activities and materials created by animal rights activists in Istanbul. To see how activists' discourses are diffused offline and online I will evaluate the materials with regard to the collective action frames discussed in the previous chapters. I will also look at the construction and expression of collective identity of the activists – or, rather - collective identities.

4.1. Activism and the internet

Various scholars of internet communication technologies have noted that 'the Internet has a substantial impact on the manner in which contemporary movements and activists organize, coordinate, and mobilize for collective action' (Ayres 1999, Bennett 2003,

cited in Van Laer 2010, 405). It has also affected the scope of social movements; transnational networking has become easier than it ever was (Maiba 2005, Della Porta and Tarrow 2005). The diffusion of movement ideas, practices, and frames from one country to another has accelerated with the widespread accessibility of the internet (Della Porta and Tarrow 2005). Particularly for counter-hegemonic factions the internet is a useful and affordable tool to spread their ideas and offer an alternative paradigm. Grassroots nonhuman animal rights factions that adopt a progressive, radical approach face hegemonic exclusion by professional mainstream animal rights organizations (Wrenn 2012). According to Wrenn 'the relative newness of the abolitionist movement and strong countering from the mainstream nonhuman animal welfare movement has prevented abolitionism from obtaining a large presence within the nonhuman animal rights movement' (ibid, 439). She notes that Francione's abolitionist approach – despite the publication of his ideas since 1995 – only started to gain a sizeable audience from the moment Francione started utilizing the internet (ibid). In 2012 she writes the following observation about the abolitionist movement: 'the Abolitionist movement, comprised of grassroots and often localized individuals and small groups self-identifying according to Francione's theory, is less than a decade old' (ibid, 438). Hence, we can assert that the internet fulfils a significant role for grassroots nonhuman animal rights activism. This is in line with Summer Harlow's (2012) argument that 'alternative media have become the mediated site' of Fraser's (1990) concept of '(subaltern) counterpublics' (Harlow 2012, 4). With counterpublics Fraser envisioned 'multiple counter-public spheres' for marginalized groups to assemble, discuss and work toward social change, which in turn would allow multiple discourses to exist simultaneously (ibid).

Contemporary activists and academics alike have feared that internet activism may have a declining effect for activism "on the streets". However, in their study of civic participation among young people Banaji Shakuntala and David Buckingham (2010) have found that online activism turns out not to replace offline activism. Rather, these two types of civic participation are strongly positively correlated; they are complementary to each other rather than substitutive (Banaji and Buckingham 2010, 52). Although this is an important finding, not many studies have focused on figuring out how particular social movements utilize this interaction between online and offline spaces and activities.

To shed light on this issue I have looked at how and for what purposes Turkish nonhuman animal rights activists use the internet and social media. I have identified four specific functions: (1) connecting and organizing, (2) reporting (also the transnational), (3) advocacy with the purpose of conversion and recruitment but also convincing other activists of the "right" collective action frames, and (4) petitioning. These functions that are offered by the internet often run parallel to offline events. By using data from my field research I will illustrate how they contribute to the emergence and the construction of the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul and to the diffusion of discourses within the movement.

4.2. Finding each other through social media

Many nonhuman animal rights activists celebrate social media for enabling vegans (and vegetarians) to find each other and to connect with each other. That so many ethical vegans in Istanbul do not have to feel that they are alone in their aspiration for nonhuman animal rights anymore is can partially be accredited to the availability of internet resources. Isolation due to a lack of finding like-minded others is something that should belong to the past. Half a decade ago however the situation was quite different. The grassroots nonhuman animal rights movement did not exist yet in its current form. Ethical vegans and vegetarians did exist in society but they were mostly disconnected from other vegans and vegetarians. Metin Kılıç tells that because of the widespread availability of communication technologies nonhuman animal rights activists are now like a family.[181] He recalls what it was like for him prior to the use of these media:

> In the past when we used to meet other vegetarians friends we said like: 'oooh do you also exist?' They thought "we are the only one". They had never met anyone else in Turkey'. (..) But we were already working for 16 years. But it didn't work out. They didn't see us on television; they didn't see us in the news paper. But look, we are crowded now. There are many on Facebook, Twitter,

[181] He tells that they hang out with each other, they make food together, they dance together, and as we saw in chapter one there are even plans of him and about twenty other vegans of sharing an apartment together and building a vegan village in the future.

> TV, radio, we can all use this. Through this we are getting organized, every person can meet people with whom they want to work.[182]

Social media serve as accessible tools for organizing. Whether it is for a public protest or for an informal get together, Facebook is often used for organizing and announcing all kinds of meetings. Establishing informal social contacts is also prominent in this context. As I have described in chapter one people often establish and maintain friendships with other nonhuman animal rights activists once they have entered the movement. Besides meeting in physical spaces regularly much of the informal communication also happens over Facebook.

Metin's remark points to another function of the internet, one that is shared by other mass media such as TV and radio: reporting. It includes making oneself known to the public, to the extra-movement environment. This in turn enables people that are interested in nonhuman animal rights to connect. It also makes the larger society aware of the movement and aware of nonhuman animal rights. Once already known, the nonhuman animal rights group can keep the public or its sympathizers informed about its campaigns. It is not only local events that are being reported; a large amount of internet publications involves transnational nonhuman animal rights news and activities.

4.3. The controversy of new media technology

Despite its widespread use by the movement the topic of social media is controversial within some of the nonhuman animal rights groups and for some of the activists. This seems to be the case mostly for the ones who adhere to an anarchist ideology because they are explicitly opposed to capitalism, industrialism, and technology. Freedom to Earth has developed a flyer in which they criticize and protest science. M. Keser tells about it:

> This is something nouvelle in activism because leftists are still taking sides with science for example, all around the world. And animal rights people they are just against animal testing but still backing the other forms of science. And when I was in the UK I realized that even animal testing protestors are saying: please do

[182] 'Önceden biz bazı vejeteryan arkadaslarla karsılasınca "Aaa siz de mi vardınız?" diyoruz. Onlar zannetmiş, "biz tekiz". Turkiye'de hic karsılasmamıslar. Ama biz 16 yıldır calısıyoruz, hic denk gelmemisler.Televizyonlarda bizi gorememisler, gazetede gorememisler. (…) Bak kalabalık oluyoruz artık. Bir sürü, Facebook var Twitter var iste televizyonlar, radyolar hepsini kullanabiliyoruz biz. Onlar uzerinden örgütleniyoruz, herkes artık görüşebiliyor, kendi görüşmek istediği kişilerle çalısmak istedikleri kişilerle tanısıyor.'

> other kinds of testing and please do advanced science. And we ask: what is advanced science? You know, so we are looking from a different eye and we say: sorry guys but there is no science independent of industry. There is no science now independent of state. So science is also somehow dirty. Well, you can do science freely, you can do this class by yourself. It could be out of exploitation. But if you buy a new electronic device it includes so much different exploitations.

Keser explains that rather than seeing science as progressive and something that leads to freedom people should see what is really going on: that conglomerates and industries such as the pharmaceutical industry and the weapon industry are in charge of it. The Freedom to Earth activists want to bring these issues to light. They address the ethical problems that come with scientific experimentations. The abolishment of testing on nonhuman animals is not enough. Keser tells that European history is full of testing on humans. He mentions the German pharmaceutical company Bayer, which sells medicines that have been tested on Eastern Germans in the past. Japan has tested on Vietnamese people forty years ago. Even in the current era 'many companies now use secret testings on African people' (Keser). According to Keser this is related to the mentality of "the civilized mind" that is trained to exploit the "other". The "other" can be any disadvantaged or marginalized group such as people of color, poor people, gypsies, and animals. About this topic Keser concludes: 'if testing is really working for our welfare, but if you exploit some other being we are totally against it. If this is progress, we are against progress. We might be okay with progress if it harms no one but if it harms anyone we don't want progress then'.

But what to do if you are engaging in a social movement in the digital age where social media technologies belong to the order of the day? Keser clarifies how Freedom to Earth activists deal with this conflict:

> Many of us on a personal level we don't like Facebook, we don't like Twitter. Cause it's shallow, it's not political and it's the same patterns with capitalist way of life. You are somehow peaceful with the system in that and you show your life there. Even if they're writing something political they write their own thinking. So you destroy your privacy. But we still use it. So on a personal level we don't like Facebook but if you want to create a social movement you should somehow be within the society and you should play their own terms. That's why we have a Facebook account and Twitter account. For example I don't have a Facebook account but I'm also running that Facebook account of Freedom to Earth because we want to communicate with the general public basically.

The members of Freedom to Earth use social media as an 'interface to the public'. They post information about nonhuman animal abuse and announce public events. They are very discrete when it comes to publishing some of their actions that are more risky. In case a secret action is planned it appears only on Facebook after the action has already happened and if all security measures are taken.[183] Neither do they post anything about the regular meetings that the core members have. These regular meetings always happen face to face every two or three weeks. They take place in public parks and in "political cafes". The members also see each other at the weekly anarchist freegan event Food not Bombs (Bombalara Karşı Sofralar) that they organize with other social movement groups. The use of social media is seen as inevitable when it comes to constructing and maintaining an effective nonhuman animal rights movement. For the activists who dislike social media using Facebook and Twitter is a compromise that they are willing to make for the sake of the movement.

4.4. Petitioning

Before I analyze the digitalized advocacy I will briefly go into the fourth function of on line activism. Petitioning and sharing petitions and other campaigning materials seems to be less central than other types of activism for most people that I interviewed. In chapter one I have briefly discussed online activism such as sharing graphic images on Facebook. It seems that this type of activism in itself is not regarded as fully-fledged activism. For each of the people I spoke with who explicitly mentioned online activism as the locus of their activism[184] there was a physical distance between where they live and where the nonhuman animal rights movement usually operates. Selin was in Israel in her intensive online activism phase. She had not joined any Israeli nonhuman animal rights organizations although later she would attend some protests there. She was not yet embedded in vegan networks. During the eight months that she spent in Turkey Selin started to hang out with nonhuman animal rights activists. She then joined street protests instead of doing activism online.

[183] On 21 November 2013 for example animal rights activists sabotaged the opening ceremony of a leather and fur fair in Istanbul. The activists interrupted the speech which was held by the president by the Istanbul chamber of commerce by standing up, showing banners of nonhuman animals that are killed for leather and shouted about the realities of the industry. Recordings of the event can be seen here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Qz7Got7D78.

[184] Whether at a certain period in their life or continuously.

For Siren internet activism plays a central role in her daily life. When we speak about activism during the interview she mostly refers to online campaigns. She is well-informed about all the local, national and international nonhuman animal rights campaigns. She signs as many petitions as possible. There are so many of them that Siren remarks: 'maybe they're sick of seeing my name but I don't care'. She also shares the petitions on her Facebook page so that others will do the same. Besides, she posts a lot of graphic images that display cruelty to nonhuman animals. Not everyone appreciates being confronted with these images; many people criticized her for it and even 'unfriended' her. But this is not a problem for Siren. Being able to do something for nonhuman animals is the only reason why she has a Facebook account, she tells me.

The centrality of internet in Siren's activism may be caused or reinforced by physical distance from the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. Siren lives in Çanakkale, a city which is more than three hundred kilometers away from Istanbul. When a street protest is planned she travels all the way from Çanakkale to participate on it. Because of the distance she cannot make it to all of the protests but she tries to attend as many as possible. Other devoted "clicktivists" that I spoke with were, like Siren, people who participated on street protests now and then but not on a regular basis.[185] These cases suggest that on line activism may serve as a substitute for off line activism for an individual in case the person is unable to be regularly actively involved in activism 'on the street'. Most activists that I interviewed did not mention on line activism when we talked about their activist life. This does not mean that they are active only on the streets. It does suggest that the internet is not the focal point of their activism.

However, there have been some campaigns organized by nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey where petitioning was used as a main tool to achieve specific goals. One of the most famous examples is the protest in support of the political prisoner Osman Evcan. Osman Evcan was been in prison since the 1990s. Over the course of his prisoner time he became an anarchist and an ethical vegan. In 2011 Evcan went on a hunger strike for 42 days in a row because he was not offered nutritional vegan food in his isolation cell in Kandıra. Freedom to Earth and Vegan Collective reported Evcan's harsh circumstances and struggle to the public. They also organized street protests in

[185] They were not among my interviewees.

seven different cities in Turkey.[186] With their petition titled 'Tutsak Osman Evcan'a Vegan Yemek!' (Vegan Food for Prisoner Osman Evcan!) they gathered signatures from concerned citizens. After having contacted parliament member Melda Onur the issue was publicly discussed. It received considerable attention from mainstream media. This eventually led to the government's legislation of vegan and vegetarian food for prisoners in Turkey (Freedom to Earth source).

4.5. Digitalized advocacy

The internet offers the possibility for nonhuman animal rights advocacy to reach an audience that is wide in scope. Digitalized advocacy is expressed through the production of articles, video's, slogans, and images. These creations are crucial for the movement because of their educational function. Groups and activists develop and spread their ideologies, frames and discourses through these products. It is illustrative of the relatively participatory nature of this component of activism. The internet therefore provides a virtual space for discussions and exchange. Many of the discussions, disputes and quarrels take place over the internet but often go parallel with discussions that occur in physical locations between the different groups and activists.

Blogging is one such online activity that is used by nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey. Blogs such as Vegan Türkiye (Vegan Turkey)[187] and Hayvan Özgürlüğü Cevirileri (Animal Liberation Translations)[188] post new articles frequently, sometimes several times a day. In an interview with nonhuman animal rights advocate Palang Ly a spokesperson from Vegan Turkey answers a question regarding the role of blogging and social networking for the animal rights movement in Turkey. The answer is as follows:

> Internet is a vital tool to make the animal rights movement known all over the country and to share materials related to the movement. By using the Internet animal rights supporters make brainstorming and inform others as an individual, as a group and even as a civil defense organization. Although each of us has different ethics – it is obvious that we have different action and discourse types. There are sometimes misunderstandings and fierce quarrels, but we haven't

[186] Recordings of the demonstration that was held in Izmir can be watched here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=csmjGULnpWY

[187] http://veganturkiye.blogspot.com.tr/.
[188] http://hayvanozgurlugucevirileri.com.

> experienced that those quarrels have turned into scandal, yet. We all follow us as online, and support one another. Animal liberty movement is being continued by ceaseless information shared via Internet. In this context, we will not be wrong if we say that the animal liberation movement is fed by social media and blogs.[189]

When it comes to social media Facebook and Twitter are usually mentioned as movement tools. These media indeed offer a high degree of communication between people as well as the diffusion of information. However, Youtube should also not be underestimated as a powerful platform for digitalized advocacy. In chapter one we have seen that almost half of the nonhuman animal rights activists mentioned having watched video materials as catalytic experiences that triggered them into ethical veganism. In many of these cases they had come across the video materials through Youtube.

Veganoloji is one of the Youtube channels[190] run by a few nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey. Most of their videos are materials in English or other languages that they added Turkish subtitles to but some are originally created by the Veganoloji activists. In the fall of 2014 one of the activists, Yüce Ozan Öztürk, uploaded an interview that he did with the popular animal rights advocate Gary Yourofsky.[191] Öztürk lives in Canada and travelled to the United States to meet Yourofsky. Prior to the interview he had collected questions from nonhuman animal rights activists that they specifically wanted to ask Yourofsky. Thus, the interview was done 'on behalf of Turkish speaking vegans'. One of the questions was whether social media may play a role in the rise of veganism. Yourofsky gave an affirmative answer. He also suggested that 'Youtube is probably the most valuable social media' and said that he is 'not a fan of Facebook'. His observation is that generally people use Facebook for talking, not for learning.[192]

Youtube indeed offers a lot of potential for sharing educative materials with the world. It also gives rise to the production of forms of art that is used for nonhuman animal rights advocacy. A bilingual creative video for animal rights advocacy was made by 'independent' activist Earthlings Dünyalı. The title is 'soda pop-milk-vegan' (gazoz-süt-vegan).[193] The video begins with a zoom in on a glass with soda pop drink (the

[189] Palang Ly. 2015. Vegan Türkiye about intersectional vegan outreach and Nonhuman Animal Rights, published on 28 April, http://simorgh.de/niceswine/, accessed 10 July 2015.

[190] Veganoloji also has a website and a Facebook page.
[191] The interview can be watched here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Msf8FW_qJEw
[192] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Msf8FW_qJEw.
[193] The video 'soda pop-milk-vegan' can be watched here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=07K1POA09kc

activist avoids using a brand name such as Coca Cola). We hear the whizzing sound of the drink being poured into the glass. The following words appear: 'Soda pop: a carbonated, flavored, and sweetened soft drink. Drinking soda pop is a personal choice.' (The words are written both in English and in Turkish). The next part of the video shows a zoom in on something that looks like cow's milk. We see a red substance, presumably blood, being mixed with the milk.[194] The image is accompanied with a melodramatic musical tone and with the words: 'Cow's milk: a whitish liquid produced by cows for their calves. Consumption of milk by humans perpetuates the exploitation, property and resource status, and slavery, of cows.' In the third and last part of the video the screen seems to be surrounded by water. The final words appear: 'Vegan: a person who does not use animals and their products, based on ethical reasons. Because just like us, animals are sentient beings who know pain and pleasure. Being vegan is not a choice; it's an ethical necessity for freedom, justice, and equality.'

How does the 'soda pop-milk-vegan' video relate to the collective action frames discussed in the previous chapters? This creation challenges the property status of nonhuman animals. It expresses the position that animal slavery has to be abolished and that this will be achieved by adopting a vegan lifestyle. Veganism is portrayed not as an option but as an ethical necessity. The advocacy is focused on the responsibility of the consumer. These are all frames that exactly reflect the core position of the abolitionist vegan approach. However, this position is also incorporated by the other nonhuman animal rights groups and by most of the activists, even if they engage in issue specific campaigns and even if they argue in favor of focusing on exploiters (in addition to consumers). It is thus part of the dominant discourse within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul as a whole.[195]

There are other creative videos made by nonhuman animal rights activists that express a similar vegan advocacy. There are also videos that utilize a frame of suffering. These videos employ the moral shock strategy by display horrifying images of slaughterhouses and factory farms. According to abolitionist vegans these videos are counterproductive because they may (unintentionally) perpetuate welfarism. [196] Therefore, on the

[194] When cow's milk is produced blood usually comes into the milk because of the cows' infections that they get from the milking machines.
[195] It is possible of course that the abolitionist vegans have contributed to the strengthening of this discourse.
[196] In chapter three we have already encountered other disputes over digitalized advocacy with regard to sexism, heterosexism, and misanthropy.

Abolitionist Vegan Youtube channel there are only educative videos.[197] The activists have made a series of videos where they explain their approach to nonhuman animal rights. In each of these videos a question is posed, for example 'don't we need animal products to live?' An activist then discusses his or her answer to this question. Besides, abolitionist vegans have made a report video of their vegan street stalls where they inform people about veganism.[198]

4.6. Comics

The vegan advocacy materials that are posted on the Facebook page Vegan Lobisi (Vegan lobby) is another example of digitalized advocacy to be analyzed here. The page is moderated by an ethical vegan from Istanbul. It is inspired by and mostly based on Vegan Sidekick, a website and Facebook page in English. Vegan Sidekick produces and posts comics that promote ethical veganism. The moderator of Vegan Lobisi translates these comics into Turkish. When I corresponded with him it appeared however that Vegan Lobisi is not an exact copy of Vegan Sidekick. He wrote: 'The images are translated from Vegan Sidekick; but there are those that are original images. Besides that not all of Vegan Sidekicks's images can be shared, because some of them are slightly sexist or racist' (correspondence with Vegan Lobisi on 1 December 2014). The latter remark by Vegan Lobisi's moderator affirms what I suggested in chapter three: that there is a relatively high degree of awareness within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul about forms of discrimination between human groups.

The original page, Vegan Sidekick, was established by a British ethical vegan who had become 'apathetic' and had given up on any kind of activism. Starting the page was a new way for him to get his ethical vegan message across without being perceived as 'pushy' by nonvegans. On the website he writes:

> The point of the page is to expose the absurdity of supporting and defending animal abuse, in a new way which is funny. Many other attempts at animal rights activism are very stern, and rightly so, since animal abuse is a very serious subject. But, I wanted to take this approach because I feel that everybody will react differently, and require a different approach to get them to understand the

[197] This is the Youtube channel of Abolitionist Vegan Movement: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCzCnoR2pK0eZBwtYwbg5UbQ
[198] See: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kVXWChTwGI4

> issue. So the straight forward approach may work for a great many people, but others might be switching off because of either graphic images, or "walls of text". My images might reach those people, with simple ideas, expressed in humourous ways which should challenge them.[199]

Many of the comics reveal the defense mechanisms used by those who belief in carnism. It also sheds light on society's misperceptions of vegans in a satirical way. In one of the comics a nonvegan asks a vegan: 'Why are you vegan?' The vegan says: 'You mean why I am against suffering, exploitation, rape, slavery, and killing?' The nonvegan answers: 'Yes. Why? What's the problem with those?' The moral inconsistencies of vegetarians are highlighted too. One comic for example depicts a vegetarian standing beside a calf while saying to a butcher: 'I'm against murder. For this reason I don't eat meat'. The vegetarian continues his conversation with the butcher: 'But you can still kill this calf. Because I want to drink the mother cow's milk'.

An original image by the creator of the Turkish Vegan Lobisi is the one with the title 'Her body, my choice' (Onun bedeni, benim kararım). The image shows a mother cow and her calf. From a distance a human is watching them. The statement 'nobody should say… To be feminist is to be vegan' (feminist olmak, vegan olmaktır) is written under the title. This image is reminiscent of the women's rights on line campaign 'My body my choice' (benim bedenim benim kararım) that hit the social media in 2012 as a reaction to the government's anti-abortion rhetoric. Another image originally made by Vegan Lobisi's moderator is an image in which he made a comparative table of speciesism, sexism, racism, and homophobia. The scale on which sexism is indicated is divided into 'sexist' and 'nonsexist'. For racism, the one half is 'racist' the other half is 'nonracist'. The speciesism scale is almost entirely made up of speciesists which are divided into many different kinds: lacto-ovo vegetarians, 'animal lovers', the 'just eating köfte', vegetarians, lacto-pescetarian, flexi-pollotarian, ovo-pastafarian, flexi-pascatanan, yoghurtanan, lacto-italian, lacto-ovo-flexi-pescatarian, and semi-vegan. The only nonspeciesists are the vegans, who make up a very small percentage on the scale. The originally Turkish comics that I describe here reflect the tendency of nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey to connect the animal rights cause to other social justice struggles.

[199] http://www.godfist.com/vegansidekick/about.php, accessed 20 June 2015.

4.7. Music

There is also room for artistic creations within the Vegan Abolitionist Movement. Gülce uses her musical abilities for the nonhuman animal rights movement. She has made several songs about animal rights and veganism. Not all of these songs are uploaded on Youtube, most of them are sung on occasions with fellow-activists.[200]

Rob Rosenthal (2001) has studied how music has the potential to serve social movements. Based on his empirical research he lists a range of functions that music can fulfill in this context. His study focuses on the dual function of music; i.e. how it serves those already committed on the one hand and how it might help to educate, recruit, and mobilize new people on the other hand. This dual function is something that I have also observed within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. I would like to define these different functions as intra-movement purposes and extra-movement purposes.

Whether music can educate people, whether it can change people's ideas and behavior has been called into question. Rosenthal points out that it is a difficult thing to prove and that many have argued that it cannot. The nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul is too young to see how many people have actually been educated through music produced by activists. But what we can see is that music is sometimes used as a resource to try to educate and recruit. Gülce has recently (January 2015) uploaded one of her nonhuman animal rights songs on Youtube: 'Vegan Ol' (Go Vegan).[201] One person, from outside of the movement, has expressed her admiration about the video in a comment. This person wrote that the song is the most fantastic thing that she has ever listened to and that it will perhaps change her life. Gülce replied her comment and asked if she had gone vegan because of the video. The person wrote that she had become vegan the day she wrote the original comment. It is too early to argue that vegan music increases the popularity of ethical veganism among Turkish-speaking people. But the evidence that at least one person has been converted into veganism by encountering the song on the internet is a sign that music does have the potential to educate and recruit, even if it is on a small scale.

[200] The latter are based on existing Turkish popular songs which are sang with the abolitionist vegan lyrics.
[201] Another of her songs has been uploaded by another person (without her permission). This is the link to 'Vegan Ol': https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TQyAXSUyh1U.

Besides this extra-movement purpose there are the intra-movement purposes. Rosenthal writes that through expressing and thus reinforcing basic agreements that hold a group together music can motivate the ones that are already committed (Rosenthal 2001, 12). It can also be the other way around; music can explicitly express disagreements between different movement factions. Rosenthal refers to Phil Ochs's song "Links on the Chain" for the civil rights movement in which he sang "which side are you on?" as an example of how songs can be used for comradely criticism within movements.

I observed this kind of comradely criticism expressed through music when I attended an event organized by the abolitionist vegans on 1 November World Vegan Day 2014. One of the activities was singing abolitionist vegan songs together. It was attended by core members of Abolitionist Vegan Movement as well as by new members, sympathizers, or people who had recently become interested. Gülce was playing guitar, musical instruments were handed out and the lyrics had been printed so that everyone could sing along. The songs are based on popular Turkish songs for which Gülce had made alternative lyrics. The lyrics express the abolitionist vegan philosophy. Part of the philosophy is criticism toward "new welfarism" and this criticism is also reflected in the lyrics. For example the phrase 'do not go to single-issue protests, it is difficult to return from this welfarism'.

As an identity-marker these songs powerfully construct and assert the collective identity of abolitionist vegans. Part of this collective identity is how it differs from other nonhuman animal rights factions. As Rosenthal writes about his research there was a 'sense of validation that music gave to newly emerging (and generally devalued) identities through its reflection "out there," giving such ideas and identities an "objective" reality' (Rosenthal 2001, 18). Perhaps the abolitionist vegan songs make the philosophy including all the standpoints more tangible, especially for new sympathizers and members that want to learn about the abolitionist vegan approach. It could also be a way to deal with the antagonism that these activists receive from some other nonhuman animal rights activists.

Rosenthal suggests that music may play a role in mobilizing people who already identify with the movement but who are not yet active. He refers to Bernice Reagon who observed that singing together helped create a culture of action for the Southern Civil Rights movement. It is not only the songs or the lyrics themselves that do the

"spirit maintenance" work. The act of singing together specifically creates an atmosphere of connectedness and solidarity (ibid). This was the impression that I had when I was observing the abolitionist vegans singing together. Some parts of the lyrics, especially those sentences that criticized "new welfarism", evoked smiles and laughter among the participants. It would have been a mystery for an outsider who is not familiar with the abolitionist vegan philosophy and with the discussions that have taken place within the larger nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. These notions make up the identity of the abolitionist vegan. Spreading the ideas is part of their devotion to nonhuman animal rights. Whether the songs have already mobilized abolitionist vegans into concrete action I cannot confirm. Nevertheless, I can see how it might be a potential resource for mobilization. Some of Rosenthal's respondents mentioned that music made politics seem exciting and fun and that it had served as a major emotional energizing force for them. At the abolitionist vegan gathering there was definitely this aspect of pleasure.

The dual function of music as it relates to intra-movement purposes and extra-movement purposes is clearly visible in this case. It also illustrates that virtual spaces on the internet, such as a video uploaded on Youtube, are probably of greater importance for extra-movement purposes than for intra-movement purposes (or both). The internet offers a great many options to spread movement ideas to the larger society 'out there'. But the internet cannot replace the physical proximity that activists need for singing songs together to create an intense sense of community and solidarity.

The interest in music that is supportive of nonhuman animal rights also appears from a Facebook page created by animal rights activists from Turkey. The name of the page is 'Vegan Music' and it is defined as: 'On this page we collect music groups and musicians that give their heart to the Animal Liberation movement' (in Turkish). There has also been a conversation on Facebook by activists who discussed whether the song 'Öyle Dertli' (so much pain) by the popular band Duman can be interpreted as animal rights advocacy. The video clip revolves around a bull who is trying to escape from his captivity.[202]

[202] The relation between punk subcultures and veganism has also been studied (Cherry 2010, Pellow 2014). Vegan music turns out to be inspiring for many.

4.8. Vegan collective identity construction

The internet has a strong potential for reaching a large (extra-movement) audience of potential new converts and recruits. But it is also a powerful tool for constructing identity and solidarity. Just like music making the use of internet serves both extra-movement and intra-movement purposes. Facebook and Twitter in particular fulfill the function of self-expression and identity construction. Solidarity in the social movements literature is understood as 'an identification with a collectivity such that an individual feels as if a common cause and fate are shared' (Hunt and Benford 2004, 439). The notion of Esprit de corps (introduced by Blumer in 1939) is useful when it comes to understanding solidarity in relation to social movements. Esprit de corps refers to 'feelings of devotion and enthusiasm for a group that is shared by its members' (ibid). Solidarity and esprit de corps are closely related to the concept of collective identity. Collective identity is often used in a broad sense and in different ways; however, at the core of it is 'a shared sense of "we-ness" and "collective agency" (Snow 2001, cited in Hunt and Benford 2004, 440). A commonly used definition of collective identity is the one introduced by Polletta and Jaspers (2001):

> Collective identity is an individual's cognitive, moral, and emotional connections with a broader community, category, practice, or institution. It is a perception of a shared status or relation, which may be imagined rather than experienced directly and it is distinct from personal identities, although it may form part of a personal identity. (…) Collective identities are expressed in cultural materials – names, narratives, symbols, verbal styles, rituals, clothing, and so on (...)' (Polletta and Jasper 2001, 284, 285, cited in Hunt and Benford 2004, 440).

There is thus a variety of elements and practices that for instance social movements or subcultural groups use to construct and express their collective identity. According to Haenfler (2006) collective identity is more fundamental for new cultural lifestyle-based movements than for most other social movements. Since they are diffuse in nature, often lacking formal organizational structures, collective identity is what binds lifestyle movements together (Voss 2008, 50).

The identity of nonhuman animal rights activists is strengthened through the use of a particular vocabulary, which we may call a subcultural vocabulary. Words and concepts such as "carnist" (karnist), "welfarism" (refahçılık), "new welfarism" (yeni refahçılık), "total liberation" (topyekun özgürlük), "speciesism" (türcülük) are part of their

dominant discourses which distinguish them from nonvegans and from people who lack an animal rights awareness and approach to society. This range of vocabulary is translated from English and is thus shared with ethical vegans and nonhuman animal rights activists in other places of the world. Language is a powerful tool to bring about social and cultural change or – conversely – to maintain the status quo. Vegan anarchism reminds us that oppressive language perpetuates power structures between privileged and disadvantaged groups. Earlier we have seen how activists aim to deconstruct the linguistic boundaries between humans and other animals by saying things like 'we are all animals' and 'long live the brotherhood of the species'. The example of the Vegansport football players deliberately using names of nonhuman animal species and the reaction they have received shows how thought-provoking it is for most people to think of nonhuman animals as ethical persons. For these reasons, the animal rights movement utilizes new discursive practices that are anti-oppressive (Stibbe 2001) and that bring about a paradigm shift.

Andrea Jacobs has studied the relation between linguistic innovation and activism. She argues that linguistic innovation in this context 'can be understood as an act that signals some sort of break with the accepted socio-cultural practices. The "break" is indexed by making use of language in ways that do not conform to the norms of speakers' shared sociolinguistic repertoire' (Jacobs 2005, 1). The vocabulary used by nonhuman animal rights activists not only works on bringing about a paradigm shift within society; it is also a strong identity marker. Words such as "carnist", "vegan", and "speciesist" distinguish vegans from nonvegans discursively and contribute to the collective identity of ethical vegans. Some of the nonhuman animal rights activists use the word "vegan" in their Facebook name.

Metin Kılıç has coined the term "Veganistan tribe" (Veganistan kabilesi) to refer to the social network of ethical vegans that he is embedded in. His statements suggest that the vegan identity surpasses all other possible identities that he may have. One of the statements that he wrote on his Facebook page is:

> They say to me: are you a communist, a socialist, a democrat, an anarchist, an Alevi, A Sunni, a Turk, a Kurd, what are you?
> I say to them: I am a Vegan.[203]

This statement is highly in line with Metin's argument about the inclusivity of veganism with regard to the political spectrum.[204] It seems that he attempts to rule out all possible affiliations that may divide the nonhuman animal rights movement. This way he may hope that the movement attracts a broader constituency, a tendency which has also taken place within the American animal rights movement. Another manifestation of this attempt at "mainstreaming" nonhuman animal rights is engaging in conventional politics through the establishment of the Freedom to the Animals Party.

Metin is not the only animal rights activists in Istanbul who prefers unity over attachment to specific ideologies and collective action frames. Nevertheless, there are also many who do care about the 'right' activism. For this reason factionalism and disputes over collective action frames are very influential with regard to collective identity. Factionalist collective identities matter for a considerable amount of activists, especially for those who identify as vegan anarchist or abolitionist vegan. This differs from person to person and depends on their level of attachment to a specific nonhuman animal rights ideology and set of collective action frames. For abolitionist vegans for example the notion of "new welfarist" distinguishes them from activists that operate outside of the abolitionist approach's framework.

Since ethical vegans and animal rights activists in Istanbul have started to form a community only relatively recently being part of this community involves setting up and engaging in new cultural practices. An example of how nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul participate on new cultural practices is 1 November World Vegan Day.[205] Offline activities that were carried out on this day have already been described in chapter three. We have seen that activists took the opportunity to organize seminars, make vegan food for refugees, eat and sing together, or simply seek each other's company. However, the online manifestations of it are also worthy of consideration.

---

[203] Original text: Bana diyorlar ki; sen komünist misın, sosyalist misin, demokrat mısın, anarşist misin, alevi misin, sünni misin, türk müsün, kürt müsün, sen nesin? Ben de diyorum ki; ben Veganım

[204] See chapter three.

[205] Another example is the annual Veggie Pride (in Turkish *Vegan-Vejetaryen Onur Yürüyüşü*), which took place in Istanbul in May 2013 for the first time.

People congratulated each other on social media such as Facebook and Twitter. On Twitter the expressions were put under the hash tags #1KasımDünyaVeganGünü[206], #dunyavegangunu[207], #DünyaVeganGünü[208] and #WorldVeganDay. One of the most common expressions was 'dünya vegan günümüz kutlu olsun' (let our world vegan day be blessed). One activist wrote the following on his Facebook page:

> For years while celebrating father's day, you didn't think about that I don't have a father. You made me upset when you celebrated mother's day up to now knowing that my mother is not here. Also every 14 February when you enjoyed the day with your lovers, you didn't consider me. Now that I have a special day, I will show you and even fancier "1 November World Vegan Day" so now it's my turn. I congratulate everyone with this special feast.[209]

One of his friends reacted to his writing in this way:

> What a feast this is !! Infinite HAPPINESS to everyone !!!
> Let our World Vegan day be blessed brother Metin Kılıç
> We're happy, we're proud, we're VEGAN[210]

Another activist wrote on his Facebook page:

> One of my biggest dreams is that in the whole world the awareness of veganism, which is the is loving and merciful relations between my human brothers and sisters with all other animal brothers and sisters who are living together, will come into bloom.
> Let our world vegan day be blessed for a world full of freedom and love.[211]

These examples illustrate the role of pleasure in nonhuman animal rights activism. It also shows that being an ethical vegan can evoke feelings of pride, hope, happiness and belonging.[212] How to understand the role of pleasure that is felt in relation to vegan

---

[206] 1NovemberWorldVeganDay
[207] worldveganday
[208] WorldVeganDay

[209] 'Gün benim günüm yıllarca babalar gününü kutlayıp benim babamın olmayacağını düşünmediniz. Annemin yokluğunu fırsat bilip bu yaşıma gelene kadar hep anneler gününü kutlayıp beni üzdünüz. Yine her 14 şubatta sevgililerinizle gezdiniz tozdunuz gününüzü gün ederken beni hesaba katmadınız. Şimdi çıçtım çarkınıza artık bana da özel bir gün var ve daha da havalı "1 Kasım Dünya Vegan Günü" işte şimdi sıra bende. Herkesin bu özel bayramı mübarek olsun.'

[210] 'Bayram budur iste !! Herkeze sonsuz MUTLULUKLAR !!! Mutluyuz. .....Gururluyuz....VEGANIZ.'
[211] 'Insan kardeslerim ile yasayan diger tum hayvan kardeslerim arasindaki sevgi ve merhamet iliskisi olan veganlik bilincinin tum yer yuzunde cicek acmasidir en buyuk dileklerimden biri. Ozgurluk ve sevgi dolu bir dunya icin dunya vegan gunumuz kutlu olsun...'

[212] Despite the discourse among some vegan anarchists that vegans should always remain self-critical and not feel proud. This particular discourse dictates that vegans should feel shame because in the past they were not vegan. These activists also warn that feeling proud of being vegan may alienate nonvegans. Besides, according to vegan

celebration days, making music together and other activities or practices that evoke feelings of solidarity and belonging? Tim Jordan has studied the relation between pleasure and politics with regard to social movements. What he defines as pleasure-politics is when the pleasure itself is politics; it does not serve as a means to an external cause. This is not the case for the nonhuman animal rights movement as there is very clearly an external aim: that is, social and cultural change in human-animal relations. When pleasure plays a role in animal rights activism 'politics is pursued through the pleasure rather than being the pleasure itself' (Jordan 2004, 82). In other words, pleasure is a tool for mobilization and not the aim itself. However, pleasure-politics the way Jordan describes it does have similar characteristics with what I have observed during the making music activity by the abolitionist vegans. Pleasure-politics is characterized by inarticulateness (Jordan, 2004). To be fully comprehended it has to be experienced: 'it is a politics lived through touch, sound, and sensation that is betrayed when it is articulated into speech or text. (…) Pleasure-politics is based on some form of shared experiences and only becomes real within that experience' (Jordan 2004, 90, 93). Practices such as the music making activities are illustrative of how positive emotions and in particular affections take part in collective identity formation (Jordan 2004, Melucci 1996).

4.9. The internet as an internal battleground

Events like World Vegan Day connect all vegans and nonhuman animal right activists to a common ground; it is a shared cultural practice regardless of the faction that one is affiliated with. However, the internet also gives room to the expression and construction of factionalism and subidentities within the movement. Many of the disputes between different factions are fought over on the internet. This varies from discussions in written form to images of mockery. The abolitionist vegans' critique against the ALF for example was mocked in an image posted by the moderator of the Facebook page Vegan Music. An ALF militant is shown holding a rabbit that he or she liberated. The first part of the image is represented as 'the fantasy of the abolitionists'. In this photo the rabbit

anarchists vegans should be open to see how they still engage in oppressive practices such as consumerism and capitalism.[212] However, discourses about how one *should* be or how one *should* feel as an activist are often in conflict with the reality of a heterogeneous social movement and subculture in which conflicting discourses exist.

says: ‘Please do not protect me, tell the people about veganism instead.’ The second part of the image represents the “reality”. Here the rabbit says: ‘Thank you A.L.F.’. The message in this image complies with the view that as an individual, a nonhuman animal has the right to be saved from slavery. Another one is a photo of an Abolitionist Vegan Movement leaflet. The leaflet explains the necessary steps for their activism: ‘1) become vegan, 2) learn the arguments about becoming vegan, and 3) tell nonvegans about veganism’. The mocker wrote a fourth step on the leaflet with pen: ‘burn down the slaughterhouses’. Examples such as these indicate that materials diffused on social media not only function as a reach out to the public but also as an intra-movement battleground over frames and tactics.

It is through interactions (of which the majority happens over the internet), whether the interactions are of cooperative or conflictual nature, that opposing factions do not only develop positions that are distinct from one another, but also exert influence on each other’s positions. According to Gülce the dominant discourses within the nonhuman animal rights movement in Turkey have already undergone significant changes from the time of the Gezi protests onward. She observes that the idea of veganism as an ethical necessity (and, consequently, the role of vegan outreach) has gained considerable recognition among activists. Gülce tells about this period:

> Fortunately we were there and we really defended strictly to go vegan. We were writing about that and translating stuff and arguing with people about that and in all these vegan forums we were all telling people how important going vegan and spreading veganism is and after that kind of stuff people who used to say you do not have to be vegan: “of course we are also telling people about going vegan”. I’m sure they still hate us but I really feel that our ideas are reaching them because we see some parts of our ideas in their writings now.

4.10. Conclusion

Nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul make extensively use of new media technologies. Even those who are opposed to technology and “the system” acknowledge the internet’s merit when it comes to building a social movement. The internet is an important tool for connecting with other vegans and vegetarians. The same is true for reporting animal rights activities or campaigns, whether local actions or transnational. Petitioning seems of lesser importance for most activists although the opposite seems to

be true for activists who lack the means or proximity to participate on offline activities regularly.

Digitalized advocacy is particularly interesting because, in addition to the actions and campaigns that are reported, it provides information about collective action frames utilized by the activists. Looking at the materials from this perspective reveals both differences and similarities between movement factions. It illustrates that the difference between abolitionist vegans and other animal rights activists is not always as rigid as it may seem based on their disputes. Rather, discourses and the use of particular collective action frames are diffused to a certain extent. More specifically, the frame of veganism as an ethical necessity that the consumer is responsible for and the importance of spreading this idea is existent beyond the realm of abolitionist vegans. At other times however, factionalist divisions appear very clearly, which we primarily see with materials that include a frame of suffering. Besides, in chapter three we have encountered disputes over digitalized advocacy with regard to forms of discrimination such as sexism, heterosexism, and misanthropy.

Collective identity construction happens both through online activities and through offline activities such as singing abolitionist vegan songs. Positive emotional states, particularly pleasure, seem to have a strong potential for activist mobilization and solidarity, as well. As such, online and offline activism are complementary. While the internet does not replace physical interaction between activists, it is a powerful platform for building and expressing solidarity. This strengthens collective identity, whether a general ethical vegan (or nonhuman animal rights) identity or a specific factionalist identity where collective action frames highly matter. The internet thus simultaneously facilitates collective identity building and stimulates (further) polarization between groups and activists, thereby deepening factionalism within the movement. Nevertheless, factionalism does not always and does not only imply diverging paths, for as we have seen, interactions can also lead to increased convergence on certain issues.

CONCLUSION

In this concluding chapter I will sum up my findings about the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul. I will show how the different chapters relate to one another, in particular how chapter one relates to chapter two, three, and four. More specifically, how does the conversion-recruitment process relate to the collective action frames utilized by animal rights activists? Besides the transnational connections that link animal rights activists in Istanbul with their counterparts in other countries, what are some of the particularly local characteristics of this movement? This is a central question throughout the chapter.

Conversion-recruitment: important points

There are several important points to be considered about the conversion-recruitment process of nonhuman animal rights activists that relate to the debates about collective action frames. One of them is the question whether the movement should try to elicit emotional reaction to mobilize people. While a considerable amount of vegan activists had moral shock type of catalytic experiences this does not necessarily mean that it is the only effective tactic. Depictions and narratives of suffering is by far the most commonly used tactic that the animal rights movement has historically relied on. Wrenn's research (2013) shows that this tactic is problematic due to contextual constraints and that such depictions may often be interpreted in a welfarist framework. Whether the nonhuman animal rights movement can be more effective in spreading veganism and recruiting solely on the basis of rational arguments still remains an open question. However, we can affirm that the conversion-recruitment process is usually characterized by an interaction between emotion and cognition; these aspects are equally influential and in fact inseparable from one another. The learning period is considered something very important by nonhuman animal rights activists in Istanbul. Abolitionist vegans especially emphasize that it is never too early to speak about their set of arguments to nonvegans; people have to be presented with the 'right' knowledge so that they do not fall for the (new) "welfarist trap".

Another observation on emotions is the transition from negative emotions to positive ones. Newly converted vegans and vegetarians often feel guilt, shame, anger and grief about having used nonhuman animals in the past and about society using nonhumans. But through their activism they often compensate those negative feelings with positive feeling states such as empowerment, self-realization, pride, and happiness. In chapter four we saw how pleasure and solidarity play a role in crafting the community and constructing collective identities.

Chapter one also illustrated the significance of social networks for people who are into nonhuman animal rights. The social implications of the lifestyle changes stimulate the emergence of social networks and activities. As Cherry's work (2006) had already shown previously, social networks are also positively correlated with commitment to veganism. Social networks and activities in turn facilitate participation in political activism.

Finally, the role of new media technology cannot be ignored. The internet is used for finding one another, but it is also an important tool for spreading veganism and animal rights ethics. The internet offers rich possibilities for creative digitalized advocacy and for the conversion and recruitment of new people. We see that the collective action frames generally inform and shape the digitalized advocacy of animal rights activists. The frame of veganism as an ethical necessity and of the nonhuman animal rights cause as a problem of slavery is a common frame which is not limited to a specific faction but rather diffused as a dominant discourse.

Disputes over collective action frames

The abolitionist vegan faction and the vegan anarchist faction share a main goal. Their aim is to eliminate oppression and exploitation of all nonhuman and human animals. Their collective concern to incorporate other social justice causes is illustrative of this commonality. At the same time, this is also where we see the major disagreements between these radical nonhuman animal rights activists.

The question of 'what is the (most) effective way to achieve the elimination of discrimination and exploitation?' is what causes the disputes. Abolitionist vegans reason from a perspective of primarily cultural change; a paradigm shift, a shift in moral thinking. Anarchist vegans on the other hand see that approach as too narrow-minded,

passive and a-political; they opt for incorporating economic, political, and institutional change in animal rights activism.[213] Abolitionist vegans identify as the fundamental problem: the property status of nonhuman animals. Their reasoning is that 'even if capitalism would be abolished, we still would not get rid of speciesism as long as the paradigm shift has not taken place'. The vegan anarchists identify as the fundamental problem: capitalism and consumerism (as part of the capitalist system). Their reasoning is that 'even if everyone in the world would go vegan we would still not get rid of capitalism. This is a problem because capitalism perpetuates hierarchical power structures between human groups.' For a freegan the increase in demand for vegan foods brings a tension with it because it is another market that supports the capitalist system. This difference in diagnosis leads to difference in prognosis. Diagnosis informs prognosis and thus informs tactics. While abolitionist vegans focus on nonhuman animal users /consumers vegan anarchists focus primarily on nonhuman animal exploiters. However, vegan anarchists also advocate that animals should not be considered property and resources, a frame both factions have in common. A difference with regard to motivational framing deals with the fear to alienate potential recruits. From an abolitionist vegan perspective "violent tactics" as well as issue-specific campaigns alienate the public.[214] Many vegan anarchists or "animal liberationists" believe that it is the extreme emphasis on vegan outreach that alienates the public. They also dislike the fact that abolitionist vegans criticize all nonhuman animal rights groups that deviate from their approach. Both factions advocate against misanthropy, sexism, heterosexism, racism, and other possible forms of discrimination.

These debates are a reflection of what is happening within radical nonhuman animal rights movements globally, particularly in the United States. But the debates in Istanbul also have a specifically local flavor. It appears that abolitionist vegans in Istanbul have a more broad interpretation of what constitutes new welfarism than many of their counterparts elsewhere. Francione's definition of new welfarist organizations is those organizations that regard welfare reform as effective and necessary in the process of achieving abolition. However, from the perspective of abolitionist vegans in Istanbul a group that uses tactics that can be misinterpreted in a welfarist framework is also new

[213] "The Paralysis of Pacifism: In Defense of Militant Direct Action and "Violence" for Animal Liberation" held by Prof. Steve Best in ex slaughterhouse of Aprilia - Italy - 06 September 2012**,** retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sHDTZniuzyc.

[214] There are also vegan anarchists who think of ALF tactics as counterproductive. Thus, not all vegan anarchists support ALF but it seems that a majority of them approves of this method.

welfarist. This broader interpretation could emanate from the fact that the activists in Turkey who were interviewed for this thesis have studied animal rights ethics, the history of the movement, and the abolitionist philosophy and arguments thoroughly. They are highly concerned about the correct application of it. Any deviance from it may lead the nonhuman animal rights movement in Turkey to go in the direction of (new) welfarism, like it did in most of the "Western" world. This, from the abolitionist vegans' perspective, would be a catastrophe.

Other local factors

The late emergence of the movement in Turkey made it possible for these new activists to look critically at the history of the animal rights movement. They could learn from the mistakes and the corruptness that characterizes the mainstream movement. In today's digital age this information is available and accessible. As such, activists in Turkey that have developed a vision could start with a clean slate; they could craft the movement according to their perception of what the right activism is. This is not only true for abolitionist vegans but also for vegan anarchists, who are just as learned and as careful about the choice of tactics that they employ. This knowledge and the development of different visions have led and continue to lead to debates, which in turn stimulate even more knowledge production and the development of critical perspectives. This also challenges other discriminations still present within the movement such as sexism, racism and most of all misanthropy. Critical, progressive discourses are expressed on the internet and some get diffused among activists that belong to different factions. As Melucci argues, 'groups and movements are discursively created in ongoing interaction' (cited in Oliver et al. 2013, 231). Nonhuman animal rights activists in Turkey continue to learn and develop new perspectives. A spokesperson from Vegan Turkey puts it this way: 'it can be said that we are now in trial and error period'.[215]

As I wrote in the introduction chapter, there are limitations to this thesis that make it difficult to compare the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul to radical activism in other parts of the world. However, based on the available literature about

[215] Palang Ly. 2015. Vegan Türkiye about intersectional vegan outreach and Nonhuman Animal Rights, published on 28 April, http://simorgh.de/niceswine/, accessed 10 July 2015.

other countries that I have referred to in previous chapters some further assumptions can be made. Doris Lin argues that the nonhuman animal rights movement largely lacks an intersectional perspective (Lin, 2014). Similarly, Broad concludes his article about the Michael Vick case with the argument that ethical vegans with an intersectional perspective are 'not sufficiently represented in organizational nor in mediated domains' (Broad 2013, 795). He acknowledges the presence of 'minor rumblings at the grassroots level' but suggests that a 'concerted, national, and media-oriented structure' is required in order to make a broader impact. Broad calls on the antispeciesist/antiracist voices to be more active and organized; he opts for coordinated organization so as to access public debate (Broad 2013, e-mail correspondence with Broad on 14 November 2014). While I cannot make a fair comparison between critical activists in the US and those in Turkey, I can affirm that Turkey's intersectional vegan voices are loudly speaking and actively writing through the organizations and networks that they are embedded in. Whether they already reach public opinion to some extent or whether their pleading remains purely limited to the domain of counterpublics is another question. However, they certainly reach activists in Turkey that struggle for other social justice causes.

Finally, it is the participation on the Gezi protests that makes the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul unique. Many have argued that the Gezi protests failed to bring about significant change. But is this really so when we look at it from the perspective of nonhuman animal rights activists? Did Gezi really subside? If we "zoom in" on some of the alliances that have developed since the incident in 2013, we see that alliances between the animal rights movement and other progressive leftist movements that were facilitated by Gezi are still very much alive. In this sense, Gezi is not an event but rather a collective consciousness that continues to inspire activists from different backgrounds and which allowed for new connections and cooperation to be formed. It also paves the way for an anti-speciesist awareness to gradually arise within progressive leftist movements in the country. Thus, besides the transnational dynamics there is also a specific local factor that contributed to what the animal rights movement in Istanbul looks like today.[216] As such, the Gezi protests can be regarded as a significant event through which the nonhuman animal rights movement in Turkey gained momentum.

Unity in diversity: illusion or reality?

[216] I thank my supervisor Ayşe Öncü for this insight.

It may come as a surprise after having analyzed all the disputes that are going on within the animal rights movement in Istanbul but a considerable amount of activists appreciate the work of the Abolitionist Vegan Movement, even if they do not agree with all of their positions. Some activists told me that they support any organization that effectively spreads veganism and this is what abolitionist vegans do. Despite his disapproval of their stark criticism toward other groups, Ahmet believes that the abolitionist vegans carry out important work that will change the course of animal rights activism. He says:

> The situation in Turkey is also linked to other parts of the world. This weakness in Turkey actually originated from the lack of some philosophy or some political vision.[217] In that case I believe that abolitionism is important in that sense because they have a political vision. They argue other movements. So they think more, they write more, they work more, they try to establish this political mentality and organization. They establish a strategy, even though if you like it or not.

Besides the high level of attachment to certain collective action frames on the part of some nonhuman animal rights activists there are also activists who see pluralism within the movement as a strength. M. Keser for example says about the growing vegan community in Istanbul:

> There are people from really different backgrounds and I feel it's good too. Freedom to Earth positions itself as a radical. So we cannot start a petition towards a supermarket or restaurant: 'please include more vegan whatever meals or products'. But if there is a group of people who do this it's good as well you know. It's somehow a change you know, for animals. We are not against that. Different groups should fight from different angles we think. We don't want to impose one way of doing this but of course we have a perspective so we don't petition to state or we don't petition to supermarkets you know. What I mean is like, there are many vegans and vegetarians out there I believe I didn't meet and I will never meet, but they exist and they do something too. Because there are many people who possibly feel not so good when they hear radicalism of kind of us but still they fight for animals so there are different channels of animal rights I think and some of them are not even activists they're vegans but just be working somewhere and going home that's it. Otherwise we wouldn't have 15 vegetarian cafes in the city. I mean, who is going there? Some people are going there you know. (laughs)

Similar on this issue is Metin Kılıç' attitude. He tells that his group does not participate on "violent" tactics but that they are neither against it. Rather, they themselves prefer to operate within the conventional and institutional way, via TV, news papers, on squares,

[217] Ahmet means that historically the nonhuman animal rights movement has lacked and still largely lacks a philosophical and political vision and that this causes the movement (not only in Turkey but globally) to be weak.

opening street stalls, organizing book fairs, having food parties, etc. Despites the differences with regard to tactics and philosophies Metin emphasizes the unity of the movement and compares it to a family:

> Our door is open to anyone. But some (vegans) are racists or speciesists. Even though they don't eat animal flesh, even though they changed their diet we don't like them. (…) Other than there is no difference between us. Vegans, vegetarians, animal rights defenders, we are all brothers and sisters. We are all close to one another. We're all activists, we are all commonly working for animals. This means: the animal lovers, animal rights defenders, activist, vegans, vegetarians, we are all united. We are not distinct and we don't exclude anyone.[218]

He continues that occasionally there may be a fight between individuals but that they always make it up. After all, he says, fighting happens in every family. And so he determinedly concludes: 'We are a family, yes.'[219]

Metin's words may sound utopian and far from reality but they contain some truth. All nonhuman animal rights activists work toward the same goal. The debates continue; the final word about the controversial issues has not been spoken yet. In the meantime, the existence of this pluralism may be the reason for its very success. The pluralism that exists within the movement studied in this thesis is a kind of pluralism that takes place within the confines of a rights-based framework (not welfarist). Even activists who attempt at somewhat "mainstreaming" animal rights still have an explicitly vegan character. Steven Best has a point when he states that nobody knows at this moment what the right tactic is. While there are those who argue that internal divisions form an impediment to social movements, I would rather ask: are social movement disputes and factionalism really so problematic? What if they create a rich movement environment of debate which in turn highly stimulates critical thinking and further knowledge development? Is this not exactly which prevents a movement from getting stuck in path-dependencies; from refusing to replace traditional tactics which have already proved ineffective by newer tactics that fit more with the current zeitgeist? Is it not exactly the

[218] 'Bizim kapımız herkese açık. Ama bazıları ırkçı ya da türcü oluyor. Hayvan eti yemiyorlar diyetlerini değiştirmiş oluyorlar ama biz onları sevmiyoruz. (…) Hiç farkımız yok. Veganlar, vejeteryanlar, hayvan hakları savunucuları, biz hepimiz kardeşiz zaten birbirimize yakınız, aktivistiz, hepimizin ortak yani hayvanlar için calısıyoruz. Yani hayvanseverler, hayvan hakları savunucuları, aktivistler, veganlar,vejeteryanlar hepimiz biriz. Hiç birbirimizden ayrı değiliz ve hiçbirimizi dışlamıyoruz.

[219] 'Aileyiz biz, evet.'

grassroots character of this movement which allows for critical debates, which facilitates an open attitude to knowledge and new ideas?

In whatever direction the nonhuman animal rights movement in Istanbul may develop from this point onwards, vegan missionaries have become a small but determined activist minority in the city and in other locations in Turkey. The vibrancy of animal rights activism, the plethora of organized groups, and the increasing popularity of veganism are signs that they are here to stay and likely to increase in number.

REFERENCES

Abolisyonist Vegan. (2015, January 2). Vegan Ol. Retrieved March 20, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TQyAXSUyh1U.

Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket: http://abolisyonistveganhareket.org/, accessed October 2014 – July 2015.

Adams, Carol. 2003. The pornography of meat. New York: Continuum.

Akit TV. (2015, March 16). "HEPİMİZ HAYVANIZ" DİYE YÜRÜDÜLER. VE BAKIN AKİT TV'NİN CEVABI NE OLDU... Retrieved June 15, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qk6JfonLCUs.

Altınal, Berk Efe and Gülce Özen Gürkan. 2013**.** Kafesler Kırılsın: Özgürlük Mücadelesinin Temelleri. Retreived from: https://independent.academia.edu/G%C3%BClce%C3%96zenG%C3%BCrkan, accessed on 13 May 2015.

Animal Liberation Press Office: https://animalliberationpressoffice.org/NAALPO/f-a-q-s/#1, accessed 10 July 2015.

Banaji, Shakuntala and David Buckingham. 2010. Young people, the Internet, and civic participation: an overview of key findings from the CivicWeb Project. International Journal of Learning and Media, 2 (1): 15-24.

Benford, Robert D. 1993. Frame Disputes within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement. Social Forces, 71 (3): 677-701.

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment", Annual Review of Sociology, 26: 611-639.

Best, Steven and Anthony Nocella. 2004. Terrorists or freedom fighters?: Reflections on the liberation of animals. New York: Lantern Books.

Birke, Lynda. 2012. Unnamed Others: How Can Thinking about "Animals" Matter to Feminist Theorizing? NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 20 (2): 148-157.

Broad, Garrett M. 2013. Vegans For Vick: Dogfighting, Intersectional Politics and the Limits of Mainstream Discourse, International Journal of Communication 7: 780 -800.

Cherry, Elizabeth. 2006. Veganism As A Cultural Movement: A Relational Approach. Social Movement Studies 5 (2): 155-70.

Cherry, Elizabeth. 2010. Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies Of The Animal Rights Movement. Sociological Forum 25 (3): 450-75.

Della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow. 2005. Transnational Processes and Social Activism: An Introduction, Transnational Protest and Global Activism pp. 1-17. Lanham, MD: Rowman& Littlefield.

Desaulniers, Elise and Martin Gibert. 2013. Carnism. Forthcoming Thompson P., Kaplan D. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Food and Agricultural Ethics: Springer Reference Retreived from www.springerreference.com. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.

Dominick, Brian A. 1997. Animal Liberation and Social Revolution, 'Rev. Ed'. Syracuse: Critical Mess Media.

Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. 2013. .Animal Right, Multiculturalism and the Left, paper presented at the Mellon-Sawyer seminar series, Graduate Center, CUNY, in April 2013. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/3533560/Will_Kymlicka_and_Sue_Donaldson_Animal_Rights_Multiculturalism_and_the_Left_2014_.

Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. 2015. Make it So: Envisioning a Zoopolitical Revolution. In Philosophy and the Politics of Animal Liberation, edited by Paola Cavalieri et al. Palgrave, forthcoming.

Earthlings dunyali. (2013, January 12). Sanat mı, Cinayet mi? Damien Hirst İstanbul'da... Retrieved June 22, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JIUxiJo_rt0.

Earthlings dunyali. (2014, November 25). Veganspor (Yaşasın Türlerin Özgürlüğü!): Retreived March 22, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ingAT7iV13c.

Earthlings dunyali, e. (2015, February 5). gazoz-süt-vegan/soda pop-milk-vegan. Retrieved March 21, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=07K1POA09kc.

Earthlings Dünyalı (activist name). 2015. Hayvan Hareketinde Neden Cinsiyetçiliğe Yer Yok. Published on 22 February. http://earthlingsdunyali.blogspot.nl/2015/02/hayvan-hareketinde-neden-cinsiyetcilige.html, accessed 1 April 2015.

Einwohner, Rachel L. 2002 Bringing the Outsiders in: Opponents' Claims and the Construction of Animal Rights Activists' Identity. Mobilization: An International Journal,7(3): 253-268.

Gallagher, Erin. 2014. KarşıLeague: A Coed Soccer League with a Message. Revolution News, 23 December 2014. http://revolution-news.com/karsilig-a-coed-soccer-league-with-a-message/, accessed 10 April 2015.

Gaarder, Emily. 2011. Where the Boys Aren't: The Predominance of Women in Animal Rights Activism. Feminist Formations, 54-76.

Freeman, C. P. 2010. Framing animal rights in the 'Go Veg' campaigns of U.S. animal rights organizations. Society & Animals, 18 (2), 163-182.

Francione, Gary L. and Tom Regan. 1992. A Movement's Means to Create its Ends, The Animal's Agenda.

Francione, Gary L. Veganism: Just Another Way of Reducing Suffering or a Fundamental Principle of Justice & Nonviolence? http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/veganism-just-another-way-of-reducing-suffering-or-a-fundamental-principle-of-justice-nonviolence/#.VeCtXfmqqko, accessed 1 April, 2015.

Francione, Gary L. The Six Principles of the Abolitionist Approach to Animal Rights, : http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/about/the-six-principles-of-the-abolitionist-approach-to-animal-rights/#.VeNfmfmqqko, accessed 27 June 2015.

Gerbaudo, Paolo. 2012. Tweets and the Streets Social Media and Contemporary Activism. London: Pluto.

Haenfler, Ross, Brett Johnson, and Ellis Jones. 2012. Lifestyle Movements: Exploring the Intersection of Lifestyle and Social Movements. Social Movement Studies 11, no. 1: 1-20.

Harlow, Summer. 2012. Social Change and Social Media: Latin American Activists' Use of Digital Tools in the Face of the Digital Divide, Prepared for delivery at the 2012 Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, San Francisco, California, May 23-26, 2012.

Harper, Amie Breeze. 2011. Going Beyond the Normative White "Post-Racial" Vegan Epistemology. In Taking Food Public: Redefining Foodways in a Changing World. New York: Routledge.

Hayvan Özgürlüğü Çevirileri: http://hayvanozgurlugucevirileri.com, accessed February 2015 – July 2015.

Hayvan Özgürlüğü: http://hayvanozgurlugu.blogspot.nl/, accessed February 2015 – July 2015.

HAYTAP. 2009.'Vejetaryen Olmak Isteyenler Için Bilgiler'. Published on 24 August, http://www.haytap.org/index.php/200908242127/vejetaryen-dunyasi/vejetaryen-olmak-isteyenler-icin-bilgiler, accessed 27 June, 2015.

Herzog, Harold A. 1993. "The Movement Is My Life": The Psychology Of Animal Rights Activism. Journal of Social Issues, 49 (1) 103-19.

Herzog, Harold A., Jr., Dinoff, B., & Page, J. R. 1997. Animal rights talk: Moral debate Over the internet. Qualitative Sociology, 20: 399-418.

Hunt, Scott A. and Benford, Robert D. 2004. Collective identity, solidarity, and commitment. In The Blackwell companion to social movements, edited by David A. Snow. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

ICAM: http://www.icam-coalition.org/, accessed 27 June 2015.

Jacobs, Andrea M. 2006. Innovative Language Practices and the Sociolinguistic Dimension of Israeli Feminist Social Change Work. Texas Linguistic Forum, 49: 84-94 Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Symposium About Language and Society – Austin April 15-17, 2005 © Jacobs.

Jacobsson, Kerstin. 2014. Elementary Forms of Religious Life in Animal Rights Activism. Culture Unbound, 6: 305–326.

Jasper, James M. and Jane D. Poulsen. 1995. Recruiting Strangers and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests. Social Problems, 42 (4): 493-512.

Jordan, Tim. 2002. Activism!: Direct action, hactivism and the future of society. London: Reaktion Books.

Kaos GL: kaosgl.com, accessed October 2014 – July 2015.

Lin, Doris 2014. What is Intersectionality? How animal rights fits in with other movements. animalrights.about.com/od/animalrights101/fl/What-is-Intersectionality.htm, accessed 1 June, 2014.

Lowe, Brian M. and Caryn F. Ginsberg. 2002. Animal Rights as a Post-Citizenship Movement. Society and Animals 10 (2): 203-215.

Mahalodotcom. (2011, September 8). Difference Between Carnism and Specism with Melanie Joy. Retrieved June 25, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=meTtKAXplko.

Maiba, Hermann. 2005. Grassroots Transnational Social Movement Activism: The Case of Peoples' Global Action. Sociological Focus, 38 (1): 41-63.

McDonald, Barbara. 2000. Once you know something, you can't not know it: An empirical look at becoming vegan. Society and Animals, 8 (1): 1-23.

Moacmtv's channel. (2011, November 23). 23/11/2011 İzmir - Osman Evcan'la Dayanışma Eylemi. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=csmjGULnpWY.

Munro, Lyle. 2005. Confronting Cruelty: Moral Orthodoxy And The Challenge Of The Animal Rights Movement, Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.

Novovic, Gloria. 2014. Nonviolent struggle and its application in new social movements: an interview with Srdja Popović. Interface: a journal for and about social movements, 6 (2): 230 – 243.

Oliver, Pamela E. and Hank Johnston. 2000. What a Good Idea: Frames and Ideologies in Social Movements Research. Mobilization: An International Journal, 5: 37-54.

Oliver, Pamela A., Jorge Cadena-Roa, Kelley D. Strawn. 2013. Emerging Trends in the Study of Social Movements and Collective Behavior. Political Sociology for the 21st Century. Research in Political Sociology, 12: 213-244.

Palang Ly. 2015. Vegan Türkiye about intersectional vegan outreach and Nonhuman Animal Rights, published on 28 April, http://simorgh.de/niceswine/, accessed 10 July 2015.

Pallotta, Nicole R. 2005. Becoming an Animal Rights Activist: An Exploration of Culture, Socialization, and Identity Transformation. PhD thesis, University of Georgia.

Pellow, David Naguib. 2014. Total liberation: The power and promise of animal rights and the radical earth movement. The University of Minnesota Press.

Rosenthal, Rob. 2001. Serving the movement: The role(s) of music. Popular Music and Society, 25 (3-4): 11 - 24.

Shostak, Stanley. 2012. The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation. By Gary L. Francione and Robert Garner. The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms, 17 (5): 710-711.

Socha, Kim. 2014. "Beyond Vegan 'Cheeze': Anarchism, Animal Liberation, and the Commodity Fetish", published on 7 July. http://speciesandclass.com/2014/07/07/beyond-vegan-cheeze-anarchism-animal-liberation-and-the-commodity-fetish/, accessed 10 April, 2015.

Stibbe, Arran. 2001. Language, Power and the Social Construction of Animals. Society & Animals, 9 (2): 145-161.

Taylor, Nik. 2008. Review of Munro, L., Confronting cruelty. Journal of Critical Animal Studies, 6 (1): 68 - 70.

Ted Talks. (2015, February 5). Beyond carnism and toward rational, authentic food choices | Melanie Joy | TEDxMünchen. Retrieved April 10, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0VrZPBskpg.

Torres, Bob. 2007. Making a killing the political economy of animal rights. Edinburgh: AK Press.

Utku, Murat. 2014. Karşı Lig'dan Muahlif Goller. Al Jazeera Turkey, 26 April 2014, http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/al-jazeera-ozel/karsi-ligden-muhalif-goller, accessed 10 April 2015.

VeganKanal. (2013, September 13). Steve Best: Total Liberation - Revolution for the 21st Century at IARC 2013 in Luxembourg. Retrieved April 11, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pr7Ax_p7ocw.

Vegan Objektif. (2014, December 8). Vegan Doğrudan Eylem - 7 Aralık 2014, Kadıköy. Retrieved April 10, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iddbeEkuqvk.

Veganoloji. (2013, November 23). FUR AND LEATHER FAIR INTERRUPTED! ISTANBUL-TURKEY. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Qz7Got7D78.

Veganoloji. (2014, November 30). Gary Yourofsky ile Özel Röportaj. Retrieved April 10, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Msf8FW_qJEw.

Vegan Sidekick: www.vegansidekick.com, accessed 10 July 2015.

Vegan Türkiye: http://veganturkiye.blogspot.com.tr/, accessed July 2015.

Vegan Research Panel: Vegan Statistics: www.imaner.net/panel/statistics.htm, accessed 27 June 2015.

Veggie Channel. (2012, October 17). Steve Best - The Paralysis of Pacifism. Retrieved April 11, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sHDTZniuzyc.

Voss, Lasse. 2008. Subcultural Narrative Identity Construction in Personal Zines. The New Orleans Punk Anarchist Scene and the Impact of Hurricane Katrina. Masters thesis, Free University of Berlin.

Williams, Rhys H. 2004. The Cultural Contexts of Collective Action: Constraints, Opportunities, and the Symbolic Life Of Social Movements. In The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements, edited by David A. Snow. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Wolf, Silvia Ilonka. 2015. Beyond nonhuman animal rights: a grassroots movement in Istanbul and its alignment with other causes. Interface: a journal for and about social movements, 7 (1): 40 – 69.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2011. Resisting the Globalization of Speciesism: Vegan Abolitionism as a Site for Consumer-Based Social Change. Journal for Critical Animal Studies 9 (3), 9-27.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2012. Abolitionist animal rights: critical comparisons and challenges within the animal rights movement. Interface: a journal for and about social movements, 4 (2): 438 - 458.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2012. Applying Social Movement Theory to Nonhuman Rights Mobilization and the Importance of Faction Hierarchies. Peace Studies Journal, 5 (3): 27-44.

Wrenn, Corey Lee and Rob Johnson. 2013. A Critique of Single-issue Campaigning and the Importance of Comprehensive Abolitionist Vegan Advocacy. Food, Culture, and Society, 16 (4): 651 – 668.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2013. Abolition Then and Now: Tactical Comparisons Between the Human Rights Movement and the Modern Nonhuman Animal Rights Movement in the United States. Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 26, No (3): 177 - 200.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2013. The role of professionalization regarding female exploitation in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement. Journal of Gender Studies, 24 (2): 131-146.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2013. Resonance of Moral Shocks in Abolitionist Animal Rights Advocacy: Overcoming Contextual Constraints. Society & Animals, 21 (4): 379-394.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2015. The role of professionalization regarding female exploitation in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement. Journal of Gender Studies, 24: 2, 131-146.

Yates, Roger. Singer's Utilitarianism or 'New Welfarism', Regan's and Francione's Animal Rights Theories, and Philosophical Inconsistencies in the Contemporary 'Animal Rights Movement. http://roger.rbgi.net/singer%20regan%20francione.html, accessed 27 June 2015.

Yeryüzüne Özgürlük Derneği. (2015, March 16). Azerbaijan Dog Massacre Protested in Turkey, March 15th 2015 (English). Retrieved June 15, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X6FyOzbTqO0.

Yeryüzüne Özgürlük Derneği: http://yeryuzuneozgurluk.org/, http://yeryuzuneozgurluk.blogspot.com.tr/, accessed October 2014 – July 2015.

Yourofsky, Gary. (2015, May 16). Palestinians, Blacks and Other Hypocrites - Gary Yourofsky. Retrieved July 15, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pqhUIns86cA.

Zengin, Aslı. 2013. What is Queer about Gezi? Fieldsights - Hot Spots, Cultural Anthropology Online, October 31, 2013, http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/407-what-is-queer-about-gezi, accessed 27 June, 2015.

Zulmü Görüntüle: zulmugoruntule.wordpress.com, accessed 15 April 2015.