REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MASTER PROGRAM

MASTER THESIS

ANTI-SPECIESIST ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN TURKEY: AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF ANIMAL ADVOCATES

ARZUM KALFA
19735006

THESIS ADVISOR
ASSIST. PROF. FAHRİYE DİNÇER

İSTANBUL
2023

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MASTER PROGRAM

MASTER THESIS

ANTI-SPECIESIST ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN TURKEY: AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF ANIMAL ADVOCATES

ARZUM KALFA
19735006
0000-0002-4248-2971

THESIS ADVISOR
ASSIST. PROF. FAHRİYE DİNÇER

İSTANBUL
2023

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MASTER PROGRAM

MASTER THESIS

ANTI-SPECIESIST ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN TURKEY: AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF ANIMAL ADVOCATES

ARZUM KALFA
19735006

Date of Submisson: 06.02.2023

Date of Oral Examination: 17.02.2023

The thesis has been approved unanimously

Thesis Advisor:	**Assist.Prof. Fahriye Dinçer**
Jury Member:	**Assoc.Prof. Kerem Karaosmanoğlu**
Jury Member:	**Assist.Prof. Barika Göncü**

İSTANBUL
FEBRUARY 2023

ABSTRACT

ANTI-SPECIESIST ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN TURKEY: AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF ANIMAL ADVOCATES

Arzum Kalfa
February, 2023

Speciesism is the widespread discrimination that is practiced by humans against nonhuman animals because of their species and the belief of human superiority. Speciesism is accepted as a prejudice like racism, sexism, fascism and ableism which are forms of oppression and violence. It is claimed that the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in Turkey aims to struggle for animal rights and animal liberation and to challenge speciesism. The objective of this thesis is to explore the current situation, successful and unsuccessful aspects of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy in Turkey in the light of anti-speciesist animal advocates' critical perspectives. Considering its objective, this research also attempts to fill the research gap in the literature of critical animal studies in Turkey.

A critical examination of theoretical and historical texts and primary sources, like newspaper articles, was held to create the contextual and theoretical framework of the research. The most original chapter of the thesis is the ethnographic research. The data of the ethnographic case study was collected by utilizing basically two methods. Twenty-two in-depth semi-structured interviews were held with twelve advocates through oral history method. Participant observations were held for two months. Thematic analysis was applied on the collected data.

Based on the analyses, keeping hope alive, seeking for total liberation for animals and humans, the rise in the number of vegans, and stipulating veganism as a must to be an animal advocate were stated as the powerful and successful aspects of the movement. Lack of collective and goal-oriented action, failure of getting together, interpersonal relationship problems of the advocates were stated as the unsuccessful aspects of the movement. In the light of anti-speciesist animal advocates' perspectives, the anti-speciesist animal advocacy is not entirely successful or unsuccessful, but an ever-developing movement.

Key words: anti-speciesism, speciesism, animal advocacy, animal rights, animal liberation, veganism

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE'DE TÜRCÜLÜK KARŞITI HAYVAN SAVUNUCULUĞU: HAYVAN SAVUNUCULARININ BİR ETNOGRAFİSİ

Arzum Kalfa
Şubat, 2023

Türcülük, insanların insan olmayan hayvanlara türlerinden ve insanın üstünlüğü inançlarından dolayı uyguladıkları yaygın bir ayrımcılıktır. Türcülüğün, ırkçılık, cinsiyetçilik, faşizm ve sağlamcılık gibi baskı ve şiddetin biçimleri olan bir önyargı olduğu kabul edilmektedir. Türkiye'deki türcülük karşıtı hayvan savunuculuğunun, hayvan hakları ve hayvan özgürlüğü için mücadele etmeyi amaçladığı ve hayvan özgürlüğü için türcülüğe meydan okuduğu söylenmektedir. Bu tezin amacı, Türkiye'deki türcülük karşıtı hayvan savunuculuğunun mevcut durumunu, başarılı ve başarısız yönlerini, türcülük karşıtı hayvan savunucularının eleştirel bakış açısı ışığında incelemektir. Amacı göz önüne alındığında, bu araştırma aynı zamanda Türkiye'deki eleştirel hayvan çalışmaları literatüründeki araştırma boşluğunu doldurmaya çalışmaktadır.

Araştırmanın bağlamsal ve kuramsal çerçevesini oluşturmak için kuramsal ve tarihsel metinlerin yanı sıra gazete makaleleri gibi birincil kaynakların eleştirel incelemesi yapılmıştır. Tezin en özgün bölümü etnografik araştırmadır. Etnografik alan araştırmasının verileri temelde iki yöntem kullanılarak toplanmıştır. On iki savunucu ile sözlü tarih yöntemiyle yirmi iki derinlemesine yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme ve iki ay boyunca katılımcı gözlem yapılmıştır. Toplanan veriler üzerinde tematik analiz uygulanmıştır.

Yapılan analizlere göre umudu diri tutabilme, hayvanlar ve insanlar için topyekûn özgürlük arayışı, veganların sayısındaki artış ve veganlığın hayvan savunucusu olmanın şartı kabul edilmesi hareketin güçlü ve başarılı yönleri olarak ifade edilmiştir. Birlikte ve hedefe yönelik hareket eksikliği, bir araya gelmede başarısızlık ve savunucuların kişilerarası ilişki sorunları ise hareketin başarısız yönleri olarak belirtilmiştir. Türcülük karşıtı hayvan savunucularının bakış açısı ışığında, türcülük karşıtı hayvan savunuculuğunun tümden başarılı veya başarısız değil, sürekli gelişen bir hareket olduğu görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: türcülük karşıtlığı, türcülük, anti-türcülük, hayvan savunuculuğu, hayvan hakları, hayvan özgürlüğü, veganlık

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For my thesis, I owe many thanks to many both human and nonhuman beings. I am thankful to my dear mother Fatma, who raised and encouraged me to prioritize my sense of justice by saying her precious sentence, "Move on the right path even if you are all alone"; to my kind-hearted younger sister Dilara, (whom I wish to be an anti-speciesist person), who has dedicated almost all of her salary and time on (some) animals; to Eyüp the cat, who lives with my mother and sister and brings beauty to the world with one eye; to my aunt Günen, who has lived with at least one dog and helped me establish close relationships with animals.

It is time to thank my family's cat-members for reminding me often that I should struggle for their animal friends' rights and liberation. I give thanks to Bahab, who first appeared to me with his bloody eye in Kızıltepe eight years ago and inspired me to be an animal advocate; to Sannora, who was adopted from an animal rehabilitation center six years ago with the wish that she -as a very sick baby- would spend her last days in a cosy home and who is now six years old; to Mona Lisa, who is full of love and purrs despite having been abandoned four times before me for ridiculous and unscrupulous reasons; to Rüya, who I first had intended to foster temporarily while he was recovered from hip surgery following a car crash, but whom I ultimately adopted after realizing he could not live in streets due to his gentle personality; to Canan, a blind cat who joined our family just a week ago.

This paragraph holds special significance since, if it had been conducted with another advisor instead of my advisor Fahriye Dinçer, the thesis would not have been written in such detail and in compliance with its intended objective. In fact, without Fahriye Dinçer and her kind yet professional attitude, I have been quite sure that I would not have been able to finish this thesis, which I frequently considered giving up. Hence I owe my advisor Fahriye Dinçer a debt of gratitude for her guidance and for creating an environment that I felt comfortable talking to her with any concerns I might have. I would want to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to our department director Mehmet Sait Özervarlı for introducing me to Fahriye Dinçer, since he thought she would be a great advisor for me and this thesis. In addition, I want to thank him for being a kind, caring, and wise professor who served vegan cookies during classes and gave me cat food as a gift in honor of my success in the oral examination of my thesis. I want to thank Kerem Karaosmanoğlu for participating in my thesis defense, reading my thesis carefully and expanding my perspective with supportive comments. Together with these motives, I also want to thank Barika Göncü for giving courage and power to me and animals by taking part in my thesis defense.

For the support they have given me and, therefore, my thesis, I would like to thank many people who are vegan or nonvegan who I look forward to seeing go vegan, to my friends Doğan, Burcu, Kübra, Atakan, Gizem, Arzu, Özge, Işıl, Şehnaz, Aysun, Özge, Çağlar; to Eray teyze; to my cousin Beyza; to Ms. Özlem, who never stopped encouraging me; to all animal advocates who do their best for animals; to Berk Efe Altınal for his inspiring thoughts; to my neighbour Zeynep Güneysu with whom I have been caring for the animals in streets.

I want to dedicate this thesis to all animals who have been exploited and will be exploited for human benefit, as well as who have not been loved and will not be loved. I would also like to dedicate it to all of my animal friends –some are alive, some are not-, who I believe have been rather fortunate compared to animals in general, to the cats Sevimnur, Fatoş, Kitap, Susam, Çörekotu, Vino, Uranüs, Venüs, Pati, Mucize, İnci, Gelecek, Zeyno, Kinki, Marx, Simmel, Weber, Durkheim, Bayram, Luna, Nergis, Yağmur, Otis, Nohut, Cüneyt, Ülker, Leyla, Nermin, Bulut, Fare, Masal, Pamuk Peri, Kadife, Hanım, Maski, Necati, Osman, Adar; to the dogs Nino, Çolak, Garip, and 3000 dogs living in Yedikule Animal Shelter; to budgie Şeniz and Cukcuk; to pigeon Zülal, seagull Umut, nameless pigeon and crow, and to all nameless friends; to three motherless newborn kitties who I bottle-fed for days but could not save from death; to the sheep who I -unfortunately- had to buy to keep them from being slaughtered and who now lives in Angels Farm Sanctuary.

Finally, I dedicate this thesis to Burak Özgüner who was the greatest animal advocate I have ever met and I would like to close this part with Burak's sentence.

"With our rejection, our joy, our anger..."[1]

İstanbul, February 2023 Arzum Kalfa

[1] In Turkish, "Reddedişimiz, neşemiz, öfkemiz ile…".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ..... **iii**
ÖZ ..... **iv**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **v**
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **vii**
LEXICON ..... **ix**

1. INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1. Conceptual Framework 3
1.2. Literature Review 7
1.3. Methodology 17
1.4. Outline of the Thesis 20

2. ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE **21**

2.1. Speciesism 21
2.1.1. The Relationship of Speciesism with other Discrimination Types 23
2.1.2. Sample Justifications for Speciesism 25
2.2. Animal Advocacy Theories 26
2.2.1. Utilitarian Animal Liberation Theory of Peter Singer 26
2.2.2. Animal Rights Theory of Tom Regan 28
2.2.3. Abolitionist Animal Rights Theory of Gary L. Francione 31
2.2.4. The Animal Standpoint Theory of Steven Best 36
2.3. Veganism 39

3. ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE **41**

3.1. Animal Advocacy Movement as a New Social Movement 41
3.2. Animal Advocacy Movement in the World 44
3.3. Animal Advocacy in Turkey 54
3.3.1. Animal Rights Movement in Turkey 55
3.3.2. Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement in Turkey 58

4. AN ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY ON ANTI-SPECIESIST ANIMAL ADVOCATES IN TURKEY **72**

4.1. On the Way of Being An Animal Advocate 75
4.1.1. Starting with Going Vegan 76
4.1.1.1. Going Directly Vegan 76
4.1.1.2. Going Vegan after Being Vegetarian 80
4.1.2. Starting with Taking Care of Animals who Live in Streets and Temporary Animal Rehabilitation Centers 84
4.2. The Current Situation of Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement in Turkey 86
4.2.1. The Action Methods of the Movement 88
4.2.2. The Advocates' Ideal Goal of Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement 91

4.2.2.1. "A Vegan World that Destroys the Property Status of Animals" 92
4.2.2.2. "Total Liberation" 93
4.3. Successful Aspects of Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement 94
4.3.1. Keeping Hope Alive 95
4.3.2. Seeking Total Liberation in Comparison to other Countries 96
4.3.3. Rise in the Number of Vegans 98
4.3.4. Stipulating Veganism as a Must to be an Animal Advocate 98
4.4. Unsuccessful Aspects of Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement 99
4.4.1. Lack of Collective and Goal-Oriented Action: "We are Groping for something" 100
4.4.2. Failure of Getting Together 108
4.4.3. Interpersonal Relationship Problems of the Advocates: "Because Advocates' Identities Get Ahead of the Subjects: Animals" 109
4.5. Evaluation of the Narratives 113
4.6. Self-reflexivity 118

5. CONCLUSION 123

REFERENCES 127

APPENDICES 141

Appendix 1.Sample Questions for the In-depth Semi-structured Interviews 141
Appendix 2.The Informed Consent Form for the Interviewees 142

END NOTES 143

LEXICON

Abbreviations

AAAM : Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement
ALF : Animal Liberation Front
ARM : Animal Rights Movement
AVH : Abolitionist Vegan Movement
BURHAK : Burak Özgüner Animal Rights Study Center
CAS : Critical Animal Studies
HAKİM : Animal Rights Monitoring Committee
HÖK : Animal Liberation Collective
In. : Initiative
PETA : People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
RSPCA : Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
SHAC : Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty
SPCA : Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
TARC : Temporary Animal Rehabilitation Center
TBMM : The Grand National Assembly of Turkey
TVD : The Vegan Association of Turkey
Un. : University
YÖP : Freedom for Dolphins Platform

Vocabulary[2]

Animal abuse : animal use
Animal flesh : meat
Animals living in streets : stray animals
Animals raised and killed for food : farm animals
Cow's breast milk : milk
Temporary animal rehabilitation center : animal shelter
They : the pronoun for animal/s
Who : the relative clause word for animal/s

[2] The anti-speciesist vocabulary was developed with the help of two guides: *Animal Friendly Communication Guide* and *Animals and Media: A Style Guide for Giving Voice to the Voiceless.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Animals are earthlings like humans and they share the same world. It is not just the world that we share, nonhuman animals[3] and humans share a great deal of features. We all possess the capacity to feel, to love, to have a family and all of us have mothers and fathers. Then again, we all live in the world and we are conscious of our existence. Even though we have a lot in common, there is a significant distinction between these two earthlings: the property status of animals. It is argued that because of their species, humans refer to animals as property and use, abuse, exploit, and enslave them.

As it will be discussed throughout this study, animal advocacy scholars have asked the following question: Can we say that this situation differs from the degrading of Afro-Americans or Jews because of their race; the degrading of women because of their gender; the degrading of people with disabilities because of their physical or mental distinctions; or the degrading of LGBTİ+ people because of their sexual identities? Every one of these forms of discrimination has a name: respectively racism, sexism, ableism, and homophobia. So, is there a name for the discrimination that animals encounter as a result of their species? Once again, the animal advocacy scholars have responded to this question with the following term: speciesism.

When I first heard the word speciesism – *türcülük* in Turkish-, I had no idea what it meant, so I assumed it was a misspelled version of Turkish word "Türkçülük" meaning "Turkism" in English. Because up until that point, I had described myself as an animal lover for as long as I can remember, and I had spent a year volunteering at an animal rehabilitation center caring for cats and dogs once a week. Moreover, I had been living at home with my two cat-kids who were rescued from the street and from an animal rehabilitation center. In addition, even though I had had financial difficulties, whenever I had come across an injured or sick cat or dog, I always had had them treated in private veterinary clinics. Even so, I had not been aware of what speciesism was until the day when I learned about it and I

[3] Animals who are nonhuman will be referred to as "animals" throughout thesis.

noticed that I had been taking care of and worrying about several species –in other words, being a speciesist person. I could no longer be a speciesist, at which point I had become vegan.

After being vegan and adopting an anti-speciesist life, I decided that I should struggle for the freedom and rights of all animals. Hence, I joined the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement by becoming a member of an animal advocacy group on the grounds that strength comes from unity. To improve myself as an advocate, I read many anti-speciesist animal advocacy theories such as those that I discussed in Chapter 2. But when I examined the animal advocacy literature in Turkey, I noticed that there was a gap in animal studies literature. Most of the texts I read dealt only with the rights of certain animals such as cats and dogs and the movement that struggled for these animals' rights under the heading of animal rights. I thought that studies that discuss the rights of all animals that include all species provided theoretical perspective about the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement, but that field studies were insufficient in examining the existence of this movement, as it is discussed in the section of literature review.

Since I thought that I could not adequately support literature and animals on my own, I made the decision to have a master's degree in social studies to improve myself more. During the master program, I came to the conclusion that the themes of the courses did not include animal ethics –especially anti-speciesism and veganism. Despite being aware of the gap in the literature, I was surprised to notice that while many discrimination types were discussed in the courses, speciesism was almost not one of them. Along with my experience in the movement, I had the opportunity to add the different perspectives given by my graduate courses, the discussions in the courses and the papers I wrote as homework on anti-speciesist animal advocacy. With my fresh perspective, I tried to continue evaluating the movement more, and I shared and discussed my opinions with my friends who are also advocates. The movement's successes made me very delighted, but I was also deeply concerned about its deficiencies and problems. For my thesis, I had several subjects in mind that I could support both animals and animal advocates. Eventually I decided to write a thesis that I could examine many aspects of the movement and then I could present it to the advocates.

The objective of this thesis is to answer the following significant question: “What is the current situation of anti-speciesist animal advocacy in Turkey with its successful and unsuccessful aspects?”

1.1.Conceptual Framework

Speciesism is the widespread discrimination that is practiced by humans against nonhuman animals because of their species (Ryder, 2011, 59). If a human favours a human over a dog, it is a practice of speciesism. And if a human favours a dog over a cow -or other animals raised and used for food, clothing, entertainment, testing etc, -it is again a practice of speciesism. As Steven Best (2014, 17) states, there was speciesism in the first place as the first form of hierarchy and source of discrimination paving the way for “other forms of oppression, power, and violence” like racism, fascism, sexism, homophobia, classism and ableism. Animal ethics scholars like Ryder, Regan, Francione and Best argue that to reject speciesism is to believe that all forms of animal exploitation should end. This argument is referred to as anti-speciesism. It is also argued that in a coherent perspective “every anti-speciesist should also be a vegan and every vegan should be an anti-speciesist (Marmara, 2020, 52, 53)”.[4] One of the main goals of Turkey's anti-speciesist animal advocacy, it is claimed, is to challenge speciesism for the liberation and rights of nonhuman animals.

The subject of the thesis is the anti-speciesist animal advocacy in Turkey and as a case study, it focuses on anti-speciesist animal advocates’ critical perspectives about the current situation. The anti-speciesist animal advocacy is differentiated from the mainstream animal advocacy. In Turkey the mainstream animal advocacy is often referred to as animal rights movement (ARM) and it struggles for the rights of certain species of animals like cats and dogs living in streets and temporary animal rehabilitation centers (TARC). Thus I deliberately chose the term “anti-speciesist” to accentuate the advocacy for all nonhuman animals.

The anti-speciesist movement that advocates for nonhuman animals, their rights and liberation has been called with multiple names. The most common of these

[4] Marmara (2020, 53), in the PhD thesis, claims that anti-speciest veganism can be called "ethical veganism" and uses the words "anti-speciesism" and "ethical veganism" interchangeably.

names have been “animal rights movement”, “animal liberation movement” and “animal advocacy movement”. Since the names are rather generic, inclusion of anti-speciesism can only be understood by unravelling the practices performed under various names, I will discuss this issue in detail in the historical part of the thesis in Chapter 3. In terms of my own research conducted for this thesis, however, since the terms “anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement” usually includes both of them in Turkey, I will use this term to refer both to animal rights movement and animal liberation movement, as long as they clearly reveal anti-speciesist tendencies.

But this decision was not taken readily that it took a long time to reflect upon. At first, I had been quite sure about using the name “animal rights movement” since most of the animal advocates whom I knew located themselves in the animal rights movement even though they had been identifying themselves as animal rights or animal liberation advocates. But during the interviews and participant observations, I realised that most of the animal advocates use the terms “animal liberation movement” and “animal rights movement” interchangeably. Beyond Turkey, as Pendergrast affirms, like other social movements, animal advocacy movement also has differentiated titles that are being used amongst the advocates, such as animal rights movement and animal liberation movement (Pendergrast, 2014, 2). Consequently, I concluded with using the term “animal advocacy movement” as an umbrella term for the anti-speciesist movements of both rights and liberation. Moreover I will use the words “animal advocate” to identify the participants of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement to cover all advocates who identify themselves either animal rights or animal liberation advocates.

I deliberately avoided using the term “animal movement” which is suggested by Munro (2005, 8; 2012, 169) as an umbrella term for animal welfare, rights and liberation movements. Because in this thesis, animal welfare movement will not be included since it is considered as a movement not for the sake of animals, but of humans who need to regulate animal abuse, exploitation and slavery to ease their conscience (Francione, 2009, xi).[5] Here I need to define the animal welfare

[5] Further information about animal welfare is on title 2.2.3.

approach and movement in order to explain why I do not include it and use the term "animal advocacy movement" for this study.

Animal welfare is defined as an approach and a movement that defends using animals is morally justifiable if humans make sure that "unnecessary" suffering of animals is avoided. In that respect, for example, animals should be treated and killed "humanely"; and they would die painlessly. Animal welfare approach assumes that the primary problem is not the animal use; but treatment of animals who are being used (Francione, 1996, 42; 2009, xiii, 1, 5). Disputing the meanings of the terms "unnecessary" suffering and "humane" treatment, animal rights/liberation approach, which I defined in the previous paragraph, challenges animal welfare approach by proposing the following questions: What suffering is "unnecessary"; and who decides which treatments are "humane" and or not for animals"? And the animal rights/liberation approach provides answers for these questions: For the first question, no suffering is necessary since humans do not really need any animal use or products; and for the second question, the ones who decide which treatments are "humane" are not animals themselves, but owners and exploiters of animals regarding their benefits (Francione, 1996, 11; 2009, 8). As an example of the difference between the animal welfare and animal rights/liberation movements, the animal welfare movement seeks to require that vivisectors treat cats –or other animals- used in laboratories more "humanely" and avoid "unnecessary" suffering of cats, while the animal rights/liberation movement seeks to abolish all vivisection system that abuses cats and all animals.

It is said that animal welfare is a speciesist approach and movement because of these characteristics that care about the interests of humans, not animals. Therefore, it can be argued that a speciesist movement in nature cannot struggle for the rights and liberation of animals. Anti-speciesist animal advocacy scholars and advocates criticise and oppose animal welfare approach. For all of these reasons, animal welfare movement is not included in the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in this study.

On the other hand, it is needed to state that I do not use the term "animal advocacy movement" in the same sense that Nick Pendergrast (2014, 282) did in his brilliant doctoral thesis. He claims that he chose the term over others because it is a broad

term covering animal rights and animal welfare perspectives. Although I use the same term, I did not do so to include animal welfare; rather I did so just to include animal rights and animal liberation movements.

However, taking these decisions and producing a language parallel to the concepts that I utilized with specific meanings had not been easy. Besides available literature, I have been inspired by my ethnographic experiences:

> "Today is 8th October 2022. I held an interview with Funda in Vegan Masa[6]. While I was there, [as one of the customers] the mother of a [human] baby asked Funda, who is one of the owners of the restaurant, if she could feed the baby with cow's breast milk inside the restaurant. Funda smiled and answered 'We say that here is a safe space for all animals' and offered them vegan soup instead. All of a sudden I noticed that my thesis could be a safe space for all animals (Arzum, memo, October 2022)."

I wrote this memo only twenty minutes after the interview with Funda who is an animal advocate I interviewed. The concept of safe space has grounds in the feminist movement for humans and could be expanded to animals by challenging the implicit hierarchy of humans over animals (Parker, 2016, 6, 19, 20). I have avoided using the speciesist vocabulary that continuously constructs human-animal binary not to reconstruct the language that promotes animal exploitation and property status of animals. I have done my best to produce anti-speciesist vocabulary to create a safe space for all animals as much as possible.[7]

In addition to Carol J. Adam's theory, I have benefited from *Animal Friendly Communication Guide*[8] edited by Bârika Göncü (2021) to be able to develop the anti-speciesist language of this study. This Turkish guide was translated from English from a prior guide that is *Animals and Media: A Style Guide for Giving Voice to the Voiceless* developed by Debra Merskin and Carrie P. Freeman (2020). I also have benefited from this English guide.

However, I want to mention a concept here since I have utilized it throughout my research as part of my understanding: the concept of "the absent referent" in *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* of Carol J. Adams

[6] A vegan restaurant in Beşiktaş, İstanbul
[7] The anti-speciesist emancipatory vocabulary was stated in the lexicon part of the thesis.
[8] The original title of the guide is "*Hayvan Dostu İletişim Kılavuzu*".

(2010). The absent referent, according to Adams, disconnected the existence of meat[9] from the existence of an animal who was killed to become meat. Animals are the absent referent in the act of meat eating. Using the absent referent has allowed the exploitation and oppression of animals. Thus she has claimed that there is absent referent – or animal in this sense- behind every meal of meat (Adams, 2010, 13). Absent referent is a term that encompasses more than only meat. For example, when the mother cow's breast milk that is produced for her own calf is called as "milk", the mother and baby cows become invisible or "absent". Another example is the elimination of the existence of an animal who wants to live but is murdered against their will, when this murder is called as euthanasia. With the support of this concept, I have sought to adopt the anti-speciesist language that I use in every moment of my daily life into an academic language in this thesis. I have attempted to draw attention to and highlight the absent referents that are animals as individuals throughout the thesis.

Here, I would wish to mention a few of the concepts in this anti-speciesist language that I developed with the help of the quides and concepts I mentioned. I specifically chose not to use the pronoun "it" and the relative clause word "which" since they represent animals as unsentient objects and repeatedly reproduce the property status. Instead, I have substituted "they" for it and "who" for which. Since naming TARC, the facilities where animals living in streets should receive the necessary treatment when they need it, as misleading word "shelter" normalizes the captivation of animals there, I decided to name these facilities as TARC (Karataş, 2022).

1.2.Literature Review

In this section, I will examine the publications on the animal advocacy and animal advocacy movement in Turkey. I will only include studies conducted in Turkey in this section, because they are the most relevant ones to my research subject. I have included the studies conducted in other countries, while describing the philosophical theory behind the movement and the history of the movement in chapters two and three. I will examine first the books, then the theses and articles,

[9] In order to avoid changing the meaning of the argument, I chose not to substitute "animal flesh" for meat in these sentences.

and in chronological order. While there are several publications in this topic that date back to the Ottoman era, I will not include these old publications in this section since they are too detached from the contemporary animal advocacy movement, which is the primary subject of this thesis. However, information they provided will be included in the chapter that deals with the animal advocacy in Turkey in historical perspectives.

Veganism: Ahlakı, Siyaseti ve Mücadelesi[10] was written by Zülal Kalkandelen and Can Başkent in 2013. This book was the first Turkish book about veganism and all animals' rights. The book was published as an e-book and it was the transcript of the conversation of its authors on various topics related to veganism, which was a new ethical and philosophical issue in Turkey at that time (Kalkandelen, Başkent, 2013). In the book, Kalkandelen, who has been a journalist and an animal advocate, stated that she immediately accepted Başkent's proposal on writing the book, because she thought that she might have given a collective response to people who have reached out her and asked questions about veganism. Moreover she was excited by the idea of creating a resource on veganism in Turkish, her mother tongue (Kalkandelen, Başkent, 2013, 3).

The book *Hayvan Hakları*[11] written by Çetin Nerse (2015) starts by delving into the goodness and badness of humans and continues stating some fundamental moral principles of philosophy. He also provides sample justifications for speciesism and attempts to disprove them. It can be said that this study differs from many others in that it explicitly addresses and disproves the arguments presented by humans to defend speciesism. Nerse advocates for total liberation claiming that the freedom of humans can only and primarily come about through the freedom of animals.

The books *Vegan Beslenme*[12] and *Vegan Sağlık*[13] were written by Murat Kınıkoğlu (2015; 2018) who is a medical doctor. The books encourage people to switch plant-based diet as being a more healthful and moral diet, and asserts that eating animal product triggers many diseases, including cancer and cardiovascular disease.

[10] English translation of the book is "*Veganism: Its Ethics, Politics and Struggle".*
[11] English translation is "*Animal Rights*".
[12] English translation is "*Vegan Diet*".
[13] English translation is "*Vegan Health*".

Besides inviting people to plant-based diet, he also invites them to go vegan for animals and a fairer world.

Zülal Kalkandelen's (2018) another book *Vegan Devrimi ve Hayvan Özgürlüğü*[14] was published in 2018. Another edition of the book was published in 2021 and the new book has more chapters related to current events in Turkey and the world (Kalkandelen, 2021b). The book includes chapters on veganism, epidemics, animal rights and politics, various action methods of the movement, the vegan revolution and animal liberation. Each chapter is made more specific by subheadings. In a way that can serve as theoretical guidance for animal advocates, Kalkandelen, as one of the co-founders of animal advocacy group Bağımsız Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu (BHHT)[15], explores the animal advocacy movement in Turkey in her perspective.

Another book *Türkiye'nin Yakın Tarihinde Hayvanlar*[16] was written by Sezai Ozan Zeybek (2020). Although the book includes topics related to dogs living in streets, cows transported from overseas, animals as soldiers, and various animals like goats, bees, ants, and worms, and ecological issues, the issues related to animal ethics and animal liberation are not addressed in the book. By reading this book, I once more realised that the literature of animal studies only discusses the animal advocacy movement in theory and not the movement itself by conducting fieldwork.

Yağmur Özgür Güven and Oğuzcan Kınıkoğlu (2020), who are the co-founders of Deneye Hayır Derneği[17], published the book *Hayvan Deneyleri*[18], the first Turkish book on this topic, to be able to explain the fundamentals of the struggle against animal testing in as simple a manner as possible. On the cover of the book, it is written "Do the animals exist for us?"[19] and this sentence seems to proclaim anti-speciesisist content of the book at the very beginning. Since the emergence of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement has had strong ties to anti vivisection struggle, this book explores not only the issue of animal testing, but also the movement's origins, main arguments and history.

[14] English translation is "*Vegan Revolution and Animal Liberation".*
[15] English translation is "Independent Animal Rights Group".
[16] English translation is "*Animals in Turkey's Early History*".
[17] English translation is "Anti Vivisection Association".
[18] English translation is "*Animal Testings*".
[19] "Hayvanlar bizim için mi var?" in Turkish.

The book *Şehir ve Hayvan*[20], consisting eight chapters written by different academicians, was edited by Ayten Alkan (Alkan et al., 2020). In a thorough theoretical and methodological framework, the book examines urban studies and human-animal studies. Although the book's articles discuss the subjects of animal justice, animal ethics, and animal rights, İnal (2020, 215) claims that they fail to address the subjects of veganism, vivisection, and animal farming. The book was published in honour of animal advocate Burak Özgüner who passed away one year before the book's publication. The book's net income has been donated to the Hayvan Hakları ve Etiği Derneği[21].

The book *İnsan Hayvan ve Ötesi - Türkiye'de Hayvan Çalışmaları*[22] was edited by Özdoğan, Tatari and Bilgin (Özdoğan et al., 2021). The book has chapters written by collective authors from different disciplinary areas who research on animal studies in Turkey in 2021. The book has covered topics of animal liberation, the biopolitics of dogs living in streets, vivisection, interspecies relationships and the hierarchy of death, the use of animals in movies, rural common area practices, zoos as urban captivity sites, and Covid-19 vaccine research on primates. Most of the articles in the book highlight the connections of the processes of marginalising animals and other people.

The book *Hayvan Hakları Tarihi ve Türkiye*[23] was published in August 2022 and it is the most recent publication on the history of animal rights in Turkey (Yaşar et al., 2022). For this book, many authors that specialize in animal studies were gathered together by Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality publishing house. Despite the fact that some of the book's authors are anti-speciesist -vegan- animal advocates, anti-speciesist animal ethics and animal advocacy movement were not adequately discussed in the book, considering its writers or time of publishing. I extensively examined the book because it was released at the same time as this thesis and because I was familiar with the majority of its authors. The book's approach can be regarded as speciesist and welfarist[24] when taken as a whole. For example, the majority of the book's images depict animals living with people like cats and dogs.

[20] English translation is "*City and Animal*".
[21] English translation is "*Animal Rights and Ethics Association*".
[22] English translation is "*Human Animal and Beyond – Animal Studies in Turkey*".
[23] English translation is "*Animal Rights History and Turkey".*
[24] For further information about welfarism, see title 2.2.3.

On page 179, there is a photo named “a demonstration that a young animal lover also attended” and it solely contains posters advocating for the rights of cats and dogs (Yaşar et al., 2022, 179). On another page, there is a photo named “a Labrador dog and its owner”; the word "owner" could be interpreted as supporting the property status of animals (Yaşar et al., 2022, 170, 171). In the second chapter of the book, on title “Animal Rights in Philosophy”, the author discusses the animal advocacy theories of Singer and Regan. While including Singer’s utilitarian theory, it is seen that the author does not discuss thoroughly Francione’s abolitionist animal rights theory, which suggests that being anti-speciesist requires being vegan. This situation may indicate that this chapter is more concerned with animal welfare than animal liberation or animal rights.

Regarding the image titled "a dinner for vegans," it can be argued that the presence of foods like avocado in the image tends to support the misleading idea that becoming a vegan is expensive (Yaşar et al., 2022, 175). Nevertheless it is asserted that veganism is not a diet; it is an ethical position on animal advocacy. A two-page size image of a food made from an animal's dead body can be seen on another page of the book, and it might be interpreted as contradicting the book's title (Yaşar et al., 2022, 175, 176). The image named "a rabbit that is used as test animal in the cosmetics sector" shows a tiny white rabbit (Yaşar et al., 2022, 141). The image nearly seems to be an attempt to depict the vivisection of animals as not a cruel experience by hiding the torturous, bloody and endless experiments. In addition, the term "test animal" reinforces speciesist language that views these animals as mere objects for animal testing (Marmara, 2020, 89). Because animals, whose right to life has been violated, are depicted in that picture.

When certain parts of the book are evaluated separately, it can be claimed that some articles are written with an anti-speciesist tendency. This evaluation is particularly applicable to the parts written by vegan animal advocates. For example, Yağmur Özgür Güven, who is one of the co-founders of Deneye Hayır Derneği[25], wrote the "Animal History in Science" part with the rights of all animals in mind, not only those of a few certain species, who suffered or were used as test objects (Güven, 2022, 98-125). The book's preface claims that the book "*Hayvan Hakları Tarihi ve*

[25] English translation is “Anti Vivisection Association”.

Türkiye is the most complete work that sincerely deals with the ignored and neglected issues up to now". But, it may be asserted that this book is insufficient in addressing the long ignored and neglected issue of animal advocacy in an anti-speciesist manner.

I have been observed that all the books that I have provided information about so far addressed some specific topics of the extensive animal studies and examined these topics in detail. Particularly for people who are new to the discipline of animal studies, they managed to discuss the important philosophical questions in an understandable way. The authors of these books have introduced the philosophical and ethical issues that have been studied in English literature for decades to Turkish literature from their own critical perspectives. Therefore, these books are significant sources in the discipline of animal studies in Turkey. On the other hand, these books have not given detailed theoretical and historical information about the animal advocacy movement. Although each book examines a large number of topics in its own way, they did not examine the movement in Turkey and the world in detail and none of them included fieldwork observing all the theoretical information they provided.

There are some master's theses relevant to animal advocacy and animal rights. "New Social Movements: Animal Rights Advocacy and Social Media in Turkey" by Miray Aksulu (2013) examines the social media activities of animal rights organisations of The Nature and Animal Protection Association (DOHAYKO), Animal Rights Federation (HAYTAP), and Respect About Life (YHS). Although the thesis's title and content claim to examine the animal rights movement, it seems that the movement that struggles for the rights of certain animal species, such as cats and dogs, is the focus of the thesis. This thesis is the only thesis that includes the case study on the animal rights movement, however, it exclusively examines the movement that defends the rights of certain animals, not all species.

Another thesis "Peter Singer's Idea of Animal Liberation and its Evaluation from the Point View of Religious Thought" by Fatıma Şeker (2019) evaluates the utilitarian theory and asserts that it is in line with religious belief systems that guide people on how to treat animals and advise them to treat animals well in order to preserve the order of the universe. This thesis can be regarded to provide in-depth

information on both animal welfare approach and movement, and the book that had helped to start the animal rights movement.

“Speciesism and Media: Speciesist Journalism Practices in Turkey” by Alican Eralp (2020) examines the ways Turkish journalism encourages speciesism that is a discrimination against a disadvantaged group who are marginalized and have no voice in how they are represented. In the literature review section of the thesis, in-depth discussions comparing speciesism to other forms of discrimination were included as well as examination of speciesism's justifications and origins. The research investigates twenty-three speciesist journalism practices and according to the data, newspapers find animals to be very “processable” topics. Moreover, the research asserts that speciesist news articles are a valuable tool for journalists to create the meaning they desire. This thesis can be considered as an example of critical animal study since it challenges speciesism and promotes anti-speciesism for animal liberation. Eralp also expresses gratitude to Burak Özgüner, who passed away in 2019, by dedicating this thesis to him.

In the area of animal studies, there are two PhD theses in Turkey. The thesis “Vegan and Vegetarianism in the Frame of Bioethics” by Güzin Yasemin Tunçay Son (2016) examines veganism and vegetarianism thoroughly in terms of culture, feminism, health, animals rights and bioethics. The research reveals that participants have preferred veganism and vegetarianism for the following reasons: a stand against animal exploitation, ethics, respect for living life, conscience, ecology, feminism, and being healthy. These arguments lead the thesis to the conclusion that veganism and vegetarianism are bioethical issues.

Another PhD thesis “From Subject to Object: An Analysis of the Changing Status of the Animal through Discourse Analysis” by Sezen Ergin Zengin (2017) examines the status of the animal is influenced by societal factors such as culture, history, politics, and economics, as in every social phenomenon. This research examined the ideological and discursive roots of animal oppression within the frameworks of anthropology, critical discourse analysis, critical animal studies, and posthumanism. Additionally, it offers a critical interpretation of ideas like the human-animal duality, human dominance, and anthropocentrism.

In Turkey, there are five master's theses on anti-speciesism and ethical veganism. I will examine the thesis that is most similar to my research after examining each one independently in chronological order. “Emergence of the Vegan Identity in İstanbul” by Pınar Üzeltüzenci (2018) refers to veganism as an identity and explores how it has emerged in İstanbul through vegan people’s perspective.[26] Even though some issues related to animal rights are addressed in this thesis, the animal advocacy movement has not been examined. However, according to the advocates whom with and my observations, it is questionable whether veganism is an identity movement. Veganism is considered as a movement that struggles for nonhuman animals in the advocates’ perspective. Most of them asserted that veganism should not focus on humans and their identities, since the subject of veganism is animals not humans themselves.

Another thesis “New Media and Social Movements: An Examination on Vegan Movement Example” by Ayşe Büşra Yılmaz (2018) has discussed how the vegan movement has been influenced by social media, its usage has grown recently as a result of the growth and development of mobile technologies. The research claims that mainstream media does not give much coverage to vegan movement, animal rights movement, environmental movement and women’s rights movement and the participants of these movements use social media to support their ideas. “Humans vs. Animals: A Contemporary Moral Perspective toward Dietary and Ethical Lifestyles” by Yunus Bayramoğlu (2019) aims to determine whether there are any ethical judgmental distinctions among between different groups of omnivores, vegetarians, dietary and lifestyle vegans. The research finds that omnivores show a speciesist mindset while making ethical judgments, but vegans show a more species-egalitarian attitude and are more open-minded.

Another thesis “A Critic of Androcentric World View within Intersectionality of Feminism and Anti-Speciesism” by Zülâl Hazal Karakaş (2019) discusses if it is possible and necessary for women, who are objectified when situated in the category of nature, to participate in the anti-speciesist movement. “Framing the Everyday Resistance in Vegan Lifestyle” by Tutku Turgay (2020) examines

[26] A vegan animal advocate who participated in this thesis also has contributed to my thesis.

veganism as a lifestyle movement that is shaped by everyday resistance on ethical concerns towards nonhuman animals.

Berk Efe Altınal has two master's theses on anti-speciesism, veganism, animal advocacy theories. Although the theses do not fully examine the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement, it can be said that he has examined all of the ideas that are the foundation of the movement. These two theses differ from other ones because of these features. As an animal advocate Altınal (2015) critically analyses the animal advocacy movement in thesis "A Critical Study of the Moral Status of Non-human Animals in Western Ontology and Ethics". After discussing the animal advocacy theories, the research suggests that abolitionist animal rights theory of Francione, which considers sentience as the only requirement for receiving equal moral consideration, is a consistent and justified position.

His other thesis (Altınal, 2019) "Marginalization of Animals in the Context of Speciesism" intends to develop a scale that assesses the speciesism within the terms of current animal ethics. In order to develop the speciesism scale, Altınal examined three scales related to speciesism: Social Dominance Orientation Scale, Basic Empathy Scale and Caviola, Everett and Faber's speciesism scale. But he realised that each of these scales has had deficiencies and contradictions within the current animal ethics and a reliable speciesism scale is needed to measure speciesism. I think that this Turkish scale, which was developed in accordance with the contemporary animal ethics, can be applied to numerous research and contribute to the literature.

As can be seen, significant research on animal advocacy has been carried out in Turkey. The theses from various disciplines, which I have so far examined, have discussed numerous subjects in the literature on animal advocacy, including anti-speciesism, veganism, and animal rights. It is seen that only one thesis included a case study examining the activities of the animal rights movement on social media. But, the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement has not been examined as a case study in any of the theses. In this regard, it can be said that my study, which examines the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in defense of animal liberation and the abolition of animal exploitation, aims to fill a significant gap in the critical animal studies literature in Turkey.

Wolf's research, on the other hand, is the only thesis that addresses the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement as a case study. Silvia Ilonka Wolf's (2015) well-written master's thesis "We Are All Animals': The Emergence of the Grassroots Nonhuman Animal Rights Movement in İstanbul" is the only master's thesis focusing on the emergence of the animal advocacy movement in the year 2014 in Turkey. The nonhuman animal rights movement of the year 2014 was considerably different from today's movement on several counts. There has been a great rise on the number of animal rights/advocacy groups and organisations in last eight years. Unfortunately, it was also observed that the majority of the groups that were active around 2014 did not last very long. On the other hand, the population of vegan people in Turkey is on great increase and it directly has affected the rise on the number of animal advocates in the movement. In addition to all these, I have been writing this thesis as a native Turkish speaker who is an active part of animal advocacy movement in Turkey as a five-year vegan and a four-year animal advocate, and covering the situation after 2014, as well.

The ethnographic case study of my research on the anti-speciesist advocacy movement's current situation as of 2022 focuses not only on the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in İstanbul but also in Turkey. I conducted it as a researcher who, like the advocates of the movement, is familiar with the local culture and society. Hence, based on my own four-year-long observations as an animal advocate in the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in Turkey, which has significant goals, I have noticed substantial problems with various unsuccessful aspects besides a few successful ones. Particularly because of that I have purposed to research on it and contribute to literature of critical animal studies by filling the gap. I also have intended to support nonhuman animals and animal advocates by contributing the literature.

I position this thesis in the discipline of "Critical Animal Studies (CAS)", instituted by philosopher Steven Best and professor Anthony Nocella in 2001 against "Mainstream Animal Studies (MAS)" (Best, 2009, 12). Best (2009, 11, 26) claims that MAS should be replaced by CAS, because MAS is ethically inconsistent with animal liberation in theory and practice that requires adopting a vegan lifestyle and advocating for animals rights. Best (2009, 17, 40) argues that scholars pursuing

CAS do not only purpose to explore animal exploitation, but rather fight for animal liberation aligning themselves with animals.

1.3. Methodology

For chapters two and three, I have benefited from the theoretical and historical texts on animal advocacy movement in order to conduct this research. While creating the contextual and theoretical framework of the thesis, I have searched for relevant literature and evaluated the sources. I have paid particular attention to include both historically significant and recently published texts. I also have included primary sources like newspaper articles -both printed and online- for current information that has not yet been thoroughly covered in books and articles. I have conducted a critical examination while reading all these texts, and then I have tried to reflect this examination on this research. I did not include the theoretical and historical information in the introduction chapter. Because I have considered it has been important for my research to examine the theoretical concepts and historical events critically in two separate chapters, in chapters two and three.

The most original chapter of the thesis is the case study based on oral history interviews, intertwined with ethnographic research, a qualitative research method. Oral history is a qualitative interview method that emphasizes the perspectives of the participants and usually includes several open-ended interviews per participant. The practice of oral history has its origins in anthropology, and it has been utilized for many years by field researchers to obtain the personal knowledge based on experiences of participants (Leavy, 2011, 3). The data of ethnographic case study has been collected by utilizing basically two methods: in-depth semi-structured oral history interviews and participant observations. While I recorded oral history interviews, I took notes during the participant observations on my research journal.

After collecting the data, I decided to apply thematic analysis method due to several reasons. One reason is its theoretical flexibility to be able to analyse complex and rich data as a researcher who has little experience to work with rich qualitative data (Braun, Clarke, 2006, 87, 97; Riessman, 2008, 111). Another reason is thematic analysis has overlapping features with thematic narrative analysis that is a widely

used method to analyse narrative data including interview transcripts (Braun, Clarke, 2006, 81; Riessman, 2008, 81).

I mostly followed Braun and Clarke's (2006, 87) six-step approach of thematic analysis, and I applied thematic narrative analysis when the sequence of events is important to keep the narrative "intact" (Riessman, 2008, 25, 80, 111). On the first step of the analysis I got familiarised with my data through transcribing the interviews on word files. I frequently re-listened to the recordings to refresh my memory on the nuances in the interviewees' statements. After completing the transcription process, I read and reread all interview transcripts and noted down my thoughts and feelings on my journal and word files as memos. On the second step, I looked for patterns in thoughts and opinions of the advocates. I coded each of them and highlighted with different colours on word files. Not to intervene in the narrations as much as possible, I did not apply line-by-line coding system, which is suggested mostly in grounded theory approach (Riessman, 2008, 112). On the third step, I explored all codes and looked for categories and sub-categories within them to be able to develop the candidate themes and sub-themes. I noted down some codes which did not fit in any category. Some of these codes were too distant to fall under any category and some codes were mentioned by only one or two interviewees. In either situation, these codes seemed to be unable to create patterns for any category.

On the fourth step, I checked the candidate themes and sub-themes, which I developed in the previous step. I also checked all the codes and excluded most of them because of the reasons that I mentioned in the previous step. I transferred the remaining codes to the proper theme or subtheme. I ensured that the data –codes- inside each theme was meaningfully consistent when developing the themes. I also tried to ensure that the themes could be differentiated from one another in a definite and noticeable way. As a result I developed the themes and sub-themes which were component themes which were complementing each other. Since I could study better through visual material, I drew many thematic maps on my research journal to be able to see the relations of subthemes and themes. On the fifth step, I named each theme concisely according to their content and organised my thematic maps.

On the sixth and last step, I wrote the analysis following the outcomes of previous five steps.

The in-depth semi-structured interviews[27] were held with twelve interviewees between the beginning of October and ending of November in 2022. Before each interview, the interviewees were asked to read and sign the informed consent form[28] if they agree to be a volunteer in this research. Since I live in İstanbul, the interviews were held face-to-face with seven interviewees who live in İstanbul. The place of the interviews was arranged as the closest place to the location of the interviewee. Generally the places were vegan restaurants, vegan cafes or places with vegan options. The interviews with five interviewees who live in other cities than İstanbul were held online via online meeting applications.

The interviews were held in Turkish that is the mother language of the interviewees and me. Since the research is written in English, I translated the narratives of interviews when I quoted them. As Riessman (2008, 67) claims I had to take difficult decisions on the process of translating the transcriptions since the process includes interpretation. "To bring the translator from behind the shadows (Riessman, 2008, 77)", I have accepted my active role as a translator and researcher who has produced knowledge by inevitably interpreting the interviews and interviewees' narrations. However, to provide a basis for cross checking I will present the Turkish transcriptions of the quoted parts as endnotes.

I planned to conduct two interviews per interviewee which is suggested by oral historians to be able to get detailed narratives and not to tire the interviewees with long-lasting interviews at once (Thompson, 2000, 170, 237, 241). Conducting more than one interview per interviewee –serial interviews in other words- has many opportunities, such as to assess multiple dimensions of a single topic which contains multi layers and to obtain deep accounts of interviewees who are reluctant to share further information (Read, 2018).

In this research, twenty-two interviews were held with twelve interviewees in total. Two interviewees were not available for the second interview, so one interview -

[27] For sample questions for the interviews, see Appendix 1.
[28] For informed consent form, see Appendix 2.

including the planned questions of second semi-structured interview- was held with each of them. Most interviews lasted between 40 minutes and one hour. But some interviews lasted more than one and half an hour, if a fruitful narrative on a subject was going on and the interviewee and I were not tired. All interviews were audio-recorded by mobile phone application and saved down immediately after each interview in case of any technological problem. The recordings of interviews were transcribed on computer. The audio-recordings and transcription documents were not saved using the interviewees' name as title, since five of them remain anonymous. At the end of the interviews, there were approximately 1.296 minutes of sound recording and 173 pages of transcription.

1.4. Outline of the Thesis

This thesis is structured along five chapters including introduction as the first chapter. In chapters two and three I searched for relevant literature, evaluated the sources to develop the theoretical and historical framework of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy. Because the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement has a philosophical foundation, there are a number of fundamental concepts that underlie anti-speciesism that needed to be explained in this thesis. Hence, I have examined the fundamental concepts and animal advocacy theories in great detail so that the movement's philosophy and in particular the ethnographic case study could be understood. Therefore, the second chapter starts by defining the term speciesism, continues with theories which are based on anti-speciesism and finishes suggesting veganism as rejecting speciesism and accepting anti-speciesism. The third chapter introduces anti-speciesist animal advocacy in historical perspective. It depicts animal advocacy movement in the world and in Turkey and differentiates the animal rights movement and anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in Turkey.

The fourth chapter examines the animal advocacy movement in Turkey in animal advocates' critical perspective through interviews and participant observations. This chapter also has a part that evaluates the narratives of the advocates and self-reflexivity section at the end. The fifth and last chapter is the conclusion that states the final remarks and overall examination and analysis of the movement. The conclusion chapter also includes the limitations of this work and suggestions for future research.

2. ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Anti-Speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement (AAAM) has been referred to as the first and only social movement launched by philosophers and scholars. The theories of these philosophers and scholars have served as the foundation for the movement and formed the framework of the AAAM. I will examine animal advocacy theories to understand the fundamental concepts and ideas that helped to define the movement's history and continue to do so currently.

I will start this chapter off with defining thoroughly speciesism, the concept that these theories are opposed to and struggle against, before getting into an examination of the theories themselves. Afterwards, I will examine the theories, their arguments against speciesism and how they perceive the phenomenon of animal rights in historical order. Finally, I will provide a comprehensive explanation of veganism, which theories indicate as the only morally right approach for rejecting speciesism.

2.1. Speciesism

Speciesism is the term coined in 1970 by Richard Ryder. He defined it in his book *Victims of Science* in 1975 as: “The widespread discrimination that is practised by man against the other species [...] speciesism and racism are both forms of prejudice that are based upon appearances (Ryder, 2011, 59)”. Although Ryder made the final definition of the term speciesism in 1975, he had described it in his writings since 1970. He described speciesism as illogical and selfish in 1972 and claimed that just as arguing that one race has the right to oppress another race is discrimination known as racism, saying one species has the right to exploit other species is discrimination known as speciesism (Ryder, 2011, 59).

As a hospital scientist in Oxford in 1969, Ryder (2011, 56) witnessed animals’ suffering, fear, distress and pain in animal testing. He sent letters to a national newspaper condemning animal testing. He got explosive reaction from the public, so he started to organise protests against hunting and animal testing and take place in radio and television. He (2010, 1) tells that one day in 1970, while lying in his

bath, the term suddenly emerged: speciesism. He immediately wrote a leaflet and handed them out in Oxford. But he did not get any reply; he wrote and handed out another leaflet with an image of a miserable chimpanzee who was experimentally infected. After the second leaflet, he got some replies and one of them was from Peter Singer. It was an important encountering for animals since it caused Singer to care about animals and write the book *Animal Liberation*.[29]

The definition of speciesism has been changed by scholars over time. As one of the scholars, Singer slightly changed the definition of speciesism in his *Animal Liberation* of 1975 (Ryder, 2011, 59). In Singer's understanding of speciesism, if a human favours cats over dogs, this would not be speciesism. But if a cat favours cats over dogs, this would be speciesism. Even that minor change opened the way for other definitions of speciesism and other scholars defined speciesism attributing different features to it. Contrary to Singer's altered definition of speciesism, scholars and philosophers commonly suggest that speciesism is practiced in two ways (Caviola, Capraro, 2020, 1, 2). First, humans value humans more than nonhuman animals, for instance if a human favours humans over cows. Second, humans value some nonhuman animals more than other nonhuman animals, for instance if a human favours dogs over cows. Consequently, when I combine Ryder's first definition with the current suggestions and attributions, it can be said that speciesism is the widespread discrimination that is practiced by humans against all animal species and by humans against certain animal species over other animal species.

The belief of human superiority to nonhuman animals goes back to Ancient Greek. Human beings have thought that they have been superior to animal beings since they have been the only species who have been capable of rational thinking. Hence they have believed that they have had right to use other animals to satisfy their needs and desires (Steiner, 2014, 79). In the modern age, for Descartes human beings holds a rational soul in contrast to animals, hence without that rational soul animals are biological machines that have no "inner" experience, "inner awareness, no interests and certainly no moral status". Thinkers of humanist tradition, like Aquinas, Kant and Peter Carruthers have suggested that humans should not be cruel

[29] Further information is on title 2.2.1.

to animals. But they did not suggest that because of humans' ethical duty towards animals. They claimed that the more humans are cruel to animals, the more they are cruel to human beings (Steiner, 2014, 83).

In his article titled "Taking Humanism beyond Speciesism", Singer (2004, 19) claims that humanism and humanist thinkers challenged Christian dogmas which could not be questioned previously. Moreover humanists criticised Christians who did not free themselves of some prejudices like against the equality of women or against nonreproductive sex. Here Singer states that he is curious that why humanists do not free themselves from the prejudice of speciesism which is one of the most basic Christian dogmas.

As a matter of fact, well before, in 1859, Darwin and his book *The Origin of Species* have started a revolution in human understanding in the relationship between humans and nonhuman animals (Singer, 2015, 299). Darwin asserted that humans were not "special creation of God" and there had been no great differences between humans and nonhuman animals. *In The Descent of Man* in 1871, Darwin compared humans and nonhuman animals and wrote that the boastful characteristics of humans like intuition, love, memory, attention and curiosity might be found in the other animals. Despite this intellectual revolution, speciesism has continued to be seen in the practices of intellectual thinkers and writers of nineteenth century. Hence here Singer (2015, 301) asks "What went wrong?" and most of the thinkers and writers have not questioned and challenged speciesism in their practices. As an answer to the question, Singer (2015, 301) states that with rare exceptions like Lewis Gompertz and Henry Salt, these writers stopped to make a choice between giving up eating animal flesh or accepting that they did not live up to their own moral conclusion about speciesism. Although they clearly condemned speciesist treatments and presented themselves as anti-speciesist in their writings, at some point they created a new reasoning to be able to free themselves from their dietary concerns.

2.1.1. The Relationship of Speciesism with other Discrimination Types

Speciesism is observed across cultures and throughout history; it has been a prejudice like racism and sexism (Caviola, Everett, Faber, 2018, 2). In their

research on speciesism, Everett et al. (2019, 799) found that the speciesist, racist, sexist and homophobic people were assessed in the same way by their participants. The participants, who were ordinary people within public, had the same negative opinions of speciesist people as they exactly had of racist, sexist and homophobes people. In addition, the participants assumed that speciesist people possess more discriminatory beliefs and attitudes as racists, sexists and homophobes.

Years before the emergence of the term speciesism, in 1891 Henry Salt, who was a rationalist, socialist, pacifist and vegetarian, founded Humanitarian League to struggle against war, whipping and to support women's and animals' rights. He founded this League because he probably realised the relationship among the discrimination types. In 1892 Salt published the book *Animals' Rights* and the book caused discussion on animals and animals' rights and it was translated into many languages (Kew, 1999, 10, 58).

According to Singer (2015, 35) "the fundamental objections to racism and sexism […] apply equally to speciesism". Hence Singer (2015, 572) states that he uses the term "speciesism" deliberately to make the connection with other 'isms' which are more familiar to human beings as sexism and racism. Although racism and sexism are not tolerated in western societies, speciesism is not recognised as evil as like them and animal abuse is accepted as a part of their culture (Sollund, 2008, 1). However speciesism as a prejudice type like racism, ageism, sexism and classism should not be approved and tolerated in a modern morality (Ryder, 2011, 53). It is undebatable that using one's race or sex to rationalise their property status is racism or sexism. Thus in the same way using an animal's species to rationalise their property status is speciesism (Francione, 2000, xxix). According to Best (2014, 105) the politics of twenty-first century should struggle against the moral and scientific lies of speciesism and humanism as it should do the same against other discrimination types. For this struggle, Best (2014, 18) suggests the Animal Standpoint Theory to enlighten and struggle against the problems and lies of humanism and speciesism.[30]

[30] Further information is on title 2.2.4.

2.1.2. Sample Justifications for Speciesism

Caviola, Everett and Faber (2018, 3) claims that humans devalue nonhuman animals because of three beliefs; animals are not at the same level with humans cognitively; animals, unlike humans, cannot be responsible for their acts morally; animals are less sentient than humans as they cannot feel and experience feelings such as suffering. Although humans have sincere relationships with the animals they live with, it is widely accepted that animals do not have consciousness. As an answer to that fallacy, on the day of July 7, 2012, it was stated that nonhuman animals have consciousness in The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness.

In her article titled "Causes for Speciesism: Difference, Distance and Denial", Sollund (2008) emphasises four dimensions of human beings' treatment of nonhuman animals: difference, cultural legitimacy, industrialization and alienation, and denial. She suggests that common properties and differences in appearance effect humans' sensibility for others. Humans' dehumanisation of animals, because of difference in appearance, has its roots in thoughts of Rene Descartes who viewed animals as machines which had no soul, feelings, or consciousness. Cultural legitimacy for speciesist attitudes towards animals has been created by religions and philosophy. Although in many religions it is said that animals must be protected, the protection is not for the animals, but for preventing human's character from practicing cruelty to any being. Even Thomas Acquinas, who is one of the first philosophers attributing a soul to animals, claimed that animals could not be our fellows since they had no reason. As a result of technological developments -in other words industrialization- humans have alienated from animals more and more. Today, a slaughterhouse worker works by contract and s/he knows that s/he will earn more money when s/he kills more animals (Sollund, 2008, 18). The final dimension is denial that helps to neutralise speciesism by drawing attention away from uncomfortable truths of animal abuse (Sollund, 2008, 20).

In addition to these justifications and also as a result of them, humans who have been the victims of violence often describe the violent treatment saying that "they were treated like animals" (Best, 2014, 92). They say this sentence as if violent

actions that they have experienced could be justified, and thereby accepted, if the targets were animals. That speciesist sentence reveals the arrogance of humanism.

2.2. Animal Advocacy Theories

I will start this title off by discussing three theories –of Singer, Regan, Francione- that have made significant contributions to the emergence and development of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement (AAAM). After that, I will discuss the theory -of Best- that regards the AAAM as the initial stage of total liberation. This review of theories will be done in a chronological order since the AAAAM has evolved over time by addressing the inadequacies or deficiencies of earlier theories or by expanding them.

2.2.1. Utilitarian Animal Liberation of Peter Singer

The book *Animal Liberation* was written by Peter Singer who is a utilitarian ethicist. When it was published in 1975, it was accepted as a ground-breaking book for animals' liberation because Richard Ryder's term speciesism that is a crucial term for animal liberation and rights got popular almost immediately with the book (Singer, 2015, 464). Singer used Jeremy Bentham's, the founder of the utilitarian moral philosophy, utilitarian principle that human and nonhuman animals are equal since they are capable of feeling pain and pleasure (Ojong, 2019, 119; Singer, 2015, 33).

Singer (2015, 296) claims that the Enlightenment challenged some thinkers' thoughts on attitudes toward animals but at the same time Immanuel Kant kept saying the following ideas on his lectures: "So far as animals are concerned, we have no direct duties. Animals are not self-conscious, and are there merely as a means to an end. That end is man." Singer compares Kant to Jeremy Bentham who completed his *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* in the same year that Kant said these sentences, in 1780. In this book Bentham asked his famous question "The question is not, Can they *reason*? nor Can they *talk*? but, Can they *suffer*?" Bentham was possibly the first person who condemned human oppression and dominion over nonhuman animals, but even Bentham "flinched" by justifying eating animals as humans "like to eat it" and humans were "the better for

it" (Singer, 2015, 305). Therefore Singer (2015, 301) claims that the era of Bentham will be mentioned as "the era of excuses" when the history of the animal liberation movement is written. As a result Singer criticised and improved Bentham's utilitarian philosophy and reconstructed his theory of animal liberation.

As the Australian Humanist of the Year of 2004 (Singer, 2015, 464), Singer (2004, 20) states that humanists did not believe the myth about creation which is written in Genesis and they accept that humans are also animals. But although Copernicus showed evidence that humans are not at the centre of universe, that old and religious idea has stayed lively in humanist spheres. Singer (2004, 20) states that in 2003 he was invited to sign the manifest named "Humanism and Its Aspirations", that had lines claiming ethical values should be determined by and for humans. He was surprised to read these lines and did not sign it, seeing that the manifest excluded animals' role to determine the ethical values. Singer (2004, 21) mentions another humanist manifest named "The Affirmation of Humanism" of The Council of Secular Humanism. Refraining from needless suffering to other species was suggested in the manifest. Singer asked "What is 'needless suffering'?" and who decides whether suffering is needless or not. For example, is keeping calves and pigs in narrow places "needless suffering" since its aim is to eat cheaper? He declared that humanists should question the religiously given master role of humans and oppose the exploitation of sentient animals.

On the other hand, utilitarianism of Singer in terms of animal liberation was harshly criticized by Regan because of speciesist practices of utilitarianism and Singer's thoughts on killing animal and vivisection[31] (Kew, 1999, 97; Regan, 1983, 315). About killing animal, Singer (2015, 55) stated that it was not possible to give an exact answer to "the question of when it is wrong to kill (painlessly) an animal". About vivisection, he (2015, 79) stated that the abolition of animal testing is not required and animal testing could be acceptable if it would save many lives. In other words, Singer has not rejected speciesism totally, although he was one of the first people who defended veganism in his book even he was not –and still is not- vegan. Best (2014, 41) claims that Singer's book was "deceptively titled" because it did not defend animal rights or animal liberation. On the contrary Singer defended

[31] performing animal testing on live animals

utilitarian welfarist ideas and animal protectionism as long as it is nonviolent (Best, 2014, 65). Best (2014, 41) suggests that Regan's book *The Case for Animal Rights* published in 1983 caused a great improvement from animal welfarist position of early nineteenth century to animal rights position. Hence this chapter will proceed with the animal rights theory of Regan.

2.2.2. Animal Rights Theory of Tom Regan

Tom Regan (1985, 13) described himself "as an advocate of animal rights -as a part of the animal rights movement". He stated that he knew some people who believed in animal rights and wanted to treat animals humanely but did not seek the total abolition of animal abuse in any means. According to him the wrong issue is not about how animals are treated –humanely or not-; it is the whole system that allows people to recognize animals as resources. Because once humans adopt the speciesist perspective of seeing animals as their resources, animals' rights cannot be discussed and advocated (Regan, 1985, 13). Since animals are not resources but individuals, Regan (2003, 93) coined the term "subject-of-a-life" to express and accentuate that each animal has interests, emotions and expectations for their own lives. Hence he criticised Singer's utilitarian theory because it did not reject the recognition of animals as resources and it did not accept animals as subject of their lives. Consequently Regan established a moral theory as an alternative to utilitarian theory to question humans' treatment of animals and to advocate animals' rights.

Besides Singer's utilitarian view, Regan also criticised Kant's moral philosophy for the case of nonhuman animals. He (2003, 77, 78) accepts that Kant's position had influenced his own thinking and praises Kant's perspective on being person and the duty of respect. However, he suggests that Kant's position has some problems. One of the problems is the idea that humans are the unique beings who have inherent value. Regan (2003, 80) abandons that Kantian idea and expands Kant's moral philosophy to nonhuman animals.

In his book *The Case for Animal Rights*, Regan (1983) differentiates moral agent and moral patient. Moral agent is an individual who has sophisticated abilities including to decide what ought to be done morally, to choose or fail to choose doing what is wrong or right. Since moral agents have these abilities, it is fair to

hold them morally responsible of their actions. Moreover moral agents can be affected by the wrong and rights acts of other moral agents. Normal adult humans are examples of moral agents (Regan, 1983, 151, 152). On the other hand, moral patients are individuals without precondition of controlling their action who cannot do what is right or wrong. Thus even if a moral patient harms someone, the moral patient has not done anything wrong.

But moral patients can be affected by the wrong and right acts of moral agents; therefore they are similar to moral agents (Regan, 1983, 154). Human infants, children, the mentally defective people and animals are examples of moral patients (Regan, 1983, 154). Regan asserts that moral agents -normal adult humans- have direct duties to moral patients like a direct duty to be kind to them and a direct duty not to be cruel to them. In this sense, humans have direct duties to nonhuman animals who are moral patients, too. When humans accept that they have a direct duty to human moral patients while rejecting that they have a direct duty to animals, it is a sign of unjustifiable speciesist morality (Regan, 1983, 154).

Regan conceptualised "inherent value" as a value that cannot be earned or lost, that cannot increase or decrease depending on its utility and that is irrespective of one's being the object of others' interest. He claims that nonhuman animals also have inherent value and coins the term "subject-of-a-life" what is the heart of inherent value (Regan, 1983, 237; 2003, 93). Individuals are subjects-of-a-life if they are conscious of themselves are in the world, if they have feelings, desires, beliefs, expectations and memory. Subjects-of-a-life are somebodies who have a biography, not somethings (Regan, 1983, 243; 2003, 80, 93).

Regan (2003, 93) states that in traditional moral philosophy there are three main concepts: (1) humans, (2) animals, (3) persons. Persons are humans who have intellectual capacities like reason and autonomy (Regan, 2003, 77); humans, like infants and mentally defeated human beings, lack the intellectual capacities that persons have (Regan, 2003, 78). In the Kantian sense only persons have moral rights, but Regan's animal rights theory does not restrict rights to only persons (Regan, 2003, 82). He claims that humans and animals also have moral rights and

realizes that a concept is required to fill the lexical gap[32] that identifies these humans and animals. Because although all humans are animals, all animals are not humans and although some humans are persons, in the Kantian sense, no animals are persons. This is the reason why Regan (2003, 93) coins term "subject-of-a-life" to define the overlapping psychological area of both humans and animals and fills the lexical gap in question.

Regan (2003, 103) claims that he is not sure which animals are subjects-of-a-life and which are not, because consciousness remains as mystery. He suggests that mammals and birds are subjects-of-a-life since they have consciousness. For the case of fish, he believes that it is possible that they are subjects-of-a-life but eventually he does not consider fish as subjects-of-a-life in his theory (Regan, 2003, 93). Although the world of science and majority of scientists have not accepted that animals have consciousness until "The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness", Regan accepted that some animals had consciousness and built his moral theory on that acceptance in the years of 1983 and 2003. 29 years later, on July 7, 2012, scholars on different scientific fields gathered and declared that "nonhuman animals, including all mammals and birds, and many other creatures" have consciousness like humans. Therefore it can be said that Regan's assumption that nonhuman animals are subjects-of-a-life was scientifically proven with this declaration.

The goal of animal rights theory is to demonstrate how a moral philosophy that is "principled, nonarbitrary, nonprejudicial, and rationally defensible" supports the recognition of animals rights (Regan, 2003, 96). Regan (2005, 62) argues that when the rights of children are violated and they do not understand that injustice, humans have a duty to intervene, stand up and speak out in defense of children. Both moral agents and patients are subjects-of-a-life, humans and nonhuman animals have inherent value, and both deserve equal respectful treatment as a matter of justice (1983, 279). What must be done in the case of animals is the same; to intervene on their behalf, to stand up and to speak out in their defense. Because treating animals with respect is not an act of kindness, but an act of justice (1983, 280).

[32] Lexical gap is "a point within a system of sense relations at which a word might be expected but none exists (lexical gap, [9.10.2022])".

as I gave already explored in this section, Regan challenged Singer's utilitarian and welfare theory and subsequently established his notion of animal rights. It can be claimed that Regan's theory marked the beginning of an important period by rescuing animal advocacy from welfarism and it established the foundation for animal rights. According to Regan's theory, the great majority of animals, if not all of them, are "subjects-of-a-life" and have "inherent value." The issue of which animals could be included in these concepts was criticised by Francione. Francione, on the other hand, asserted that sentience should be the only criterion taken into consideration when determining whether or not animals have rights. According to him, since all animals are sentient beings, they all must have rights. He developed the abolitionist animal rights theory and developed Regan's theory by adding his own perspective. It can be claimed that Regan and Francione's ideas are very similar to one another and just differ in few minor respects. In addition, these two scholars and advocates participated in many animal rights campaigns together in the USA (Francione, 2018). Therefore, this section will proceed with the abolitionist animal rights theory of Francione.

2.2.3. Abolitionist Animal Rights Theory of Gary L. Francione

Gary L. Francione (1995) states that animals are the property of humans and they are treated as economic commodities in laws, therefore in the legal system animals do not have rights like humans have. The laws protect them from unnecessary suffering and inhumane treatment since they are the property of humans, not being animals. Francione asserts that "As long as animals are property, they can never be members of the moral community. The interests of animal property will always count for less than the interests of animal owners (2010, 22)."

For abolition of all animal oppression and exploitation, Francione comes up with the Abolitionist Theory of Animal Rights in his book named *Introduction to Animal Rights; Your Child or the Dog?* As a starting point, he describes "right as a particular way of protecting interests". He (2000, xxviii) assumes that "the basic right (is) not to be treated as a thing". He asks whether it is moral to accept that basic right for all humans while refusing it for animals. He defends to extend this right to all animals as a result of rejecting speciesism and believes that once humans do not consider animals as things, they would no longer justify their exploitation of

animals for food, clothing, amusement, or experiments (2000, xxix). He says that people claim that there are some differences between humans and animals, because animals cannot think rationally. He suggests that the same people would never think of using infants or mentally defeated humans, who cannot think rationally, in animal testing or resources of food or clothing.

Francione (2010, 3) criticises and opposes animal welfare harshly. Animal welfare reform defends using animals for human purposes as long as it is humanely and it supposes that human life has a higher moral value than animal life. Animal welfare approach claims that animal liberation is not realistic so that we must do something practical against enormous animal suffering. They state three benefits of welfare reform. First, it will reduce animal suffering immediately with more humane exploitation. Second, it will increase the production cost of animal products as a result the demand of people will decrease immediately. Third, it will help to raise consciousness on animal exploitation and gradually it will stop it.

Francione (2010, 26) rejects all these benefits and opposes the fundamental premise of animal welfare reform that the welfarist position is the best and only approach. He suggests that the premise is wrong and animal advocates should not leave moral theory since animal welfare regulation does not work on a practical level. Supporting animal welfare is unnecessary and counterproductive for nonhuman animals and the animal rights movement since animal welfare reforms and regulations do not seek for the abolition of animal abuse and exploitation (Francione, 2010, 84, 85). He claims that when an industry does reformation for its economic concerns generally, supporters of welfare reform glorify the industry and reflect it to public as if the industry cares about animal. He says that there is no evidence that type of action will end animal suffering and decrease animal use in future, because the regulation and reformation make public to feel more comfortable about using animal products. As a result overall suffering and death will increase with more animal usage. In this aspect, he asks whether it can be accepted that torturing an individual for one hour rather two hours (Francione, 2010, 26). In his abolitionist thery, he (2010, 75) claims that many animal advocates, including vegan ones, support single-issue campaigns, but these single-issue campaigns are parts of welfarist ideology. He considers these campaigns as

welfarist because they do not challenge the property status of nonhuman animals since they support animal use as long as the animals are treated humane.

Francione (1996, 32) claims that all contemporary animal advocates identify their positions as they are reflecting animal rights theories, but most of them have "new welfarist" views in fact. He (1996, 34) argues that traditional animal welfarism supports humane abuse of nonhuman animals accepting humans superior to animals and tries to reduce suffering. On the other hand "new welfarism" does not support any use of animals and aims to end all animal exploitation in the long-term but practices traditional welfarist strategies to reduce suffering in the short term. He (1996, 78) suggests that "new welfarism" caused a great deal of complication within the animal movement by seeking for abolition of animal abuse and practicing welfarist strategies at the same time.

For Francione, ethical veganism is the moral foundation of animal rights and his abolitionist theory. Defending that if people are not vegans, they are definitely animal exploiters (Francione, 2009, 17), Francione (2010, 62) defends ethical veganism because it is a deep political and moral devotion to abolition of animal abuse on the individual level. He (2010, 80) states that the abolitionist theory that he established opposes the idea that using violence is a proper approach to affect the increasing change. According to him, abolishing all animal abuse succeeds in "nonviolent vegan education" (Francione, 2010, 100). Clear, unequivocal and nonviolent vegan education is the best approach to decrease animal abuse and suffering in the short term and the unique approach to develop an abolitionist animal rights movement in the long term to end animal exploitation and the property status of animals (Francione, 2010, 85; 2017, 7).

Using the word nonviolent, Francione (2017, 9, 121) accepts animal rights movement as a peace movement and veganism as a part of nonviolent life. He (2017, 6) asserts that abolitionists perceive animal rights movement as a social justice movement and going veganism is a matter of justice for them. Besides nonviolent vegan advocacy, he supports creative vegan advocacy to make the problem of animal abuse visible in different ways to the people who care animals but continue to exploit them. He does the math to show the efficiency of creative nonviolent vegan advocacy and claims that if each vegan in the USA persuaded one

other person to go vegan each year, the whole population of the state would go vegan in 10 years. As guidance to abolitionist animal advocates and animal advocacy movement, Francione (2017, 120) created the six principles of the abolitionist approach:

1. "Abolitionists maintain that all sentient beings, human or nonhuman, have one right—the basic right not to be treated as the property of others.
2. Abolitionists maintain that our recognition of this one basic right means that we must abolish, and not merely regulate, institutionalized animal exploitation, and that Abolitionists should not support welfare reform campaigns or single-issue campaigns.
3. Abolitionists maintain that veganism is a moral baseline and that creative, nonviolent vegan education must be the cornerstone of rational animal rights advocacy.
4. The Abolitionist Approach links the moral status of nonhumans with sentience alone and not with any other cognitive characteristic; all sentient beings are equal for the purpose of not being used exclusively as a resource.
5. Abolitionists reject all forms of human discrimination, including racism, sexism, heterosexism, ageism, ableism, and classism—just as they reject speciesism.
6. Abolitionists recognize the principle of nonviolence as a core principle of the animal rights movement."

Francione condemns groups and individuals who support and use violence such as Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and argues that violent acts are not ethically true, they do not decrease demand of animal products and they detach animal activists from general public (Socha, 2013, 37). Contrary to this condemnation, Best and Nocella (2004, 12) describes Animal Liberation Front (ALF) as "a new breed of freedom fighters". For them the fighters are animal advocates who jeopardize their own freedom to liberate animals who are held captive in the worst kinds of hell that human minds can create.

Francione (2009, 164) suggests that since domestic animals have been produced by humans for human use, the production must stop to end the property status of domestic animals. In their book *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*, Donaldson and Kymlicka (2011, 51) criticise Francione's suggestion to end the production of domestic animals and suggest that domesticated animals such as dogs, cows, cats, sheep have right to be accepted as "equal members" of the society. They claim that asking domesticated animals extinction is not the solution

of their continuing and historic injustice. The relationship of humans and animals should be rebuilt on the principles of justice (Donaldson, Kymlicka, 2011, 86).

Building their political theory on their recognition that the animal advocacy movement is deadlocked, Donaldson and Kymlicka (2011, 1) intend to challenge mostly accepted animal rights theories of Francione and Regan to overcome the deadlocked situation. Arguing that animals citizenship might and should be expanded to animals, they support to continue some use of domesticated animals and their products under non-exploitative conditions such as cow for milk, pig as companion, dog as guide or police dogs, hen for egg, sheep for wool etc (Donaldson, Kymlicka, 2011, 137). Since veganism is the baseline of animal rights theories and movement, the political theory of Donaldson and Kymlicka seems welfarist in Francione's sense due to supporting using animals and animal products. Because Francione (2009, 17) claims that most of the new welfarists disagree with veganism as the moral baseline. They believe that supporting animal welfare and "humane" animal use is more useful.

Wrenn (2012, 452) claims that Abolitionist Approach has been criticised considerably and it differentiated itself from mainstream animal movement as being unique to value nonviolence and veganism as a baseline. She (2012, 439) suggests that abolitionist approach could not take an important place in animal rights movement because of being new and refusing humane product, single-issue campaigns, welfare reform and new-welfarist position. Based my observations and interviews, I can say that this issue also seems to be a reality in the case of abolitionist vegan advocates in Turkey due to my observations and interviews, as I will discuss in Chapter 4.

It can be said that Francione provided a consistent and uncompromising theory since he argues that the biggest problem of animal rights is the property status of animals and that sentience should be the only criterion taken into consideration for the issue of animal rights. It can be said that the majority of Francione's ideas addressed in the preceding part are supported by Best's "Animal Standpoint"

theory, which I will explain in the following section.[33] He claims that the animal rights/liberation movement would not only lead to the animal liberation, but will also pave the way for human liberation. In light of this, the Animal Standpoint Theory of Best will be discussed in the following section.

2.2.4. The Animal Standpoint Theory of Steven Best

Steven Best (2014, xi) claims that earthlings have been experiencing "dystopian and apocalyptic" times, hence he attempted to "articulate a revolutionary politics of total liberation for the twenty-first century" in his book *The Politics of Total Liberation Revolution*. He (2014, xi) argues that "all political approaches and social movements have been fragmentary, weak, noninclusive, and regressive in their views toward nonhuman animals". Although in last thirty years it has been understood that both natural world and people have been affected by the attack of capitalist system and agriculture society, social justice alliences excluded "the causes of vegan and animal rights/liberation movements" which have the capability to progress total liberation.

Best (2014, xii) asserts that he did not refer to a utopia by "total liberation" in his book. Instead, he refers to the human, animal, and earth liberation movements which are "different components of one inseparable struggle -against hierarchy, domination, and unsustainable social forms- none of which is possible without the others". He (2014, xiii) suggests that the interdependence and interconnection of these three movements could be realised by only few people. Despite the cruel history, "predatory behaviors, systems of exploitation (2014, xii)" and possible extinction of humanity, he (2014, xiv) invites human to "not only hope, but also struggle, for a far different outcome".

Steven Best (2014, 1) claims that if history is analysed from the standpoint of animals, "we can glean new and invaluable insights into psychological, social, historical, and ecological phenomena, problems, and crises." The animal standpoint theory "looks at the fundamental role animals play in sustaining the natural world and shaping the human world in co-evolutionary relations". He asserts that the

[33] Although Best agrees with the most of Francione's concepts that I have stated in this thesis, he is one of the academicians who criticizes Francione for his ideas on activism. For further information, see Best, 2014 and Best and Nocella, 2004.

human domination over nonhuman animals “underpins the domination of humans over one another and over the natural world.” Thus, the animal standpoint theory emphasises nonhuman exploitation by human, interconnectedness of human and animal lives and the necessity of significant changes for all animals and earth.

Toward a new perspective, Best (2014, 2) claims that the animal standpoint theory embraces “key influences” and goes beyond them. First, it engages “perspectivalist philosophy” of Nietzsche who suggested that “Perception and cognition are always perspectival” and there were only interpretations in science, not explanations. Humans tend to have a single viewpoint shaped by “presuppositions, biases, and limitations”, “but reality is too complex and many-sided to grasp from one outlook”.

Second, besides its perspectivism, “the animal standpoint is an extension of feminist standpoint theory, which was developed to illuminate patriarchal domination and its debilitating impact on women and humanity as a whole. (Best, 2014, 3)” Having its roots on Hegel’s master-slave theory, the standpoint theory claims that “an oppressed person or group can glean unique and important insights into the nature of social reality”. Since these unique and important insights cannot be revealed by “oppressor’s biased position”, the standpoint theory utilizes the oppressed group’s insights to discover the oppressor group’s “partial, limited, and flawed modes of understanding”. While “people of color and postcolonial and critical race theorists can illuminate colonial domination, slavery, and racist pathology, all central to the origins of modernity and global capitalism”, the animal standpoint illuminates the catastrophic outcomes of speciesism and humans’ “alienation from nature and of the pathological humanist project to “dominate” and “master” it.”

Third, Best (2014, 3) based the animal standpoint “on the modern leftist tradition that examines history from the perspective of the conquered rather than the conquerors”. He claims that this tradition inspired the genealogies of Michel Foucault to recover the voices of marginalised groups which had been ignored by Marxist theory that limited all social issues to class struggle. Therefore Best asks a crucial question at that point:

> "What group has been more oppressed, for the longest period of time, and in the most intensive and invasive ways, than nonhuman animals? If history is a struggle between the masters and slaves, as Marx contended, humans in general are the masters and exploitable animals are their slaves."

Best (2014, 5) argues that "the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, literary studies, or philosophy, theorists" are mistaken by viewing animals as "passive objects", "nothing more than resources", "objects of prestige, sacrifice, food, or transport devices". "They assume that only humans are conscious, self-directing, and purposeful agents and reduce animals to being mere means to human ends (Best, 2014, 5, 6)". Thus Best (2014, 7) claims that the animal standpoint theory perceives nonhuman animals as integral part of human history and individual actors of their lives. Humans domesticated animals for their benefit and animals' detriment. According to Best (2014, 7) domestication is only a "euphemism" for a cruel system of abuse, forced breeding, imprisonment, castration, and death. Humans developed this system and other control methods such as cages, chains, whips and collars to claim animals as their property to abuse them for food, clothing, transportation, warfare and work.

Best (2014, 10) claims that speciesism supplied the prototype for hierarchical domination and a variety of control mechanism. Humans characterised themselves as "rational beings" and nonhuman animals as "irrational". Being rational made humans unique and special. "Once animals became the measure of alterity" as being irrational, "it was a short step to begin viewing different, exotic, and dark-skinned peoples as brutes, beasts, and savages, wholly deficient in rationality, and thus sub or nonhuman." Best (2014, 10) summarizes the speciesist dominance history of humanity:

> "The study of human history reveals the pattern: first, humans exploit and slaughter animals; then, they treat other people like animals and do the same to them. Whether the conquerors are European imperialists, American colonialists, or German Nazis, Western aggressors always engage in wordplay before swordplay, in order to vilify their victims—Africans, Native Americans, Filipinos, Japanese, Vietnamese, Iraqis, and other unfortunates—with opprobrious terms such as "rats," "pigs," "swine," "monkeys," "beasts," "vermin," or "cockroaches."

Best (2014, xiv, 19, 20) suggests that according to the animal standpoint, there is a close connection between human and animal freedom and happiness. He suggests that the theory brings attention to the significant consequences for people when they violate animal life on a significant, worldwide scale, as is characteristic in modern societies. Without the animal standpoint, according to Best, humans might not able to adequately understand human conflict, the pathology of violence and genocide, the alienation of humans from one another and the natural world. And again without the animal standpoint, a politics of total liberation might not build coalitions that are stronger and more advantageous than anything that has come before. He argues that total liberation could free not only a particular class, interest group, or even the entire human species from a society that values only power and profit, but also animal communities and ecosystems.

2.3.Veganism

Until this point, I have discussed the concept of speciesism as a prejudice, how it relates to other forms of discrimination, and the justifications for speciesism. Then I have addressed the animal advocacy theories that emerged as a result of rejection of speciesism and what the theories suggested about animal rights and liberation. The theories asserted that defending animals rights, viewing animals as subjects-of-a-life and rejecting the property status of animals could only be consistent with becoming a vegan. Therefore, I consider that it is crucial for animal advocacy and this thesis to comprehend veganism, which is a moral and ethical attitude, not diet contrary to what is generally accepted in society.

In this section, I will start with vegetarianism because it has strong ties with veganism. Vegetarianism has been advocated and practised -or advocated and not practiced- for a long time before veganism (Kew, 1999, 42). Since at least seventeenth century, the notion of vegetarianism had been accepted as a way of decreasing aggressive attitude and meat was seen unhealthy, not natural for non-carnivore humans who had not right kind of teeth for meat (Kew, 1999, 43). The word vegetarian appeared in 1842 and has started to be used generally with the foundation of the Vegetarian Society which was founded in 1847 (Kew, 1999, 42; Singer, 2015, 259).

In August 1944 some members of the Vegetarian Society demanded a section for non-dairy vegetarianism in the newsletter of the society, but the demand was rejected. As a reaction to that rejection Donald Watson, who had been the secretary of the Leicester branch of the society, coined the term “vegan” and used it in the first newsletter of The Vegan Society, named *The Vegan News*. The desire of world peace has increased after the Second World War and sharing the same desire, Donald Watson and his wife Dorothy Watson founded The Vegan Society in 1944 (Watson, 2002, 11; 2004, 6). Watson asserted that world peace and veganism is inseparably linked (Kean, 1998, 121).

In the first issue of *The Vegan News* on 1st November 1944, Watson explains the reason and process of coining the word vegan. He states that the terms of ‘non-diary’ and ‘non-lacto’ seemed negative and these terms did not include the objection of consuming eggs as food. Moreover, since the terms of ‘vegetarian’ and ‘fruitarian’ did not exclude the products made of animals like cows and hen, the term ‘vegan’ was taken as a new and appropriate word that has the virtue of being a short term (Watson, 1944, 2). In an interview, Watson (2004, 6) said that he created his own word "vegan", taking “the first three and last two letters of "vegetarian". Later the word was accepted by the Oxford English Dictionary and no one has attempted to enhance it.

Veganism is defined by The Vegan Society (2016, 2) in 1944 as:

> “a philosophy and way of living which seeks to exclude – as far as is possible and practicable – all forms of exploitation of, and cruelty to, animals for food, clothing or any other purpose; and by extension, promotes the development and use of animal-free alternatives for the benefit of humans, animals and the environment. In dietary terms it denotes the practice of dispensing with all products derived wholly or partly from animals.”

Due to this definition of veganism, the word “vegan” can be described as a person or group of people who seeks a world that animals have rights and do not use and exploit animals for food, like meat, fish, fowl, honey, milk, diary or egg, for clothing, like of wool, leather, silk, fur, for entertainment, like hunting and in circus, zoo, aquarium, for cosmetics, household goods, vivisection or any other purpose (Regan, 2003; Cherry, 2006; Cherry, 2015; Kalkandelen, 2019; McDonald, 2000).

3. ANIMAL ADVOCACY IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Chapter 3 will open with an analysis of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement (AAAM)'s features as a new social movement based on the theories discussed in chapter two. Then, in chronological order, I will list the significant occurrences in the revolution of the global animal advocacy movement that took place simultaneously when those theories flourished. After discussing the AAAM in the world, the history of the animal rights movement in Turkey, which largely struggles for the rights of cats and dogs living in streets and temporary animal rehabilitation centers (TARC), will be discussed. Then, I will examine the history of AAAM in Turkey, which advocates for the rights and liberation of all animals regardless of species. I will include a great deal of online newspapers and website articles since the history of AAAM was not sufficiently mentioned in the books and academic articles because of its being a relatively young social movement.

3.1. Animal Advocacy Movement as a New Social Movement

A social movement is hard to define, says Christiansen (2009, 2) and states that it is neither an interest group or a political party; nor is it a mass fancy of trend that are unorganised and without goals. A social movement, according to Christiansen, is instead in between. Della Porta and Diani (2006, 20) indicate some distinctive concepts of social movements. They have conflictual relationships with clear opponents; are connected by extensive informal communication networks; own a unique collective identity. Political and social movements have got some main components: “an attempt to bring about political or social change” and “a well-thought-out agenda and clear goals” (Campbell, 2009, 11).

Ilişanu and Andrei (2019, 34) argue that analysing social movements should not only analyse the mobilization process of population, their power and the threats they pose to public order, but also analyse moral and cultural dimensions of the movements, public conscience, beliefs, practices and cultural heritage which underlie them. Della Porta and Diani (2006, 150) state that scholar Herbert Blumer identified four stages of social movements’ lifecycles; social ferment, popular

excitement, formalization, institutionalization. After Blumer, the stages were refined and renamed, but the core themes maintained stable. Christiansen (2009, 2) states the four stages as "emergence, coalescence, bureaucratization, and decline". The stage of decline may seem negative at first, but there are five ways of decline: "success, organizational failure, co-optation, repression, establishment within mainstream society".

Calhoun (1993, 385) claims that social movements had experienced some changes after 1968 and they evolved to new social movements that focused on issues of "lifestyle, ethical, or identity" rather than "narrowly economic goals" using new tactics. Feminism, the peace movement, the youth movement, the gay movement, the animal rights movement, the ecology movement, the antiabortion and prochoice movements are examples of new social movements (Calhoun, 1993, 385). Melucci (1980, 217) states that the changes on the "the areas of consumption, services, and social relations" paved the way to new social movements. Tilly (2004, 70) asserts that the old social movements were being replaced by "new" social movements which emphasise autonomy, self- expression and the criticism of postindustrial society.

It has been said that the first advocacy movement initiated by philosophers is the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement (Campbell, 2009, 351). A group of people –animal advocates- have believed that rights are not exclusive to human beings and nonhuman animals also have ethical and moral rights. The animal advocates struggle for the animals' rights because of "abhorrence" of speciesism (Munro, 2005, 16). The movement seeks "cultural, cognitive, affective and behavioural transformation rather that political revolution" and demands primarily "a change in man, not management" (Kew, 1999, 2). Although the movement aims changes in companies and government, it accepts "the individual as a sovereign actor".

Social movements challenge domination forms which are deeply rooted in the cultural practices. Hence, precisely at the early stages of the movements, the society generally labels members of the movements as "depraved, morally weak, corrupted people, unable to adapt to society's basic values (Della Porta, 2006, 106, 107)". The anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement, which challenges all domination and

oppression forms -primarily speciesism- towards nonhuman animals, receives a share from that tendency. The society tends to label animal advocates as aggressive because they reveal the animal exploitation, abuse and cruelty that is practiced by humans. Although animal abuse and speciesism are societal problems for the movement, accepting them as such is unusual for many people outside the movement. The main aim of the movement is to make that idea usual by challenging the legitimate practices of animal abuse and speciesism. The advocates strive to change people's way of thinking and their attitude towards animals and raise people's consciousness through various campaigns (Munro, 2005, 3).

Cherry (2010, 451, 452) claims that the new social movements challenge dominant cultural values by creating collective identities. The collective identity is not only a strategy of the movement but also a goal of it. The strict boundaries of cultures are softened when they formulate their collective identities with the help of new social movement advocates. Creating collective identity is one of the main goals of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement, too. Along with creating a collective identity, advocates also push for external acceptance of collective identities and encourage humans to change their own viewpoints. They aim to split human-animal boundary and companion-farm animal boundary, in other words to challenge speciesism.

Munro (2012, 166) asserts that traditionally philosophers have concerned with humans' treatment of nonhuman animals, social scientists have engaged with this issue only in recent years. Anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement, although it is classified as a new social movement, did not take part sufficiently in the books about new social movements written in English and Turkish. Sociological literature of the social movements tends not to mention the movement or it mentions the movement as a subsection of the environmental movement (Kew, 1999, 1). Charles Tilly (2004, 71) gives examples of new social movements in the book *Social Movements, 1768-2004.* He mentions the movements related to feminism, homosexual rights, environmentalism and even psychedelic drugs. But the movement related to animal rights is not mentioned. The book *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research* edited by Donatella della Porta (2014) has the word "animal" only for once that is related to a campaign of an animal

advocacy group, not the movement itself. Andrew Heywood's (2017) book *Political Ideologies* situates the movement as a subsection of the environmental ethics in the chapter named Green Ideology. In the book *An Alternative Look at New Social Movements*[34] of Aziz Coşkun (2019) which is one of the newly-published books in the literature, the word "animal" is stated only twice, moreover none of them is related to the movement. However, the book mentions many new social movements like women, environment, anti-war, anti-globalization, anti-consumerism and human rights. In another book *Social Movements: History, Theory and Experience*[35], Çetinkaya et al. (2014) include wide ranges of social movements like labour, feminist, occupy, environment, peace movement and the Arab Spring, but not animal advocacy movement. It can be said that the movement gains a place in the list of new social movements, but it has not been accepted worthy enough to be mentioned in literature. However, as it will be examined in chapter four, it shares many qualities of the new social movements.

3.2. Animal Advocacy Movement in the World

The history of ethical concerns on animals and vegetarianism goes back to Ancient Greece (Kew, 1999, 24). As example, Pythagoras, Plutarch and Porphyry defended vegetarianism for different ethical reasons. In this thesis the history of thoughts on animals and vegetarianism before nineteenth century will not be stated, since these periods and thoughts are not directly related to the animal advocacy movement although it is known that a social movement is a cumulative reaction to these periods and thoughts. Kean (1998, 13) claims that "the attitude towards animals did not suddenly change at the start of the nineteenth century." when animal welfare movement had started. He (1998, 70) states that "the first decades of the nineteenth century saw the animal welfare movement following the Benthamite nostrum".

The first legislative steps of animal protection were taken in Britain and the animal advocacy theories that initiated and directed the movement were written by scholars who lived there. Thus it can be said that the history of animal advocacy movement has been shaped by the events took place mostly in Britain. That might explain why Britain is the country with the strongest animal advocacy movement (Munro, 2005,

[34] The original title of the book is "*Yeni Toplumsal Hareketlere Alternatif Bir Bakış"*.
[35] The original title of the book is "*Toplumsal Hareketler: Tarih, Teori ve Deneyim"*.

4). Therefore, in this thesis, the historical perspective of animal advocacy movement will be highly focused on Britain inevitably, yet important events in other countries will be taken into consideration.

The first attempts at legislation took place in British Parliament in 1800 not only to defend property status of animals or to regulate the attitude towards animals, but also to protect animals who are unable to speak for themselves (Kean, 1998, 32). On 2nd April 1800, advocate and politician Sir William Pulteney introduced the first bill into Parliament to ban the inhumane and barbaric practice of bull-baiting of bulldogs, but the bill was lost. Since people were drinking too much and gambling in bull-baiting or cock-baiting contests and they had problem going to the work, it was perceived as a social problem. In 1802 Society for the Suppression of Vice was founded by the Evangelicals to campaign against bull-baiting and other cruelty forms (Munro, 2005, 50).

In 1809 Lord Thomas Erskine, who had also argued for the abolition of the slave trade, asserted that animals deserved protection because they had rights and they were not property. Unlike Pulteney's attempt, Erskine's attempt emphasized "routine cruelty" which is visible in daily life in the streets. But the bill was lost again (Kean, 1998, 32). In 1821 a law to prevent the ill-treatment of horses was proposed by Richard Martin, an Irish gentleman-landowner and a member of Parliament for Galway and in 1822 Martin's Act was passed (Singer, 2015, 297). The bill was legislated and cruelty to animals became a punishable offense for the first time.

In 1824 in London, Britain, the first welfare organisation Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) was founded by Fowell Buxton, who was an anti-slavery campaigner (Kew, 1999, 41). The Society aimed to control the implementation of the Martin's Act and to educate people through booklets, brochures and instructive animal fiction. Lewis Gompertz, who was a founding member and second secretary of SPCA, described "a cruelty-free environment for animals" and defended a plant-based diet with suggestions in his book *Moral Inquiries on the Situation of Man and of Brutes* written in 1824 (Kean, 1998, 32). Gompertz was also a pioneer vegetarian of 19th century who refused to use horse-drawn carriages and gave up leather although it was so hard to find shoes made of

other material and (Singer, 2015, 334). In 1840, Victoria added the prefix Royal to SPCA and it emerged Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). Before the prefix Royal, the supporters and followers of the society were a mixed bunch of people. But after the prefix, the society and its members started to lose its enthusiasm and became less idealistic. Other organisations emerged to fulfil the room of "the Society's failures and loss of radicalism" like the League Against Cruel Sports and anti-vivisection groups. Until the late of 20th century RSPCA managed to maintain peaceful, but later it could not manage it. Starting from 1970s, the RSPCA started to expulse its members who RSPCA regarded to be overly idealistic including Robin Webb who was the spokesman of the animal advocacy group Animal Liberation Front and Webb's friend Lewis Gompertz who was vegan at that time (Kew, 1999, 41, 42).

Singer (2015, 317, 318) claims that animal welfare movement was not able to prevent most important types of crueltyin 1970s because of two reasons. First, RSPCA was a radical group when it was founded that it was against all forms of cruelty including animals raised and killed for food. But later with the wealth and reputation it gained, it lost its radical attitude. Second, since the animal welfare societies are registered as charities, they could not take part in political activities. Thus they started to protect stray dogs and prevent individual cruelty; they did not campaign against systematic cruelty. As a result, they did not engage with animals raised and killed for food who were the great victims of systematic cruelty. But hopefully he says that there has been a change in the middle of 1970s. Many radical animal liberation and animal rights groups emerged and they took their place against cruelty stronger than RSCPA (Singer, 2015, 317).

Going back to the 19th century, the Vegetarian Society was founded in 1847, again in Britain (Kew, 1999, 42). In 1876 the first vegetarian restaurant was set up in London and until 1886 twelve more opened. These restaurants performed as meeting point of Humanitarian League events. There Gandhi met Henry Salt who is the writer of *A Plea for Vegetarianism and Animals' Rights* and was influenced by him (Sorenson, 2011a, 234). Since the foundation of the Vegetarian Society, vegetarianism had gained popularity and took a female dimension. In 1895 Women's Vegetarian Society was founded (Kean, 1998, 123, 124). The publications of Darwin's book, *The Origin of Species* in 1859 and *The Descent of*

Man in 1871, brought the human and nonhuman animal relationship into question (Singer, 2015, 299, 301). In Britain in 1860 the Battersea Dogs' Home was founded by women to take care of the dogs living in streets and find them home. It was the first welfare organisation which was founded by a woman, Mary Tealby (Kean, 1998, 88). The Home was supported by members of new socialist and feminist groups (Kean, 1998, 137).

The animal killing method for food started to change at those times (Kean, 1998, 130). In 1883 London Abattoir Society was founded to remove private slaughterhouses and to get animals slaughter in humane conditions. About the status of slaughterhouses during nineteenth century, Kew (1999, 43) states that slaughterhouses started to become distant from the public view and animal corpses were less frequently seen in public spaces and houses. The relationship with killing animal broke loose from food.

Women did not appear directly in cruelty acts until the late nineteenth century. The vivisection had been applied by middle-class men, horses and cattle were beaten by workingmen. But for the sake of fashion and being chic, the middle-class women started to be adorned with plumage and dead bodies of small birds. Therefore, while some women were also responsible for the cruelty to animals, some others Plumage League in 1886 to campaign against the excessive use of birds' feathers and plumage in fashion. Women also founded the Society for the Protection of Birds in 1893 in Britain. They protested against new fashion, shooting birds for sport and collecting birds' eggs and nests. In 1890s collecting birds' eggs and nest, and in 1896 shooting birds for sport was prohibited thanks to their campaigns (Kean, 1998, 113).

In 1875, in Britain the Victoria Street Society for Protection of Animals from Vivisection was founded by Francis Power Cobbe and Lord Shaftesbury as the first society with the aim of opposing specifically vivisection (Curnutt, 2001, 437). In 1876 Cruelty to Animals Act, which aimed to license vivisectionists and inspect vivisectionists and vivisection facilities, was passed into law. However, the Act did not aim to stop vivisection, but to legalise the vivisection procedure. According to it, animal testing was not a deliberate cruelty towards animals and it protected vivisectionists from legal prosecution for deliberate animal cruelty. Therefore, anti-

vivisectionists were not happy with the Act since they considered animal testing as an unnecessary and deliberate cruelty (Kean, 1998, 105). In 1886 Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, which has done almost nothing beneficial to animals, was passed (Kean, 1998, 210). In 1898, the division of beliefs in The Victoria Street Society split the society into two groups: The National Anti-vivisection Society (NAVS) and The British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV). The NAVS aimed to regulate legal regulations as a step to stop vivisection (Kean, 1998, 110, 144). On the other hand BUAV aimed to stop vivisection by opposing all the legal regulations (Langley, D'Silva, 1998, 2). In 2015, BUAV declared that the group changed its name to Cruelty Free International since animal testing is a global problem, not a British problem (Buav Changes..., 2015).

On 2 February 1903, a little brown terrier dog who was taken from the street was operated as an act of illegal vivisection by William Bayliss at University College London in front of seventy students. The vivisection was recorded by two Swedish anti-vivisectionist students and reported to NAVS since multiple vivisections were performed without anaesthesia on the same dog who was conscious and struggling during them while the students were joking (Garlick, 2015, 806; Lind-Af-Hageby, Schartau, 1903, 131,132). The secretary of NAVS accused Bayliss contravening the Cruelty to Animals Act. Bayliss sued the secretary for libel and won in November 1903 (Garlick, 2015, 806). After the trial, the anti-vivisectionists erected a noble statue of the Brown Dog in Battersea on 15 September 1906. Then a group of medical students wanted to destroy the statue on 20 November 1907 but two police officers stopped them. On 10 December 1907, hundreds of students marched and aimed to damage the statue and they were stopped by police officers again. After the "Brown Dog riots", the brown dog statue was removed with the order of council on the night of 9 March 1910. Seven decades later, on 12 December 1985 the second brown dog statue was erected by antivivisection groups (Garlick, 2015, 808, 809, 811).

Through the middle of the 20th century, The Vegan Society was founded by some former members of the Vegetarian Society who rejected to consume not only meat but also other animal products.[36] 1960s was a new period with many new

[36] Further information about the society is on title 2.2.3. Veganism.

organisations related to various right struggles “from the Fellowship of the New Life, through Theosophy, the Labour Party, Syndicalism and militant suffrage feminism”. But almost no one talked about misery of animals (Kean, 1998, 136). Kew (1999, 54) asserts that the welfare movement’s legislation and regulations of a few specific cruelties towards animals served as a mask of compassion. The welfare movement had pretended to be concerned for animals but its mask was torn off in 1960s. Although many people have made significant contributions to the advancement of bloodless culture -or vegetarianism- such as Paley, Franklin, Schopenhaur, Bentham, TH Huxley and Darwin, like many other people they were vegetarian “only intellectually and/or equivocated about vivisection”. Once more, these people were compelled to behave contrary to what they intellectually discovered due to the tension caused by the influence of authority, tradition, status and habit (Kew, 1999, 46, 47).

Although there had been some people who advocated animals’ rights individually or in some groups, the contemporary anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement has started in 1970s in Britain (Kew, 1999, 257). In 1969 the group “Oxford Vegetarians” was founded by Roslind and Stanley Godlovitch, Renata and Richard Keshen who were graduate philosophy students in Oxford. John Harris, David Wood, Michael Peters, Richard Ryder, Andrew Linzey and Peter Singer were other members of the group. They studied different branches of philosophy but agreed on the immorality of their present treatment on animals. Peter Singer (1982, 6), as a member of the group, tells his story in his article “The Oxford Vegetarians-A Personal Account”. He states that he had no particular thoughts on animals and on animal ethics till his accidentally meeting with the group which changed his life.

In 1970s “animal rights, as a theoretical and political discourse, gained ground” (Silverstein, 1996, 43). Kew (1999, 266) claims that animal liberation manifesto did not appear until 1971 “due largely to welfarism, the continuing inconsistency of bloodless culture, increasing scientism, wars and their aftermaths.” In 1971, *Animals, Men and Moral: An Inquiry into the Maltreatment of Non-humans* edited by Roslind Godlovitch, Stanley Godlovitch and John Harris, who were the members of Oxford Vegetarian Group, was published. The authors and editors had great hopes for the book because “it demanded a revolutionary change in our attitudes to, and treatment of, nonhuman animals (Singer, 1982, 8).” The book was

referred as animal liberation manifesto by Singer in 1973, even though Britain's major newspapers and weeklies did not mention it. The authors were disappointed that this book, which was published with the great hopes for animals, did not receive the recognition it deserved in Britain. Hence Singer decided to write a review of the book and sent it to The New York Review of Books. In 1973 Singer's review was appeared with the title *Animal Liberation*. As a result, the book was offered to be published in the USA in 1974. The review helped the book to be known in the USA. Moreover, Singer was offered to write a full-length book, hence he started to write *Animal Liberation*.

As discussed above, in 1975 Peter Singer's book *Animal Liberation* was published and considered as the "bible" of the animal liberation. Singer (2015, 22) states that "The title of this book has a serious point behind it. A liberation movement is a demand for an end to prejudice and discrimination based on an arbitrary characteristic like race or sex.". For him animal liberation movement is similar to Black and Gay Liberation movements, but has a lot of handicaps in comparison to them. Because the oppressed group cannot form a protest for themselves, people have to speak on behalf of them. Thus animal liberation movement which emerged in 1971 with the animal liberation manifesto -as Singer referred to Roslind Godlovitch, Stanley Godlovitch & John Harris' book *Animals, Men and Moral*- was strengthened with the publication of Peter Singer's book *Animal Liberation* in 1975.

In the USA, in 1972 Ronnie Lee, Cliff Goodman and a group of people formed Band of Mercy and decided to work underground. In 1973, Band of Mercy's first direct action was setting on fire a not-completed building which was about to start vivisection. In August 1974 Lee and Goodman were arrested and given three years in prison. After a year in prison, they took different paths, Ronnie Lee and his 30 friends formed Animal Liberation Front which is "loosely bonded in a decentralized, anonymous, underground, global network (Best, Nocella, 2004, 12)" The ALF increasingly became an international organization and was stated in FBI's domestic terror list. On the contrary, Best and Nocella (2004, 12) defined the ALF as powered by "love, empathy, compassion and justice" is "antithesis of the terrorist organization". In 1989 Ronnie Lee and Vivian Smith founded the animal liberation magazine *Arkangel* which had non-censorship policy. The magazine

included controversial issues such as using violence (Nocella et al, 2015, 142). Lee states that the title of the magazine refers to the Ark of Noah which was a protector of animals and *Arkangel* was protecting animals as an angel (Hochschartner, 2017, 138). Today *Arkangel* is now-discontinued magazine and its online archive is hard to reach as the people who are in charge are busy with other projects on animals (Sorenson, 2011b, 184, 192).

In 1980 People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) was established in Virginia, USA. In November 1988, PETA led an international campaign against Benetton to make it stop animal testing and the campaign succeeded. In December 1988 Noxell Corporation declared that it will reduce animal testing by 80 to 90 percent, later Noxell stated that it did not use any animal in the first half of 1989. In 1989, the worldwide campaign decreased the number of fur sold especially in Europe. The House of Fraser was the target of the campaign in Britain. In December 1989, it declared that it was closing fifty-nine of sixty fur saloons, only keeping a famous one (Singer, 2015, 353). On the website it is claimed that today PETA has had more than 9 million members (Membership Services, [18.11.2022]), it was 250,000 in 2015 (Singer, 2015, 353).

Silverstain (1996, 33) asserts that the publication of Singer's *Animal Liberation*, despite its utilitarian approach –which has been discussed in part 2.2.1-, opened a way to talk about animal rights. It helped the animal rights movement to reborn, renamed and reoriented in 1980s. Animal rights movement has shaped through the theories of Tom Regan and Gary Francione. In 1983 in his book *The Case for Animal Rights,* Tom Regan (1985, 13; 2003, 96) criticised utilitarian theory of Singer and constructed animal rights theory which was not focused on the wrong treatment of animals but the whole system that allows people to recognize animals as sources. In 1995, Gary Francione (1995) asserted that the main problem of the animals' rights is property status of animals and built the abolitionist theory on that problem[37].

In 1999 Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) was founded to end animal testing and started a war against the company of Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS) in Britain (Smith, 2010, 130). The founders of SHAC were Heather Nicholson,

[37] For further information on theoretical discussion, see Chapter 2.

Greg and Natasha Avery (Pellow, 2014, 155). SHAC adopted primary, secondary and tertiary targeting campaigns. In primary targeting, the SHAC would target the directors and employees of the HLC. In secondary targeting, SHAC would put pressure on the company's business partners to end their contracts with HLC. In tertiary targeting, SHAC would force companies which were conducting business with the HLC's business partners to end their contracts (Pellow, 2014, 39, 151). SHAC claimed the secondary and tertiary targeting were taken straight from the anti-apartheid movement, which in 1980s pushed many companies to quit conducting business with racist South African regime (Pellow, 2014, 39). The campaigns of SHAC had stunning consequences. The shares of HLS decreased from 3.55 British pounds in 1990 to 1.75 pence in early 2001, many companies sold their shares in HLS. The major investor Stephens Inc., located in the USA, provided a rich loan to HLS to keep the company running and HLS's financial center was moved from Britain to USA to be able to escape SHAC.

After this move from Britain, SHAC-USA expanded its campaigns to USA in 2001 and participants from USA continued the struggle against HLS (Pellow, 2014, 152). In 2006, seven participants (SHAC7)[38] of SHAC were found guilty because they violate the Animal Enterprise Protection Act (AETA) in the USA. For the seven participants, known as SHAC7, one to six-year sentence started in 2006 (Pellow, 2014, 154, 155, 183). To depict the story of SHAC7, the documentary movie "The Animal People"[39] was released in 2019 by Joaquin Phoenix who has been known as a lifelong animal advocate (Kretzer, 2019).

Similar incidents also happened in Britain during the time that these were taking place in the USA. About the campaigns and activities of the movement, the government and the police have achieved their goal of reducing animal extremism between 2004 and 2010 in Britain (Mills, 2013, 39). After 2004, the movement was labelled as "extremist" that related the movement with terrorism, although no activists were charged with terrorism offences due to Terrorism Act 2000. When

[38] The names of participants are Kevin Kjonaas (also known as Kevin Jonas), Lauren Gazzola, Jacob Conroy, Joshua Harper, Andrew Stepanian, Darius Fullmer, and John McGee. See Pellow (2014) for further information.

[39] For the trailer of movie The Animal People, see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IXcmqguK3DE&embeds_euri=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.peta.org%2Fblog%2Fjoaquin-phoenix-the-animal-people-documentary%2F&source_ve_path=OTY3MTQ&feature=emb_imp_woyt . [26.01.2023].

activists had problems with police and law, they tended to create new tactics using technology and social media. The movement, adopting direct action campaigns, was "at an all-time low" in 2012, because of the prosecution of leading members of activist organisations in Britain (Mills, 2013, 39, 41).

On the day of July 7, 2012, "a prominent international group of cognitive neuroscientists, neuropharmacologists, neurophysiologists, neuroanatomists and computational neuroscientists" gathered at the University of Cambridge to reassess consciousness in human and non-human animals and declared "The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness". The scientists stated these sentences at the end of the declaration:

> "Convergent evidence indicates that non-human animals have […] substrates of conscious states along with the capacity to exhibit intentional behaviors. Consequently, the weight of evidence indicates that humans are not unique in possessing the neurological substrates that generate consciousness. Nonhuman animals, including all mammals and birds, and many other creatures, including octopuses, also possess these neurological substrates."

In 2016, the animal advocacy group Surge Activism was founded by Ed Winter and Surge team in London, England. In 2019, in 49 cities[40] across the world over 41.000 people took part in The Official Animal Rights March which is an annual event initiated by Surge (Our Mission, [18.11.2022]). In 2019, around 10.000 people joined the march in London, although the number of the people had been only 2.500 in 2016, the first year of March (Hockaday, 2019, [18.11.2022]).

As an analysis of the movement, Simnett (2019, 15) suggests that the animal advocacy movement is "still in an early stage of development" as a new social movement. Although the movement has achieved great things in number and importance, Stallwood (2013, 52) also claims that the movement is "mostly in stage one" and has some treats of stage two according to his five-staged analysis approach. The stages of the approach are public education, public policy, legislation, implementation and public acceptance. He states that stage one and two are related to moral crusade, while stage three and four are related to political movement. At the end of these four stages, in stage five, the movement values are accepted in society.

[40] For further information about the march in İstanbul, Turkey, see 3.2.2.

On the other hand, referring to Bill Moyer's eight-staged outline dated 1987, Isacat (2015, 45) suggests that the animal advocacy movement is "at a particular stage". He claims that the issue of animal rights is a constantly discussed on social and political areas; participants of the grassroots animal advocacy movement are becoming numerous; the animal advocacy groups are gaining strength and they are educating the public. Therefore Isacat asserts that the movement has not reached stage six which is being supported by public majority. There is a long way to stage eight that public will push for change. Moreover, he claims that these stages are not clear-cut since they are related to social change in the public.

The animal advocacy movement, I have examined from the 19th century to the present, continues to struggle for all animals regardless of their species; to be increasingly more anti-speciesist; to embrace and promote veganism as a natural and unavoidable consequence of anti-speciesism. After extensively covering the worldwide movement, now I will examine the animal advocacy movement in Turkey.

3.3. Animal Advocacy in Turkey

Animal Advocacy in Turkey has two main units. "Animal Rights Movement" is the mainstream unit which advocates for the rights of cats and dogs mostly living in streets or temporary animal rehabilitation center (TARC) and some other species who live with humans such as birds, turtles, rabbits. It can be said that animal rights movement struggles to improve the life conditions of certain species of animals, but it does not aim to annihilate speciesism. The advocates of the movement call themselves as "hayvansever", "animal lovers" in English. And the people who take care of the animals in streets and TARC voluntarily are called "hayvan gönüllüsü", "animal volunteer" in English (Haspolat, 2019, 80).

The second unit is the "Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement (AAAM)" which advocates for the rights and liberation of all animals aiming to eradicate speciesism. As the rejection of speciesism, the advocates of the movement are vegan for animals and they generally do not call themselves as animal-lover since they support animal rights primarily in order to seek justice for animals, rather than acting merely out of love. They call themselves as "animal rights advocate/activist", "animal liberation advocate/activist", "animal advocate" or

"vegan activist". It can be concluded that anti-speciesist animal advocacy in Turkey covers the aims of animal rights movement since it is anti-speciesist and expands these aims to all animals. Despite the uncertainty of the date, it can be said that the AAAM has emerged from 2010 onwards (Wolf, 2015, 8). Thus the history of these two movements after the year of 2010 will be stated under the title of AAAM in Turkey.

3.3.1. Animal Rights Movement in Turkey

Going back to the period before the foundation of Republic of Turkey is necessary in order to understand the history of the animal rights movement (ARM) in Turkey. Because it does not seem reasonable to separate the history of Turkey's animal rights movement from the developments that took place during the time of in the Ottoman Empire. As the animal advocates, media and literature in Turkey name this movement as animal rights movement, I will use the same name while examining the history of it until the year 2010.

In Ottoman Empire, legal acts about animal welfare dated back the beginning of 1500s, almost three centuries earlier than the western world (Özen, 2017, 1019). At the beginning of 16th century, the welfare of horses, mules, and donkeys was mentioned in Kanunname-i Ihtisab-i İstanbul (The Law of Istanbul Municipality). The Law suggested that horses with foot problems should not be forced to work; horses, mules and donkeys' feet should be taken care of; excessive amount of weight should not be made to carry to these silent animals (Gürler, Osmanağaoğlu, 2009, 326). Besides the welfare of these animals, birdhouses were built and charitable foundations fed the hungry animals in winter. Although these legal acts and charities are seen as good examples of animal protection, it cannot be said that animals were taken care of in 17th and 18th centuries (Özen, 2017, 1020).

In the summer of 1910, the great dog massacre that is called Hayırsızada Olayı (Inauspicious Island Event[41]) took place in İstanbul. Although the dogs living in streets had been seen as a natural part of the city, attracted the tourists and taken care of by locals, with the modernisation reforms of the Ottoman Empire the dogs were started to be seen as a big problem. With the instructions of the municipality,

[41] In the texts of Gündoğdu (2018) and Haspolat (2019), the name of the island and event is trabslated to English as "wicked", but the word "inauspicious" would seem to define them better.

thousands of dogs were put first in the cages and then exiled to Sivriada (Oxia) a small island close to the coast of İstanbul. In Sivriada, thousands of dogs were left to death; they were forced to eat their fellow dogs' bodies; they died of thirst and hunger. After this event, the island's name has changed into Hayırsızada, meaning "inauspicious" island (Gündoğdu, 2018, 1, 11).

In 1912, Turkey's first animal advocacy association İstanbul Himaye-i Hayvanat Cemiyeti was founded to gather people who care animals. The name of the group was changed into Türkiye Hayvanları Koruma Derneği (Turkish Society for the Protection of Animals) in 1923 following Atatürk's instructions (Yaşar, Yerlikaya, 2004, 43). The association aimed to prevent the abuse towards animals and improve living conditions of animals. But it could not manage to protect the animals, especially dogs, from getting poisoned and deported to distant part of the cities in 1930s (Gündoğdu, 2018, 11). Furthermore, despite its aims, the association "humanely" killed thousands of unwanted dogs, cats and horses using euthanasia to form clean, hygienic and civil cities in 1929. Humane killings continued increasingly in 1930s (Haspolat, 2019, 62, 63). In 1950s, 9322 animals were killed by the association. It was in 1990 that the association stopped to kill animals (Gürler, Melikoğlu, Osmanağaoğlu, 2011, 904).

After the first unsuccessful attempt for the protection of animals in 1932, as a second attempt, Animal Protection Draft Bill was offered to the Parliament in 1980s. However, the bill was not even examined. It is said that, in the Turkish Constitution of 1982, there is not direct legal regulations regarding animal protection and this situation has been considered as a significant lack in the legal system (Uyumaz, 2016, 167). Until the year 1999 when Turkey became a candidate for the European Union (EU), Turkey had not had any animal protection or animal welfare law. As a candidate for the EU, Turkey had to take action for animals and enacted "Law 4934 on the Approval of the Ratification of the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals" in 15 July 2003 (Özen, 2017, 1020; Yaşar, Yerlikaya, 2004, 44).

Turkey's first "Animal Protection Law" no 5199 was made in 2004 (Gürler, Osmanağaoğlu, 2009, 328; Özen, 2017, 1020). The aim of the Law no 5199 was stated as to "ensure the comfort of animals, provide for their fair and proper treatment, and secure their protection against the infliction of pain, suffering and

stress (Özen, 2017, 1021)". The Law was legitimised under the Misdemeanor Law, so the highest punishment for breaking the law was an "administrative" fine, not prison sentence. Furthermore, the crime was not recorded on criminal report, person who broke the Law and mistreated animal was offered some advantages such as paying the fine in instalments (Kıroğlu, 2021, 176). As it can be understood by its name, the Animal Protection Law no 5199 was not a law for animal rights, but for the protection of animals, in other words animal welfare. On the other hand the law had seemed speciesist since it did not seek the welfare of all animals although it was written "animal" in the title. It can be said that it aimed to protect mostly some animals like dogs, cats and birds who live with humans.

The legalisation of Law no 5199 opened a way for the foundation of numerous animal rights groups[42] which are focused on primarily the rights of cats and dogs living in streets and temporary animal rehabilitation center (TARC). These groups occasionally pay attention to the rights of other animals who are sick, injured and disabled like horses and donkeys. Hayvan Hakları Türkiye Aktif Güç Birliği Platformu (HAYTAP) [43] and Hayvanların Yaşam Hakları Konfederasyonu (HAYKONFED)[44] have been the most active groups in the movement. In 2008, five non-governmental organizations of animal rights united and founded HAYTAP (Manifestomuz, [07.01.2023]). The group has aimed to gather animal advocates under a single roof. It has organised many campaigns to draw attention to different problems of the animals. The group has fought against the mistreatment of animals; selling fur; camel wrestling; imprisonment of animals in zoos, aquariums and dolphinariums; horse-drawn carriages; circuses with animals. It has raised donations to achieve all these goals. It also aims to improve the conditions of TARC; buy operating rooms for animals; support animal volunteers by giving them cat and dog food; educate the public through booklets, posters, advertisements, books and short movies (Başarı Öykülerimiz, [07.01.2023]). HAYKONFED is another active group which was founded in 2015 with the uniting of five federations that left HAYTAP (Biz Kimiz, [07.01.2023]; Haspolat, 2019, 79). This

[42] Gürler, Melikoğlu, Osmanağaoğlu's (2011, 907) research asserts that there were 155 non-governmental animal rights groups in 53 cities of Turkey in November 2011. For the year of 2023, it can be said that the number of the groups has increased although the exact number is unknown.
[43] English translation is "The Federation for Animal Rights".
[44] English translation is "The Confederation for the Rights of Animals".

group has shared similar aims and campaigns with HAYTAP. Today it consists of twenty-four animal rights group in itself.

Today, the animal rights groups, animal lovers and animal volunteers continue to struggle for the rights of some animals. Besides the animal rights movement, since 2010s the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement has started to blossom. The AAAM struggles for the rights and freedom of all animals including the animals that animal rights movement does. Consequently the history of these separate but connected movements after the year 2010 will be discussed under the title of the anti-speciesist advocacy movement.

3.3.2. Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement in Turkey

Up until this title, I had only discussed the animal rights movement (ARM), which even though has the word “animal” in the title, struggles for only certain species of animals like cats and dogs living in streets and TARC and it thus can be better characterized as a speciesist movement. The main movement that this thesis has examined is the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement (AAAM) that has included the ARM and has not discriminated between species in the literal sense of the word "animal" in its name. Because the AAAM is a relatively young movement that still remains in the shadow of the animal rights movement, it is not given much consideration in literature, particularly in books and academic articles. For this precise reason, while I was writing the history of the AAAM, I have included examination of newspapers both in print and online, which can be referred to as primary sources. In order to better grasp the perspectives of the advocates that I interviewed, I have extensively covered the events that occurred during the time that this thesis was written and in the years that before it.

The exact emergence date of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement (AAAM) in Turkey is not certain. However, when the founding date of the groups and associations is considered, it can be said that it has emerged in 2010 onwards (Wolf, 2015, 8). Though today, in 2023, there are more than fifty anti-speciesist animal advocacy groups, while there were a few groups and associations in 2010s: Yeryüzüne Özgürlük Derneği (Freedom to Earth Association, YÖD), Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket (Abolitionist Vegan Movement, AVH), Türkiye Vegan Derneği

(Turkey Vegan Association, TVD). The history of the AAAM will be covered by following the founding stories and the activities of these groups.

Yeryüzüne Özgürlük Derneği (YÖD) was founded in the beginning of 2010 by the advocates who struggled against speciesism, anthropocentrism, racism and sexism. Although YÖD disbanded in 2018, I include it since it had been an active and effective group for eight years in the history of animal advocacy. In the website of YÖD, it is asserted that it sought for total liberation of humans and nonhuman animals. It challenged binary oppositions such as me-other, human-nature, human-animal, man-woman, adult-child, heterosexual-gay, normal-abnormal since every binary opposition was related to the others. Additionally, the association gave priority to struggle against speciesism since it was an unheard but highly practiced discrimination in the society (Biz Kimiz, [11.01.2023]; Manifesto, [11.01.2023]).

As an association that was identified as veganarchist -vegan anarchist-(Wolf, 2015, 58), YÖD organised panels in universities; published press releases; made press statements; and organised joint press statements on various issues. It also organised many campaigns against injustices and violence towards animals and humans. As an example, in 2015 and 2016 YÖD played an important role in the campaign against the construction of Kısırkaya Animal Rehabilitation Center that was against the law (Haspolat, 2019, 76, 79). YÖD claimed that by illegally imprisoning thousands of animals, Kısırkaya would turn into the modern equivalent of the Hayırsız Ada. As a result, YÖD referred to the Kısırkaya as "five-star animal death camp" and a project of genocide and involved in the planning of the majority of the activities against it (Özgüner, B., 2015).

Now called Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket (Abolitionist Vegan Movement, AVH) [45] was founded in 2013 by animal advocates under the name Diren Vegan (Resist Vegan). The group has based its activities on the abolitionist theory of animal rights of law professor Francione, and it has worked in this line. Beginning on July 18, 2013, AVH, or Diren Vegan as it was then known, began organising vegan forums in Gezi Park. It subsequently carried on with these events every Saturday (Gezi Park Vegan..., [10.01.2023]). In Kadıköy, Istanbul, on October 14, 2013, the first

[45] Further information is on the title 4.2.1.

day of the feast of sacrifice[46], Diren Vegan gave a press statement. They carried a banner that said, "Beware of the slaughtered animal, it is on your plate every day"[47] at the event. They said in the statement that while they celebrate the feast with everyone else, they oppose the killing of animals (Bugün Bayram, Vegan..., 2013).

In 2013, on November 1st World Vegan Day, Diren Vegan invited other vegan animal advocacy groups to Vegan March[48]. The groups Bağımsız Hayvan Özgürlüğü Aktivistleri[49], Vegan Özgürlük Hareketi[50], Vegan Sözlük[51], Vegan Yaşam Kulübü[52], Yeryüzü ve Hayvan Aktivistleri[53] participated in the Vegan March in Kadıköy, İstanbul. These groups provided a thorough explanation of what speciesism and veganism are in the press statement issued during the march. They also stressed how being a vegan has a healing effect on the environment and the climate (Mutfak ve Gardırop..., 2013).

A little over a year later, Diren Vegan released the article titled "The Feast of Sacrifice and Single Issue Campaigns"[54] (2014), in which the group also criticized its earlier activities. The group said in this article that using the feast of sacrifice to introduce veganism and invite people to veganism was insufficient and inappropriate. It claimed that despite its efforts to raise awareness of the daily slaughter of animals in the demonstration in 2013, the media wrote that the vegan people solely campaigned against the feast of sacrifice. Due to this circumstance, the group asserted that there is only one effective way to inform other people about veganism and this method is to "tell veganism directly". Despite criticizing its demonstration that was held in the feast of sacrifice in 2013, the group did not express any self criticism of the vegan march they had organised. However, it may be argued that the group also criticized itself for organizing the Vegan March, since it claims that the only and most effective action method is to "tell veganism directly".

[46] I used the words "the feast of sacrifice" to describe these religious days, since I -along with some other animal advocates- adopted the belief that "Yes to the feast, no to the slaughter of animals!", although it may not be suggested in anti-speciesist vocabulary (Eliaçık, 2014).
[47] The original sentence is "Kesilen hayvana iyi bak, o her gün tabağında".
[48] Turkish translation is "Vegan Yürüyüş".
[49] English translation is "The Independent Animal Liberation Activists".
[50] English translation is "Vegan Independence Movement".
[51] English translation is "Vegan Dictionary".
[52] English translation is "Vegan Life Club".
[53] English translation is "Earth and Animal Activists".
[54] The original title of the article is "Kurban Bayramı ve Tek Konulu Kampanyalar".

Another group Türkiye Vegan Derneği[55] (TVD) was first founded as a platform named Vejetaryen Kulübü[56] in 2006. It gained an official status on March 3rd 2012 and became an association named Türkiye Vejetaryenler Derneği[57]. The association changed its name to Türkiye Vegan Derneği in 2018 (Kurt, 2019, 11; Biz Kimiz, [10.01.2023]; Yıldırım, 2013). It is an animal rights group that advocates for equality and justice between species aiming to annihilate speciesism. It organises events like VegFest –vegan festival- and World Vegan Day -1 November- and aims to introduce veganism to people. TVD's campaigns are mostly centered on education. Through Vegan Academy, which was established by TVD, it offers free trainings of veganism in animal rights, environment and health in the universities across Turkey. TVD is full member and representative of Turkey of International Vegetarian Union and European Vegetarian Union (Biz Kimiz, [10.01.2023]). It is responsible of universal V-Label certificate that is given to vegetarian or vegan products in Turkey (Hakkımızda, [10.01.2023]).

Now that the three key groups, which have planted the movement's initial seed, have been discussed in detail, the history of the AAAM will be discussed in chronological order. On September 2013, *Veganism: Ahlakı, Siyaseti ve Mücadelesi*[58] was written by Zülal Kalkandelen and Can Başkent which was the first Turkish book about veganism and all animals' rights. In 2018, Zülal Kalkandelen's (2018) another book *Vegan Devrimi ve Hayvan Özgürlüğü*[59] was published.[60] For individuals who are interested in learning more about veganism and animal liberation movement, these two books have been addressed as reference sources.

On 1st January 2019, a fire broke out in a barn of horses in Big Island of the Princes' Islands in İstanbul. In the barn there were 12 horses who were used for horse-drawn carriages and all of them died. As an advocate, Zülal Kalkandelen criticised the speciesist language of the mainstream media which reported that the horses "perished" ignoring the dead horses as sentient beings and defined this event

[55] English translation is "Turkey Vegan Association".
[56] English translation is "Vegetarian Club".
[57] English translation is "Turkey Vegetarian Association".
[58] English translation of the book is "*Veganism: Its Ethics, Politics and Struggle"*
[59] English translation of the book is "*Vegan Revolution and Animal Liberation".*
[60] Further information about these two books is in Introduction Chapter.

as a disaster (Kalkandelen, 2019; Kara, 2019; Koç, 2019; Savcılık Büyükada'da.., 2019). The issue of banning the horse-drawn carriages, which has been discussed for years, came up again after this disaster. The Mayor of the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IBB) declared that the municipality is considering changing the system of horse-drawn carriages completely (Özgüner, B., 2019a).

On 15th May 2019, TBMM [61] Hayvan Hakları Araştırma Komisyonu [62] was established and the commission started to hear about the animal rights violations from NGO's on animal rights and from industry representatives, who were criticized by the advocates of the AAAM, as well. Faytona Binme Atlar Ölüyor İnisiyatifi [63] joined the commission and reiterated their previous statement of banning horse-drawn carriages to liberate the horses. While the liberation of horses was demanding in the parliament, on 16th June, animal advocates organised Turkey's biggest Cube of Truth [64] demonstration in İstanbul to reveal the exploitation of horses who were forced to draw carriages. When it came to 23rd June, Ekrem İmamoğlu was elected as the new mayor of IBB, who had signed the "I Promise" document prepared by Hayvan Hakları Yasama İzleme Delegasyonu[65] which included the banning of horse-drawn carriages on 27th March (Özgüner, B., 2019b).

On 28th August 2019, IBB and the municipality of Princes' Islands organised Adalar Ulaşım Çalıştayı (Princes' Islands Transportation Workshop) to solve the transportation problems since horse-drawn carriages were means of transportation of Princes' Islands. At the end of the workshop, it was determined to reduce the number of the horse-drawn carriages and to continue by improving them in order to sustain the nostalgia. However, the advocates countered that this workshop was held in hurry and the advocates and academicians, who were interested in the issue, were not informed before. 26 animal advocacy groups came together and released a statement in which they claimed to not agree with the workshop's outcomes. They demanded that the new mayor of IBB keep his word and entirely ban horse-drawn

[61] The Grand National Assembly of Turkey
[62] The Parliamentary Animal Rights Research Commission
[63] English translation is "Do not Ride Horse-Drawn Carriages Horses Die Initiative".
[64] Further information on the demonstration is on title 4.2.1.
[65] English translation is "Animal Rights Legislative Monitoring Delegation".

carriages rather than continuing to abuse the animals in the name of nostalgia (Dikin, 2019).

By December 2019, the horse-drawn carriages had not undergone any improvements and even the decision to reduce the number of horses given at the end of the workshop was not implemented. On 18th December 2019, the animal advocacy group WARF (Work Animals Rescue Foundation[66]) tweeted that 20 horses with rheumatoid arthritis and 60 horses with suspected disease would be put to death the following day in the evening in Princes' Islands (Büyükada'da Ruam Hastası..., 2019). 81 horses were murdered without waiting for the following day at midnight of 18th December.

Thereupon, on 19th December 2019, animal advocates gathered in front of IBB building and read the press statement that had been signed by 347 animal rights and environment groups. The advocates repeated their demand that the mayor of IBB keep his promise and ban the carriages. In order to press their demands, they set tents in front of IBB and started "Watch of Life"[67] (Hayvan hakkı savunucuları..., 2019). On 20th December, seven advocates were invited to meet the mayor of IBB, but the mayor said that 35 carriages and 200 horses will remain in a symbolic way in Princes' Islands. Thus, the advocates declared that they would keep "Watch of Life" until the carriages were totally removed (Karlı, 2020; Yaşam Nöbeti temsilcileri..., 2019). The area of watch of life was given a name in honour of animal advocate Burak Özgüner[68], who passed away in 2019 (Yaşam Nöbeti'nden İBB..., 2020). Some citizens voluntarily provided vegan food, drink and camping equipment to the advocates who demanded "zero horse-drawn carriages" not symbolic ones in severe winter weather. TVD also provided basic supplies like tents, heaters, sleeping bags (Yaşam Kazandı! 2020; Yaşam Nöbeti..., 2019). Despite rain, mud, wind, cold, the advocates continued the watch of life for 41 days until 28th January 2020, when IBB announced that the horse-drawn carriages will be banned. Thus the advocates succeeded and decided to end Watch of Life (Ferhat, 2020; Karlı, 2020).

[66] The original name of the group is "Yük Hayvanlarını Koruma ve Kurtarma Derneği".
[67] In Turkish "Yaşam Nöbeti"
[68] For further information about Burak Özgüner, see title 3.3.2.

Several months earlier, 4th August 2019 has been stated as an important day in the history of anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement. For the first time in Turkey, the Official Animal Rights March[69], which has been an international annual event since 2016 to unite vegan animal advocates and encourage them to speak up for animals, was held in Kadıköy, İstanbul. The March was organised by thirteen animal advocacy groups including Bağımsız Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu and Hayvan Hakları İzleme Komitesi (HAKİM)[70], which are some of the most active groups in Turkey. Hundreds of animal advocates –individually or as a group member- came from different cities of Turkey and marched behind the banner "Advocating Animal Rights is Veganism"[71] (Özgüner, B., 2018; Fıstık, 2019; Aydın, Çelebi, 2019).

On 9th July 2021, the new Animal Protection Law no 5199 was legitimised as a modified version of the prior law of 2004. With the new changes, it was said that the crimes against animals have started to be punished under the scope of the Turkish Penal Code (TCK), not under the Misdemeanour Law as it had been in law of 2004; meaning that animals have been no longer considered property and have been assessed as living beings instead. But these changes did not remedy the deficiencies of the existing law and the new law have had more contradictions in itself (Kıroğlu, 2021, 177; Özgüner, Ö., 2021).

On the day of 11th July 2021, a group of animal advocates organised a street demonstration in the capital city of Turkey, Ankara. The advocates from all over Turkey joined the demonstration to demand that the new law be vetoed, since there has not been much improvement in the law. The advocates and some lawyers, who are interested in animal rights, aroused several arguments against the law. They claimed that, in the new law, prison sentences do not serve as deterrence, contrary to misinformation in the media. Those people who broke the law cannot possibly be sent to prison, because jail times of less than three years are suspended. The advocates also asserted that rape of animal was defined by the law as "sexual intercourse with animals" and this crime should have been referred to as "rape an

[69] The name of the march was translated to Turkish as Resmi Hayvan Hakları Yürüyüşü.
[70] For further information about these groups, see the end of this title.
[71] The original sentence is "Hayvan Hakları Veganlıktır".

animal" so that those who broke it could face severe penalties (Pişkin, 2021; Hayvanları "Koruma" Kanunu..., 2021).

As another problem, in the new law it was stated that animals could not be sold at pet shops but they might be sold online or through catalogues or brochures as if they are objects. According to lawyers and advocates, this situation has contradicted the new law which has promoted animals from the property status to living beings (Pişkin, 2021; Kıroğlu, 2021, 177; Özgüner, Ö., 2021). With the law, animal advocates, NGOs, and bar associations no longer have had the right to register a complaint against the person who tortured, raped, burned, or murdered an animal, unless they witnessed the crime in person. The right to complain about these right violations against animals living in streets or in the TARCs was given only to the ministry. It was said that the law makes it easier to conceal evidence of crimes and will result in crimes going unpunished (Pişkin, 2021).

By the end of 2021, it seemed that the problems of law no 5199 had become worse. A 4-year-old child died in Gaziantep in December 2021 as a result of an attack by an owned pit-bull dog. Following this incident, the president of Turkey stated that animals –mostly dogs- living in streets should be culled and placed in TARCs that are the only ideal place for these animals. Upon hearing this statement, rumours started to spread that certain town had been culling and transporting dogs living in streets to TARCs. Lawyers and advocates argued that the culling was illegal and in violation of the 6th article of the law no 5199. Moreover, culling the animals living in street after an attack by an owned dog was unfair. They said that the notion of pit-bulls as a "prohibited breed" or "dangerous breed" should be abandoned and these animals are generally abused because of their powerful jaws by their owners. They recommended creating a law that makes the animals' owners accountable, not the animals themselves (Bavra, 2021; Kalkandelen, 2021a).

At the beginning of June 2022, Erman Paçalı, president of HAYKURDER[72], mentioned a website called "Havrita"[73]. In the opinion of Paçalı and animal

[72] The original title is "Hayvanları Koruma Kurtarma ve Yaşatma Derneği". The English name is "Turkey Animal Protection Association".
[73] A compound word formed by combining the words "hav (bark in Turkish)" and "harita (map in Turkish)".

advocates, The Stray Dog Problem Platform[74] developed this website and later the application known as Havrita. In the application, people marked the places where the dogs living in street were seen. After some time, the advocates claimed that several of these dogs, whose whereabouts were marked, had vanished or been poisoned. Only one day after the release of this Havrita application, not only the animals but also the animal caregivers were targeted. Three animal lovers from the same family, who were caring for and feeding dogs living in the street on June 10, 2022, were shot and murdered by their neighbours (Özen, 2022).

On June 22, 44 animal advocacy groups released a statement in which they claimed that Havrita was targeting both animal lovers and dogs living in street. In this claim, Twitter says that Havrita's words, which were posted on Twitter, were protected as free speech. However, they said that the practice of Havrita has just recently caused numerous dogs to be stabbed, poisoned, shot, and beaten to death. In this statement, they said that Havrita was organized via Twitter and that Twitter saw Havrita's targeting statements as freedom of speech. But they said that the practice of Havrita has just recently caused numerous dogs to be stabbed, poisoned, shot, and beaten to death. They reminded that in addition to attacks on dogs, an animal lover in Ankara was beaten up; an animal lover in Antalya suffered a brain haemorrhage as a result of the attack; and 3 people from the same family were shot and murdered in the middle of the street in İzmir. They urged the local law authorities to take the required measures, and the general public to speak put on behalf of the dogs who had been cruelly murdered and the animal lovers who had been assaulted and murdered for feeding the dogs.

On August 22, 2022, the Havrita application's collective Twitter discussions were made public by unknown people. These revelations were brought by Zülal Kalkandelen (2022) into her newspaper column. She claimed that although the public just recently became aware of the Havrita app, this organisation has really been around for two years. She also suggested that the major goal of the organization was to try to remove Article 6 of Law no 5199. The Article 6 has guaranteed that animals in need are taken to the TARCs, where they must get medical care, neutering and vaccinations, and returned to the place where they were

[74] The original name is "Başıboş Köpek Sorunu Platformu".

taken from. It has been the key obstacle to cull animals from streets in which they live and locking them in TARCs. According to Kalkandelen, despite the efforts of several organizations –including the one that developed Havrita- to get this Article 6 removed, they were unable to do so due to the opposition of animal advocates.

The 21 Bar Associations opposed the culling of animals living in streets in a statement they released on 21st November 2022. They offered some suggestions in this statement for how municipalities could uphold animals' right to life. The need to collaborate with animal lovers, outlaw the production and sale of animals, and implement animal rights education in schools were among the solutions they suggested (Sokak hayvanlarının toplatılması..., 2022).

On 24th November 2022, just 3 days after the bar associations' statement, the news of 2 sequential bad incidents came from the two TARCs. About the first incident, animal advocates alleged that Ankara Mamak TARC's personnel were illegally collecting and that two dogs were killed in the process. Additionally, the staff members attacked an animal lover who attempted to stop them as they took the bleeding dogs into the car. Following this incident, animal advocates stood out in front of the Ankara Mamak TARC and requested that the dogs be given to them (Animal lovers were "beaten to death"..., 2022).

Again on 24th November, videos of personnel of TARC of Konya Municipality beating dogs over the head with a shovel to death were posted on social media. Animal advocates then called for people to come to the front of the center to react. Animal advocates and lawyers who are members of the bar organizations' animal rights centers gathered in front of the center. They claimed that the center in Konya had not accepted volunteers or visitors for the last four years and described all shelters in Turkey as "death camps" (Konya'da İşkenceyle Öldürülen..., 2022).

On January 2, 2023, the two TARC personnel who beat the dogs over the head with a shovel went on trial and asked for prison sentences of up to 6 years in accordance with the Animal Protection Law no 5199. Both offenders were released, according the court's decision. The second hearing was scheduled on January 20, 2023 (Konya'da işkenceyle öldürülen..., 2023). On 9th January 2023, the 6th article of Law No. 5199, which stipulates that neutered and treated animals be returned to the

location from which they were taken, was the subject of a statement by Minister of Agriculture and Forestry Vahit Kirişçi. Kirişçi claimed that, if required, the law might be changed to restrict the return of these animals to their original location from which they were taken (Bakan Kirişci: Kısırlaştırılmış..., 2023).

In response to this statement, Hülya Yalçın of Hayvanlara Adalet Derneği (Justice for Animals Association, HAD) stated that the statement of the Minister meant that Article 6, which animal rights activists have been working to defend and maintain for years, is attempting to be repealed. According to Yalçın, it is now mandatory for this purpose to register companion animals by chipping them. Since the animals - primarily dogs- who were not chipped and were therefore living in streets would be taken to TARCs to be killed by the municipality and the ministry. Advocates were aware, according to Yalçın, based on their prior experiences, that if the 6th article were repealed, millions of animals would be culled, imprisoned in TARCs, and put to death. Thus she emphasized that the animal advocacy movement should oppose the mandatory chip application and defend Article 6 (‘6. Madde Kaldırılırsa..., 2023).

January 15th January 2023, animal advocates from all across Turkey gathered in Ankara for the "Great Ankara Meeting" to denounce the culling of animals living in streets and the imprisonment of them to TARCs, which were served as “death camps” for them. By waving the poster "We come with the heart, not the shovel", the animal advocates brought to mind the dog that was beaten to death in Konya by TARC personnel (Hayvanseverler sokak hayvanları..., 2023).

In a press statement, Animal advocates objected the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry Kirişçi's claim that animals living in streets would eventually transferred to forests. The advocates also underlined their demands, which included the following: an immediate end to municipalities' cruel and illegal collections; assurance that each municipality establishes its own TARC within its borders; extension of the registration and neutralisation deadlines for the so-called prohibited breeds; formulation of a new regulation through collaboration between lawmakers, animal advocates and veterinary doctors (Hayvanseverlerden eylem: "Nereye..., 2023).

On 20th January 2023, the second court in the lawsuit brought against two personnel of Konya Municipality's TARC took place. The two offenders were each given a prison sentence of one year and six months. However, due to the offenders' good behaviour, the sentence was lowered to one year and three months, and the announcement of the sentence was delayed (Büyüksamancı, 2023). Animal rights activists objected to this decision in front of the courtroom. Speaking on behalf of the advocates, a lawyer stated that there was a condition of impunity considering the existing law and this sentence would not ease the public's conscience (Köpeğin kürekle öldürülmesi..., 2023). The AAAM continues to struggle to strengthen law no 5199 and preserve article 6 of the law.

In the time period that this research is conducted, there have been more than fifty animal advocacy groups of vegan animal advocates in Turkey except the university-based groups.[75] I have formed the list based on a page in Wikipedia (Türkiye'deki Vegan Hayvan..., [15.11.2022]) which I have started to create three years ago foreseeing this thesis and I searched social media accounts of the groups that was not included in the Wikipedia page. Through the perspectives of the advocates that I interviewed and my research of their social media accounts, the most active animal advocacy groups are Hayvan Hakları İzleme Komitesi (Animal Rights Monitoring Committee, HAKİM), Bağımsız Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu (Independent Animal Rights Group, BHHT), Burak Özgüner Hayvan Hakları Çalışma Merkezi (Burak Özgüner Animal Rights Study Center, BURHAK), Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket (AVH), Vegan Derneği Türkiye (TVD). In the next

[75] Other anti-speciesist animal advocacy groups are stated alphabetically: Adana Vegan İn., Afalina Hayvan Hakları, Animal-Climate-Health Save Türkiye, Antalya Vegan İn., Antalya Vegan Topluluğu, Aydın Vegan İn., Burdur Vegan İn., Bursa Vegan İn., Çanakkale Vegan İn., Deneye Hayır Derneği, Denizli Vegan Aktivizm Topluluğu, Denizli Vegan İn., Didim Vegan İn., Eskişehir Vegan İn., Gaziantep Vegan İn., Giresunlu Veganlar, Hatay Vegan Topluluğu, Hayvan Hakları Meclisi, Hayvan Hakları Yasama İzleme Delegasyonu, Hayvan Özgürlüğü İn., Hayvan Özgürlüğü Kolektifi, Hayvan Özgürlüğü Komitesi, Hayvanlara Adalet Derneği (HAD), Hayvanlarla Dayanışma İn.(HAYDİ), İzmit Vegan, Kayseri Vegan Topluluğu, Kocaeli Vegan İn., Mersin Vegan İn., Ordu Vegan İn., Samsun Vegan Topluluğu, Tekirdağ Vegan ve Vejetaryen, Trabzon Vegan Topluluğu, Van Vegan Vejetaryen İn., Vegan Beylikdüzü, Vegan Stant Eskişehir, Veganizm Özgürlüktür, VegAnkara, Yaşamdan Yana Ol Derneği, Zonguldak Karaelmas Vegan Topluluğu. There is only one high school-based vegan group in Turkey: Galatasaray Lisesi Vegan Topluluk. The university-based anti-speciesist animal advocacy groups are: Ankara Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, Bilkent Vegan Topluluğu, Boğaziçi Ün. Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu (BUHAY), Dokuz Eylül Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, Ege Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, Galatasaray Ün. Vegan Topluluk, İstanbul Teknik Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, İstanbul Teknik Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, İzmir Ekonomi Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, İzmir Ekonomi Ün. Yaşam Kolektif, İzmir Katip Çelebi Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, Koç Ün. Vegan Topluluğu, MEF Ün. Vegan Kulüp, Orta Doğu Teknik Ün. Vegan, Yıldız Teknik Ün. Vegan ve Vejetaryen Topluluğu, Yunuslara Özgürlük Platformu (YÖP).

paragraphs, I will provide brief information on these groups that I did not previously mentioned.

Hayvan Hakları İzleme Komitesi (Animal Rights Monitoring Committee, HAKİM) was founded under the leadership of Burak Özgüner and Fatma Biltekin in 2014. HAKİM has had many goals. Hakim has been conducting legal struggle to make sure Law no 5199 operates as intended and to transform it into a law that could oppose speciesism. The group seeks to expand the animal rights, which have been reduced to those of cats and dogs, to all animals regardless of their species by challenging the way society and state officials see this issue. Contrary to what society and the official authorities claim, it tries to demonstrate that rights violations are deliberate, systematic, and intentional. HAKİM has kept track of and reported on all of these abuses of all animals' rights using statistical data since it was founded (HAKİM ile çalışmalarını..., [12.01.2023]).

Burak Özgüner Hayvan Hakları Çalışma Merkezi (Burak Özgüner Animal Rights Study Center, BURHAK) was founded by Özgüner's family and fellow advocates to offer assistance, collaboration and a place for activities and events of animal advocates and of animal advocacy groups. Burak Özgüner was a right advocate primarily of animal rights who passed away on 9th November 2019. BURHAK was founded a year later of Özgüner's passing away on 9th November 2020. Özgüner made significant contributions to animal advocacy movement in Turkey. Numerous groups were founded by Özgüner, who was also a member of them. Some of them are: Bahçeköy Hayvansever Çocuklar Derneği[76], Freedom to Earth Association, HAKİM, Hayvan Hakları Yasama İzleme Delegasyonu[77], Anti Vivisection Association, Hayvan Hakları ve Etiği Derneği[78] (Güven, 2019; Burak Özgüner Hayvan..., [12.01.2023]). In 2021, BURHAK has started to give scholarships to university students who advocate for rights, particularly in the area of animal rights (2023 Burak Özgüner..., 2022). In June 2022, BURHAK has begun creating a library at BURHAK study center and began asking for donations of books (Burak Özgüner Hayvan..., 2022).

[76] English translation is "Bahçeköy Animal-lover Children Association".
[77] English translation is "Animal Rights Legislative Monitoring Delegation".
[78] English translation is "Animal Rights and Ethics Association".

Bağımsız Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu (Independent Animal Rights Group, BHHT) was founded in May 2017 in Istanbul by three vegan animal advocates –journalist Zülal Kalkandelen, Tarkan Apari, owner of Turkey's first vegan store[79], and Canan Apari. The little group of three people steadily developed. As a result of the media's failure to portray the cruelty and abuse that speciesism causes to animals, BHHT has staged Turkey's first Cube of Truth demonstration to produce their own media. Moreover, BHHT has raised money for the animals in Angels Farm Sanctuary[80] in Izmir by selling second-hand goods that the group members had brought from their homes (Özgüner, B., 2018).

According to newspaper articles about the movement's activities over the last three years, it is seen that there were only a few street demonstrations and press statements held by advocates and advocacy groups. Hence, it can be said that there has been a decline in the movement's street demonstrations and press statements since 2019. The COVID-19 pandemic could be seen as one of many possible causes for this decline. Although there have been fewer street demonstrations, it can be said that individual advocacy has continued, particularly on social media. Due to the social media accounts of the advocacy groups, it can be seen that many in-person and online workshops and discussions are planned, and advocates who are professionals in their fields are invited to speak at these events. The history of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in Turkey, which I have examined in the light of primarily newspaper articles from 2010 to the beginning of 2023, will continue to be examined from the critical perspectives of the advocates, whom I interviewed, in chapter 4 of an ethnographic case study.

[79] Vegan Dükkan opened as a store in 2004 under the name Ecolife that sold vegetarian goods. In 2010, it became 100% vegan and changed its name into Vegan Dükkan (Vegan Shop) (Hakkımızda, [11.01.2023]).

[80] For further information about the Turkey's first and biggest animal sanctuary, visit the website: https://angelsfarmsanctuaryturkey.com/#. [04.02.2023].

4. AN ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY ON ANTI-SPECIESIST ANIMAL ADVOCATES IN TURKEY

The theories that served as the foundation of animal advocacy and the animal advocacy movement in the world and in Turkey were examined prior to this chapter. Because I have thought that examining the movement through theoretical and historical perspectives was essential for understanding this chapter, which provides space to opinions held by animal advocates. I have considered that their examination could also illuminate the way to understand how theories and historical events in the movement have affected the advocates' thoughts and emotions.

I have broken the chapter up into different themes to make it easier to examine the animal advocacy movement. In order to avoid getting lost in the data when examining the movement in light of the thoughts and emotions held by animal advocates, I have thought that the themes and sub-themes would guide the reader while reading. Four major themes were developed under Chapter 4 in the advocates' perspectives. Each theme has also been divided into several smaller sub-themes. I have examined how people become animal advocates in the first theme. I have taken a broad examination at the AAAM's current situation under the second theme. In the third theme, I have focused on the movement's effective and successful aspects. I have examined the movement's problems and weaknesses in the fourth theme. Since this chapter of the thesis has been the most original and significant part, and has raised numerous arguments, I have decided to write a separate part to evaluate the narratives thinking that I should examine this chapter in and of itself. In the last part of this chapter, under the title self-reflexivity, I have tried to provide my personal perspective as the researcher who conducted this research.

Before starting to examine the movement in advocates' perspective, I will give brief information about the observations and detailed information about the advocates who are the interviewees of this ethnographic case study. Since I have been an active participant of the animal advocacy in Turkey for 4 years, I have been familiar with many advocates and advocacy methods that were held by advocates individually or in groups. I continued to be an animal advocate as I have

done for 4 years attended almost all activities related to animal advocacy, but this time I have started to take notes, to observe more critically and meet fresh advocates. There was only one advocacy group that I had never contacted before: The Abolitionist Vegan Movement (AVH). Before going to their picnics which is one of the main advocacy methods of them, I sent them a message on social media to inform them and they told me that I would be welcomed. I attended the picnics, talked to other advocates or vegans and took notes on my journal. Besides their picnics, I have observed them in other activities such as vegan festival. I took notes not only during participant observations, but before and after them, too. Sometimes I noted down my opinions about an observation in two or three days. I always wrote the date and time.

I interviewed with twelve adult animal advocates who identify themselves as a part of the animal advocacy movement in Turkey. Five interviewees remain anonymous, seven interviewees preferred to be in this research with their real names. To protect the anonymous interviewees' anonymity, the demographic information of the interviewees, such as gender, age, educational background, profession, place of residence, time as an animal advocate, group participation, of interviewees will not be shared by person. Four of the interviewees stated themselves as male, seven of them stated as female and one of them stated as non-binary. The ages are from 25 to 45. Two of the interviewees are university students, one is university drop out, one is a college graduate, one is a graduate student, two have bachelor's degrees, three have master's degrees, and two are PhD. The professions of them are: two teachers, a dramaturgist, a new-collar, a lawyer, a data analyst and documentary-producer, a journalist, a graphics designer, two academicians, a former teacher who is now a vegan lahmacun-maker[81], a worker in civil society organization. Seven interviewees live in İstanbul, five live in other cities of Turkey. The time as an animal advocate ranges between 1 year and 15 years. Four of twelve interviewees are not part of an animal advocacy group and identify themselves as "individual advocates" now. Two of these individual advocates had been in animal rights groups before but then left because of problems. Eight of the interviewees have actively and currently engaged in one animal rights group. Besides engaging actively, some interviewees have been supporting some groups without being an

[81]Lahmacun is very thin Turkish pizza covered with seasoned minced animal flesh and onions.

active participant of them. And some of them had been a participant in a group some years ago and then left it. The interviewees and groups that they have currently engaged are: two in Hayvan Hakları İzleme Merkezi (HAKİM)[82], one in Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket (AVH)[83], one in Yunuslara Özgürlük Platformu (YÖP)[84], one in Hayvan Özgürlüğü Kolektifi (HÖK)[85], one in Deneye Hayır[86], two in Burak Özgüner Hayvan Hakları Çalışma Merkezi (BURHAK)[87].

Since I am a part of anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement in Turkey, I had known more than half of the interviewees before the interviews. Four of them have been my friend and accepted to take part in my research. I have been acquainted with four of the interviewees thanks to animal advocacy activities, social media groups and accounts, and animal advocacy Whatsapp groups, but never met in person previously. I contacted them via Whatsapp messages. One of them is one of the two authors of a book on animal rights written in Turkish and accepted to take part after my message via social media. Although I have been a part of animal advocacy, there were some groups that I had never contacted directly. Therefore, I started to join their activities to observe them and I reached one interviewee there. After recruiting ten interviewees, at the end of their first interviews two of my interviewees recommended two other people. Although initially I had planned to interview with ten people, I decided to include these two people. Because one of them has been a participant of a different group that I wanted to include and the other one has had a significant profession for animal advocacy. Hence I contacted the recommended people via social media messages and they accepted my demand. Unfortunately two other people whom I wished to interview had some issues in their personal lives; eventually they could not take part in the interviews of this research.

I purposed to interview with people who look at animal advocacy from different aspects. Therefore I recruited interviewees having various demographic information. Animal advocacy in Turkey has advocates of various ages, professions

[82]English translation is “Animal Rights Monitoring Committee”.
[83]English translation is “Abolitionist Vegan Movement”.
[84]English translation is “Freedom for Dolphins Platform”.
[85]English translation is “Animal Liberation Collective”.
[86]English translation is “Anti Vivisection Association”.
[87]English translation is “Burak Özgüner Animal Rights Study Center”. For further information about Burak Özgüner and BURHAK, see title 3.3.2.

and educational background, so I did not have to decide on these aspects. But the diversity about gender was important since I have observed that the majority of the animal advocates are female. Besides my observation, Gaarder (2011, 55) states that women "have been at the forefront of animal rights activism in the United States and Great Britain since the 1800s, and current studies show that women constitute 68-80 percent of the animal rights movement". The survey of The Vegan Society ([27.10.2022]) shows that the number of female vegans (63%) was almost twice of male vegans (37%) in 2016 in Britain, where people go vegan mostly on ethical issues concerning animals. Unfortunately there has been no study on gender ratio of animal advocates of vegans in Turkey. But in the light of these studies and the impression I acquired from my observations of four years, I interviewed with four males in total twelve interviewees.

While recruiting interviewees, I considered some details except for demographic information. For example although I wanted to interview with people younger than 25 since the animal advocates are getting younger and younger in last years, I did not interview any because of the fact that these advocates were too new in animal advocacy to be able to criticize it. But at the same time, I had interviewed with two people who are in animal advocacy only for one and a half year. Since they knew many animal advocates and groups and they were really active in the movement, their point of view was important for this research. One of them is a lawyer who tries to attend all the courts related to animal advocacy. The other one is the director of a documentary on animal advocacy in Turkey and he had chance to interview with many animal advocates whom I could not interview.

4.1. On the Way of Being An Animal Advocate

All advocates have experienced different and unlike emotional or rational paths on the way of being an anti-speciesist animal advocate. Since each animal advocate has unique and dissimilar narrative of their process with their personal history of childhood and youth related to animals and animal advocacy, I paid careful attention to find patterns and create themes and subthemes by not disturbing the sequence of events of their personal narratives (Riessman, 2008, 110). Hence I applied thematic narrative analysis by keeping the "story" intact (Riessman, 2008, 111). I did not fracture their narratives into small codes and I explored the narrative

of each interviewee separately (Riessman, 2008, 75, 76). I have determined the themes and subthemes by considering the interviewees' starting point to be an anti-speciesist animal advocate.

On the way of being a part of Anti-Speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement (AAAM) in Turkey, ten of my interviewees stated being vegan as a milestone and the first step. Their process will be explored in the theme of "starting with going vegan". Seven of ten advocates went vegan after being a vegetarian for a period of time. Thus that theme will have two subthemes: (1) going directly vegan, (2) going vegan after being vegetarian. Only two advocates stated that they had been an animal advocate before going vegan. One of them clearly stated that her animal advocacy did not start with her going vegan and she had been an animal advocate years ago since she had been a volunteer in TARCs. Thus the processes of these two interviewees will be explored in the theme of "starting with taking care of animals who live in streets and TARC".

In each theme and subtheme I will start exploring their relationships with animals in their childhood or youth before being vegan or vegetarian and animal advocate. Then I will continue exploring their unique process of going directly vegan or their process of going vegan after being vegetarian and finally being an animal advocate.

4.1.1. Starting with Going Vegan

On the way of going vegan, three AA went vegan directly and seven AA went vegan after being a vegetarian for a short or long period of time. Therefore I will explore their narrations in two subthemes: (1) going directly vegan, (2) going vegan after being vegetarian.

4.1.1.1. Going Directly Vegan

Three of ten animal advocates went directly vegan and they stated that they became an animal advocate after going vegan. Hazar is an animal advocate, who went directly vegan at the age of 27 in March, 2012. He stated that he went vegan overnight. To understand his process better, I asked him his relationship with

animals when he was a child. He said that he had a quite bad relationship with animals and he had a father who was a hunter:

> "So many things were normalised. You feel animal love sometimes when you are a child but it is different. You are not able to realise it. You love a living animal when you see it, but you approach differently when you see the dead body. This is what is normalised simply (Hazar, interview, October 2022)."[i]

Then I asked him about his relationship with the animals who live in streets free and he said that he was loving them with a laugh. To grasp the meaning of the laugh, I said "So you say the ones who we love and the ones who we eat?" and he affirmed what I said but without laughing this time. He said that three years before going vegan he had been following some social media accounts of people or groups liberating animals from labs without knowing that the activists were vegan at that time. He mentioned that he missed the point about animals until he went vegan:

> "Besides that while questioning family and other relationships in life, I had never seen the missing part. Animals is the case. Whether it was about violence or sex discrimination, while I was focusing on these I had neglected animals. In fact it had been a missing part. You realise it years later. And then everything settles (Hazar, interview, October 2022)."[ii]

Here I asked how he went vegan and he said that he went vegan overnight just after he saw graphic images on animal abuse after coming across a vegan activist via his video on Youtube:

> "There is a ... Actually I do not want to mention his name, he is very... was a white fascist person. It was a video of Gary Yourofsky, called *The Best Speech You Will Ever Hear*[88]. There are slaughterhouse images there. I watched it, and then I searched real slaughterhouse images. When you watch any documentary or presentation, there would be marketing, there would be exaggeration. On my own, I watched from fish markets of Japan to slaughterhouses. Then everything settled (Hazar, interview, October 2022)"[iii]

Hazar emphasised that the graphic images affected even him as the son of a hunter father. He questioned that because there were too many normalised things in his life but yet the images made him think. He thought that if seeing images of blood, flesh and a dying animal's flutter made him react negatively to the graphic images, it

[88]The video is still available with same title on Youtube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8ocqcy0qeka [15.11.2022].

cannot be natural although it had been accepted natural by society. At the end he went vegan as the son of a hunter.

Oğuzhan is another animal advocate who went directly vegan at the age of 31 in November, 2014. He said that as a child he loved feeding animals like the children of many of the middle-class families in Turkey. As a child he and his family had chicks and budgies at home. They did not force the budgies to stand in cages, they let them fly over the house, they slept together, they cared and loved them a lot. But at the end the chicks and budgies were just like objects which were bought. He and his family were seeing animals as instruments for his joy or his toys. His relationship with animals changed totally after he went vegan.

His process of going vegan is different from that of Hazar's. He did not go vegan overnight, it took him some time to go vegan. When he was in France for his PhD, an e-mail from his elder-brother made him question his perception of ethics:

> "My elder-brother wrote me that 'Using animals is not ethical actually. One has to go vegan.' When I heard the word ethical, at one moment I thought how I could have done ethically wrong things about animals for years. But my first reaction was a classic one, 'OK you speak good but veganism is too much'. [...] And then, maybe you also have come across, there is a video with also Turkish subtitles focused on industrial animal use. It is like one of the best videos you will ever watch. [...] I watched that video[89]. Then I said that let me try my luck and write to that person. I wrote him, to the maker of the video, James Wildman. I sent an e-mail. In less than one day, he wrote me back in many pages. I had written him that I could not stop eating yoghurt, I liked it so much. [...] OK I care for animals but how I will stay healthy. He told me in detail with links. He sent me even recipes of alternatives for yoghurt. I wrote him that 'I was surprised, thank you very much. I did not expect such a detailed e-mail. I guess I will step in the path of going vegan.' That's how my adventure started (Oğuzhan, interview, October 2022)."[iv]

Another animal advocate who went directly vegan is Onur. Onur went vegan at the age of 35 at the beginning of 2007. When I asked his relationship with animals, he said that for a short time he used to be cruel to cats as it is typical to a specific age of childhood. He thought that maybe it was the curse of these cats that made him an animal advocate. Because now he feels that he has a responsibility to advocate

[89] The video is still available on Youtube. The title is "*Sizden Bir Sır Gibi Saklanan Gerçekler*": https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kb7bpva0ioo [15.11.2022].

animals' rights. He used to live with a dog and her mother used to care for the cats living in streets when he was a child. So he was in interaction with animals and loved them. He emphasised that he was in interaction with only one or two species of animals although the neighbours and he thought that they loved all animals. In the feast of sacrifice, his family used to perform the act of killing an animal not religiously but as a result of tradition. After going vegan and thinking on animals, his relationship with animals changed. The sharp division of animals in regards to their species faded away. As an example, now he disputes about killing flies and mosquitoes with his mother. He did not go vegan overnight like Hazar or in a short time like Oğuzhan. His journey of going vegan lasted almost ten years. He summarised his up-and-down journey as follows:

> "There was a person on social media. We were writing to each other. S/he posted something about the feast of sacrifice, like 'sacrifice is murder'. [...] It was at the beginning of 2010. [...] Then an unconscious testing period came. I was like that... you are on fire and think that there is something nonsense here. Look, there are some people who manage to do it, but you do not know how to do it. [...] So it was like a wave came in 2011, 2012, 2013 and then went away. In 2016, I was about to go on a bike tour with a friend. There were vegan versions of food that you cook in nylon bag in ten minutes. They used to be used in army. [...] I could not do it. [...] Then in 2017, you know there was *Vegan Rehber* [vegan guide][90]. Now [it's] veganlik.org. There was a thing for 21 days. Each Monday it sends you an e-mail. One is about food. It was not [a good] resource if you compare it to the current ones. It gives you general information. Another week, here comes information about slaughterhouses. Another week, about eggs... Then again food, menu... I saw it was happening (Onur, interview, October 2022)."[v]

In the meantime, he was also reading some books, like Zülal Kalkandelen and Can Başkent's dialogue and then felt that he laid the foundation of going vegan.

As it is seen, the advocates' reasons, motivations and process of going vegan are different from each other. Hazar went vegan overnight after he searched for real graphic images of slaughterhouses after watching a video on animal abuse. The images helped him question and challenge what is called natural. Onur and Oğuzhan did not see graphic images. They questioned the speciesist world while they were communicating with the vegan people and after a period of rational

[90] The website is https://veganlik.org/ [15.11.2022].

thinking they ended up deciding that going vegan is the unique ethical path for them.

4.1.1.2.Going Vegan after Being Vegetarian

Seven of ten animal advocates went vegan after being a vegetarian for a period of time. Their reasons, motivations and process of being firstly vegetarian then vegan are various. Moreover the period spent as a vegetarian is also various ranging from two months to two years. By reading the interview transcripts over and over, I confirmed that the majority of my interviewees became vegetarian before going vegan.Then I realised that their process was so tangled that each advocate had at least two main and many overlapping minor reasons to become vegetarian.

To analyse and discover every single reason, I started labelling each reason as a code, so I ended up with almost twenty sub-codes. These sub-codes were like the minor reasons. Then I grouped these sub-codes under four codes. While I was examining their process of being vegetarian under the light of the categories, three categories were developed: (1) taking care of animals living at their home or in streets, (2) ethical and/or rational thinking with the help of new information about animals and animal abuse, (3) being an advocate in other right struggles. I will explore the narrations of advocates taking the most important reason into consideration, because none of them had a single clear reason but rather tangled reasons. By doing this, I aim to explicitly demonstrate their process of being firstly vegetarian and later going vegan. According to their narratives all advocates could not help being vegetarian sooner or later, after finding out brand-new information about animals, animal abuse and animal rights.

Two advocates said that they had started thinking about animals' rights after meeting and taking care of one or more animals at home or in streets. As one of them, Atakan went vegan when he was 21 years old and he had been a vegetarian for one year. He also said that it could be reasonable to assume that he has been a vegetarian since he was a high school student at the age of 16, because he rarely used to eat animal flesh. As a child he used to feel sorry for the sheep who were bought to be killed for the feast of sacrifice. Since the sheep were bought days before the feast, he used to spend time with them. But he tried not to bond any

emotional relationship and never watched the moment that the sheep were killed. While he was rejecting to witness, his family members were looking forward to see their boy as a "man" who could watch the killing scene of animal. After he said this sentence, I asked "So, when did you become a man and watch it?" He answered after a laugh "I never watched it, so I am a half man (Atakan, interview, October 2022)." and challenged the gender roles.

In the university he took a course named Animal Ethics that is taught by a vegan academician. He stopped eating animal flesh in the beginning of the course and started to think about veganism. At the same time, he started to take care of animals in streets and he started to live with a cat. He emphasised that his relationship with the cats and dogs affected and changed his relationship with other animals. When he looked at a cat, he realised that he was not supposed to exploit a calf, either. While these thoughts were in his mind, one morning he realised that he had not eaten cheese for a long time. After he reviewed his last months, he understood that he had already gone vegan thanks to mostly his relationship with cats and dogs and the course.

Throughout the Animal Ethics course, he desired and planned to shoot a documentary film about the animal advocacy movement in Turkey. At the end of the course, he started to put his plan into practice. He met many animal advocates; he witnessed and listened to their stories while shooting the documentary. The advocates and their efforts influenced him and he thought that he could and should do what these advocates do for the animals.

Three of the advocates that I interviewed stated that they became vegetarian at the end of a rational thinking period. Cansu is one of them. She went vegan at the age of 32 in 2014 after a period of time as being a vegetarian. She told that when she was a child, her father had rescued a poor-cared dog while working on a ship in India and took the dog with him to Turkey. The dog was like Cansu's annoying little brother so they were constantly fighting, but it was because of Cansu. But she did not start to worry about other animals who were living in streets until 2010, the year she came back to Turkey from Germany where she studied at university. She summarised becoming an animal advocate saying:

> "I was thinking 'Ooo, do the animals in street need us?'. [..] I did not decide to be [an advocate]. It was like a natural transition. Like 'Yes, they need us. Ooh, no one speaks up this issue! Yes, there are some people and I should help them.' and then it can be called a natural process that I found myself in it (Cansu, interview, October 2022)."[vi]

In 2010, she became an "advocate of cat and dog rights" or animal-lover, not an animal advocate. With her friend they founded "BirOne" as an organisation to find homes for cats and dogs. After she went vegan, the organisation evolved a vegan organisation. But since the organisation is not active now and the domain of the website is owned by someone else, there is no information about it online as Cansu expressed.

About being vegan, she said that she had already noticed something about animal abuse before going vegan or even as a vegetarian. She had watched *Earthlings* when it was first presented. And she had thought that:

> "Everyone who eat animals or use or exploit them somehow must watch these video footages. Because I was thinking that if you are doing it, you need to be able to watch it. But my thinking was not emotional. And I was watching, I mean, footages of killing. And because I was eating animals, too. It was kind of a justification way like, you see, 'I manage to watch in the end.' Then in the struggle of cat and dog [rights], I came to a point that I could not deny that they [cows, fish] are not different [from cats and dogs] as for the matter of sensitivity (Cansu, interview, October 2022)."[vii]

Identifying herself as an "animal liberation activist" now, she stated that before going vegan she was an "advocate for the rights of cats and dogs" or in other words "an 'animal-chooser' like Zülal [Kalkandelen] was naming." Her journey through going vegan and being an animal advocate for all animals is as follows:

> "Meeting with cows affected me also, I mean [meeting] face-to-face. Because it was an annoying situation for me. Because I saw how the cows wanted to play. I went to a dairy farm by coincidence, to a small dairy farm in Tekirdağ. There was a birth there and I saw them all. I mean, I saw the birth, I saw the post-partum, I saw the baby standing up and their [mother and baby cow's] separation. I saw the horror in the eyes of the baby. I took the photos of the whole process, the horror moment has a photo. Then I continued to visit the baby. When they were few-days or a-week old [I saw] them wanting to play with me, being happy and jumping with a wagging tail whenever they saw me. They put them in a small cabin, you know there was no space, they crashed around. It was too annoying. And it was my transition to veganism. I was a vegetarian until then (Cansu, interview, October 2022)."[viii]

Two advocates stated that they had been an advocate in other struggles for rights before being vegetarian. As one of them, Aycan[91] became vegetarian, went vegan and finally became an animal advocate and an advocate in other right struggles. She became vegetarian at the age of 23 in 2010, after two years as a vegetarian she went vegan at the age of 25 in 2012. When I asked her relationship with animals as a child, she stated that she was very lucky:

> "My mother was a huge animal-lover, actually she was an animal rights advocate for her time. For example she did not use to ride horse-ridden carriages. People used to ride camels and she did not let us ride them. Always we had an animal at our home. So my relationship with animals was so good. Like holding an animal to kiss, petting creepy crawly, catching a frog to kiss, etc. But it was a natural relationship just at the level of love, not their rights. Like they were children and I was a child, too (Aycan, interview, October 2022)."[ix]

After finding out her intimate relationship with animals as a child, I asked her why she did not go vegan 15 years ago. She said that she had been a person who emulated to manhood since her childhood. As a child she was thinking that women were talking about "small issues" like cooking and child care, while men were talking about "big issues" like politics. She wanted not to be like "the women" so she happily boasted of doing "manly things" such as eating animal flesh and watching the killing of an animal on the feast of sacrifice. She said that "In fact facing with gender, gender inequality and speciesism progressed in parallel for me. [...] So it was not easy for her to go vegan. I wish she [Aycan, 15 years ago] had gone so (Aycan, interview, October 2022)."[x]

Aycan said that her relationship with animals had dramatically changed after going vegan. She emphasised that she was learning a new thing every other day. Just after she said this, she also said "In the simplest term, formerly maybe I was harshly petting the cat that I was feeding, but now I immediately stop when the animal says so. Because now you know that the animal is an individual." And the next second she corrected herself saying "you see, saying 'feeding' animal is even wrong" as if she confirmed what she had said about learning new things each day. Then she told about her awakening:

[91] It is a pseudonym for the anonymous animal advocate.

> "First here comes an awakening about the animals that you live with. And of course you also feel ashamed for what you had done till today. It took me a long time to face that shame. Really a long time... In fact I still cannot look into the eyes of cows and hens, I feel bad. [...] Before that I had not feel responsibilities like that. I did not feel such emotions, either (Aycan, interview, October 2022)."[xi]

When I asked about her process of going vegan, she told me that her process was multi-level, which was like an enlightenment process for her. She said that she had read or known nothing about veganism. In an ecology forum held by Kaos GL, a vegan stood up and said that "If you are a socialist, you must not ask for equality and eat animals at the same time". She thought that it was rational and became vegetarian at that very same moment. Two years later she went vegan at the moment that she found out there was something called veganism in a demonstration in İstanbul. She saw a parade of only three vegans holding posters written animal liberation on them, and she said "Ohh one moment, what is vegan?" and she joined them as a person who became a fresh vegan at the very moment. It can be said that the main reason of her going vegan was rational and ethical. Additionally, there were minor reasons. For instance she has already had an intimate relationship with animals since her childhood.

4.1.2. Starting with Taking Care of Animals who Live in Streets and Temporary Animal Rehabilitation Centers

Two of twelve advocates stated that they had been animal advocates before going vegan. They have been taking care of animals who live in streets and temporary animal rehabilitation center (TARC) for more than ten years. Here I need to mention Cansu's case since she also has been an advocate for animals who live in streets and TARC before going vegan. But she clearly stated that she had not been an animal advocate before going vegan but she had been an advocate of cat and dog rights or animal lover since a nonvegan person cannot be an animal advocate. Thus she started to call herself as an animal advocate after going vegan. But the cases of Özgür[92] and Yaprak[93] are different. Yaprak emphasised that she had been an animal advocate before going vegan. Moreover she does not identify herself as "vegan"

[92] It is a pseudonym for the anonymous animal advocate.
[93] It is a pseudonym for the anonymous animal advocate.

animal advocate although she is vegan for animals, because being vegan is just a part of being an animal advocate for her.

Özgür, who is 41 years old and has been vegan for 9 years after living for 11 years as a vegetarian, is one of them. She has had sincere relationship with animals since she was a little girl. She had a grandfather who took care of animals of many species including chicks, hens, rabbits and cats whom she loved deeply. At the age of 9, her father adopted a lovely dog whom she always wanted to live with at home. She told me that she never ate animal flesh or drink cow's breast milk willingly but her parents forced her. At the age of 21 in 2002, she became vegetarian. Not about going vegan but being vegetarian, she said that "I had not known what veganism was. I mean, there was something called veganism. I mean... it took me too long a time to make the connection. I see the latest generation; they make that connection in their 20s, at about 15-year-old (Özgür, interview, October 2022)."[xii] In 2013, she watched *Earthlings* that has been the most famous and striking documentary on animal abuse with the graphic images and information. Then her ex-boyfriend said to her that "You are a vegetarian but there is something called veganism. You see, vegetarianism is more emotional but veganism is a more ethical position (Özgür, interview, October 2022)." She found it odd at first but she agreed what her boyfriend had said after reading the article that he had brought to her and then she went vegan. So it can be said that first watching Earthlings made her think on what she had seen and second meeting veganism as an ethical position thanks to her ex-boyfriend caused her to stop animal exploitation on her own life and go vegan.

After telling her journey of going vegan, she talked about her journey of being an animal advocate. It has started in 2008 when she was 27 years old, as a person who had taken care of animals in streets she decided to shot a documentary on animals living in streets for a TV channel. That documentary helped her to meet the problems of animals and an association for the animals who live in TARC. She worked with that association voluntarily for two years. At the same time she had been a volunteer in HAYTAP[94] but she left it two years later. Then she founded a platform working for all animals who are captured for the entertainment of humans in zoos and aquariums. With her going vegan, the platform evolved into a vegan

[94] English translation is "The Federation for Animal Rights".

group for all animals. She emphasised that she had never stopped taking care of animals in streets and TARCs.

4.2. The Current Situation of Anti-Speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement in Turkey

In this section, I first aim to explain why I name this movement, in which vegan animal advocates struggle for the rights and liberation of all animals, as anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement. I discussed the academic aspect of the name decision in the introduction chapter and in this part I will discuss how interviews I conducted and my observations in the field influenced my decision to use this name. Based on my four years of observations as an advocate in the movement and the research that I examined, I had known that I would need to choose a name for the movement even before the interviews. Because when one thinks about the animal rights movement in Turkey, the first thing that comes to mind is the movement advocating on behalf of cats and dogs. Thus, it would not be quite accurate for me to refer to the movement as the animal rights movement.

Another factor was that some of the advocates I knew identified themselves as animal rights advocates and some as animal liberation advocates. Some other advocates had to choose between these two identifications depending on the situation. If I had chosen the "animal liberation movement" or "animal rights movement" in this case, I would not have addressed the other movement and its advocates. So, I delayed my decision on the name until I start conducting the interviews. In this way, I had the opportunity to discuss this issue with the advocates who mentioned the difference or similarity between these names during the interviews. The interviews led me to name this movement as “animal advocacy” and add the terms “anti-speciesist” since it stands up for the rights of all animals.

In making this choice, I was influenced by the following factors that I discovered during the interviews. (1) The majority of the advocates I spoke with used the terms "animal rights" and "animal liberation" interchangeably, just as I had noticed before the interviews. For instance, when I asked “What do you think about the animal rights movement in Turkey?”, all advocates mentioned the movement in which

vegan advocates stand for the rights of all animals. In other words, none of the advocates thought that this movement is different from the animal rights movement. (2) Some advocates used sometimes the name “animal rights” and sometimes “animal liberation to refer to this movement. (3) Although I asked the questions using the name “animal rights movement”, two advocates insisted on naming this movement as “vegan movement”. When I examined these three factors, it became clear that I should use a name other than “animal rights movement”, “animal liberation movement” or “vegan movement” in order to refer to all advocates that I interviewed, to avoid any conflict with the literature and define the movement appropriately.

When I asked about the current situation of AAAM in Turkey, most of the advocates had a long time to think and hesitated to answer, at least for some time. Although the reason of hesitation is not clear for me, I presume that it was because they had never thought about the general situation of the movement before, at leaat loud. While some advocates expressed certain opinions on whether AAAM is successful or not, most of the advocates shared general thoughts on effective and ineffective sides of it. Since the thoughts of the advocates are mostly negative and they generally talked about its ineffective sides, it can be said that the AAAM is not a successful but again, as it could also be depicted from the interviews, an ever-developing movement in the advocates’ perspective.

Only two advocates portrayed AAAM as a “quite” successful movement. Comparing herself as an animal advocate to her past version and considering her ever-changing advocacy process, Funda claimed that AAAM is going well and improving itself. She thought that the advocates were educating each other, they were taking lessons from former mistakes and they were trying not to repeat them. According to her, the advocates are thinking hard on the new and creative ways of telling veganism that focuses on animals and they share their ideas to inform other advocates.

Hazar, who is an advocate who follow the situation of worldwide AAAM, compared it to the feminist movement and came to the negative conclusion that “It is not even in its first wave in Turkey, as I see it. We are pretty far behind (Hazar,

interview, October 2022).” Cansu is the only one who defined AAAM as an unsuccessful movement in the most certain way:

> “I had read it somewhere that ‘animal rights movement is an unsuccessful movement in conclusion. It’s continuing till today... It is unsuccessful because the world is not vegan ultimately.’ [...] You know... Why have we been struggling for the same thing for fifteen years? It’s too hurtful (Cansu, interview, October 2022).”[xiii]

Along with discussing the movement as a whole and whether it is successful or not, the animal advocates also talked about the action methods which are mostly utilised by advocates to struggle for animal rights and liberation. They also shared the ideal goal of the movement in their perspective. These issues will be discussed on title 4.4.1.

4.2.1. The Action Methods of the Movement

While talking about the current situation of the AAAM in their perspective, most of the advocates mentioned the action methods that are performed by anti-speciesist animal advocates and advocacy groups in Turkey. The mentioned action methods are street demonstrations like press statements or vegan marches; legal struggle on animal advocacy; vegan festivals; Cube of Truth demonstrations; social media activities like writing articles, creating images and videos; creating and sharing vegan recipes on social media platforms; taking care of animals –mostly cats and dogs- living in streets and TARC; rescuing animals from places where they are captured; vegan picnics and vegan tablings.

Majority of the advocates clearly stated that all these action methods were effective and necessary. They said that there was a great variety of people with different personalities, backgrounds and living conditions, so the movement and advocates need to utilise different action methods which might affect and apply to different people. They also agreed that the activities must exclude welfarist ideology since it weakens and harms the AAAM. Although majority of the advocates appreciated all the mentioned action methods, some of them shared their hesitations about the effectiveness of Cube of Truth demonstrations.

Cube of Truth is a type of street demonstration which is mostly performed by the worldwide animal advocacy group Anonymous for the Voiceless (The Cube of

Truth, [20.12.2022]). The Cube of Truth demonstration has two teams of advocates. Each member of the cube team holds a sign or screen that displays graphic footage of animal exploitation and wears a white mask. Each member of the outreach team talks with the people who watch the footage and answer their questions. In Turkey first Cube of Truth demonstration was held by Bağımsız Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu on 2nd October World Farm Animals Day in 2017 in İstanbul (Özgüner, B., 2018). Many animal advocacy groups have organised Cube of Truth demonstrations since 2017 in different cities of Turkey (Veganlardan 'Gerçeklik Küpü'..., 2018; Gerçeklik Küpü: Sömürünün..., 2018). Bilge[95], an animal advocate I interviewed, stated that Cube of Truth demonstrations make people ask themselves questions like these: "Do you realise what you have been doing? Do you realise that you are in the middle of helix of violence? (Bilge, interview, October 2022)"[xiv]

The hesitations of some advocates have been related to the display of the graphic footage in the public sphere. They thought that the graphic footage might affect people negatively and they want to run away from them physically and mentally. As a result, they might not want to even think about what they have just watched and they do not question their beliefs, thoughts and attitudes about and towards animals. On the other hand, the same advocates thought that the truth about animal exploitation must be displayed since it has been concealed by mainstream media and the speciesist world system. They shared that they found the cube of Truth demonstration necessary to remind people of their exploitative relationship with animals. At the end, none of them have decided whether the Cube of Truth demonstration is a "totally" effective or harmful activity.

Contrary to the majority of the advocates, two advocates stated that at present "vegan piknik" (vegan picnics) and "vegan stant" (vegan tablings) are the only and most effective action methods of street demonstrations that aim the abolition of animal exploitation. As I explained the importance of nonviolent vegan education in chapter two, these activities are good examples for the activities of Abolitionist Vegan Movement that based on the theory of Francione (2017, 29, 30). Oğuzhan, as an abolitionist[96], described vegan picnics as activities that have been organised

[95] It is a pseudonym for the anonymous animal advocate.
[96] Further information about the theory and abolitionists is on the title 2.2.3.

each Saturday since 2014 for 9 years. In vegan picnics, nonvegan people are more welcomed than the vegan people, because the main aim of the picnics is inviting non-vegans to veganism. The picnics also aim to educate -already vegan- animal advocates on the advocacy of animal rights and veganism. Because the majority of the people in society, in which vegan animal advocates live, are not vegans. In order to effectively invite non-vegans to veganism, the advocates should have a greater understanding of both veganism and animal rights.

Vegan tablings are another type of activity of AVH. In other countries besides Turkey, vegan tablings has different physical characteristics. Advocates set up a table and lay out various vegan visual and written resources on it in these countries. But in Turkey, as Oğuzhan described, the abolitionists organise this activity without setting up a table since it requires permission here. In Turkey, every abolitionist holds posters written "I am vegan. You can ask me questions." or "Do you also think it is wrong to harm or kill animals?" during vegan tablings and they stand in a crowded square of the town. These squares are those in Kadıköy, Beşiktaş, and Bakırköy in Istanbul in the case of AVH in Turkey. The abolitionists are approached by curious onlookers who ask them about veganism and the advocates respond to these questions and hand out brochures to people who are interested. They argue that other types of actions are harmful to the AAAM since they do not aim to abolish animal exploitation. Being an abolitionist himself, Francione, the founder of the Abolitionist Animal Rights Theory, agrees to the same viewpoint. Along with Francione, these activists criticized street demonstrations like vegan marches, press statements and Cube of Truth, as well as legal struggles in courtrooms and TBMM, and rescuing animals from locations where they are captured.

With the exception of these two advocates, most of the advocates stated that they do not agree the abolitionists' classification of the majority of action methods as "new welfarist". They claimed that while the abolitionist philosophy was significant and valuable for animal rights, it did not provide inclusive solutions to issues relating to animal rights in practice. They claimed that simply inviting people to veganism by explaining what veganism is precious but not sufficient for the problems; instead, they argued that legal struggle, rescuing animals from captivity

and a variety of street demonstrations were also required. They asserted that abolitionists should not exclude other advocates who are not abolitionists but yet struggle for animal rights; they should not claim to have the only right approach while insulting other advocates' views and efforts. In addition, they claimed the fact that abolitionists only accept their own advocacy approach as being right is one of the problems that harm the movement.[97]

While advocates evaluated the activities of the movement, most of them mentioned the names of some animal advocacy groups. According to advocates, HAKİM, Bağımsız Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu, BURHAK, Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket, Deneye Hayır Derneği, Vegan Derneği Türkiye, and Yunuslara Özgürlük Platformu are the most active groups in the movement.[98] My analysis of these groups' social media profiles also indicated that they might be regarded as active groups. It can be said that these groups have made good use of social media to educate social media users about veganism, anti-speciesism, animal liberation, and animal rights through written and visual texts.

4.2.2. The Advocates' Ideal Goal of Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement

The Anti-speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement (AAAM), like any other social movement, should have a clear ultimate goal which is accepted by animal advocates who are involved in the movement (Campbell, 2009, 11). In the absence of a clear ultimate goal, a collective and goal-oriented action plan could not be constituted. Precisely because of that I asked some advocates their idea of the ultimate goal of the AAAM if they had not specifically mentioned it until I asked. All advocates wished and dreamed a non-speciesist and vegan world for animals who are not seen as property, objects or resource but conscious living beings just like us, human animals. It can be said that the animal advocates, whom I interviewed, have shared the same ideal goal of AAAM which is an essential criterium for a successful social movement. Although all of them stated this exact common goal for animals, some of them expanded upon it to a world of total liberation for each nonhuman and human animal.

[97] For further information about this issue, see Wolf's (2015) master's thesis.
[98] Further information about these groups is on title 3.3.2.

The ideal aims held by the advocates, which refer to their hopes and desires, have been found to be common. As will be discussed later in this chapter, the advocates, whom I interviewed, however, emphasized that the movement lacks a common clear ultimate goal, and they regarded this lack as one of the movement's most significant deficiencies.

4.2.2.1.“A Vegan World that Destroys the Property Status of Animals”

As an animal advocate who translated two books related to anti-natalism into Turkish, Cansu stated her ideal goal of AAAM in the line with anti-natalism. Here it would be appropriate to define what it is. According to Macmillan Dictionary (Antinatalism, [15.11.2022]) anti-natalism is a noun meaning “a philosophical stance that assigns a negative value to birth” and it is “the belief that those born into our miserable world are doomed to suffer”. Thus Cansu suggested that coming into existence is full of sorrow itself and we must not give birth to children without taking their consent to be born into that sorrowful world. She defined her well-organised ideal goal of AAAM like that:

> “[To create] a world where animals are exploited in no circumstances. In other words, if we stopped eating animals today but later we started growing organs in pigs for human use, stopping eating animals would make no sense. I would say that [the ultimate goal is] a world in which all exploitation types of animals are prohibited, of course exploitation types of human, too. Yes, a vegan world as much as possible, because [it is about] the ground that we step on as well. My ultimate thing is a world that we all disappear from (Cansu, interview, October 2022).”[xv]

Yaprak is an advocate who is fond of reading books and articles about the history of animal advocacy movement and is “obsessed with research that includes questionnaires and statistical results about animal rights movement and advocates”. She stated the ideal goal for her as follows:

> “We [humans] do not look over our habits or behaviours unless we are in charge to account. Or we do not need to create legitimate justification about them. The animal rights struggle is exactly about that. The animal rights struggle is the unique struggle area that people account to other people for their behaviours towards animals. Thus the animal rights struggle has only one goal: to try to make people accounted for their behaviours towards animals who are seen as property by them and to wait for these people to change their behaviours. And we are

> working on it. Actually the ultimate goal is not about animals, it is about people, about changing the people (Yaprak, interview, October 2022)."[xvi]

Although advocates have shared a common ideal goal about destroying the exploitation of animals, none of them told about the future of already domesticated animals explicitly and clearly except for Oğuzhan who established his advocacy on the theory of Abolitionist Animal Rights of Gary Francione. As an abolitionist vegan in Abolitionist Vegan Movement (AVH), Oğuzhan expressed his ideal goal saying that it is "to stop domestication, to stop producing animals. To tell people that animals are not objects, not slaves. And to destroy the property status of animals". The reason for Oğuzhan's being the only advocate who mentioned this issue so clearly is possibly because the abolitionist theory has clear ideas on almost all problems about animals as well as on domestication of them (Francione, 2009, 164).

I would like to state some of the ideal goals wished by two advocates. Güneş said that "The ultimate goal is securing the justice for animals. But we will never know exactly what the justice for animals is (Güneş, interview, October 2022)." And Atakan stated that "Its [the movement's] goal is creating a whole of equal relationships destroying all exploitation. Not seeing animals from a different perspective. Wishing to include them in the system as exactly we do ourselves (Atakan, interview, October 2022)."[xvii]

4.2.2.2."Total Liberation"

The idea of total liberation has its roots in the thought that speciesism is the very first discrimination and prejudice as if it was "prototype for hierarchical domination (Best, 2015, 6)". So that every and each prejudice and discrimination types in the world, such as sexism, racism, fascism, ableism, had started with speciesism which is the prejudice supporting that humans are superior to nonhuman animals or some nonhuman animal species are superior to others as it was expressed in Chapter 2 in detail.

Hazar, who is frankly against all authority and domination systems, stated that he could define the AAAM as a successful movement only when the system of all exploitation and domination is completely destroyed. Hence he said that the

movement could not be successful if advocates continued not to challenge these systems. He stated that the movement and advocates should seek for total liberation for all nonhuman and human animals in the world. He portrayed the current AAAM like that: "Some people try to form hierarchy. That is a very wrong thing. Moreover we still do not understand it. [...] There should not be authority (Hazar, interview, October 2022)."[xviii]

Onur described his ideal goal as an "extensive total goal". He believed that the world would be a fairer place if people start struggling for the most fundamental injustice, speciesism. And he added:

> "What I mean by a fairer place... There is no fairness now. [...] If we mention fairness, it can only be a world where the rights of animals are accepted and put into practice. The ultimate goal... we say that it is animal liberation, we include human [in it]. No one will be free, if even one species remains unfree. For example, we were saying it for human, now it has expanded. Hence, it is extensive... I suppose that there will not be another movement that can be so inclusive, so all-encompassing grounding on the most fundamental [injustice] among the unsolved and unresolved struggles in the world (Onur, interview, October 2022)."[xix]

4.3. Successful Aspects of Anti-Speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement

As I had mentioned the AAAM has been seen as an unsuccessful but ever-developing movement in the advocates' perspective and when I asked the current situation of the movement only two advocates shared positive thoughts. Although it was so obvious that there were almost no clear successful or powerful aspects of the movement for other ten advocates, I asked some of them to think and share their ideas on the successful aspects of the movement. Then they told me some little positive thoughts within all other negative ones. Their ideas were not well-organised and they said what they really thought at the very moment that I asked. Under that theme, I ended up with four subthemes as successful aspects of the movement: (1) keeping hope alive, (2) seeking total liberation in comparison to other countries, (3) rise in the number of vegans, (4) stipulating veganism as a must to be an animal advocate.

4.3.1. Keeping Hope Alive

> "Today another animal advocate whom I interviewed told me that the situation of the world and Turkey as a country has effects on the situation of the animal advocacy movement in Turkey. He said that the people who have the power are restrictive. He also said that if this restrictive environment or period loosens a bit, if the conjuncture changes a bit, people will start to [get together and] be organised again. I had been relating our inactivity to the problems among advocates that arose during and after "Yaşam Nöbeti"[99]. I had not felt that the situation in the world and Turkey affected the movement so much (Arzum, memo, October 2022)."

I wrote these sentences at night on my journal after a very long but striking online interview. The advocate was the third person who mentioned the situation of the world and Turkey as an effective factor on the movement. I remember that I felt weird when I had found out that. Indeed the relation was so clear to be seen, but I failed to perceive it until I conducted the interviews. I was more attentive while reading the transcripts over and over again for the data analysis after discovering this relationship. In addition, sometimes I listened to the recordings again to be able to catch the nuances that are aroused as a result of the advocates' feelings and emotions.

Aycan was the first person who brought the issue into question. After describing the negative situation of Turkey in detail, she said that even under these circumstances the advocates manage to create the accumulation of knowledge and data base. And when this period ends, when the wind blows for us, the advocates will be organised rapidly thanks to this data base. Hazar, who emphasised that he is waiting for that period to be an active advocate again, meant almost the same thoughts with different sentences.

Özgür told me that the politic and economic conditions of the world and hopefulness of people pacified the advocates and actions of the movement and she did not accept this situation as advocates' faults. Despite that the advocates are trying to struggle using other ways which the situation of Turkey and the world allows according to her. Onur said that he strongly believed that the AAAM would be successful, if the situation of Turkey had changed positively.

[99] It means "Watch of Life". For further information, see title 3.3.2.

Güneş[100] said that the AAAM is "quite" successful pointing out the sociological and economic conditions of Turkey:

> "I am saying this because the society's and country's point of view is like that. Somehow human rights come first than animal rights. Because the person who advocates for the animal rights has to struggle to advocate her own rights first. [...] Activism is getting difficult, [...] Despite this setting, I think the animal rights movement is in good state in Turkey (Güneş, interview, October 2022)."[xx]

Atakan stated that the movement is not in a good state, it is getting better, but there is nothing he can do except thinking that it is hope-inspiring within the conditions of the country, in which we live.

As if she was trying to sum up what had been said before and my thought, Yaprak said that "So, absolutely geography is destiny. Because this geography is so messy (Yaprak, interview, October 2022)." But she was not hopeless about the situation of the movement and she shared her thoughts as follows:

> "Even though we struggle with very difficult things [...] somehow we believe in struggle. Because to believe is very important. I think, we somehow have the virtues of keeping our hope alive and maintaining our stubbornness. Maybe it is something that comes from our genes or not, I do not know. [...] Even though we are tearing each other apart, I also think that we support each other in a way. Sometimes, we may not show our support by encouraging and complimenting each other, most of the time (Yaprak, interview, October 2022)."[xxi]

4.3.2. Seeking Total Liberation in Comparison to other Countries

This theme needs to be explored carefully. Because many advocates claimed that the lack of seeking total liberation is one of the main unsuccessful aspects of the AAAM. On the other hand, three advocates clearly stated that seeking and adapting total liberation is one of the successful aspects of the movement in Turkey in comparison to other countries, although they had different reasons for their statements. In addition, one other advocate, Cansu, mentioned some young animal advocates who are also participants of other right-based movements like feminist movement. They stated that the movement in Turkey is not in a perfect situation

[100] It is a pseudonym for the anonymous animal advocate.

about seeking total liberation, but it can be considered as a successful aspect when they compare the situation in Turkey to those of other countries, especially the USA and European countries.

The second interview with Cansu was held few weeks after Burak Özgüner Animal Rights Study Center's (BURHAK) meeting which was an event to celebrate Burak Özgüner's birthday. When she started to talk about the struggle of total liberation, she got so excited and talked smilingly until she stopped:

> "You know, in the meeting of BURHAK we saw young people. They are vegan, you know, and LGBT activist, they are in the women movement. This is a magnificent thing for me. It is an integrated movement. I want to see this. I want to see gay vegans in the world. I want it in the world. Queer vegan, I mean... After you tick these boxes [of struggles] it seems impossible to remain insensitive to other movements. In Turkey, I see this at least among young people (Cansu, interview, November 2022)."[xxii]

Before the interview with Aycan, I had not thought that seeking for total liberation was a successful aspect of the animal advocates and the movement although I had known that we had been trying our best to do it. So when she said all these positive thoughts and observations, I became so happy and hopeful but surprised and suspicious at the same time. In the same second, I recalled that she knew what she was talking about. That was the reason why I wanted to interview with her, because she was performing integrated activism. Through her observations, she told that:

> "I see that Turkey adopted vegan activism fast. Why I think like that? For example, feminism, LGBTİ+ organisations - not leftist organisations- adopt veganism as a principle in Turkey. It is so precious. There is no such thing anywhere in the world. You know, you go to European countries, they are called cradle of civilization... [When you mention] veganism in LGBTİ+ organisations, they say 'Bah!" to you, they make fun of you. My observations have been in this direction. I saw this in Germany, France and Serbia. [The movement in Turkey] makes the best of intersectionalism. [...] I had been saying that we obtained it from Europe. Then I went and saw that they paid no attention. [...] That gave me great hope (Aycan, interview, October 2022)."[xxiii]

The ideas I have included in this section were not expressed by most of the advocates I interviewed. However, three advocates emphasized and commented on the fact that the total liberation struggle was carried out more effectively in Turkey than in other countries, and their opinions led me to think that this issue may be

regarded as one of the movement's successful aspects. Furthermore, it might be argued that Cansu's example shows that Turkey's total liberation struggle is not at a bad point. Additionally, I came to the conclusion that this sub-theme might emerge after the majority of advocates stated that the movement's ultimate goal should include total liberation struggle, as will be discussed on title 4.4.1.

4.3.3. Rise in the Number of Vegans

Six advocates said that they are so happy to meet fresh vegans. For them the rise in the number of vegans is another successful aspect of the movement, because it is one of the results of successful activism performed by vegan animal advocates. Funda shared her observations saying "In the trainings which are special for vegans [who want to be animal advocate], most of them [say], you know, I am vegan for one month, [or] I am vegan for six months. You know, they have been [vegan for] less than one year mostly (Funda, interview, October 2022)."[xxiv] Although the vegan population of Turkey is not known exactly, it is said that the population of vegetarians and vegans was approximately 80000 in November 2020 and it will rise in the future since a considerable amount of today's nonvegan people plan going vegan in the future (Tapınç, [30.11.2022]). Thus it seems that the advocates' observation is highly right and they will be happier when they meet more fresh vegans.

Besides the rise in the number in general, the rise in the number of young vegans was another successful aspect for them. While Oğuzhan said he was so happy to see young vegans who create videos on social media accounts about animal rights, Onur said that "They are the ones who will take the lead. Because they can influence their families, they can influence their environment, too (Onur, interview, November 2022).".[xxv]

4.3.4. Stipulating Veganism as a Must to be an Animal Advocate

All of the advocates agreed that an animal advocate must be vegan not to contradict themselves and their advocacy. Moreover two of them congratulated the AAAM in Turkey because it stipulates ethical veganism as a must to be an animal advocate. In other words, if you are not a vegan person, it means that you cannot be a part in the

AAAM since being a nonvegan person cannot be an animal advocate. Besides these thoughts, Oğuzhan, who is an abolitionist advocate, said that he was so happy to see that most animal advocates, even if they are not the abolitionist advocates, accept veganism as the moral baseline. They do not support less-than-vegan campaigning which is the third principle of the abolitionist theory of Francione (2017, 120). Comparing Turkey to USA and Europe, he said that welfarism was not the dominant discourse and establishing a welfarist association was not common as it was in the USA and Europe.

Emphasising the positive change in the AAAM, as an advocate who have been in many advocacy groups, Funda told me her process:

> "I know that all the advocates and groups are against welfarism. [...] About welfarism, you know, now [there are] Kafessiz Türkiye [Cage Free Turkey][101] and Meatless Monday. I mean, [they are] money-focused. I suppose, they are collecting money. [...] I know almost all groups in the cities. [The groups in Turkey are not] focused on money. [...] and you know [now] it is so clear in the groups that you cannot be an animal rights advocate if you are not vegan. For instance, in 2016 in Çanakkale when I was not vegan completely... But [in the animal advocacy group] there were... people who were not vegan [and who were] only taking care of cats dogs, you know. [At that time] we were discussing [these] things [saying] like 'Oh! OK. We need these people, too. They would go vegan. Let them come and perform activism with us.' Moreover, I was a vegetarian as well [at that time]. [smiling] But now there is no question about it. In all the groups, here is the principle 'The minimum condition of being here is to be vegan.' Because being an animal rights advocate starts with being vegan. [...] It is like the main principle of the groups in Turkey (Funda, interview, October 2022)."[xxvi]

4.4. Unsuccessful Aspects of Anti-Speciesist Animal Advocacy Movement

"I can still use the same posters of the year 2014!"
Cansu

As Cansu said in the sentence I quoted above, the majority of the animal advocates concurred that despite significant progress, the movement was not a victory. It is possible that is why more than half of my conversations with each advocate were about the movement's problems. Actually, this was what I had anticipated, but what

[101] A welfarist organisation that seeks to regulate the exploitation conditions of hens. Further information will be on title 4.1.1.1.

I had not anticipated was that the majority of advocates would be unable to address solutions to these problems and weaknesses. Moreover, once again the majority of them were unable to even express their opinions regarding the causes of these problems and deficiencies. I will thus examine the problems and deficiencies in this theme through the perspectives of the advocates. In the fifth part of this chapter, I will provide a detailed examination by considering the advocates' perspectives and contributing my own observations.

4.4.1. Lack of Collective and Goal-Oriented Action: "We are Groping for something"[102]

Ilişanu and Andrei (2019, 39) defines "*collective* and *goal-oriented action*" as one of the main concepts of a social movement, since they get a large number of advocates to move in harmony to achieve the ultimate goal. Seven of twelve advocates clearly said that the AAAM does not have the concept of "*collective* and *goal-oriented action*". Moreover they expressed that the AAAM does not have any collective action plan even consisting of the short-time goals. And they indicated that the AAAM desperately needs to constitute a collective and goal-oriented action plan consisting of short and long-time goals.

Cansu summed up this huge problem which is described with paragraphs by other advocates only with a sentence saying "In general, [one of the unsuccessful sides is the] absence of an understanding of goal-oriented discipline (Cansu, interview, November 2022)."[xxvii] After that interview, for me it became so clear that the issue of "absence of collective and goal-oriented action plan" is an important unsuccessful aspect of the movement and I wrote a memo saying "Today, finally Cansu named it. She named one of the biggest problems. Yes, we have no plan which I had known before I started the interviews. Moreover we do not even know that we need it for a movement, for animals actually."

She thought that the advocates have wasted their precious time telling their personal memories almost everywhere even in a meeting related to animals and their rights in The Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM). The advocates mentioned here are the ones who are seen as "animal lovers" who struggle for the rights of

[102] The original sentence is "El yordamıyla bir şeyleri bulmaya çalışıyoruz."

only cats and dogs living in streets and TARC. Cansu accept them as a part of animal rights advocacy although they do not struggle for all animals' rights. By generalizing it to all advocates, she even gave an example of an animal lover that she witnessed in TBMM "In the meeting of committee... There one [person] started [telling]... 'There was a dog in our neighbourhood, and then I took it, bla bla bla.' I think they act too emotionally in some places. One must move without personalising (Cansu, interview, November 2022).". Asserting that wasting time with personalisation is a result of not having a goal-oriented action discipline, Cansu continued talking about a goal-oriented advocate. She said:

> "Moreover I think that the most successful people are the certain and rational ones. For instance, I think Burak [Özgüner] was like that. I know that, of course, he was also so emotional but he did not tell her personal memories here and there. Because it was not the issue (Cansu, interview, November 2022)."[xxviii]

Although Cansu is the one who named the problem clearly, Yaprak was the first advocate who made it a current issue saying a well-formulated sentence so that I used it as a title of this category. She said:

> "In fact, when looking from outside it looks like we are groping for something. But in some countries, that organised struggle continue more consciously, no let me not say consciously, more planned, yes more systematically. For example, England is one of them. In Germany, they move in regimented manner. I mean, they do not move like... like animals are hostages of people and if we do not rescue them immediately in 12 hours, they will... they do not move like that. They are too laid-back in comparison to us. I do not know which one is right (Yaprak, interview, October 2022)."[xxix]

When I asked some of the advocates their opinions about the reasons of absence of goal-oriented plan, most of them continued to talk about the problem in a more detailed way but without mentioning the reasons. Although they saw the problems they continued to describe as consequences, I could understand that some of them were the causes of these problems. For example, some said that because the movement has not had a plan and the advocates have not known what to do, the advocates and the movement have to deal with "pseudo and selfish advocates" who wants to stand out. I think the presence of "pseudo and selfish advocates" in the movement, who cares for themselves not for animals, is the reason for both the lack of goal-oriented action plan and many other problems that will be discussed below.

On the other hand, few of the advocates stated some clear reasons about the problem.

As I quoted above, Cansu clearly stated the absence of goal-oriented plan and discipline and gave an example of the problem's result:

> "Its reason is the same with the reason of emergence of a grass-root movement. Because we are always in interaction with cats and dogs and we experience emotional moments all the time. We do not know where to discharge the trauma of these [sad emotions]. [...] Because most of the grass-root people lose themselves in a lot of things, I mean intense work. You know, maybe it's the reason why they cannot move organized (Cansu, interview, November 2022)."[xxx]

The reasons of that Yaprak stated are different than Cansu's. Yaprak said that one of the reasons might be building activism on social media mostly. She said that via social media one could not give a message to an older person who lived in a village in rural area. So advocates, including her, must criticize themselves and find other ways to reach all people. Indicating that solution is so hard because of the geography that we live, she gave another reason about the problem:

> "We move disorganisedly, gropely. Because as the agenda of our country on every issue, the animal rights agenda is also a disaster. In other words, each day another report, another disgusting event [about animals is coming] from somewhere. As a result we choose one to work on... Actually we do not have time and strength (Yaprak, interview, October 2022)."[xxxi]

On the second interview, Bilge said me that she had thought about the current situation of the AAAM after the first interview. She said that in 2018 when she joined the AAAM first, the movement used to be stronger and more notable by community, the groups used to declare their action plans on social media for other advocates who wanted to join them. She specified those days as the peak point of the movement and then the movement faded out according to her. Then I asked the reasons of that fade-out. She emphasised the absence of collective and goal-oriented action saying:

> "The weakness of mind... This will be a little tough, but... I mean collective mind. I think it was because of the weakness of the collective mind about veganism. I mean, joining a group with too individualistic stimulations worsen that situation. [...] A decline,

> disengagement occurred. [...] In fact, I think that individual activism is coming to the forefront (Bilge, interview, October 2022)."[xxxii]

Describing the AAAM as a young social movement, Aycan stated the reason saying "a young [social] movement always comes with two things. First is great speed, great power. On the other side, [second is] lack of experience (Aycan, interview, November 2022)."[xxxiii]. Besides Aycan, Funda also stated being a young social movement as a reason of that problem. She said that we had no idea about how to get organised. She told me her experience as a former member of a lot of animal advocacy groups:

> "I, for example, was member of lots of groups till HÖK[103]. And I found out that one group must adopt principles in HÖK. Isn't it ridiculous? A lot of people are coming together, you have a name [as a group], and you do something. But it is not determined that on which principles you come together. [...] The fact that the people there [in HÖK] had been in other groups […] before brought the principles there. [At first] I was saying 'Principles! What is principle for?' So I see that as a lack because of [the movement's] being young. [Now] people are writing manifestos for them and adopting principles. Of course, besides these principle, feasibility also [matters] (Funda, interview, October 2022)."[xxxiv]

To be able to constitute a collective and goal-oriented action plan, according to most of the advocates, the AAAM and the advocates within the movement should have a common clear ultimate goal to constitute a plan around it. Hence, here I will explore different factors, according to the advocates, which should be included in the common ultimate goal of the AAAM. However, as I have explored the advocates' ideal goals of the AAAM in the category of the current situation of AAAM, all advocates had a common ideal goal in their perspectives: "a vegan world that destroys the property status of animals". In addition, many of them shared another ideal goal: "total liberation" of animals and humans. But when they thought of the unsuccessful aspect of the movement, most of them stated that the movement itself does not have a common clear ultimate goal which should be accepted and aimed by most of the advocates and they regarded the absence of this goal as an important deficiency of the AAAM.

[103] The name of the group is "Animal Liberation Collective".

In the second interview, when I asked Atakan about the unsuccessful aspects of the movement, the first thing he said was "not being able to unite", so I asked him "who must unite?" He quickly answered "vegans". Then he clearly stated that the vegan animal advocates must unite in a common goal even though they are members of different groups. At that point, I asked: "Do you think that the ultimate goal is the same for all advocates?" He answered without hesitation:

> "It must be. I realise that it is not. Even if we managed to perform well-organised demonstrations in Turkey, [...] I'm sure that lots of annoying things would occur till the moment of that demonstration. There are kazillion of vegans, but no [demonstrations]. [...] Because we have veganism in common. We have a definition of veganism to unite for. We might be different, our actions might be different but we are united on veganism (Atakan, interview, November 2022)."[xxxv]

Atakan continued laughing and talking "The ones who are not vegan, they can go and join Kafessiz Türkiye (Cage Free Turkey)."[xxxvi] and I said that "But they are vegan, too.". He stopped laughing and said that "They are vegan, too. Yes. I am shocked. So I say that, the vegans are divided into two, the genuine vegans and the ungenuine vegans (Atakan, interview, November 2022)."[xxxvii] with a smile. Why did Atakan define the Cage Free Turkey team as the ungenuine vegans? Here is the answer.

In the website of Cage Free Turkey (Kafessiz Türkiye, [20.11.2022]), it is written that "By changing the institutions, we protect animals from cruelty." Actually they, the team of Cage Free Turkey, aim to protect only some animals from only one type of cruelty according to their website. Their only aim is to take the chickens off the cages, they do not aim to stop egg production or consumption, and they do not aim to stop even killing of chicken for human use. It is also written that "chickens carry lives too" so that they must be out of the cages since "cages torment chickens". So they feel sorry for the chickens when the chickens cannot spread their wings and see sunlight, but they do not feel sorry when the same chickens are killed. But they do not want to free the chickens from exploitation; they want to continue to exploit the chickens in better conditions. Here the problem is not the cages, it is speciesism. Thus Kafessiz Türkiye is the first and welfarist organisation established by "the ungenuine vegans" in Turkey. That's why Atakan defined the team of Cage Free Turkey as "the ungenuine vegans". Then he said that "Because I do not think it is

veganism to take so much money [and] fund to make the animals exploited in welfare (Atakan, interview, November 2022).” as an explanation of the ungenuine vegans.

Here we come to an important point. In the category of successful aspects of the AAAM, it is said that welfarism is not the dominant movement in Turkey if it is compared to Europe and USA. But according to advocates, whom I interviewed, this situation is about to change. Welfarism is getting stronger and Güneş suggested that the advocates must foresee the growth of welfarism and take precautions. She criticised some worldwide companies that produce and sell vegan products “only for show” and money but not for animal advocacy. She said that it seemed a good thing at first, but on the other hand, it was like a situation of “talk out of both sides of your mouth”[104]. She said that capitalism had noticed that it had to change with the world to be able to make money. This change in capitalism concerned her, because it strengthens the welfarist movement by funding welfarist organisations. And the welfarist organisations evolve to companies by taking fund and donation. Like Atakan, Güneş also mentioned the same ungenuine vegans of Cage Free Turkey who join the welfarist movement and expressed it as a very dangerous move for the AAAM.

As a very concerned and unpleasant advocate about the growth of welfarism in Turkey, Güneş shared some of her concerns about the AAAM and advocates as a lawyer. She said that the “Animal Protection Law” no 5199 in Turkey is a welfarist law because it is only about “the protection” of “some species of animals”, but that is all we have for the animals. For her, animal advocates must study on this law to convert it into an anti-speciesist law as much as possible and adopt struggling against welfarism as a goal. But according to her observations, the animal advocates do not even notice the danger of welfarism, so they do not think and discuss on it. At that point she asked a crucial question: “For example, what if the process of making the law no 5199 has started again, what will the vegan animal advocates demand?” She said that vegan animal advocates will not demand bigger cages for animals because they are against animal welfare, but what will they do to convert that law into an anti-speciesist law? And she continued as follows:

[104] The original sentence is “Nabza göre şerbet verme”.

> "For example, what will we [vegan animal advocates] demand there? [...] The people of welfarist side will attend [the process of making law] but vegan ones will not. Vegans do nothing about that issue. No one sits and discusses these: 'What will we demand? Let's negotiate with that [political] party or try to join a [political] party.' There are very few vegans who do that. [...] I think [most] vegans adopt the premise that 'Nothing can be done unless the property status of animal is destroyed.' and so they make no effort to progress the movement (Güneş, interview, October 2022)."[xxxviii]

Güneş also stated that the animal advocates must emphasise the ethical and anti-speciesist ideology of veganism since it is the basis of animal advocacy. She said that social media influencers do not reflect the reality of veganism, they show it as a diet without reflecting its political and ethical aspects. So for her, the animal advocates have to break the link between veganism and plant-based diet to be able to advocate animals' rights and liberation.

Aycan is another advocate who declared the same problem as the second unsuccessful aspect of the AAAM for her. She clearly said that animal advocates have to adopt the idea of confronting speciesist ideology as an ultimate goal:

> "I think second deficiency in the movement is anti-intellectualism. But I think the reason of it is not being a fresh movement. It is because our people are enemy of intellectualism. For example, it is a big problem that the movement does not encourage people to read and discuss the reading [materials] in order to confront the speciesist ideology. Because, as I said before, the issue is not kitchen only. But through this activism [methods] it [the issue] is coming down to 'only and only eating'. So sometimes [That's why] most of the attacks [we receive] are like 'today I ate chicken' or 'today I ate fish [or] liver'. It is a response to us [and our activism], because we, as vegans, also [act like] them. [...] Confronting our own speciesism is not about confronting the plate [or kitchen] (Aycan, interview, November 2022)."[xxxix]

As it can be understood from what Güneş and Aycan said, they both think that the idea that veganism is not equal to plant based diet must be emphasised by the advocates. Instead of emphasising the plate or kitchen and they should educate themselves to achieve it. Here a sentence comes to my mind that I have heard since I have gone vegan. It is a famous sentence which can be seen on stickers: "Barış tabağında başlar" means "Peace starts on your plate" I think it is a good sentence to face nonvegan people, who identify themselves as peaceful, with the animals' struggles against exploitation, abuse and slavery for their life, rights and liberation.

But after the interviews with Güneş and Aycan, I questioned that sentence for a long time and I think this sentence can be used only as a beginning sentence to face nonvegan people with their plates of almost each meal containing animals' body parts or products that are taken forcibly. But after facing the plate, nonvegan people must be encouraged to question speciesism and the power relations between humans and animals.

Besides stating her well-analysed criticism of the movement, Aycan was the only person who differentiated the ultimate goal of the current AAAM and her ideal goal of the AAAM. Indicating her dissatisfaction with the ultimate goal which is mostly accepted by the current AAAM, she supported the struggle for total liberation:

> "When I try to look from outside, what I see is a situation like inviting everyone to vegan diet. I do not think the movement is well-coordinated, I mean the vegan movement in Turkey. At the same time rescuing animals, at the same time, you know, struggling for ecological rights, at the same time struggling for LGBTİ+ rights. Instead of covering all of these, veganism is told [only]. I saw this as predominant. I think that the groups who do not call themselves as abolitionists act like that, too (Aycan, interview, November 2022)."[xl]

Onur is another advocate who emphasised total liberation as an ultimate goal both in the first and second interviews. Not seeking of total liberation is one of the main problems of the AAAM for him. That is why we talked about it for almost one hour of three-hour-long interviews. It was so clear that he had thought about the problems of the movement and the reasons of these problems before the interviews. He thought that all discriminative ideologies have been arm in arm in recent times. This situation made him think more about the interrelation of all right struggles and he believed that if all right struggles stand in solidarity, all of these struggles will be more powerful and achieve the goal of total liberation. Hence, he emphasised that the struggle for total liberation should be included while determining the movement's ultimate goal.

Advocates, whom I interviewed, believed that in order to construct a goal-oriented action plan the movement's advocates need to decide on a clear ultimate goal. They stated that this goal of the movement should include these important minor aims: creating a vegan world; struggling for total liberation; struggling against welfarism

which is getting stronger in recent years; confronting speciesism; emphasizing veganism as anti-speciesism, not a diet.

4.4.2. Failure of Getting Together

At first, I had thought of the problems about lack of goal-oriented action and failure of getting together as the same problem. Moreover they had not been differentiated by any advocates whom I had talked about the AAAM until I conduct this research. Even some of the advocates whom I interviewed did not differentiate them. I can understand them. Because I managed to differentiate them in the middle of data analysis process. I am also looking forward to talk about them about this differentiation when I finish this research.

But why do not most of the advocates know and tell the difference between goal-oriented action and getting together? To be organised, first of all, the advocates need to get together and be able to talk, discuss, define and decide on an ultimate goal for the movement. The well-organised goal-oriented action plan can start only afterwards. But if advocates are not able to get together, they could not have an ultimate goal to create a goal-oriented action around it. Thus "to be organised" or to create a goal-oriented action the advocates have to get together in the first place. But according to most of the advocates and me, the AAAM advocates fail to get together. So they cannot decide on an ultimate goal and as a result they cannot constitute a goal-oriented action plan for the AAAM.

Özge was another advocate who complained about the failure of getting together and managed to differentiate it from goal-oriented action. Saying that we need to make the communication free from hierarchy since hierarchy was the starting point of the problems for getting together and Özge emphasised the importance of adopting principles to avoid the problem of hierarchy. Özgür labelled the failure of getting together as the biggest problem of the AAAM. She said that "Even we exclude each other, the ones in the movement. How could we manage to include other people and involve them in the movement? This is the main problem, I think (Özgür, interview, October 2022)."[xli]

When I explore the narratives of Özge and Özgür, I figured out that the advocates should find a way to get together first to be able to define an ultimate goal and second to constitute a goal-oriented action plan. Since Özge mentioned hierarchy as the main obstacle for getting together and Özgür mentioned exclusion of each other, it became clear that the reasons of the failure of getting together are closely connected to the problems of interpersonal relationships.

Then, when I looked at my notes and codes about the unsuccessful aspects, I came up Aycan's statements again: "Whenever three people come together, there happens harassment. Whenever three people come together, a group disbands because of one's ego (Aycan, interview, November 2022)."[xlii] Thus the data and I ended up forming the following theme since it was seen as a significant problem by the advocates.

4.4.3. Interpersonal Relationship Problems of the Advocates: "Because Advocates' Identities Get Ahead of the Subjects: Animals"

Here I come to a crucial point. I argue that this problem is one of the main reasons of all unsuccessful aspects of the AAAM. Besides my observations and the problems due to interpersonal relationships among the advocates I have experienced in the movement, all of the advocates mentioned this issue as a problem. Thus another theme was emerged.

Although I have expected the advocates to complain about their personal problems before starting to conduct the interviews, I did not presume that each advocate has experienced some problems related to interpersonal relationships among the advocates. Truthfully I have felt relieved, because before the interviews at some point I had not been sure about studying the successful and unsuccessful aspects of the AAAM. I had mistakenly thought that I had pictured a negative image of the AAAM because of the problems that I personally had experienced with my former animal advocate friends but actually the movement had not had so many big problems. But then, when I continued to conduct the interviews and transcribing them, I realised that most of the advocates complained about the interpersonal problems in the movement even before I ask about the situation of the AAAM.

Hence here, I will investigate the interpersonal relationship problems of the advocates in the AAAM.

All of the advocates think that some advocates' identities generally go ahead of the subjects, who are the animals, in the AAAM and they identified it as a huge problem: the problem of pseudo advocates. This issue in the unsuccessful aspects category is the only one that each advocate has common thoughts and opinions. They reflected their worry and displeasure using different words but they meant that the AAAM must struggle for the rights and liberation of animals, not for the "pseudo advocates and these advocates' identities".

Güneş was one of the advocates who defined the problem using a well-said phrase: "Because Advocates' Identities Get Ahead of the Subjects: Animals"[xliii] Indicating its harm to the AAAM, she continued:

> "Actually I am not at a point that I can criticise all the people who do that. Because the society prompts you to do it. And suddenly you realise that you have started to advocate yourself, you have started to advocate vegans. Since the people's point of view is like that, at some point it evolves to identity movement. [...] I think the reason of the disbandment of initiatives [and groups] seems to be that. On the other hand, it seems also the result of the disbandment of initiatives [and groups] (Güneş, interview, October 2022)."[xliv]

Although Güneş said that she was not at a point to be able to criticize the mentioned advocates at first, then she described what they did as the possible reason of the disbandment of the groups. It can be understood that she wanted to stress the difficulty of being an advocate in this society where an advocate necessitate protecting her/himself from verbal assaults at first. Then she stressed its harm to the groups and advocates. During the interview, while she was talking about the conflicted issues of the movement, with dissatisfaction she said that "You know, while the welfarism is getting stronger, vegans are criticizing each other so harshly... [These vegans are] saying that 'Hey you, do not do it. I will do it [the same thing] (Güneş, interview, October 2022)."[xlv] These sentences can be seen as other signs that she was upset about the interpersonal problems of advocates since the advocates were not –and should not be- the subject in animal advocacy.

During the interviews I did not need to ask about this problem explicitly to all advocates, because most of them mentioned it without asking. But when I realised that Funda slightly mentioned the personal problems of the advocates, I asked her opinion about that problem explicitly. She clearly stated that she had not thought of it before saying: "Well, it is a nice issue [to think]. It made me think... A huge question mark... At the beginning, you know, I mentioned devotion. This problem crates an obstacle for it [for being devoted] (Funda, interview, October 2022)."

Yaprak stated that she has discussed that problem from time to time with her close friends and said:

> "I am sorry, but we [with my close friends] sometimes laugh at it. I think that there are lots of people who use [veganism] as identity with the necessity to belong to a group. But they give themselves away [in time], anyway. You also would experience it. It does not happen in a long time, actually. In a very short time they give themselves away. And they are forced to be outside [of the community] or they prefer to leave (Yaprak, interview, October 2022)."[xlvi]

According to the advocates I interviewed, some animal advocates want to become visible or prominent in the movement and that is a problematic wish. Advocates suggested that advocates' wishes must be to struggle for animal rights and the advocacy must focus on animals. But this kind of people does not struggle for animals; they wish is to become popular among the advocates, to place themselves at the top of a group of advocates and to clearly imply that: "I know the best". That sentence was said by Özgür to express the ideas of some advocates. I had planned to use that sentence as the title of this theme because it clearly summarised the problem. But I changed my mind after the interview with Güneş.

Aycan said "Everyone who goes vegan declares themselves The Messiah Christ." to define the arrogance of the animal advocates. This problem was the third of four biggest problems of the AAAM according to her. Before starting sharing her thoughts, she said me that her thoughts were "too subjective" about the reasons. I think she was referring to the fact that her thoughts on this issue were not appropriate to mention in an academic thesis and I must take the note of "too subjective" as a warning before adding it on the thesis as data. However, I chose to quote her perfect sentence exactly since I found this sentence to be so impressive

when I first heard it. Apart from her, two more advocates shared similar thoughts. Moreover that sub-theme is a part of the interpersonal relationship problems theme, which is seen as one of the main problems of the AAAM. Aycan stated that:

> "And there is arrogance. I mean, this is too subjective. Certainly that case has a social-politic aspect. But there is a certain degree of arrogance. I mean, OK. Everyone who goes vegan declares themselves The Messiah Christ. It cannot be like that. You see, we all are people who try and support some exploitation types and we are products of this system. You know, it is also a sign that we [as advocates] still could not leave human-centrism [ideology]. We do what we need to do. That's it. That is the all case. This is an issue that must not be in any struggle (Aycan, interview, November 2022)."[xlvii]

About the unsuccessful aspects of the AAAM, she talked about four main problems. At the end of the second interview, I asked Aycan the possible solutions of all the problems that she mentioned, she said me only one sentence: "Physician, heal thyself."[105] After we laughed, I asked again "Really, is not there any [solution]?" and she said:

> "I tried what I knew, but it did not work out. I may mention them. First of all, the wish of the groups, organizations and movements must be this. The wish must be the struggle that you place the animal rights, animals' right to live at the center of it [the struggle]. If the wish was not that, it could not work with whichever tactic or way. Because, I know it's extremely unpleasant, but this kind of things happen. Definitely there would be some people who want to become visible. Oh! You know. Our age is age of visibility. People go mad to become visible. I have witnessed so many fights that all of them were so personal and none of them were related to animals. So the people who wish really this [struggle for animals] must get together (Aycan, interview, November 2022)."[xlviii]

I asked her "How could we find those people to come together?", I meant the people who wish to struggle really for animals. Again, she said a very short sentence as an answer "We cannot." and continued:

> "Maybe this can help... forming so strict principles. Something like... everybody is anonymous. For example, all texts are signed anonymously. All division of work is done equally. But, you know, at that point people lose their minds. For instance, someone would speak to the press, everybody loses their minds. They eat each other alive. [You think] 'What's that!' You know, the issue must have been hunting. Or we must have been against something. But, no. It does not work, you know. This is the question of all opponent movements and I have not met someone who had the answer (Aycan, interview, November 2022)."[xlix]

[105] The original Turkish proverb is "Kelin ilacı olsa kendi başına sürer".

Hazar is another advocate who shared his unpleasant experiences that he had through in many animal advocacy groups as the unsuccessful aspects. According to him, someone in a group imposes her/his ideas and eliminates others' ideas to build an authoritarian system or someone experiences "hubris syndrome" and become the king or queen of the hierarchy of authority that s/he had created. For Hazar, this problem is not acceptable for an advocacy movement, but he thinks that the advocates fail to realize that problem.

4.5. Evaluation of the Narratives

In this chapter, which is the most original chapter of the thesis, I examined the current situation of the AAAM in Turkey, which was brought up to the present date in the previous chapter, through in-depth semi-structured interviews and observations in various activities within the movement. The interviews were conducted with 12 anti-speciesist animal advocates from various cities of Turkey in October and November. The observations were held in the last months of 2022. I provided the collected data through interviews and observations in detail and without interpretation. In this part, I aim to state and interpret the collected data of chapter 4 by taking into account the information from chapters two and three. Even though I have made connections throughout the previous three chapters, I believe that explaining how they relate to one another in this part will contribute to a better understanding of the chapter four.

According to the narratives, all of the animal advocates I interviewed openly rejected and condemned speciesism and said that going vegan means rejecting and challenging speciesism. They said that their aim of taking part in the movement was to fight against speciesism. Nearly all of the advocates claimed that speciesism was discrimination like other forms of violence and oppression. It was evident that the advocates based their ideas and activities on the fight against speciesism. In this sense, it can be seen that the advocates' ideas and activities are similar to animal advocacy theories, which are based on the fact that speciesism is a wrong attitude.

The majority of advocates, nine of twelve, stated to have been a vegetarian for a while before going vegan. Most of these -former vegetarian now vegan- advocates

said that when they had been vegetarians, they had thought that they rejected speciesism and they had been fighting for animals' rights. But when they went vegan, they realised that they had not rejected speciesism as a vegetarian, but rather they had continued to harm animals by abusing them for some products such as diary, honey and leather. They suggested that an animal advocate must openly reject speciesism and go vegan as a natural consequence of this rejection. Moreover they must advocate for the rights of all animals who are the most oppressed living beings in society. In this context, they expressed their hope that non-vegan animal lovers and animal volunteers will expand the concept of rights that they advocate for cats and dogs. Some advocates said that the animal lovers and animal volunteers must go vegan for a fair world, questioning the speciesist ideas and practices which differentiate cats and dogs from other animals.

The great majority of advocates –eleven of twelve- stated that they started to identify themselves as an animal rights or liberation advocate after going vegan. It can be said that going vegan made them an animal advocate. This statement can be considered in accordance with the consequence of animal advocacy theories stated in chapter 2, which states that a person who advocates for animal rights and accepts animals as individuals –subjects-of-a-life in Regan's term- rather than property can only be a consistent person if s/he goes vegan. Furthermore, some animal advocates had deep relationship with certain animal species –mostly cats and dogs- before they became vegan and advocate. Based on their relationships with these species, they evaluated their relationships with other animals and inevitably went vegan and became animal advocates as a result of the evaluation process.

While talking about their process of becoming animal advocates and their opinions on the current situation of AAAM, the advocates frequently used the terms and ideas in animal advocacy theories. Although they did not directly mention the scholars, philosophers and their theories that were discussed in Chapter 2, their opinions referred to Ryder and Singer while rejecting speciesism; and to Regan while claiming the fact that animals are sentient and conscious beings; and to Francione while asserting that viewing animals not as individuals but as property is one of the biggest problems of animal advocacy; and to Best while suggesting that

speciesism is inextricably linked with other forms of discrimination and therefore animal advocates should struggle for total liberation.

In this context, it can be claimed that these advocates, who actively participated in the movement, developed their viewpoints in accordance with animal advocacy theories. Even though the advocates -with a few exceptions- did not read the academic books or articles about animal advocacy firsthand, they might have unintentionally formed their own viewpoints on what they heard at seminars and events they attended, or on what they read on posts in social media. They could have developed a common language within the advocates in accordance with academic theories.

About the current situation of the movement, animal advocates mentioned some strong sides. Many of the advocates claimed that it is extremely difficult to maintain optimism in the state of the world today especially in these times of severe social and economic crises. Despite these challenges, they congratulated the advocates who manage to keep their hopes alive. Another successful aspect mentioned by two advocates is that the movement in Turkey, in contrast to other countries, especially the USA and European countries, places a high value on seeking total liberation.

I noticed that the advocates mentioned mostly the negative, deficient or problematic issues and unsuccessful aspects, besides the positive and successful ones. The fact that the advocates mentioned so many problematic aspects led me to separate them into categories. After stating the problematic aspects, I had planned to mention what advocates said about the reasons of these aspects for understanding them better and about the suggestions for solving them. But while the majority of the advocates easily listed many problematic aspects, they did not clearly state the reasons for the most of these problems. Only a few advocates stated some possible reasons. Again, the many of them did not or could not offer any solutions to problems.

Although the advocates did not explicitly state any reasons, I realised that each of these aspects may be the reason for the other when I examined the unsuccessful aspects they listed. After realizing these possible reasons, I also noticed that

possible solutions were actually suggested by some advocates, albeit implicitly. And I realized that one unsuccessful aspect could be the reason of one or more unsuccessful aspects.

Although the advocates talked about many different unsuccessful aspects, almost all of them stated that the movement and advocates were groping for something and they identified this situation as one of the serious problems. They claimed that the movement did not have a collective action plan to organise events and campaigns within the movement. Some advocates stated that the movement and advocates did not have a common ultimate goal, so they were groping for something. They said that having a common ultimate goal was essential to have a collective and goal-oriented action plan.

Another problematic aspect of the AAAM was stated as failure of getting together by the advocates. According to them, when advocates get together to organise a campaign or an activity, many problems arise in that place. So I thought that this issue was different from the lack of collective action plan that there was a problem with getting and staying together as the participants of the same movement. Some advocates explicitly said that whenever several advocates came together, serious problems arose simply because they got together. They said that it was almost impossible for the advocates, who could not come together or stay together, to create a collective and goal-oriented action plan under these circumstances. I thought that this failure might be one of the reasons why the movement did not have an action plan. Because a plan is needed for collective action, and getting together of advocates is needed to be able to discuss and decide on a common goal. The collective and goal-oriented action, which is the most significant characteristics of a social movement, can only be created when advocates manage to get together and discuss on the common goal.

In order for this getting together to be beneficial, abolitionist advocates should consider stopping defending only their own activities and condemning other activities and advocates as being new-welfarist. I sincerely desire to believe (and hope) that the participation of abolitionists in the TVD-organized VegFest on 1st and 2nd October 2022 is a step in that direction (Keçeli, 2022). I had never met the AVH before at any event, so I was delighted and excited to see them at the festival.

Based on my observations at abolitionist vegans' events and throughout our discussions during these events, I realised that abolitionists thought only they were adopting Francione's theory to invite people to veganism. However, I have noticed that the majority of the advocates, even though they do not identify themselves as abolitionists, reject the status of animals as property and embrace the animal rights theory in their advocacy. It could be beneficial for abolitionists to interact with other advocates more in order to dispel this misconception. Moreover, some advocates, who are not abolitionists, claimed that it was unfair and even insulting to them to be referred to as new-welfarists by abolitionists. For at least 4 years, this situation has created problems for the movement, again based on my observations.

Another unsuccessful aspect of the movement was that the advocates within the movement had interpersonal relationship problems. All the advocates I interviewed mentioned at least one problem related to this issue. Seven advocates openly stated that some advocates' identities got ahead of the animals who must be the main subjects of the movement. They said that such self-centered behaviours of the advocates harmed the movement, other advocates in the movement, and most importantly animals. Moreover one advocate I interviewed said that some vegan people declared themselves The Messiah Christ. According to the advocates, going vegan was something that everyone who demanded justice should do, not just advocates. That being the case, it was an ego issue for an advocate to feel herself/himself superior simply because s/he was vegan, and it hurts the animals by weakening the movement.

As I mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the advocates I interviewed mentioned of many problems and unsuccessful aspects in the movement. Additionally, at the end of the interview which lasted for approximately an hour four advocates shared their feelings about the interviews and what we talked. They expressed that they felt relieved after sharing the problems of the movement and thanked me for listening to them when they poured out their hearts. Moreover, one advocate expressed that the interview and conversation was "healing" like therapy.

4.6.Self-reflexivity

Throughout this part of the thesis, I will refer to the notes that I took during my observations, after my observations and during the interviews, while transcribing the interviews, while organising the data I collected, while coding the data, while creating themes and while writing this research down. By following the dates on the notes, I believe and hope that I will be able to demonstrate how I changed as a researcher more effectively.

Around 1.5 years before deciding on this thesis topic, I cofounded a group of vegan animal advocates with my ex-best friend. This group originated from the idea of forming a vegan parade in other right-based movements' events. For five months, I spent the majority of my time organising and participating in the activities of this group rather than being more interested in my thesis and my master's courses. One day, my ex-best friend accused me and three of my friends of nothing more than sharing our opinions about a subject unrelated to animals or animal rights. I was actually the victim of bullying, but due to manipulation, I thought I was the bully for three days. When I realised that I was the victim, I wrote a message to explain the real situation, and I left the group. Many group members privately apologized to me in private messages. But, these members were unable to maintain the same attitude in the group because of the oppression.

After a stressful year filled with tears, anxiety, and sorrow, my thesis topic just came to me one day. The movement had significant problems, which made me very depressed. Some ungenuine animal advocates prioritized their own self-interest and identity over the interests of the animals. Due to self-centered individuals, participants of the already small group of vegan animal advocates were leaving the movement, which meant that animals were losing advocates who could stand up for them.

These issues appeared to be consistent with the features of the new social movements, which emphasized individualism and identity issues more so than the old social movements. Yet, this consistency, when coupled with the problems raised by advocates who prioritized their own identities and interests over those of animals, led to significant issues. With the knowledge I had gained throughout my

graduate education, I thought that I could conduct this research to provide comprehensive understanding of the movement. I believe that by going into great detail about these events, it became clearer why I chose this topic.

As a researcher who witnessed the harm caused by self-centered participants of the movement, the possibility that my experience would influence my research made me initially nervous since it would make it less objective. Nonetheless, in interviews with advocates, the majority of the advocates made it obvious from the start of the interviews that they were sharing the same complaint. Even the advocates, who themselves had not experienced any problems with the self-centered participants, expressed a great deal of dissatisfaction with this problem. My nervousness eased and my confidence in the objectivity of the research increased as I listened to their thoughts.

I had mentioned that some advocates claimed it was really valuable for them to speak with me after the interviews. I realized that advocates who made this claim had either gone through similar experiences to mine, had been bullied by their close friends in an effort to gain an advantage, or had seen other people being bullied. Some people may consider it gossip when these concerns are discussed among participants of the movement. The individual with whom you talk about this problem may also claim to understand you while afterwards maintaining her/his friendship with the bully. Because they witness this, the majority of those who are bullied would not talk about their experiences with others, get lonely, and leave the movement. Since they knew they would not be judged by me and that the interviews would be treated as academic data rather than gossip, it is possible that this is why advocates felt comfortable discussing these issues with me.

My transformation was also aided by the ideas Yaprak discussed with me throughout the interviews. Although I had previously discussed Yaprak's various opinions, I did not include some of them because the majority of advocates did not express those particular opinions. I wanted to address these in this part since my viewpoint on them changed during the process of this research. I occasionally - though not always- referred to animal lovers as "cat-dog people"[106] before the

[106] In Turkish, it is “kedi-köpekçi”.

interviews. Yet according to Yaprak, who works with animal lovers as an animal advocate for years, this term causes discomfort among those peoplewho care about animals. Even though I simply used this term for descriptive purposes and not in an exclusive manner, I questioned myself and its use. And in response to this questioning, I no longer call out to people who solely fight for the rights of cats; instead, I refer to these people as animal volunteers and animal lovers.

Yaprak and I had the chance to discuss another issue that has been worrying me for a while in great depth. Only Yaprak and one other advocate had brought up this issue, but Yaprak gave the most detailed description of her views. It is the truth that numerous non-vegan animal lovers who only advocate for the rights of cats and dogs have given all of their time, life, and money to protect them. While these animal lovers do their bests, the majority of vegan animal advocates do not care much about the cats and dogs that live even in their own neighborhood. Similarly, there are vegan animal advocates on social media who only and only share vegan recipes and who never once post about the cats and dogs looking for homes or in need of medical care. Of course, being a vegan is the basic and most consistent approach to support animal rights. Yet, animal lovers who take care of cats and dogs -not all animals- relieve the burden on vegan animal advocates who are obviously expected to advocate for all animals rights including cats and dogs of course. Due of everything mentioned above, I believe it would be improper to belittle and humiliate animal lovers. As a researcher, I believe that my changing perspectives on animals living in streets and animal centers and on animal lovers have changed me as a researcher, and this change is clearly seen in the language I use in my thesis.

Here, I will share one of my key viewpoints that has significantly changed over the research. Before going to experience my first observation as a researcher, I was excited and anxious about the abolitionist vegans' (AVH) vegan picnic activity, because I had not taken involved in any abolitionist activities for four years. Although I have appreciated the abolitionist theory and used it as the foundation for my own advocacy, I criticised how the theory was carried out in practice as action methods. Moreover, I had voiced these criticisms both to myself and to other vegan advocates when we came together. I was aware that some of those advocates

eventually adopted the abolitionist theory and stopped taking part in the same activities that I attended. At abolitionist events, like a vegan picnic or a vegan tabling, I might encounter into these advocates I used to know. For this thesis, I was aware that I had to interact with the abolitionist vegans and AVH that have been an important part of the movement. In addition, Berk Efe Altınal, one of the AVH co-founders, had spoken with me for two hours online about this thesis before I started to conduct and answered all of my questions using the knowledge he gained from writing two theses. The fact that Berk did not criticize me for not being an abolitionist during or after our interview gave me optimism as well. Aside from all of this, I also wanted to interact with the AVH's advocates who adopted Francione's theory.

Going back to write about my feelings before my first observations, I sent a message to AVH's social media account to express my desire to attend the picnic in order to observe. The group said I could join the picnic. However, I did not want to go alone, I went to the picnic with a friend from Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Vegan ve Vejetaryen Topluluğu (YTÜ VVT)[107]. It was a much warmer environment than I had expected. I had a two-week-old baby cat with me that I had to bottle-feed because her mother had died. During the whole picnic, the people there did the baby feeding and peeing, so I could rest and talk to the vegan people there. When I consulted the people about the advocate whom I should conduct an interview for the research, they said that this advocate could be Oğuzhan. I proposed to Oğuzhan, fortunately he accepted. Ten days later we had our first interview, which lasted 2.5 hours, while having vegan breakfast at a new-opened vegan cafe. Two weeks later, I went to another vegan picnic of AVH, and this time I felt not as only a researcher but also as an advocate who had known them for a long time. My encounter with the abolitionist vegans radically changed the way I have perceived the movement. While I still do not describe myself as an abolitionist vegan, now I know that they are no longer a "beast" for me.

In my whole life, I have never had anything so challenging to complete and write down as this research. My inner peace has been under a lot of pressure as a result of writing this thesis, which collects all of the causes of my sadness up to this point.

[107] English translation is "Yıldız Technical University Vegan and Vegetarian Group".

This research has repeatedly made me realize that I have been unable to save even a small number of animals. This situation also pushed me to complete writing this thesis. Reading other people's –mostly those of academicians- texts led me to become a vegan animal advocate, and my research might do the same for other people. I held tight to this idea. Writing down the movement I have experienced during the last four years has constantly reminded me the nights that I was unable to sleep because of thinking a way to stop cruelty in the world.

Writing down the "Watch of Life" demonstration has brought back some memories like my resentment I felt when I could not stay in the area at night because I was working, the rushed visits I made with snacks, coffee, fruits etc. in my backpack, and the peaceful sleep I had when I eventually managed to spend there one night. Even now, my eyes are starting to fill with tears while writing when I think that we succeeded in liberating the horses. Sometimes I shed tears and people in the library stare at me. They might think that "Why does this person cry and smile at the same time?" Because, every time I have seen the pictures of animal advocates in "Burak Özgüner watch of life area" in an online newspaper article, I have felt proud of knowing them, hugging and supporting them during the demonstration. After all, I have been always like that a person who always cries when she feels both thankful and proud.

On 12th December, I encountered the quote of Martin Luther King. It says that "Those who love peace must learn to organize as effectively as those who love war". So the vegan animal advocates, who love peace and need it for all sentient beings, must learn how to get together and organise for the ultimate goal of the movement.

5. CONCLUSION

This thesis has tried to find a valid answer for the following important question: What is the current situation of anti-speciesist animal advocacy in Turkey? To answer this question, I have attempted to analyze the current situation of the AAAM movement in Turkey by taking into account both its positive and negative aspects. Since the AAAM is the first and only -at least for now- social movement initiated by philosophers and scholars in the world and the movement is based on the ideas in the theories of these people, in the second chapter of the thesis, I have examined the theories in detail in historical order that have guided the AAAM. Another reason why I have examined the theories in detail is that the theoretical perspective is crucial for comprehending the movement, in assessing its current situation and understanding the ethnographic case study of the movement.

I began Chapter 3 with an analysis of the AAAM's characteristics as a new social movement built on the theories stated in chapter two. I examined the important events in the history of animal advocacy movement in the world, which took place concurrently with the theories. I stated that animal advocacy movement in the world evolved into an anti-speciesist movement for the rights of all animals in 1970s. Then, I examined the history of the animal rights movement in Turkey and I wrote the history of the anti-speciesist animal advocacy movement that is for the rights of all animals. I brought the history of the movement from 2010s to the present day by examining the written resources.

Based on the analyses, the animal advocates perceive the AAAM as a movement that can hardly be called successful, if not a complete failure. In this context, it can be said that the movement is not entirely successful or unsuccessful but that it is nonetheless developing. The movement's many positive and negative -successful and unsuccessful- aspects were outlined by advocates. They praised the movement for its strengths and themselves as well as other advocates for being a part of it. Only a few activists were able to express their opinions on the causes and other variables that might have contributed to the movement's problems and deficiencies, despite the fact that they discussed them in detail.

Creating a vegan world and struggling for the total liberation of animals and humans were stated as the most satisfying ideals of the movement by the advocates. Keeping hope alive, seeking for total liberation for animals and humans, the rise in the number of vegans, and stipulating veganism as a must to be an animal advocate were stated as the powerful and successful aspects of the movement. Lack of collective and goal-oriented action, failure of getting together, interpersonal relationship problems of the advocates were stated as the unsuccessful aspects of the movement.

It was seen that the ideas of the advocates I interviewed were based on the theories that I examined in Chapter 2. All advocates agreed that being anti-speciesist meant going vegan for animals. Although the advocates did not address the theories by name, the majority of their ideas were stated in the texts that included these theories. Especially, the beliefs expressed in Steven Best's book *Total Liberation* were known and accepted by the majority of advocates, despite the fact that the book was not translated into Turkish or read by the majority of advocates. This might be a result of the fact that the movement's leading advocates place a high value on total liberation and constantly write, share, and speak on the subject in seminars. Moreover, the advocates might have read the Turkish translations of Best's articles that were shared on the website "Hayvan Özgürlüğü Kütüphanesi (Animal Liberation Library)"[108], which has existed for more than ten years even though none of Steven Best's books have been translated into Turkish.

It can be claimed that the AAAM in Turkey shares the majority of the characteristics of the new social movements that I discussed in Chapter 3. Christiansen (2009, 2) noted that it is difficult to define a new social movement. Likewise, even deciding on the name to define the movement in the case of Turkey required a long-lasting decision making process. The advocates, whom I interviewed, shared an ultimate ideal of the movement, and it is seen that the movement has been making an effort to have a goal-oriented action plan but has encountered challenges in doing so for a number of reasons. These two characteristics demonstrate that this movement meets Christiansen's concept of the "new social movement."

[108] The website is: https://hayvanozgurluguhareketi.wordpress.com/. [26.01.2023].

It can be said clearly that the movement owns a unique collective identity, which is another aspect of new social movements. The advocates within the movement are anti-speciesist and vegan people. This movement clearly demonstrates the intention to achieve social change, which is acknowledged as one of the key elements of a social movement. Advocates, who first made changes in their own lives by going vegan, attempt to change the people of society into anti-speciesists, who do not abuse animals. The movement aims to reform the animal protection law into an anti-speciesist animal rights law in addition to attempting social change. This aim may show the movement's desire to bring about changes not only on the social level but also on the governmental level.

Although I had expected that by the conclusion of this thesis, solutions to the movement's problems and deficiencies would be clearly stated, the advocates were unable to even provide adequate causes of the problems or to offer practical solutions that would reduce or eliminate them. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that the movement's greatest problems were the failure of getting together of the advocates and the lack of a goal-oriented action plan. Even though the advocates have not stated decent solutions to the problems, I think some solutions can be suggested as a result of my analysis as a researcher and an advocate in the movement.

I believe the movement should protect itself from those advocates whose primary goal is not to struggle for the rights and liberation of animals, and who are self-centered, egocentric, and who create difficulties in interpersonal relationships. Advocates should then get together to discuss the movement's problems and deficiencies and decide on the ultimate goal and effective action methods of the AAAM. A goal-oriented action plan should be developed in the light of the goal and action methods. The movement that is currently in the first phase can be shifted to the second phase as a result of these steps. I think that while these steps are being implemented, the 10-year-old group of AVH should also participate. I believe that not all but some theoretical disagreements should and could be put aside in order to get together, when the aim is to struggle for the animal rights and liberation.

In the last title of chapter 4, I tried to introduce the ever-changing researcher Arzum, me, who has highly transformed, through the notes I took about my feelings

and thoughts and the decisions I made during this research that lasted about 2 years. As both a researcher and a participant of the AAAM, I explained how I carried out this research and how I changed and improved through what I found out, listened to, and observed along the way.

One of the limitations of this thesis is that it could not examine the AAAM's online activities on the social media platforms, where the movement is really active, according to my observations and those of the advocates I interviewed. I decided not to include social media advocacy since it has innumerable profiles, posts, and activities, and I had to limit my research. The activities of animal advocates, the posts they share, and the comments made by nonvegan people on these posts might all be considered data and could be analysed in future research. Another limitation might be conducting online interviews with advocates who do not live in the same city as me, in this case, İstanbul. I hold this opinion because having vegan food or beverages while conducting face-to-face interviews helps the interview to take a more natural course and the interviewee feels more comfortable. In addition, while three of the advocates I interviewed in person said the interviews made them feel relaxed and relieved, only one of the five advocates I interviewed online expressed the same emotions.

At the end of the interviews, some advocates expressed that they felt relieved and significant since they could make a difference in the movement by talking about it. Another advocate, Bilge said it this way: "We talked to you about issues that we need to sit down and discuss among ourselves as advocates (Bilge, interview, October 2022)." Due to these two similar situations, I believe that speaking with different advocates from different cities and different groups might provide a variety of perspectives on the movement. Particularly, research to be carried out after 2022 might give further information on the movement as it would analyse its own era and be undertaken with various advocates. Future studies might find it useful to conduct focus group interviews with the advocates to examine the narrations and conversations that the advocates have among themselves and discover more details about the movement.

REFERENCES

‘6. Madde Kaldırılırsa, Milyonlarca Hayvan Öldürülecek’. 2023. Evrensel Haber. 11 Ocak. https://www.evrensel.net/haber/479266/6-madde-kaldirilirsa-milyonlarca-hayvan-oldurulecek . [24.01.2023].

2023 Burak Özgüner Öğrenci Teşvik Bursu Başvuruları Açıldı! 2022. Burak Özgüner. 19 Ekim. http://www.burakozguner.com/2023-burak-ozguner-ogrenci-tesvik-bursu-basvurulari-acildi/ . [12.01.2023].

Adams, Carol J. 2010. **The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-vegetarian Critical Theory.** (20th Anniversary Ed.) New York: Continuum.

Aksulu, Miray. 2013. New Social Movements: Animal Rights Advocacy and Social Media in Turkey. Master’s Thesis. Maltepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Alkan, Ayten. 2020. **Şehir ve Hayvan**. ed. Ayten Alkan. İstanbul: Patika Kitap.

Altınal, Berk Efe. 2015. A Critical Study of the Moral Status of Non-human Animals in Western Ontology and Ethics. Master’s Thesis. İstanbul Bilgi University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

_____. 2019. Marginalization of Animals in the Context of Speciesism. Master’s Thesis. İstanbul University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Antinatalism. [15.11.2022]. Macmillan Dictionary. https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/antinatalism.

Aydın, Rabia, İpek Çelebi. 2019. Hayvan Hakları İçin 4 Ağustos’ta Büyük Eylem. Bianet. 2 Ağustos. https://bianet.org/bianet/medya/211188-hayvan-haklari-icin-4-agustos-ta-buyuk-eylem . [10.01.2023].

Bakan Kirişci: Kısırlaştırılmış Hayvanların Geri Bırakılmaması Kanaatı Varsa Mevzuat Değişikliği Gerektiriyor. 2023. Evrensel Haber. 09 Ocak. https://www.evrensel.net/haber/479097/bakan-kirisci-kisirlastirilmis-hayvanlarin-geri-birakilmamasi-kanaati-varsa-mevzuat-degisikligi-gerektiriyor . [24.01.2023].

Başarı Öykülerimiz. [07.01.2023]. Haytap. https://www.haytap.org/tr/bagislarinizi-nerede-kullaniyoruz/basari-oykulerimiz.

Batmaz, Ardıl. 2022. HAYKURDER Başkanı Paçalı: Havrita köpekleri hedef gösteriyor. Gazete Duvar. 07 Haziran.https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/haykurder-baskani-pacali-havrita-kopekleri-hedef-gosteriyor-haber-1568015. [11.01.2023].

Bavra, Merve. 2021. "Sokak Hayvanlarını Toplamak Kültürel Bir Katliam Olur; Yasaya Aykırıdır, Bunu Yapan Belediyeler Suç Işler!". T24. 27 Aralık.

https://t24.com.tr/haber/sokak-hayvanlarini-toplamak-kulturel-bir-katliam-olur,1003644.

Bayramoğlu, Yunus. 2019. Humans vs. Animals: A Contemporary Moral Perspective toward Dietary And Ethical Lifestyles. Master's Thesis. Kadir Has University School of Graduate Studies.

Best, Steven. 2009. The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: Putting Theory into Action And Animal Liberation into Higher Education, **Journal for Critical Animal Studies.** Vol.7, No. 1: 9–53.

_____. 2014. **The Politics of Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century.** New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

_____. Anthony J. Nocella. 2004. **Behind the Mask: Uncovering the Animal Liberation Front. in Terrorists or Freedom Fighters? Reflections on the Liberation of Animals.** Newyork: Lantern Books.

Biz Kimiz. [07.01.2023]. Haykonfed. https://www.haykonfed.org/biz-kimiz/.

Biz Kimiz. [10.01.2023]. Türkiye Vegan Derneği. https://tvd.org.tr/biz-kimiz/.

Biz Kimiz. [11.01.2023]. Yeryüzüne Özgürlük Derneği. https://yeryuzuneozgurluk.wordpress.com/biz-kimiz/ .

Braun, Virginia, Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, Vol. 3, No. 2: 77-101. ISSN 1478-0887.

Buav Changes to Cruelty Free International. 2015. Cruelty Free International. [08.12.2022]. https://crueltyfreeinternational.org/latest-news-and-updates/buav-changes-cruelty-free-international.

Bugün Bayram, Vegan Olun Çocuklar. 2013. Bianet. 16 Ekim. https://m.bianet.org/kurdi/hayvan-haklari/150639-bugun-bayram-vegan-olun-cocuklar. [10.01.2023].

Burak Özgüner Hayvan Hakları Çalışma Merkezi. [12.01.2023]. Vegfest. https://vegfest.istanbul/clients/burhak/ .

Burak Özgüner Hayvan Hakları Kütüphanesi Desteğinizi Bekliyor! 2022. Burak Özgüner. 02 Haziran. http://www.burakozguner.com/burak-ozguner-hayvan-haklari-kutuphanesi-desteginizi-bekliyor/ . [12.01.2023].

Büyükada'da Ruam Hastası Olan 80 At Öldürülecek İddiası. 2019. Birgün. 18 Aralık. https://www.birgun.net/haber/buyukada-da-ruam-hastasi-olan-80-at-oldurulecek-iddiasi-280608. [10.01.2023].

Büyüksamancı, Salih. 2023. Konya'da Köpeğin Kürekle Öldürülmesinde Sanıklara Verilen Cezayı Az Bulan Savcılıktan Itiraz. Hürriyet Gazetesi. 23 Kasım. https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/konyada-kopegin-kurekle-oldurulmesinde-saniklara-verilen-cezayi-az-bulan-savciliktan-itiraz-42208464. [26.01.2023].

Calhaun, Craig. 1993. "New Social Movements" of the Early Nineteenth Century. **Social Science History**. Vol. 17, No. 3: 385-427.

Campbell, Heather M. 2009. **The Britannica Guide to Political and Social Movements that Changed the Modern World**. Rosen Education Service.

Caviola, Lucius, Capraro, V. 2020. Liking but Devaluing Animals: Emotional and Deliberative Paths to Speciesism. **Social Psychological and Personality Science.** Vol. 11, No. 8: 1-9.

Caviola, Lucius, Jim A.C. Everett, Nadira S. Faber. 2018. The Moral Standing of Animals: Towards a Psychology of Speciesism. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**. Vol. 116, No. 6: 1011-1029.

Çetinkaya, Doğan Y. 2014. **Toplumsal Hareketler**: **Tarih**, **Teori** ve **Deneyim**. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Cherry, Elizabeth. 2006. Veganism as a Cultural Movement: A Relational Approach, **Social Movement Studies**, Vol. 5, No. 2: 155-170.

_____. 2010. Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement, **Sociological Forum**, Vol. 25, No. 3: 450-475.

_____. 2015. I Was a Teenage Vegan: Motivation and Maintenance of Lifestyle Movements. **Sociological Inquiry**. Vol. 85, No. 1: 55–74.

Christiansen, Jonathan. 2009. Four Stages of Social Movements. **EBSCO Research Starters:** 1-7.

Coşkun, Aziz. 2019. **Yeni Toplumsal Hareketlere Alternatif Bir Bakış**. Ankara: İksad Publishing House.

Curnutt, Jordan. 2001. **Animals and the Law: A Sourcebook.** Calif: Santa Barbara. https://books.google.com.tr/books?redir_esc=y&hl=tr&id=p2p0MptGeBkC&q=victoria#v=onepage&q&f=false. [20.11.2022].

Della Porta, Donatella, Diani, M. 2006. **Social movements: An introduction (2nd Ed).** Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Della Porta, Donatella. 2014. **Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dikin, Sevginur. 2019. Hayvan Hakları Savunucularından Adalar Ulaşım Çalıştayı Hakkında Ortak Açıklama: Hükümsüzdür! Gaia Dergi. 30 Ağustos. https://gaiadergi.com/hayvan-haklari-savunucularindan-adalar-ulasim-calistayi-hakkinda-ortak-aciklama-hukumsuzdur/. [11.01.2023].

Donaldson, Sue, Will Kymlicka. 2011. **Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eliaçık, İhsan. 2014. Hayvan Kesmeye Hayır Bayrama Evet. Bianet. 04 Ekim. https://m.bianet.org/biamag/diger/158920-hayvan-kesmeye-hayir-bayrama-evet. [23.01.2023].

Eralp, Alican. 2020. Speciesism and Media: Speciesist Journalism Practices in Turkey. Master's Thesis. Galatasaray University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Ergin Zengin, Sezen. 2017. From Subject to Object: An Analysis of the Changing Status of the Animal through Discourse Analysis. PhD Thesis. Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Everett, Jim A. C., Lucius Caviola, Julian Savulescu, Nadira S. Faber. 2019. Speciesism, Generalized Prejudice, and Perceptions of Prejudiced Others. **Group Processes & Intergroup Relations.** Vol. 22, No. 6: 785–803.

Fıstık, Fırat. 2019. İlk Defa Birlikte: "Vegan Ol". Gazete Kadıköy. 05 Ağustos. https://www.gazetekadikoy.com.tr/yasam/ilk-defa-birlikte-vegan-ol. [10.01.2023].

Francione, Gary L. 1996. **Rain without Thunder.** Temple University Press.

_____. 2000. **Introduction to Animal Rights: Your Child or the Dog?** Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

_____. 2009. **Animals as Persons: Essays on the Abolition of Animal Exploitation**. New York: Columbia University Press: 210-229.

_____. 2018. Reflections on Tom Regan and the Animal Rights Movement That Once Was. **Between the Species.** Vol. 21, No. 1: 2-41.

Francione, Gary L., Anna Charlton. 2017. **Advocate for animals! An Abolitionist Vegan Handbook**. Exempla Press.

Francione, Gary L., Robert Garner. 2010. **The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?** New York: Columbia University Press. doi:10.7312/fran14954.

Francione, Gary L., William M. Kunstler. 1995. **Animals Property & the Law**. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1bw1jm9 [16.12.2022].

Gaarder, Emily. 2011. Where the Boys Aren't: The Predominance of Women in Animal Rights Activism. **Feminist Formations**. Vol. 23, No. 2: 54-76.

Garlick, Ben. 2015. Not All Dogs Go to Heaven, Some Go to Battersea: Sharing Suffering and the 'Brown Dog Affair'. **Social & Cultural Geography.** Vol. 16, No. 7: 798–820. doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2015.1016096.

Gerçeklik Küpü: Sömürünün İfşası. 2019. Karşı Mahalle. 18 Haziran. https://www.karsimahalle.org/2019/06/18/gerceklik-kupu-somurunun-ifsasi. [20.12.2022].

Gezi Parkı Vegan Forumu. [10.01.2023]. Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket. https://abolisyonistveganhareket.org/VeganForum.

Göncü, Bârika. 2021. Hayvan Dostu İletişim Kılavuzu. ed. Bârika Göncü. İstanbul Bilgi University. https://www.sivilsayfalar.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Hayvan-Dostu-I%CC%87letis%CC%A7im-Kilavuzu.pdf . [12.01.2023].

Gündoğdu, Cihangir. 2018. The State and the Stray Dogs in Late Ottoman Istanbul: from Unruly Subjects to Servile Friends, **Middle Eastern Studies**. Vol. 54, No. 4: 1-20. doi: 10.1080/00263206.2018.1432482 .

Gürler, Ayşe Menteş, Berfin Melikoğlu, Şule Osmanağaoğlu. 2011. A Historical Evaluation of Animal Protection Efforts of Non-governmental Organizations in Turkey. **Kafkas Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi.** Vol. 17, No. 6: 901-908, 2011.

Gürler, Ayşe Menteş, Şule Osmanağaoğlu. 2009. Türkiye'de Hayvanları Koruma Kanununun Tarihsel Gelişimi. **Kafkas Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi**. Vol. 15, No. 3: 325-330.

Güven, Yağmur Özgür. 2019. 'Biz Daha Çocuğuz'. Yeşil Gazete. 16 Kasım. https://yesilgazete.org/biz-daha-cocuguz/. [12.01.2023].

_____. 2022. Bilimde Hayvan Tarihi. **Hayvan Hakları Tarihi ve Türkiye.** ed. Aşkın Yaşar. İstanbul: İBB Yayınları: 98-125.

Güven, Yağmur Özgür, Oğuzcan Kınıkoğlu. 2020. **Hayvan Deneyleri.** İstanbul: Yeni İnsan Yayınevi.

HAKİM ile Çalışmalarını ve Sivil Düşün Destekli Ziyaretlerini Konuştuk. [12.01.2023]. Sivil Düşün. https://www.sivildusun.net/hakim-roportaji/.

Hakkımızda, [11.01.2023]. Vegan Dükkan. https://www.vegandukkan.com/pages/hakkimizda.

Hakkımızda. [10.01.2023]. V-Label. https://www.v-label.com/tr/about-us/.

Haspolat, Gizem. 2019. Human-Non-Human Socialities in the City: An Examination of Istanbul's Multispecies Histories. Master's Thesis. Boğaziçi University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Hayvan Hakkı Savunucuları: Fayton Yasaklansın, Sorumlular için Soruşturma Başlatılsın. 2019. Evrensel. 19 Aralık. https://www.evrensel.net/haber/393500/hayvan-hakki-savunuculari-fayton-yasaklansin-sorumlular-icin-sorusturma-baslatilsin. [10.02.2023].

Hayvanları “Koruma” Kanunu için Veto Çağrısı. 2021. Bianet. 11 Temmuz. https://m.bianet.org/bianet/hayvan-haklari/247093-hayvanlari-koruma-kanunu-icin-veto-cagrisi . [10.01.2023].

Hayvanseverler “Dövülerek Öldürüldüklerini” Iddia Etti; Mamak Belediyesi’nden Kanlar Içindeki Köpeklere Ilişkin Açıklama Geldi. 2022. T24. 25 Kasım. https://t24.com.tr/haber/hayvanseverler-dovulerek-oldurulduklerini-iddia-etti-mamak-belediyesi-nden-kanlar-icindeki-kopeklere-iliskin-aciklama-geldi,1074801 . [12.01.2023].

Hayvanseverler Sokak Hayvanları Için Ankara'da Buluştu: 'Kürekle Değil, Yürekle Geliyoruz'. 2023. Cumhuriyet Gazetesi. 15 Ocak. https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/turkiye/hayvanseverler-sokak-hayvanlari-icin-ankarada-bulustu-kurekle-degil-yurekle-geliyoruz-2021798 . [24.01.2023].

Hayvanseverlerden Eylem: "Nereye Gidiyor Bu Hayvanlar?" 2023. Bianet. 16 Ocak. https://m.bianet.org/bianet/hayvan-haklari/256299-hayvanseverlerden-eylem-nereye-gidiyor-bu-hayvanlar . [24.01.2023].

Heywood, Andrew. 2017. **Political Ideologies an Introduction** (Sixth Edition). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hochschartner, Jon. 2017. **The Animals' Freedom Fighter: A Biography of Ronnie Lee, Founder of the Animal Liberation Front.** United States: McFarland.

Hockaday, James. 2019. Record 12,000 Vegan Activists Take Part in London Animal Rights March. 18 August. https://metro.co.uk/2019/08/18/record-12000-vegan-activists-take-part-london-animal-rights-march-10591790/ [18.11.2022].

Ilişanu, Georgiana, Andrei, Virginia. 2019. Discourse Analysis of Health Risk Perceptions. Understanding Public Debates on Childhood Vaccination. **Romanian Sociology**. Vol. 17, No. 1: 92-113.

İnal, Onur. 2020. "Ayten Alkan, der., Şehir ve Hayvan. İstanbul: Patika Kitap, 279 sayfa. ISBN: 9786056887741". Annual of Istanbul Studies 2 (2020): 214-215. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1462360 . [23.01.2023].

Isacat, Ben. 2015. **How to Do Animal Rights …legally, with confidence**. Lulu.com.

Kafessiz Türkiye, [20.11.2022], https://kafessizturkiye.com/.

Kalkandelen, Zülal, Can Başkent. 2013. **Veganism: Ahlakı, Siyaseti ve Mücadelesi.** İstanbul: Propoganda.

Kalkandelen, Zülal. 2018. **Vegan Devrimi ve Hayvan Özgürlüğü.** İstanbul: Kült.

_____. 2019. Yanan Atlar Ve Kafası Koparılan Kurt. Cumhuriyet Gazetesi. 6 Ocak.https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/zulal-kalkandelen/yanan-atlar-ve-kafasi-koparilan-kurt-1192475. [11.01.2023].

_____. 2021a. Hayvanları Korumama Kanunu mu Çıkarılıyor? Cumhuriyet Gazetesi. 09 Şubat. https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/zulal-kalkandelen/hayvanlari-korumama-kanunu-mu-cikariliyor-1812301. [11.01.2023].

_____. 2021b. **Vegan Devrimi ve Hayvan Özgürlüğü.** İstanbul: Yeni İnsan Yayınevi.

_____. 2022. Kim bu Devlet Yetkilileri? Cumhuriyet Gazetesi. 26 Ağustos. https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/zulal-kalkandelen/kim-bu-devlet-yetkilileri-1973775. [12.01.2023].

Kara, Furkan. 2019. Ahırlar Yandı, Atlar Alevlerin Içinde Kaldı. Sabah Gazetesi. 2 Ocak. [11.01.2013]. https://www.sabah.com.tr/yasam/ahirlar-yandi-atlar-alevlerin-icinde-kaldi-4481015.

Karakaş, Zülal Hazal. 2019. A critic of androcentric world view in intersectionality of feminism and anti-speciesism. Master's Thesis. Hacettepe Üniversitesi University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Karataş, Gizem. 2022. "Sıcak ve güvenli barınak olur mu?". Birgün Gazetesi. 04 Aralık. https://www.birgun.net/haber/sicak-ve-guvenli-barinak-olur-mu-412374. [04.02.2023].

Karlı, Barış. 2020. Av. Barış Karlı Yazdı: Adalar'da neler oluyor? Beyanet. 8 Ocak. https://beyanet.com/av-baris-karli-yazdi-adalarda-neler-oluyor/. [10.01.2023].

Kean, Hilda.1998. **Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain since 1800**. London: Reaktion Books.

Keçeli, Osman. 2022. Festival Park Kadıköy'de Vegfest 22: "Veganım Soru Sorabilirsiniz". Independent Türkiye. 10 Ekim. https://www.indyturk.com/node/561736/%C3%A7evre/festival-park-kad%C4%B1k%C3%B6yde-vegfest-22-vegan%C4%B1m-soru-sorabilirsiniz . [23.01.2023].

Kew, Barry. 1999. Fearsome Truths: The Challenge of Animal Liberation. PhD Thesis. University of Durham Department of Sociology & Social Policy.

Kınıkoğlu, Murat. 2015. **Vegan Beslenme**. İstanbul: OğlakYayınları.

_____. 2018. **Vegan Sağlık**. İstanbul: OğlakYayınları.

Kıroğlu, Filiz. 2021. Türkiye'de Hayvanlara Yönelik Şiddetin Hayvan Hakları Koruma Kanunu Kapsamında Değerlendirilmesi. **MEYAD Akademi**. Vol. 2, No. 2: 172-185.

Koç, Yüksel. 2019. Büyükada'da 9 Atın Öldüğü Yangının Sebebi Belli Oldu. Hürriyet Gazetesi. 3 Ocak. [11.01.2013]. https://Www.Hurriyet.Com.Tr/Gundem/Buyukadada-9-Atin-Oldugu-Yanginin-Sebebi-Belli-Oldu-41071811.

Konya'da İşkenceyle Öldürülen Köpek | Hayvan Hakları Aktivistleri Konya'da. 2022. Bianet. 25 Kasım. https://m.bianet.org/bianet/hayvan-haklari/270514-konya-da-iskenceyle-oldurulen-kopek-hayvan-haklari-aktivistleri-konya-da. [12.01.2023].

Konya'da İşkenceyle Öldürülen Köpek | Sanıklara İlk Duruşmada Tahliye Kararı. 2023. Bianet. 02 Ocak. https://m.bianet.org/bianet/hayvan-haklari/272271-konya-da-iskenceyle-oldurulen-kopek-saniklara-ilk-durusmada-tahliye-karari . [24.01.2023].

Köpeğin Kürekle Öldürülmesi Davasında 2 Sanığa Hapis Cezası. 2023. DHA. 20 Ocak. https://www.dha.com.tr/yerel-haberler/konya/merkez/kopegin-kurekle-oldurulmesi-davasinda-2-saniga-2193469. [26.01.2023].

Kretzer, Michelle. 2019. Joaquin Phoenix's Newest Must-See Film: 'The Animal People'. PETA. 29 November. https://www.peta.org/blog/joaquin-phoenix-the-animal-people-documentary/. [13.01.2023].

Kurban Bayramı ve Tek Konulu Kampanyalar. 2014. Abolisyonist Vegan Hareket. 15 Eylül. https://abolisyonistveganhareket.org/post/97557547556/kurban-bayram%C4%B1-ve-tek-konulu-kampanyalar. [10.01.2023].

Langley, Gill, Joyce D'Silva. 1998. **Animal Organs in Humans: Uncalculated Risks & Unanswered Questions.** London and Petersfield: British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection and Compassion in World Farming.

Leavy, Patricia. 2011. **Oral History: Understanding Qualitative Research.** Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Lexical Gap. [09.10.2022]. Oxford Reference. https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199202720.001.0001/acref-9780199202720-e-1867.

Lind-Af-Hageby, E., Schartau, L. 1903. **The Shambles of Science.** London: Ernest Bell. https://ia801000.us.archive.org/16/items/shamblesofscienc00lind/shamblesofscienc00lind.pdf.

Manifesto. [11.01.2023]. Yeryüzüne Özgürlük Derneği. https://yeryuzuneozgurluk.wordpress.com/biz-kimiz/manifesto/ .

Manifestomuz, [07.01.2023]). Haytap. https://www.haytap.org/tr/kurumsal/manifestomuz.

McDonald, Barbara. 2000. “Once You Know Something, You Can’t Not Know It”: An Empirical Look at Becoming Vegan. **Society & Animals.** Vol. 8, No. 1: 1-23.

Melucci, Alberto. I980. The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach. **Social Science Information**. Vol. 19, No. 2: 199-226.

Membership Services. [18.11.2022]. Peta. https://www.peta.org/donate/membership-services/.

Merskin, Debra, Carrie P. Freeman. 2020. Animals and Media: A Style Guide for Giving Voice to the Voiceless. https://animalsandmedia.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Pamphlets-for-AM-guidelines-2020.pdf . [13.01.2023].

Mills, Gordon. 2013. The Successes and Failures of Policing Animal Rights Extremism in The UK 2004–2010. **International Journal of Police Science & Management.** Vol. 15, No. 1: 30–44. doi: 10.1350/ijps.2013.15.1.299.

Munro, Lyle. 2005. **Confronting Cruelty Moral Orthodoxy and the Challenge of the Animal Rights Movement.** Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2012. The Animal Rights Movement in Theory and Practice: A Review of the Sociological Literature. **Sociology Compass**. Vol. 6, No. 2: 166-181.

Mutfak ve Gardırop da Bir Direniş Alanıdır. 2013. Bianet. 02 Kasım. https://bianet.org/bianet/yasam/151018-mutfak-ve-gardirop-da-bir-direnis-alanidir . [10.01.2023].

Nerse, Çetin. 2015. **Hayvan Hakları.** İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Nocella, Anthony J., Richard J. White, and Erika Cudworth. 2015. **Anarchism and Animal Liberation: Essays on Complementary Elements of Total Liberation**. North Carolina: McFarland.

Ojong, Lawrence. 2019. Singer’s Notion of Speciesism: A Case for Animal Rights in Ejagham Culture. **Int. J. of Environmental Pollution & Environmental Modelling**, Vol. 2, No.3: 116-121.

Our Mission. [18.11.2022] Surge Activism. https://www.surgeactivism.org/ourmission.

Özdoğan, Kiraz, M. Fatih Tatari, Ali Bilgin. 2021. **İnsan Hayvan ve Ötesi - Türkiye'de Hayvan Çalışmaları**. ed. Kiraz Özdoğan, M. Fatih Tatari, Ali Bilgin. İstanbul: Kolektif Kitap.

Özen, Abdullah. 2017. A Historical Overview of Turkey’s Animal Welfare Legislation. **Kafkas Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi**, Vol. 23, No. 6: 1019-1026. DOI: 10.9775/kvfd.2016.17214.

Özen, Kadir. 2022. 'Köpek' Tartışmasında 3 Kişinin Öldürüldüğü Sokakta Can Dostlarını Beslediler. Demirören Haber Ajansı. 16 Haziran. https://www.dha.com.tr/foto-galeri/kopek-tartismasinda-3-kisinin-oldurulduguu-sokakta-can-dostlarini-beslediler-2086769/1.

Özgüner, Burak. 2015. Kısırkaya "Hayvan Hapishanesi". Bianet. 17 Ocak. https://m.bianet.org/biamag/hayvan-haklari/161598-kisirkaya-hayvan-hapishanesi . [10.01.2023].

_____. 2018. Bağımsız Hayvan Hakları Topluluğu ile Gerçeklik Küpü. 01 Kasım. https://www.sivilsayfalar.org/2018/11/01/bagimsiz-hayvan-haklari-toplulugu-ile-gerceklik-kupu/. [20.12.2022].

_____. 2019a. Atlar Yanarak Öldü; Faytonlar Yasaklanacak Mı? Sivil Sayfalar. 4 Ocak. https://www.sivilsayfalar.org/2019/01/04/atlar-yanarak-oldu-faytonlar-yasaklanacak-mi/. [11.01.2023].

_____. 2019b. TBMM Araştırma Komisyonu, Faytonlardaki Atların Haklarını Kabul Edecek Mi? Sivil Sayfalar. 29 Temmuz. https://www.sivilsayfalar.org/2019/07/29/tbmm-arastirma-komisyonu-faytonlardaki-atlarin-haklarini-kabul-edecek-mi/. [12.01.2023].

_____. 2019c. Yüzlerce Vegan İstanbul'da Hayvan Hakları İçin Yürüdü. Sivil Sayfalar. 5 Ağustos. https://www.sivilsayfalar.org/2019/08/05/yuzlerce-vegan-istanbulda-yurudu-gelecek-suphesiz-vegandir/#:~:text=%E2%80%9COfficial%20Animal%20Rights%20March%E2%80%9D%20olarak,T%C3%BCrkiye'den%20de%20ses%20verildi. [10.01.2023].

Özgüner, Özge. 2021. Değişiklik yapılan Hayvanları Koruma Kanunu Neleri Değiştiriyor? Dokuz8 Haber. 06 Eylül. https://www.dokuz8haber.net/degisiklik-yapilan-hayvanlari-koruma-kanunu-neleri-degistiriyor. [12.01.2023].

Parker, Angela Dawn. 2016. "Safe" Spaces? Vegan Ideologies and Farm Animal Sanctuaries. Master's Thesis. Concordia University. Geography, Urban and Environmental Studies.

Pellow, David N. 2014. **Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pendergrast, Nick. 2014. A Sociological Examination of the Contemporary Animal Advocacy Movement: Organisations, Rationality and Veganism. PhD Thesis. Curtin University.

Perdew, Laura. 2014. **Animal Rights Movement.** North Mankato: Abdo Publishing Company.

Pişkin, Cansu. 2021. Hayvan Haklarını Korumayan Bir 'Koruma' Kanunu. Gezegen 24. 22 Temmuz. https://gezegen24.com/hayvanlari-koruma-yasasi/. [10.01.2023].

Read, L. Benjamin. 2018. Serial Interviews: When and Why to Talk to Someone More Than Once. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. **Vol. 17, No. 1.** https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069187834.

Regan, Tom. 1983. **The Case for Animal Rights**. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1985. The Case for Animal Rights. **In Defense of Animals.** ed. Peter Singer. New York: Basil Blackwell: 13-26.

_____. 2003. **Animal Rights, Human Wrongs: An Introduction to Moral Philosophy.** Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

_____. 2005. **Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights**. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.

Riessman, Catherina Kohler. 2008. **Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences**. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Ryder, Richard. 2010. Speciesism Again: The Original Leaflet. **Critical Society**. Vol. 2, Spring: 1–2.

_____. 2011. **Speciesism, Painism and Happiness: A Morality for the Twenty-First Century.** UK: Andrews.

Savcılık, Büyükada'da Çıkan Yangında İlk İncelemeyi Tamamladı. 2019. Cumhuriyet Gazetesi. 3 Ocak. https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/savcilik-buyukadada-cikan-yanginda-ilk-incelemeyi-tamamladi-1189807**.** [11.01.2013].

Şeker, Fatıma. 2019. Peter Singer'da Hayvan Özgürleşmesi Hareketinin Dini Düşünce Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. Master's Thesis. Ankara Üniversitesi University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Silverstein, Helena. 1996. **Unleashing Rights, Law, Meaning, and the Animal Rights Movement.** Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Simnett, Dorothy Jean. 2019. The Political Animal: The Animal Rights Movement and Public Policy. PhD Thesis. Nova Southeastern University.

Singer, Peter. 1982. The Oxford Vegetarians - A Personal Account. **International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems**. Vol. 3, No. 1: 6-9.

_____. 2004. Taking Humanism beyond Speciesism. **Free Inquiry**, Vol. 24, No. 6: 19-21.

_____. 2015. **Animal Liberation** (40th Anniversary Ed.). London: The Bodley Head. https://grupojovenfl.files.wordpress.com/2019/10/peter-singer-animal-liberation-1.pdf. [10.12.2022].

Smith, Weley J. 2010. **Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy: The Human Cost of the Animal Rights Movement.** New York: Encounter Books.

Socha, Kim, Sarahjane Blum. 2013. **Confronting Animal Exploitation; Grassroots Essays on Liberation and Veganism.** McFarland & Co. https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=ReFBHfrf64MC&pg=PA38&lpg=PA38&dq=francione+pacifism&source=bl&ots=dzcfaeHDej&sig=ACfU3U3F9_NGMe13WYmWWY_BVNgY08X7QQ&hl=tr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiknryAnPPoAhUryaYKHdVIAyIQ6AEwAHoECAsQKw#v=onepage&q=education&f=false. [18.04.2022].

Sokak Hayvanlarının Toplatılması Talimatına Barolardan Yanıt: "Yasaya Aykırı". 2022. Sendika.org. 21 Kasım. https://sendika.org/2022/11/sokak-hayvanlarinin-toplatilmasi-talimatina-barolardan-yanit-yasaya-aykiri-671508/. [12.01.2023].

Sollund, Ragnhild. 2008. Causes for Speciesism: Difference, Distance and Denial. **Global Harms: Ecological Crime and Speciesism.** ed. R. Sollund. New York: Nova Science Publishers: 109-130.

Son, Güzin Yasemin Tunçay. 2016. Vegan and Vegetarianism in the Frame of Bioethics. PhD Thesis. Ankara University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Sorenson, John. 2011a. **Critical Theory and Animal Liberation.** Pylmouth: Rowman & Littlefield.

_____. 2011b. Interview with Ronnie Lee. **The Brock Review.** Vol. 12, No. 1:184-193. Brock University.

Stallwood, Kim. 2013. The Politics of Animal Rights Advocacy. **Relations.** Vol 1, No. 1: 47-57. doi: 10.7358/rela-2013-001-stal.

Steiner, Gary. 2014. Animals as Subjects and the Rehabilitation of Humanism. **In Critical Animal Studies: Thinking the Unthinkable.** Canadian Scholars' Press: Toronto.

Tapınç, Hüseyin. 2021. Vegan Sayısı Artacak. Marketing Türkiye. https://www.marketingturkiye.com.tr/koseyazilari/vegan-sayisi-artacak/ [30.11.2022].

The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness. 7 July 2012 [05.10.2022]. http://fcmconference.org/img/CambridgeDeclarationOnConsciousness.pdf**.**

The Cube of Truth. [20.12.2022]. Anonymous for the Voiceless. https://www.anonymousforthevoiceless.org/what-is-a-cube-of-truth.

The Vegan Society. [27.10.2022]. Find Out How Many Vegans There Are in Great Britain. https://www.vegansociety.com/whats-new/news/find-out-how-many-vegans-there-are-great-britain.

The Vegan Society. 2016. [05.09.2022] . https://www.vegansociety.com/sites/default/files/uploads/downloads/VeganSocietyArticles_2019.pdf.

Thompson, Paul. 2000. **The Voice of the Past.** Newyork: Oxford University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2004. **Social Movements, 1768–2004**. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315632063.

Turgay, Tutku. 2020. Framing the Everyday Resistance in Vegan Lifestyle. Master's Thesis. Middle East Technical University The Graduate Program of Social Anthropology.

Türkiye'deki Vegan Hayvan Hakları Toplulukları. [15.11.2022]. Wikipedia. https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/T%C3%BCrkiye%27deki_vegan_hayvan_haklar%C4%B1_topluluklar%C4%B1.

Uyumaz, Alper. 2016. Bir Hukuk Sorunsalı Olarak Güncel Gelişmeler Işığında Türkiye'de Hayvan Hakları. **Gazi Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi.** Vol. 10, No. 3: 133-184.

Üzeltüzenci, Pınar. 2018. Emergence of the Vegan identity in Istanbul. Master's Thesis. İstanbul Bilgi University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Veganlardan 'Gerçeklik Küpü' Eylemi. 2018. Birgün Gazetesi. 05 Kasım. https://www.birgun.net/haber/veganlardan-gerceklik-kupu-eylemi-235809. [20.12.2022].

Watson, Donald. (11 August 2004). "24 Carrot Award: Donald Watson". Vegetarians in Paradise (e-Zine). 10. Interviewed by George D. Rodger. https://web.archive.org/web/20180314034642/http://www.vegparadise.com/24carrot610.html [05.09.2022].

Watson, Donald. (15 December 2002). "Interview with Donald Watson" (PDF) (Transcript). Interviewed by George D. Rodger. The Vegan Society. [05.09.2022].

Watson, Donald. (November 1944). The Vegan News. "Issue No. 1". [05.09.2022].

Wolf, Silvia Ilonka. 2015. We Are All Animals': The Emergence of the Grassroots Nonhuman Animal Rights Movement in İstanbul. Master's Thesis. Sabancı University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2012. Abolitionist Animal Rights: Critical Comparisons and Challenges within the Animal Rights Movement. **Interface.** Vol. 4, No.2: 438-458.

Yaşam Kazandı! 2020. Türkiye Vegan Derneği. 1 Şubat. https://haberler.tvd.org.tr/2020/02/01/yasam-kazandi/ . [10.01.2023].

Yaşam Nöbeti 7.Gününde: Sıfır Atlı Fayton İçin Kararlı Mücadele. 2019. K2 Haber. 25 Aralık. https://k2haber.com.tr/yasam-nobeti-7-gununde-sifir-atli-fayton/. [10.01.2023].

Yaşam Nöbeti Temsilcileri İmamoğlu ile Görüştü: Atlı Fayton Tamamen Yasaklansın. 2019. Evrensel. 20 Aralık. https://www.evrensel.net/haber/393592/yasam-nobeti-temsilcileri-imamoglu-ile-gorustu-atli-fayton-tamamen-yasaklansin. [10.01.2023].

Yaşam Nöbeti'nden İBB Önünde Basın Açıklaması. 2020. Yeşil Gazete. 20 Ocak. https://yesilgazete.org/yasam-nobetinden-ibb-onunde-basin-aciklamasi/. [10.01.2023].

Yaşar, Aşkın. 2022. **Hayvan Hakları Tarihi ve Türkiye**. ed. Aşkın Yaşar. İstanbul: İBB Yayınları.

Yaşar, Aşkın, Halis Yerlikaya. 2004. Dünya'da ve Türkiye'de Hayvan Haklarının Tarihsel Gelişimi. **Veteriner Bilimleri Dergisi**, Vol. 20, No. 4: 39-46.

Yaşar, Ferhat. 2020. İBB'de 41 Gündür Süren 'Yaşam Nöbeti' Sona Erdi. Gazete Duvar. 27 Eylül. https://www.gazeteduvar.com.tr/gundem/2020/01/28/ibbde-41-gundur-suren-yasam-nobeti-sona-erdi. [10.01.2023].

Yıldırım, Zeliha. 2013. Ebru Arıman: "Vejetaryenlik Bir Tercih Meselesi Değil, Bir Zorunluluk". Yeşil Gazete. 07 Ekim. https://yesilgazete.org/ebru-ariman-vejetaryenlik-bir-tercih-meselesi-degil-bir-zorunluluk/. [10.01.2023].

Yılmaz, Ayşe Büşra. 2018. New Media and Social Movements: An Examination on Vegan Movement Example. Master's Thesis. İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Zeybek, Sezai Ozan. 2020. **Türkiye'nin Yakın Tarihinde Hayvanlar.** İstanbul: Notebene Yayınları.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Sample Questions for the In-depth Semi-structured Interviews

1. Questions related to demographic information such as name, sex, age, etc.
2. How was your relationship with animal as a child?
3. How is your relationship with animals now?
4. How long have you been an animal rights advocate?
5. What does "animal rights advocate" mean to you?
6. How do you define veganism?
7. What characteristics should an animal rights advocate have?
8. What do you do as an animal rights advocate?
9. What do you think about the situation of animal rights in the world?
10. What do you think about the situation of animal rights in Turkey?
11. What are the successful aspects of animal rights advocacy?
12. What are the problematic aspects of animal rights advocacy?[109]

[109] The original Turkish questions are:

1. Demografik bilgilerle ilgili sorular: isim, cinsiyet, yaş vb.
2. Çocukluğunuzda hayvanlarla ilişkiniz nasıldı?
3. Şuan hayvanlarla ilişkiniz nasıl?
4. Ne zamandır hayvan hakları savunucususunuz?
5. "Hayvan hakları savunucusu" sizce ne demek?
6. Sizin veganlık tanımınız nedir?
7. Bir hayvan hakları savunucusunun ne gibi özellikleri olmalı?
8. Hayvan hakları savunucusu olarak neler yapıyorsunuz?
9. Sizce dünyada hayvan hakları ne durumda?
10. Sizce Türkiye'de hayvan hakları ne durumda?
11. Sizce Türkiye'de hayvan hakları savunuculuğunun başarılı yönleri nelerdir?
12. Sizce hayvan hakları savunuculuğunun başarısız/eksik/sıkıntılı yönleri nelerdir?

Appendix 2

The Informed Consent Form for the Interviewees

Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu

Sayın Katılımcı……..,

Arzum Kalfa olarak sizi Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Bölümü'nde Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Fahriye Dinçer danışmanlığında yürüttüğüm "Türkiye'de Hayvan Hakları Savunuculuğu" konulu Yüksek Lisans tez araştırmama katılmaya davet ediyorum.

* Bu araştırmanın amacı Türkiye'de hayvan haklarının güncel durumunu ortaya koyarak hayvan hakları savunucularını bu konularda bilgilendirmek ve hayvan hakları savunuculuğuna ve hayvan hakları savunucularına katkı sağlayacağını umarak hayvanlarla dayanışmaktır.
* Araştırma için sizinle tahminen 2 kez, 40'ar dakika sürecek yüz yüze ya da çevrimiçi yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yapılması planlanmaktadır. Aktardığınız bilgilerin etkili şekilde kullanılabilmesi için görüşmelerde izniniz alınarak ses kaydı yapılacaktır. Araştırmaya tahminen 10 (on) kişi katılacaktır. Katılımcılar araştırmada anonim olarak yer alacaktır, isimleri ve özel bilgileri paylaşılmayacaktır. İstemeniz ve bunu belirtmeniz halinde araştırmada isminize yer verilecektir.
* Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen hayvan haklarıyla ilgili soruları kimsenin baskısı veya telkini altında olmadan, size en uygun gelen cevapları içtenlikle verecek şekilde cevaplamanızdır. Bu formu okuyup onaylamanız, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz anlamına gelecektir. Ancak, çalışmaya katılmama veya katıldıktan sonra herhangi bir anda çalışmayı bırakma hakkına sahipsiniz.
* Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek bilgiler tamamen araştırma amacı ile kullanılacak olup kişisel bilgileriniz gizli tutulacaktır ve bu bilgilerle özel hayatınız etkilenmeyecektir.
* Eğer araştırmanın amacı ile ilgili verilen bu bilgiler dışında şimdi veya sonra daha fazla bilgiye ihtiyaç duyarsanız araştırmacıya şimdi sorabilir veya e-posta adresinden ulaşabilirsiniz. Araştırma tamamlandığında genel/size özel sonuçların sizinle paylaşılması isteğinizi lütfen araştırmacıya iletiniz.

Yukarıda yer alan ve araştırmadan önce katılımcıya verilmesi gereken bilgileri okudum ve katılmam istenen çalışmanın kapsamını ve amacını, gönüllü olarak üzerime düşen sorumlulukları anladım. Çalışma hakkında yazılı ve sözlü açıklama yukarıda adı belirtilen araştırmacı tarafından yapıldı. Sözlü olarak da araştırma hakkında talep ettiğim bilgiyi aldım ve kişisel bilgilerimin özenle korunacağı konusunda yeterli güven verildi. Bu koşullarda söz konusu araştırmaya kendi isteğimle, hiçbir baskı ve telkin olmaksızın katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcının adı soyadı:
E-posta:
İmzası:

ENDNOTES

[i] O yüzden bizde bazı şeyler çok normalleştirilmiş durumdaydı. Hayvan sevgisi küçükken bazı şeylerde oluyor ama o ayrıdır. Fark edemiyorsun. Yaşayan, canlı hayvanı görüp de seviyorsun ama ölü bedeni gördüğünde farklı yaklaşıyorsun. Bu normalleştiriliyor sadece.

[ii] Onun dışında hayatının içerisindeki hem aile hem diğer insan ilişkilerini sorgularken de eksik olan parçayı görmemişim hiç. Hayvanlar söz konusu. Bu şiddet olsun, işte cinsiyet ayrımcılığı olsun, bunlara yoğunlaşırken hayvanları izole etmişim. Aslında eksik bir parçaymış bu. Yıllar sonra bunu fark ediyorsun. Zaten oturuyor ondan sonra her şey.

[iii] Bir tane şey var... İsmini anmak istemiyorum açıkçası kendisi çok şey böyle. Beyaz… faşist bir insandı. Gary Yourofsky'nin o *Hayatınızda Duyabileceğiniz En İyi Konuşma* diye bir videosu vardı. Orada mezbaha görüntüleri var. Onu izledim sonra. Gerçekten mezbaha görüntülerine baktım. Herhangi bir belgesel ya da sunum izlediğin zaman bunda pazarlama olabiliyor. Abartı olabiliyor. Balık halinden canlı Japonya'daki görüntülerden mezbahalara kadar ben izlemişim galiba kendi başıma. Ondan sonra oturdu hepsi.

[iv] Abim şey yazmıştı bana ya aslında hayvanları kullanmak etik olarak yanlış vegan olmak gerek. O etik kelimesini duyunca benim de bir an böyle yani ben yıllarca yani etik olarak yanlış bir şeyi nasıl yapabilirim hayvanlarla ilgili. Ama ilk tepkim klasik şey olmuştu yani. Ya iyi söylüyorsun da veganlık çok abartı. [...] Sonra belki denk gelmişsindir, Türkçe alt yazılı olarak da yayınlanmış bir video var endüstriyel hayvan kullanımları üzerine odaklanan ve izleyeceğiniz en iyi videolardan birisi gibi bir şey işte. [...] O videoyu izlemiştim. Sonra bir şansımı deneyeyim o kişiye yazayım dedim. O videoyu yapan kişiye James Wider'a yazdım, mail attım. Bir gün sürmedi sayfalar dolusu maille geri dönüş yaptı. Yoğurt tüketmeyi bırakamam yoğurdu çok seviyorum.[...] Hayvanları önemsiyorum, tamam, ama nasıl sağlıklı kalacağım gibi. O sağ olsun linkleriyle detaylı bir şekilde anlatmış. Yoğurt alternatiflerine kadar tarifler filan göndermişti. Ben de şaşırdım çok teşekkür ederim, bu kadar detaylı bir mail beklemiyordum. Heralde vegan olma yoluna gireceğim dedim. Öyle başladı serüvenim.

[v] Sosyal medyada bir kişi vardı. Onunla yazışıyordum filan. Kurban bayramıyla ilgili bir şey paylaşmıştı işte, kurban cinayettir filan. [...] 2010'ların başı filandı. [...] Ondan sonra şey oldu ben bir böyle bilinçsiz deneme evresi. Bir gaza gelirsin ya tamam ya burada bir saçmalık var, bak yapan insanlar da var ama nasıl yaptıklarını bilmiyorsun filan. [...] 2011, 2012, 2013'te bir dalga gelmiş gitmiş. Kapanmış gitmiş. 2016'da arkadaşla tura çıkacağım. Onların böyle vegan versiyonları var, poşette pişiyor hemen yiyorsun 10 dakikada. Orduda kullanılıyormuş eskiden. [...] Yok, yapamadım. [...] 2017'de işte vegan rehber var ya. Veganlik.org. 21 günlük şey vardı, her pazartesi sana şey atıyor, mail atıyor. Bir tanesinde yemeklerle ilgili. Çok şey bir kaynak değil şimdiki kaynaklarla kıyaslarsan. Genel bilgi veriyor. Ertesi hafta mezbahalarla ilgili bir bilgi geliyor. Ertesi hafta yumurtayla ilgili, sonra yine yemek, menü… Baktım oluyor yani.

[vi] Aa evet sokaktakilerin… aa bize acaba ihtiyacı mı var vs. filan derken. […] Karar vermemişim yani. Doğal bir geçiş olmuş. Evet, bize ihtiyaçları var. Aa bu alanda kimse sesini çıkarmıyor. Aa evet hani sesini çıkaran insanlar var onlara yardımcı olayım filan derken kendimi içinde bulduğum doğal bir süreç diyebiliriz.

[vii] Yani hayvanları yiyen ya da bir şekilde kullanan sömüren insanların bu görüntüleri izlemesi gerekir. Çünkü bunu yapıyorsan bunu izleyebilmen gerekir diye düşünüyordum ama hiçbir şekilde bu hani duygusal bir yaklaşım değildi. Ve izliyordum yani bir kesim görüntüsünü izleyebiliyordum ve çünkü hayvan da yiyordum yani. Bir şekilde meşrulaştırma biçimi bu, ben yapabiliyorum sonuçta, izleyebiliyorum. Sonra hani kedi köpek hareketinin içinde o hissedebilirlik meselesinden artık bir farkları olmadığını hani inkar edemeyecek duruma geldim.

[viii] Biraz da ineklerle tanışmam yani yüz yüze tanışmamın etkisi oldu. Çünkü aşırı sinir bozucu bir tecrübeydi benim için. Çünkü ineklerin nasıl oynamak istediğini gördüm hani. İlk bir süt çiftliğine gittim tesadüfen ve sadece fotoğraf çekmek için. Burada küçük bir süt çiftliğine, Tekirdağ'da. Ve o

gün bir doğum vardı tesadüf doğum oldu orda. Ve hepsini gördüm. Hani doğumu gördüm, doğum sonrasını gördüm. Ayağa kalktığını gördüm, ayırdıklarını gördüm. Bebeğin gözlerindeki dehşeti gördüm. Fotoğrafladım da hepsini, fotoğrafı da var o dehşet anının. Sonra birkaç günlük olduğunda o bebeği ziyaret etmeye devam ettim. Birkaç günlük ya da birkaç haftalık belki tam hatırlamıyorum, oynamak istediğini beni her gördüğünde sevindiğini böyle hani kuyruk sallayarak zıplamaya çalıştığını filan. Bir küçük kabine koyuyorlar ya alan yok yani çarpıyor. Bir oraya çarpıyor, bir buraya çarpıyor. Aşırı sinir bozucuydu. Ve sonrasında da artık evet yani o veganlığa geçişim öyle. Vejetaryendim o esnada.

[ix] Annem çok hayvan sever hatta aslında o dönem için erken sayılabilecek bir hayvan hakları savunucusuydu. Mesela faytona binmezdi, bu develere falan binilirdi, bizi bindirmezdi falan. Evimizde hep bir hayvan vardı. O yüzden benim çocukken hayvanlarla ilişkim aşırı iyiydi. Hayvana gidip atlayıp öpme, börtü böcek sevme, kurbağa yakalayıp öpme gibi şeylerim vardı. Ama tabi sadece sevgi düzeyinde öyle haklarına saygıdan ziyade doğal bir ilişki. Onlar çocuklar gibi, ben de çocuğum.

[x] Aslında cinsiyetle yüzleşme, cinsiyet eşitsizliğiyle yüzleşme ve türcülükle yüzleşme benim çok paralel bir şekilde ilerledi. Önceki [Aycan] o yüzden vegan değildi.

[xi] Önce evde birlikte yaşadığın hayvanlarla ilgili bir aydınlanma geliyor. Ve tabi ki büyük bir utanç da hissediyorsun bugüne kadar yaptıklarınla ilgili. Benim o utançla yüzleşmem çok uzun süre aldı. Gerçekten uzun süre hatta hala ineklerin tavukların gözlerine bakamam kendimi çok kötü hissediyorum. […] Eskiden böyle sorumluluklar hissetmiyordum. Böyle duygular da hissetmiyordum.

[xii] Ve ben veganlık nedir bilmiyordum. Yani veganlık diye bir şey olması yani o aradaki bağlantı kurmam bence çok geç oldu. Şimdiki nesle bakıyorum da yani daha 20'li 15'li yaşlarında bu bağlantıyı kuruyor.

[xiii] Bir yerde okumuştum, hayvan hakları hareketi sonuç olarak başarısız bir harekettir. Bugüne kadar gelmiş olması… Başarısızdır çünkü dünya vegan değil en nihayetinde. […] Yani… biz niye 15 senedir aynı şeyin mücadelesini veriyoruz. O kadar acıklı ki.

[xiv] Siz ne yaptığınız farkında mısınız? Nasıl bir şiddet sarmalının içinde olduğunuzun farkında mısınız?

[xv] Hayvanların hiçbir şekilde mümkünse yani sömürülmediği bir dünya. Yani bugün hayvan yemeyi bırakıp sonra organ üreteceksek domuzların içinde hani bunun bir anlamı yok. Hayvanların tüm sömürü biçimlerinin yasaklandığı bir dünya diyebilirim. Tabi ki insan sömürü biçimlerinin de. Ya vegan bir dünya mümkün olduğunca. Çünkü bastığımız yerde de yani. Benim nihai olayım yok olduğumuz bir dünya.

[xvi] Başkalarına hesap verme sorumluluğu olmadıkça alışkanlıklarımızı ya da davranışlarımızı gözden geçirmeyiz. Ya da bunlara dair haklı gerekçeler üretme ihtiyacı içinde olmayız. Hayvan hakları mücadelesi de tam da aslında bununla ilgili. Hayvan hakları mücadelesi insanların diğer insanları hayvanlara karşı davranışlarıyla ilgili sorguladığı tek mücadele alanı. Dolayısıyla aslında Hayvan Hakları mücadelesinin tek bir amacı var. İnsanları mülk olarak gördükleri hayvanlara karşı davranışlarını sorgulatmaya çalışmak ve davranışlarını değiştirmesini beklemek. Ve bunun için de çalışıyoruz. Aslında nihai hedefi hayvanlarla alakalı değil, tamamen insanlarla alakalı, insanları değiştirme.

[xvii] Sömürünün ortadan kalktığı eşit bir ilişkiler bütünü ortaya çıkarmak. Hayvanlara farklı gözle bakmamak. Onları tamamen biz nasılsak öyle dahil etmek sisteme.

[xviii] Birileri hiyerarşi kurmaya çalışıyor. Bu çok yanlış bir şey. Ve biz bunu hala anlayamadık. [...] Otorite olmamalı.

[xix] Yani daha adaletli derken şuan bir adalet yok zaten. [...] Bir adaletten bahsedeceksen hani bunu hayvanların haklarının tanındığı ve uygulandığı bir dünyada ancak. Nihai şeyi de bu hayvan özgürlüğü diyoruz işte insanı da katıyoruz içerisine, yani hayvan özgürlüğü. Bir tür özgür olmadan

hiç kimse özgür olmayacak yani. Bunu insanlar için söylüyorduk şimdi genişledi mesela. Dolayısıyla hani çok. Dünyadaki herhalde çözülmüş çözülmemiş verilen mücadeleler içerisinde bu kadar kapsayıcı bir bu kadar alttan alıp her şeyi kapsayabilecek başka bir hareket olmayacak herhalde yani.

[xx] Genel toplumun ve devletin bakış açısı bu yönde olduğu için söylüyorum. Bir şekilde her türlü insan hakları hayvan haklarından önde gelmek durumunda kalıyor. Çünkü zaten hayvanın hakkını savunan kişi önce kendi haklarını savunmakla uğraşıyor. [...] Aktivizm yapmak çok güçleşiyor. […] Bu ortama rağmen bence hayvan hakları hareketi şuan çok iyi bir durumda Türkiye'de.

[xxi] Çok zor şeylerle mücadele etmemizde rağmen [...] bir şekilde inanıyoruz mücadeleye. İnanma kısmı çok önemli çünkü. Bir şekilde umudumuzu diri tutma inadımızı sürdürme meziyetlerine sahip olduğumuzu düşünüyorum. Belki bu genlerimizden gelen bir şeydir ya da değildir bilmiyorum ama. [...] Her ne kadar birbirimizi paralasak da, bir şekilde birbirimizi desteklediğimizi de düşünüyorum. Bazen birbirimizi taltif ederek yüreklendirerek bu desteğimizi belli etmeyebiliriz çoğu zaman.

[xxii] Nasıl gördük o gün BURHAK toplantısında gençleri, yani onlar vegan ve LGBT aktivisti, kadın hareketinin içindeler. Bu muhteşem bir şey bence. Bütünleşik hareket. Ben bunu görmek istiyorum. Dünyada gay veganlar görmek istiyorum. Ben bunu istiyorum dünyada. Kuir vegan yani bu zaten bunları boxları tick ettikten sonra geri gelen hareketlere duyarsız kalmak çok inanılmaz geliyor. Türkiye'de gençlerde ben bunu görüyorum en azından.

[xxiii] Ben Türkiye'nin böyle hızlı bir şekilde adapte olduğunu düşünüyorum vegan aktivizmine. Bunu da nerden düşündüm? Mesela feminizm, LGBTİ+ örgütler -ne yazık ki sol örgütlerde yok- Türkiye'de vegan ilkeler alıyorlar. Bu çok kıymetli ve dünyanın hiçbir yerinde böyle bir şey yok. İşte Avrupa ülkelerine gidiyorsun -medeniyetin beşiği- LGBTİ+ örgütleri veganlık "aman" diyorlar dalga geçiyorlar bizimle. Benim deneyimlerim bu yönde oldu. Fransa, Almanya, Sırbistan bu 3 ülkede de ben bunu gördüm. Hani o kesişimselliğin […] hakkını veriyor gerçekten. Ben de Avrupa'dan aldık falan diyordum. Gittim birkaç ülkede baktım ki asla oralı değiller. […] Baya bir umut verdi bana.

[xxiv] Veganlar için yaptığımız ayrı eğitimlerde, çoğunun işte ben 1 aydır veganım, 6 aydır veganım hani. 1 seneyi bulan yoktu çoğunlukla.

[xxv] Bayrağı taşıyacak olan onlar. Onlar çünkü ailelerini de etkileyebiliyorlar, çevrelerini de etkileyebiliyorlar.

[xxvi] Aktivistler ve toplulukların hepsinin refahçılığa karşı olduğunu biliyorum. […] Refahçılıkla ilgili şimdi işte Kafessiz Türkiye ve Meatless Monday. Yani bunların para odaklılık, bağış topluyorlar sanırım. […] Benim Türkiye'de bildiğim, nerdeyse illerdeki bütün toplulukları tanıyorum. Ne para üzerinden dönen… […] Ve hani topluluklarda şey de çok nettir. Vegan olmadığınızda hayvan hakları savunuculuğu yapamazsınız. Mesela biz Çanakkale'de 2016'da böyle hani bir topluluk kurmak filan ben daha tam vegan değilim. Ama aramızda şeyler var, vegan olmayan sadece kedilerle köpeklerle ilgilenen. Şunu tartışıyorduk ya olsun tabi ki, o kişilere de ihtiyacımız var. O da işte olur vegan. Önce bir gelsin bizimle aktivizm yapsın filan. Ki ben de vejetaryenim yani. Ama şimdi böyle şeyler söz konusu değil mesela. Toplulukların hepsinde şu ilke var, burada olmanın asgari koşulu vegan olmak çünkü hayvan haklarını savunmak vegan olmakla başlar. […] Hani böyle ülke genelindeki toplulukların temel baş ilkesi gibi.

[xxvii] Onun dışında genel olarak böyle bir hedefe yönelik bir disiplin anlayışı olmaması.

[xxviii] En başarılı ve sonuç alan insanların da en net ve en rasyonel insanlar olduğunu düşünüyorum. Yani mesela Burak böyle biriydi bence. Kendisi tabi ki çok duygusaldı, ama orada burada gidip de kişisel anılarını anlatmıyordu yani çünkü olay o değildi.

[xxix] Aslında dışarıdan bakıldığında el yordamıyla bir şeyleri bulmaya çalışıyoruz gibi gözüküyor. Ama bazı ülkelerde bu örgütlü mücadele çok daha bilinçli demeyeyim ama planlı gidiyor evet sistematik. Mesela İngiltere bunlardan bir tanesi. Almanya'da çok aşırı disiplinli davranıyorlar. Yani şey gibi davranmıyorlar yani hayvanlar insanların elindeki rehineler, hemen işte 12 saat içinde onları kurtarmazsak filan gibi davranmıyorlar. Aşırı rahatlar bize göre. Bilmiyorum hangisi doğru.

[xxx] Bunun da nedeni yine aslında taban hareketinin çıkış nedeniyle aynı yani. Kedilerle köpeklerle sürekli etkileşim halinde olduğumuz ve sürekli duygusal anlar yaşadığımız için bunların travmasını nereye boşaltacağımızı bilemiyoruz. […]Tabandan gelen insanların birçok şeyin yoğunluğun içinde yok olup gittiği için hani daha belki organize bir şekilde hareket edememeleri filan gibi şeyler olabilir. Yani kısaca bilmiyorum insan doğası yani.

[xxxi] Biz birazcık dağınık gidiyoruz, el yordamıyla gidiyoruz. Çünkü bizim ülkemizin her konudaki gündeminde olduğu gibi hayvan hakları gündemi de felaket olduğu için yani her gün bir yerden başka bir ihbar, başka bir iğrenç bir olay. Dolayısıyla bir şey seçip onda çalışmaya, aslında birazcık halimiz vaktimiz de olmuyor.

[xxxii] Aklın zayıflığından… Biraz ağır olacak ama kolektif akıl dediğimiz şey veganizmle ilgili kolektif aklın zayıflığından kaynaklandığını düşünüyorum. Çok, çok bireysel dürtülerle şeyde bulunmak topluluklarda bulunmak bu durumu perçinlediğini düşünüyorum. [...] Daha çok bireysel aktivizmin ön plana çıktığını düşünüyorum açıkçası.

[xxxiii] Genç hareket her zaman iki şeyle birlikte geliyor. Bir tanesi müthiş bir güç, müthiş bir hız. Diğer taraftan da deneyim eksikliği.

[xxxiv] Ben mesela bir sürü toplulukta bulundum HÖK'e gelene kadar ve bir topluluğun ilkeleri olması gerektiğini HÖK'te öğrendim. Çok komik bir şey değil mi? Bir sürü insan bir araya geliyor, adın var, bir şey yapıyorsun. Ama sen nasıl ilkeler etrafında bir araya geliyorsun bunun hiçbir belirliliği yok yani. […] Ben hani oradaki insanların daha önce başka […] gruplarda bulunuyor olmaları filan oraya ilkeleri getirdi. Ben diyordum ki ilkeler mi ne ilkesi ya. O yüzden yeni olmamızdan kaynaklı bunun bir eksikliğini görüyorum. Topluluklar kendilerine manifestolar yazıp ilkeler edinmeye başlıyorlar. Tabi ki o ilkelerin etrafında uygulanabilirlik de.

[xxxv] Olmalı. Olmadığını fark ediyorum. Türkiye'de sağlıklı bir şekilde […] gösteriler ne kadar örgütlenebilirdi. Yine örgütlenirdi ama eminim epey sinir bozucu şeyler yaşanırdı o gösteri yapılana kadar. Zibilyon tane vegan var ama yok yani. […] Birleşebileceğimiz bir tanım veganlık var yani bizde. Farklı olabiliriz, eylemlerimiz farklı olabilir ama veganlıkta biriz yani.

[xxxvi] Vegan olmayanlar Kafessiz Türkiye'ye girebilir.

[xxxvii] Onlar da vegan evet. Ben şoktayım. O yüzden şey diyorum, veganlar ikiye ayrılır, bir gerçek veganlar, bir de yalandan veganlar.

[xxxviii] Mesela bizim ne talebimiz olacak? [...] Refahçılar gidecek ve veganlar gitmeyecek. Bu konuyla ilgili veganlardan hiçbir çalışma da görülmüyor. Kimse oturup biz ne talep edeceğiz, şu partiyle görüşelim bu partiye girmeye çalışalım. Bunu yapan vegan çok az. [...] Veganların en baştan zaten hayvanın mal statüsü ortadan kalkmadıkça hiçbir şey yapılamaz gibi bir ön kabulü benimseyip ilerleme yolunda hiçbir çaba göstermediklerini düşünüyorum.

[xxxix] İkinci eksiklik, anti-entelektüellik olduğunu düşünüyorum. Bu genç olmasından filan değil bence. Bu bizim insanımızın entelektüel düşmanı olmasından. Mesela, türcü ideolojiyle yüzleşmek için insanları okumaya, okuduğu metin üzerinden tartışmaya yönlendirecek bir hareketin olmaması büyük bir problem. Çünkü dediğim gibi asla mutfak değil tek mesele. Ama bu aktivizmle mesela homili gırtlak şeklinde indirgeniyor. Ve bazen aldığımız saldırılar da daha çok işte ben bugün gittim tavuk yedim, ben bugün gittim balık yedim ben ciğer yedim diye bize böyle. Bunun bir karşılığı var çünkü biz de orda yürüyoruz veganlar olarak. […] Bizim kendi türcülüğümüzle yüzleşmek sadece tabakla olmuyor.

[xl] Dışarıdan bakmaya çalışarak gördüğüm gidişat daha çok böyle herkesi vegan beslenmeye çağırmak aslında. Derli toplu bir hareket olduğunu düşünmüyorum Türkiye'deki vegan hareketin. Aynı zamanda hayvan kurtarmacı, aynı zamanda işte ekolojik haklar için mücadele eden aynı zamanda LGBTİ+ hakları için mücadele eden. Yani böyle bir şeyi kapsamak yerine veganlığın anlatıldığı. Daha çok bunun ağır bastığını gördüm. Kendine abolisyonist demeyen grupların da bu şekilde hareket ettiğini düşünüyorum.

[xli] Yani biz daha kendi içimizde birbirimizi dışlarken, başka insanları nasıl kapsayıp dahil edeceğiz harekete. Asıl sorun bu bence.

[xlii] İşte 3 kişi bir araya gelse taciz yaşanıyor. 3 kişi bir araya gelse bir kişinin egosu yüzünden bir grup dağılıyor.

[xliii] Çünkü savunucuların kimlikleri oradaki esas öznenin önüne geçiyor, hayvanların.

[xliv] Bu arada bu yani bunu yapan insanların hepsini de çok böyle eleştirebileceğim bir noktada değilim. Çünkü toplum da seni biraz buna itiyor. Sanki bir bakıyorsun kendini savunmaya başlamışsın, veganları savunmaya başlamışsın, insanları savunmaya başlamışsın. İnsanların buna bakış açısı bu olduğu için bir noktada buna kimlik hareketine dönüşüyor bu. [...] Biraz daha işte yine aslında burada da yine çok o inisiyatiflerin dağılmasının sebebi de aslında bu gibi geliyor. Bir yandan inisiyatiflerin dağılmasının sonucu olarak da bu meydana geliyor gibi geliyor bana.

[xlv] Yani, refahçı hareket bu kadar yükselirken veganların birbirini bu kadar eleştirmesi. "Sen şöyle yapma, ben böyle yapacağım, en doğrusu bu" demesi.

[xlvi] Üzgünüm ki bazen de gülüyoruz. Gerçekten bunun kimlik olarak kullanılıp demin bahsettiğim o bir gruba dahil olma ihtiyacı sebebiyle yapan insanların çok olduğunu düşünüyorum. Ama bunlar zaten anlaşılıyor. Siz de görmüşsünüzdür. Uzun bir süre sonra da değil aslında. Çok kısa süre sonra zaten anlaşılıyor ve onlar bir şekilde bu çemberin dışına itiliyorlar ya da kendileri çıkmayı tercih ediyorlar.

[xlvii] Bir kibir de var. Yani bu da yine çok öznel. Bunun kesin sosyal politik bir bağlamı vardır ama çok ciddi bir kibir var. Yani tamam, vegan olmuş herkes kendisini İsa Mesih ilan ediyor. Böyle değil yani. Ya hepimiz bazı sömürü biçimlerini deneyen destekleyen bu sistemin ürünü insanlarız. Zaten insan merkezcilikten çıkamadığımızın da bir göstergesi bu. Biz olması gerekeni yapıyoruz. Bu kadar. aslında bütün mesele bu. Ama çok ciddi bir kibir de var. Bu ne konusunda olursa olsun bir mücadelede olmaması gereken bir şey.

[xlviii] Ben bildiğim şeyleri denedim olmadı. Belki onlardan bahsedebilirim. Bir kere önce istediğin bu olması gerekiyor gruplarda, örgütlerde, hareketlerde. İstediğin gerçek anlamda hayvanları merkeze koyduğun hayvanların yaşam haklarını merkeze koyduğun bir mücadele olması gerekiyor. Bu olmadığı zaman sen hangi taktikle yöntemle ilerlersen ilerle olmuyor. Çünkü çok tatsız ama şöyle şeyler oluyor. Mutlaka sivrilmeye çalışan insanlar oluyor. Ee, çağımız görünürlük çağı, insanlar görünmek için akıllarını oynatıyorlar. O kadar çok kişisel ve hiç hayvanlarla ilgili olmayan kavgaya şahit oldum ki yani. O yüzden öncelikle gerçekten bunu isteyen insanların bir araya gelmesi lazım.

[xlix] Belki şöyle bir şey işe yarayabilir. Çok net ilkeler geliştirmek. Herkesin anonim kaldığı bir şey de olabilir. Mesela bütün metinler anonim imzalanıyor. Bütün iş bölümü eşit şekilde yapılıyor. Yani işte insanlar orda akıllarını yitiriyor. Mesela medyaya biri mi konuşacak. Herkes aklını yitiriyor. Birbirlerini yiyorlar yani. Hani ne oldu! Mesele avcılıktı, biz şuna karşı olacaktık. Olmuyor yani bu. Bütün muhalif hareketlerin sorusu ve ben kimsenin cevap bulabildiğini görmedim.