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Abstract

This work argues that while the consumption of ‘dairy’ products is widely encouraged as healthy and essential, the interests of the bovine animals who ‘produce’ milk are not taken into the account. In order to make visible the existing system of oppression of farmed animals, the public access documents of the main European agri-food lobbies, namely CELCAAA, Copa-Cogeca, and FoodDrink Europe are thoroughly analyzed, with a special emphasis made on the ‘dairy’-related discourse. Besides, the role of national media in constructing the image of “healthy milk” is discussed on the example of 96 news stories collected from British (The Guardian; The Times) and Spanish newspapers (El Mundo; El País). The study follows the framework of Critical Animal and Media Studies and employs the methodology of Critical Discourse Analysis. The preliminary findings based on the empirical results reveal the perceived parallelism between the discourse of aforementioned lobbies and national media discourse.
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1. Introduction

“This friendly, Friesian family were free to roam and browse and eat the freshest, greenest grass which made them happy cows.
“They belonged to farmer Finn Who called them by their names And when it was their birthday He brought party hats and games.”
(Wills & Flynn, 2015)

The epigram opening this chapter is coming from The Tale of City Sue (2015), an artfully illustrated children’s book by Jeanne Willis and Dermot Flynn, which narrates a story of City Sue – a cow, who moved to Meadows farm after living in city sheds. Remarkably, she is not attracted by “roaming and browsing freely”, neither does she want to eat “the freshest, greenest grass” which local cows adore. Unappreciative City Sue even kicks “darling farmer Flynn” during milking time, the fact that truly horrifies the rest of the farm inhabitants. Flynn, the farmer, however, is not resentful and proposes other cows to throw a picnic for a newcomer, giving her a warm welcome. The idea is eagerly accepted, and City Sue finally understands that although standing inside – “sunrise until sundown” – is great, there are certain pleasures in farm life, too.

No matter how far from reality the countless bedtime stories of animal farming are, they are not at all uncommon. Anthropomorphised “happy cows”¹ look at us not only from the pages of children’s books, but also from commercial billboards and Instagram accounts, “laughing” from cheese packages and McDonald’s paper placemats (Glenn, 2004; Linné, 2016; Yazianok, 2016). Young players of Farmland² are reminded to take good care of “happy and healthy calves” (European Commission, no date b), the US advertisements, featuring New Zealand pastures, claim slogans like “So much grass, so little time” although, as John Robbins argues, perhaps a more accurate way to put it would be “So many cows, so little space” (Robbins 2012:23).

This being said, The Tale of City Sue, could be yet another instance in a wide range of alike narrations that depict mythologised views of farming and serene life of cartoonish cows and their families, never mentioning the real conditions of industrial agriculture. However, Willis and Flynn’s book is a particular example – freely distributed with Saturday Guardian (issued on 23 May 2015³), the lovely-coloured book was published by Kerrygold, Irish producer of butter, a company that forms part of Adams Foods⁴ giant enterprise. Disguised marketing, craftily

---

¹ "Happy Cows" is also an actual advertising campaign by California Milk Advisory Board, unfavorably sued by PETA in 2011. Available at: http://farmfutures.com/story-peta-loses-happy-cow-lawsuit-0-62929.
² “Farmland” is a recent EU-production video game, which aims at raising awareness among young children about “the importance of treating farmed animals in a respectful and humane way” (European Commission, no date b).
³ See ‘Kerrygold – Tales from the meadow’. Available at http://www.newsworks.org.uk/Partnerships/kerrygold-tales-from-the-meadow-
misleading children about the nature of farming and milk, is but one technique that agri-business corporation use to ensure the steady growth of their profits.

If young readers-oriented publications repeatedly focus on over-joyful cows’ life stories, the adult readership is often reminded of the essential elements that milk and ‘dairy’ products are rich with. It shall be mentioned, however, that the discourse speaking of milk as “perfect food” has been challenged on numerous occasions by vegan milk critics who conducted or cited recent food studies (Oski, 1996; Robbins, 2012; Gaard, 2013).

On the other hand, the idea of free-range, pasture-raised animals is also widely circulated and speculated as a comforting compromise. However, although favoured by numerous consumers, it is thought to be rather unrealistic (Nibert, 2013; Linné, 2016). As Vasile Stanescu (2014) reports, there is simply no land for free pasture animals, and if there were some – it has already been taken by grazing which, alone, occupies, according to different official sources, from 26 to 45 per cent of the global surface area (UNCTAD, 2013; Thornton at al., 2011). American sociologist David Nibert also argues that even if the world were much more equitable place, and the entire population of cows raised for food in the United States were to be freely ranged, “half the land in the country would have to be converted to pasture”, this not including the land needed for pigs, chickens, turkeys, goats or sheep (Nibert 2013:261).

Concurrently, the United Nations repeatedly report the quick growth of global population, projected to reach 9.6 billion people by 2050 (Gerber at al, 2013). Well understanding the negative ecological impact of industrialized agriculture, the UN yet seems to be more worried about feeding an increasing and more urbanized world population with what is known as ‘pork’, ‘poultry’, ‘beef’ and ‘dairy products’. To satisfy the world’s ‘meat’ and milk consumption, over 55 billion land nonhuman animals are slaughtered every year (Steinfeld at al, 2006).

Oppressing other animals, however, does not only signify killing them. According to a common definition, the word oppression (from Latin oppressio, “action of weighing on someone's mind or spirits”) makes reference to “cruel or unjust use of power or authority” (Harper, 2016). Billions of bovine animals exploited for milk, ‘veal’ and ‘beef’, live and die within the oppressive system defined by human interests, unable to express their normal behaviour, to choose a partner, to raise children, to socially interact, deprived of basic freedoms from distress, fear, pain, injury and disease.

Back in 1975, in the original preface to the first edition of his renowned work Animal Liberation Peter Singer states explicitly that his motivation for focusing on the treatment of nonhumans does not stem from his personal fondness for them (Singer 1990: ii). Even more so, Singer seems to be concerned about his readers not portraying him (or any other of us standing for the nonhumans’ interests) merely as emotional “animal-lovers” (1990: iii). As Singer specifies, his work makes no sentimental appeals for sympathy toward “cute” animals, but aims

---

5 The data provided in 2006 FAO Livestock’s Long Shadow report. However, understanding that not all countries and regions reported their data, and of those who did some might have provided incomplete statistics; also taking into consideration the growing world “meat” demand over the last decade, the aforementioned number of slaughters shall be considered as a very minimum one.
to expand people’s moral horizons and to inspire the liberation movement as a demand for an end to prejudice and discrimination (1990: iii–iv).

Although this work aims to manifest a non-speciesist perspective, much like in Singer’s case, its interest and inspiration could hardly be described as stemming from the “love” for other animals, or at least solely from it. Considering Erin Janus’ video on the “scary” aspects of dairy (2015), publications by Will Tuttle (2005), Marc Bekoff (2006, 2007), Melanie Joy (2014) and other authors cited in this work was moving just as much as it was thought-provoking. Learning a lot about emotional intelligence of cows, the author struggled to see how their sentience could be agreeable with their dreadful oppression. Inspired to look for the missing link between augmenting mistreatment of bovine animals and bouncing ‘dairy’ consumption, this work hopes to contribute with a critical analysis of how the Western European media reflect the milk consumption story, and whether their portrayals may coincide with the ‘dairy’ discourse readily provided by the giant food industries.

The work, therefore, hopes to apply what Marc Bekoff (2006, 2007) called “science sense”, a combination of common sense and scientific data. For, as Singer put it, “I feel, but I also think about what I feel” (1999:88).

1.1 Aims and Research Questions

This work, positioning itself as a critical non-speciesist, anti-corporate study, explores the trade and advocacy associations of ‘dairy’ businesses (also referred to as lobbies) and their efforts to provide the readily available references regarding the ‘dairy’ industry. The main focus of this research is on lobbyists’ promotion of milk and ‘dairy’ positive image and impact on people’s health, stimulating the message that ‘dairy’ industry needs continuous advancement. The media’s representation of the perceived acceptability of aforementioned discourse shall be investigated and analysed. This way, the work hopes to contribute to the Critical Animal and Media Studies scholarship which is addressing the role of the media in reproducing anthropocentric ideologies and perpetuating the oppression of nonhuman animals (often predetermined to both exploitation and imminent slaughter, as in the case of cows used for milk).

Since the notion of speciesism, lays in the core of this work, its volatile definition will be approached, with a special emphasis paid on its consideration as an ideology. Furthermore, the work aims to demonstrate that speciesism, representing a major ethical concern by itself, overlaps and interconnects with other oppressive ideologies.

This work deliberately does not look for the infrequent stories addressing the nonhuman animals’ conditions within the industrial farming complexes. Instead, it suggests that supporting and promoting ‘dairy’ products consumption, by itself, can be seen as an indirect reinforcement of bovine animals’ oppression, confined throughout their lives, suffering physical pain and terrible psychological conditions, dying early or killed for ‘meat’. It is, however, of utmost importance to mention that, although being presented from a particular theoretical and ideological position, the notions of neutrality and objectivity are striven to be respected despite
the limitations of bias, which is possibly present to a certain degree. The author hopes to remain neutral and avoid providing perspectives that can be seen as partial or marginal. Having said that, the purpose of the research remains mainly to analyse what the media’s perspective regarding the ‘dairy’ industry and its products is, how and in which context they present information to their readers, and if the published by national newspapers articles at any point maintain the same position as in the discourse openly proclaimed by food lobbies.

Consequently, the present work poses two research questions:

RQ1: Can the discourse of the major EU agri-food lobbies, as assessed through materials published by themselves in open access, be considered as:
   a) promoting milk consumption,
   b) appealing to the health benefits of ‘dairy’ products,
   c) devoting little or no attention to the nonhuman animals’ rights and well-being?

If the findings confirm the presuppositions a, b, and c, the agri-food lobbies’ discourse shall be interpreted as a reproduction of speciesist, and the second research question will arise:

RQ2: Do British and Spanish national news media maintain the speciesist line encouraged by the lobbies, focusing on the perceived healthiness of milk and ‘dairy’ products and promoting their consumption?

In order to answer these research questions, the following objectives are pursued:

1. To conduct a critical discourse analysis on a sample of open access documents by CELCAA, Copa-Cogeca, and FoodDrink Europe lobbies with the aim to investigate what is (and what is not) said on the topic of milk and ‘dairy’ products.
2. To conduct a critical discourse analysis on a sample of open access documents by CELCAA, Copa-Cogeca, and Food Drink lobbies with the aim to investigate what is (and what is not) said on the topic of nonhuman animal’s treatment.
3. To conduct a critical discourse analysis on a sample of news stories from British and Spanish national newspapers addressing the topics of milk and health.
4. To analyse whether there is any parallelism in the discourses of the studied lobbies and newspapers.

Before proceeding to the review of the previously released publications and studies that will hopefully provide a useful background needed prior to the analysis, a short chapter shall be dedicated to the linguistic aspects of this work.

1.2 A Note on Vocabulary: The Words That Matter

This work aims to refrain from the use of the term ‘animal(s)’ and seeks not to apply speciesist language, whenever that be possible. Since humans are also animals and share a great deal of qualities with the rest of the animal world, it would be fair to opt for more respectful terms of ‘nonhuman(s)’ or ‘nonhuman animal(s)’ as well as the ‘other animals’. Although the consistency of applying these terms is sought, the term ‘animal’ can still be occasionally seen
throughout the text, especially in well-established clusters, such as ‘animal rights’, ‘animal liberation’ and others.

Furthermore, throughout the work, the term ‘farmed’ will be used instead of ‘farm’ when referring to other animals used in agriculture. As Carrie Freeman notes, “farming is something done to these beings against their will, not something inherent to their nature” (Freeman 2009:4). Since this work focuses on bovine animals, only related examples shall be considered, namely, the ones related to ‘meat’ and ‘dairy’ industry. Following the practice of previous scholars (Nibert, 2002; Almiron et al, 2016), these broadly employed for marketing purposes terms, the ethics of which is almost never questioned, will generally be taken in single quotation marks. This work agrees with a common belief that of all the ways to objectify a living being, it is, perhaps, through language that represents the most virtuous one. As Melanie Joy, social psychologist and vegan activist, argues in her remarkable book Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows (2010), “objectification through language is a very powerful distancing mechanism, especially in what concerns industrial farming” (Joy 2010:118). The agri-business doublespeak production includes designating flash from bulls and older cows as ‘beef’, calves flash as ‘veal’, and commonly refers to cows as to ‘udder’ or ‘units’; the terms, which are to be avoided.

Further on, in ‘dairy’ and ‘beef’ industries formulations such as ‘replacement boars’ or ‘replacement calves’ are also reported by Joy (2010). Moreover, the commonly used mass noun ‘livestock’ also demonstrates a highly speciesist perspective, since, as argued by Joan Dunayer, this term is “especially desensitizing because it commodifies sentient beings as ‘stock’ (Dunayer 2016: 97). Euphemistic language within industrial units is further observed by Timothy Pachirat, the author of the book Every Twelve Seconds (2011), who covertly undertook the vacancy at Omaha slaughterhouse, the “place where blood flows” (Pachirat 2011:20) and where five cows are slaughtered every minute, one every twelve seconds. As Pachirat argues, the atrocities, that only few workers are regularly and fully exposed to, never happen in the “kill floor”; they call it “fabrication” instead (2011:38).

The use of the pronouns ‘it’, ‘that’ or ‘which’ as applied for nonhuman animals, is also unequivocally restricted in this work, since it is known to refer to a group of inanimate objects – things, which nonhuman animals do not belong to. As ecofeminist Carol J. Adams noted, “the objectified disappear as subjects of their own lives. Once objectified, a being can be fragmented, and the entirety of the living being disappears” (Adams 2016:60). Unfortunately, objectification is legitimized not only through language, but also through institutions, legislation, and policies. However, the little effort one can make in abstaining from the use of speciesist terms – and underlining the unsuitable use of the above by others – is a hopeful step of bringing a successive difference.
2. Background

The following section aims to provide a brief insight into the current state of being of ‘dairy’ industry in the EU, touching upon the volumes of milk production in Spain and in the UK, listing the main European agri-food companies, particularly those with a ‘dairy’ focus, addressing the distribution of subsidies within agri-food businesses and initiating the discussion on the importance of linking the food and health discourses for agri-food lobbies.

2.1 ‘Dairy’ Industry in the EU

The combined agricultural and food sector accounts for 3.5% of total Gross Value Added in the EU-28 as well as approximately 30 million jobs or 13.4% of total employment and represents the largest processing sector in the EU (CELCAA et al, 2014). EU dairy products are leading the best performing export products chart, having generated €11 million solely in 2014, (FDE, 2015c:15), and are listed among top five best performing export products in the fourth quarter of 2015 (FDE, 2016). Of all the subsectors involved, dairy products constitute the second (after soft drinks) most innovative food sector in Europe (FDE 2015c:10).

In 2013 Oxfam listed ten most powerful food and beverage companies, including Associated British Foods (ABF), Coca-Cola, Danone, General Mills, Kellogg, Mars, Mondelez International (previously Kraft Foods), Nestlé, PepsiCo and Unilever (Oxfam 2013:3). Of those multi-product food industries, at least half (ABF, Danone, General Mills, Mondelez International and Nestlé) are actively engaged into ‘dairy’ foods production. Most of them were also named in 2014-2015 Global ranking of food and drink companies published by FoodDrink Europe (2015c). This ranking meant to assess the global companies’ credibility and economic strength according to their revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Dairy’</th>
<th>Multi-products (including ‘dairy’)</th>
<th>‘Meat’</th>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groupe Danone (France), Lactalis (France), Friesland Campina (Netherlands), Arla Foods (Denmark).</td>
<td>Nestlé (Switzerland), Unilever (Netherlands/UK), Associated British Foods (UK), Kerry Group (Ireland), Oetker Group (Germany), Parmalat (Italy).</td>
<td>Vion (Netherlands), Danish Crown (Denmark).</td>
<td>Heineken N.V. (Netherlands), Diageo Plc (UK), Carlsberg (Denmark), Pernod Ricard (France), Red Bull (Austria).</td>
<td>Ferrero (Italy), Südzucker (Denmark), Tereos (France), DSM (Netherlands), Barry Callebaut (Switzerland).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Twenty main European agri-food companies by global food and drink sales (2014-2015).


Please, note, that these are industry provided figures.
As it can be clearly seen from Table 1, the majority of the conglomerates are of “dairy”, “including dairy” or “meat” business segments which are firmly based on a pillar of nonhuman animals’ exploitation. Moreover, several industries of “other” group also ultimately depend on ‘dairy’ businesses (e.g. using milk for chocolate production), and, therefore, are also engaged into other animals exploitation.

Currently, there are more than 250 million cows across the world whose milk is taken for human consumption (CWF, no date a). The European Union, one of the world’s largest milk producers, has about 23.5 million cows used for dairy (Eurostat, 2014). To compare, there are 10 million cows in North America, over 6 million in Australia and New Zealand, and 12 million cows in China, the country which, just like the other ones in South-East Asia, until recently traditionally refrained from milk consumption (CWF, 2012).

The following table demonstrates the figures of milk ‘production’ in the EU, focusing on the countries with the highest production volume, as well as on the cases of Spain and United Kingdom, particularly interesting for this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Cow Population</th>
<th>Cow’s milk production on farms, in tonnes (2013 data)</th>
<th>Correlation: tonnes of yield produced by a single cow, per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU-28</td>
<td>23 557 000</td>
<td>159 641 000</td>
<td>6,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4 296 000</td>
<td>32 381 000</td>
<td>7,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3 697 000</td>
<td>25 780 000</td>
<td>6,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2 248 000</td>
<td>12 986 000</td>
<td>5,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2 069 000</td>
<td>11 500 000</td>
<td>5,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1 883 000</td>
<td>15 088 000</td>
<td>8,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>845 000</td>
<td>6 780 000</td>
<td>8,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Milk Production in EU States (2013)

Source: Author’s own data; informed by and adopted from Eurostats (2014) Production of cows’ milk on farms at national and regional level, by level of production.

It is worth noting, that although the cow population in the UK and Spain is sparser than in other European states, the annual production of yield per single cow both in the UK and in Spain surpasses the EU average and the average of leading countries. This suggests that intensification of the industry in these countries might be encouraged and signifies investing into making farms fewer and greater in size, allocating more cows per farm, and forcing nonhuman females to produce more and more milk.
Generally, the largest agri-food businesses have the longest traditions of close engagement and collaboration with public policy and receive huge subsidies from the government, which, in case of the EU, are implemented through the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). According to the European Commission data, EU is very supportive of agri-foods production, devoting more than 40% of its annual budget (or €58.8 billion a year) to farm subsidies (EC 2015:26). Chemnitz & Becheva provide the data for industrialized countries, confirming that the direct subsidies for milk are, by far, the highest among all agriculture and related industries, outreached only by ‘beef’ and ‘veal’ industry (Chemnitz & Becheva 2014:21).

However, the distribution of the subsidies within the business is a very controversial issue, since the financing is very unlikely to reach a traditional farmer or a non-industrial producer, going instead to large-scale industries and international agri-business corporations. Jack Thurston, a co-founder of Farmsubsidy, upon conducting an in-depth independent research concludes that, paradoxically, it is “exactly how the CAP works: the bigger you are, the more land you have, the more money you get” (Thurston & Moyse, 2009). Thurston’s investigation was inspired by the first renowned cases of wealthy individuals receiving large amounts of money from the government as farm subsidies, including the sensational case of Gerald Grosvenor, the Duke of Westminster, who claimed £448,000 a year in subsidies for his property company Grosvenor Farms, one of the biggest mixed farming businesses in the UK (2009). Núria Almiron suggested another significant example – Nestlé, a Swiss transnational food processing company and one of the largest food industries in the world, received at least €639 million in subsidies for solely ‘dairy’ business in 2012 (Almiron 2016:30).

Notwithstandingly, the giant conglomerates are interested in applying a variety of sophisticated practices to shape public opinion about the final product of their manufacturing. Agri-food sector, as virtually any other giant industry, is represented by professional advocacy and trade associations. Not only they aim to lobby government policies, but they also continuously work on creating a positive image among the media and the customers. Education on nutrition and health is one of the most important niches in promoting the consumption of particular foods. As Lang & Heasman (2015) reveal, the links between diet and disease have become “a marketing battleground” in developed countries. Since consumers are demanding products with health benefits, large sectors of food industry (‘dairy’ included), now more than ever see health as an important potential growth area (Lang & Heasman, 2015). Thus, as this work hopes to uncover, the food lobbies clearly promote the consumption of ‘meat’ and animal-derived products, particularly ‘dairy’. While neo-liberal economics suggests that the choice and the interest of sovereign consumers should go first, in practice, as Lang & Heasman argue, “consumers tend to be under-informed, patronised and heavily targeted by marketing and sponsorship” (Lang & Heasman 2015:47).

This work does not aim to consider whether proliferation of ‘dairy’ products is the right solution to diet-related ill health, nor does it investigate whether milk and ‘dairy’ products indeed have the essential nutritional qualities they are claimed to have. Instead, it suggests that

---

7 By which are meant members of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
the message of food industries regarding ‘dairy’ products might be somewhat narrow-minded and not compatible with alternative findings. Besides, obscure promotion of animal-derived products consumption without acknowledging the hard labour and suffering of the bovine animals can be seen as a highly speciesist approach. Next section aims to clarify what is understood by “speciesism”, shed light on human-nonhuman animals’ power relations (focusing on the bovine animals’ exploitation) and elaborate on the possible justifications of the existing power dynamics.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Critical Animal and Media Studies

Since this work appoints itself into the emerging Critical Animal and Media Studies field, it is important to begin with a short explanation of its framework and formation. Broadly speaking, Critical Animal and Media Studies (CAMS) pioneers in acknowledging the interrelation of Critical Animal Studies (CAS), “a field of research dealing with issues related to the exploitation and liberation of animals” as well as “the inclusion of animals in a broader emancipatory struggle” (Pederson, 2010; as cited in Nocella et al 2014:xxvi), and Critical Media Studies (CMS), “an umbrella term used to describe an array of theoretical perspectives united by skeptical attitude, humanistic approach, political assessment, and commitment to social justice” (Ott & Mack 2014:15).

CAS was influenced or, better said, inspired, by Animal Studies (AS) scholarship domain. While AS mainly focuses on nonhuman animal suffering itself, CAS also takes into consideration the causes of this suffering, as well as the consequences and related issues that it brings about (e.g. the commonality of oppressions and discrimination, political economy, subjectivity, activism, abolitionism, etc. (Almiron & Cole 2016:2) ). However, communication and media, playing an undoubtfully important role in manufacturing consent for the oppression and exploitation of both human and nonhuman animals, do not form an essential part of CAS.

At the same time, CMS does focus on the power and influence of the media, spotlighting its scholarship across considerations of cultural studies and political economy. Yet, what CMS fails to acknowledge is a nonhumans’ perspective – as it was mentioned above, CMS maintains a purely humanistic view.

A critical thought represented by intersectional and cultural studies-based CAMS scholarship, not only considers the patterns of interaction between humans and nonhumans, as well as “draws on the knowledge of disciplines such as environmental studies, ethnic studies, women and gender studies, and media and cultural studies” (Merskin 2016:12), but also unites

8 Apart from the works mentioned in Introduction, the following readings might be of interest: Feskanich, Willett, Stampfer & Colditz’ work on milk consumption, calcium and bone fractures (1997); Feskanich, Willett & Colditz’ on calcium and vitamin D (2003); Michaelsson, Wolk, Langenskiold & Basu’s on milk intake, mortality and fractures (2014).
the issues of injustices towards other animals and their representation in the media, an academic pursuit that was so far rather scarce and much needed.

3.2 Defining and Redefining Speciesism

“Four legs good, two legs better!”
“All animals are equal. But some animals are more equal than others.”
– George Orwell

In 1970, British psychologist Richard D. Ryder introduced a new word to express his discord with inflicting suffering upon innocent beings, not only human but nonhuman alike. The word was “speciesism”, and its creation was not at all fortuitous. As Dr. Ryder, at the time working as a hospital scientist and involved into the animal research, put it, “hundreds of other species of animals suffer fear, pain and distress much as I did and something had to be done about it” (Ryder, 2010:1). Back in 1970, his first attempt to “do something about it” presented itself in a form of a privately distributed leaflet which meant to “draw attention to the illogicality of our present moral position as regards experiments with animals” (2010:2). The idea of perceived irrational discriminatory behaviour of humans towards other species was borrowed and developed further by young philosopher Peter Singer, who, by employing the word “speciesism” into his prominent work Animal Liberation (1975), eventually made the term widely acknowledged and recognized.

Since then the word speciesism has been recurrently referred to, although often in a slightly varied dimensions. Further on, this chapter shall briefly discuss the ways in which the notion of speciesism is perceived by nonhuman animals advocates, namely by Peter Singer, Tom Regan, Gary L. Francione and, most particularly, David Nibert⁹.

3.2.1 Peter Singer’s utilitarian vision of speciesism

Australian philosopher and Princeton professor of Bioethics, Peter Singer undoubtedly deserves full credit for disseminating the word speciesism into the academic discourse. In 1975, several years after the term was introduced by Ryder, he defined it as “a prejudice or attitude of bias toward the interests of members of one’s own species and against those of members of other species” (Singer 1990:6). It is worth noticing that the idea of human attitude, not only human behaviour, was already embodied in the definition. Singer’s pioneering book coined the definition of speciesism and became one of the most influential, albeit controversial works ever published on the topic, calling for a new kind of liberation movement and demanding what Carl

---
⁹ The author of this paper presents her personal outcomes supported with the evidence from primary and secondary sources. However, she well understands that the interpretation may be subjective and requires deeper knowledge of the perplexed works of the above mentioned authors as well as of the schools of thought that they represent.
Boggs of National University in Los Angeles called “a radical expansion of human moral horizons” (Boggs 2011:72).

In principle, Singer adheres to the belief that sentience, which is referred to in the upcoming sections of this work, is a sufficient condition that allows nonhumans to be recognised and respected. To quote the scholar, “the only defensible boundary of concern for the interest of others is their sentience: i.e. the ability to feel pain and experience pleasure” (Singer 1990:8-9). Moreover, it was Peter Singer who first expressed the principle of equal consideration of interests which utilitarianism school of thought readily accepted. According to the aforementioned principle, everyone’s happiness has the same weight or, if to put it in Singer’s words, “each counts for one, and none for more than one” (1990:5).

In 1979, just a few years after publishing the revolutionary Animal Liberation (which first chapter, as it is worth recalling, was entitled as “All Animals Are Equal”), Singer also publishes Practical Ethics which greatly adheres to the utilitarian school of thought, according to which the action is right “if it produces more happiness for all affected by it than any alternative action and wrong if it does not” (Singer, 1979:3). Further on in Practical Ethics, Singer quotes Roger Scruton, English philosopher and aesthetician:

> untimely death of a human being is a tragedy because there are likely to be things that she hoped to accomplish but now will not be able to achieve. The premature death of a cow is not a tragedy in this sense, because whether cows live one year or ten, there is nothing that they hope to achieve (as cited in Practical Ethics 1979:103-104).

For Singer (the assumption that has been vigorously disputed), nonhumans do not necessarily share with adult humans their imminent awareness of the future and the interest in continuing their life, which can be considered enough a justification for an instant and painless death. Furthermore, as he kept arguing (1999), the notions of suffering and killing can and shall be addressed individually. Going back to the idea of happiness equilibrium, he makes a controversial statement, literally claiming that nonhuman beings are “replaceable”:

> Let’s assume the pigs are leading a happy life and are then painlessly killed. For each happy pig killed, a new one is bred, who will lead an equally happy life. So killing the pig does not reduce the total amount of porcine happiness in the world. What’s wrong with it? (1999: 89).

Singer’s utilitarian interrogation will be revisited and, possibly, counter-charged in the next sections of the chapter where some distinct views related to speciesism shall be considered.

### 3.2.2 Tom Regan, Gary L. Francione: speciesism and inherent value of all animals

Unlike Singer, American philosopher Tom Regan as well as another significant nonhuman rights advocate Gary L. Francione, argue that nonhumans have a right to continue their exploitation-free existence, no matter how “beneficial” their life could be for the industry and how “painlessly” it could be taken. In his work The Case for Animal Rights (1983) Regan sharply disagreed with the notion that only humans belong to the “right” species, claiming it blatant speciesism and insisting that all animals possess inherent value (Regan, 1983). As Carl Boggs, summarized Regan’s thought, every sentient live being is “the experiencing subject of
life, a conscious being with defensible interests, including the avoidance of human-inflicted pain, suffering, and death” (Boggs, 2011:72).

Gary Lawrence Francione, American legal scholar, abolitionist and nonhuman rights theorist, in his book Introduction to Animal Rights (2000), in line with Regan’s beliefs, openly opposes the argument that "animals are commodities that we own" (Francione 2000:37) and expresses his intolerance towards any welfarist reform promoting the reduction of nonhuman suffering but continuing the slaughter. As he argues, reforms as such hardly ever bring any difference to the lives of oppressed nonhumans themselves since they “generally protect animal interests only to the extent that there is an economic benefit to humans” (Francione 2010:39).

Remarkably, Francione became known for openly claiming that ‘meat’ and ‘dairy’ industries are inextricably interrelated. As he said in the interview to Believer,

there is absolutely no morally defensible distinction between flesh and other animal products, such as milk or cheese. Animals used in the dairy industry usually live longer and are treated as badly if not worse than their meat counterparts, and they all end up in the same slaughterhouse anyway (Unferth, 2011; no pagination).

3.2.3 David Nibert: speciesism and the theory of oppression

Most probably inspired by Marxist thought, American sociologist David Nibert developed his theory of oppression (2002), based on Donald Noel’s (1968, as cited in Nibert 2002:12) system-based theoretical framework which meant to explain the origins of ethnic stratification. Inspired by Noel’s vision of social forces as being complex and interdependent, Nibert suggests that speciesism is interlinked with other systems of oppressions (racism, sexism, classism, etc.) which emerge from economic institutions and practices. According to Nibert, the ideological entanglements between the oppressions to a great extent are the consequences of what he calls “corporate capitalism”, or exploitation by continuously growing and expanded transnational corporations, particularly agribusiness (Nibert 2002: xiii). Expanded, Nibert’s theory of oppression (2002:13) is fundamentally based on three key factors that are necessary for the development and perpetuation of oppression of animals, human and non-human, these including economic exploitation/competition, unequal power, and ideological control (Nibert 2002).

Following the repeating cycle of theory of oppression (2002:14), the phase of construction and propagation of economically and elite-driven ideas that devalue the oppressed, facilitates creating of ideologies, encourages cultivation of prejudice and leads to discrimination becoming commonplace and oppression being “naturalized”.

Thus, speciesism, for Nibert (2002:17), is to be considered as a belief system, an ideology that naturalizes any forms of oppression. The vision of the speciesism not as a discrimination or a prejudice, as opposed to the previous thought, but as an ideology that legitimizes and inspires any prejudices and discriminations – including exploitation of the nonhuman animals out of economic interest – is, perhaps, Nibert’s most important contribution into the non-speciesist stance.

Further on, in his recent book Animal oppression and human violence (2013), Nibert introduces the notion of ‘domesecration’ which he defines as “the systemic practice of violence
in which social animals are enslaved and biologically manipulated, resulting in their objectification, subordination, and oppression” (Nibert 2013:12). Not only he provides ground breaking historical overview of domesecration of nonhuman animals, but also analyses how this process overlaps with the durable suffering of indigenous people, women, and people of color. As Nibert emphasizes, the ability of elites to maltreat vast numbers of humans and other animals has been – and still is – possible only because of their enormous influence over the state (2013). Further exploring his theory of oppression, Nibert also introduces a hopeful and fully-dedicated theory of liberation, which, however, does not fall into the scope of this work.

3.3 Bovine Tale: A Glance into the ‘Dairy’ Industry

"I don’t eat grass!” frowned City Sue.
"It’s ghastly stuff!” she cried.
"It’s not the modern thing to chew.
I want to live inside!”
(Wills & Flynn, 2015)

One of the most problematic sides of speciesism is, perhaps, the fact that it is institutionalized, making it possible for humans to exploit nonhumans “fiscally, socially, culturally, and spiritually” (Noske, 1997; Torres, 2006; as cited in Khazaal & Almiron, 2014). The following chapter aims to consider living conditions of cows used for ‘dairy’, and, imminently, for ‘beef’, to provide a background for the upcoming Analysis sections where nonhuman animals will no longer be addressed (that is to say, directly addressed). A brief insight into the cows’ intellectual and emotional lives shall be provided first.

3.3.1 Highly intelligent and sentient beings

As Dr. Melanie Joy well explains, bovines are “communicative, emotional, gentle and docile social creatures”, who “have multiple vocalizations and gestures to communicate their feelings” and “are likely to form ongoing friendships with one another in the natural environment” (Joy 2010:49). Karen Davis, American animal rights advocate, also acknowledges that cows, as well as chicken, ducks, pigs, turkeys, and any other animals, are capable of reverting to living complex social lives if placed in their own natural habitats (Davis 2011:41). By nature, cows are also loving and affectionate mothers. As Will Tuttle, award-winning speaker, author and educator, insists “of all mammals, it is the cow whose maternal instinct has been perhaps the most obvious and celebrated” (Tuttle 2005:115). Several witnesses noted very particular stories about cow baby-sitting on their online blogs. To quote but one, “one cow babysits all the calves, while the rest of the cows go off to graze. The babies don’t follow their mothers, but stay with the babysitter. The babysitter watches over the calves, but will not clean or nurse any but her own calf” (Schuster, 2011; no pagination). The calves are very active
and creative and engage into games while not suckling from their mothers. Naturally, calves suckle their mothers for up to a year, and maintain a strong bond with them throughout their life.

For Davis, imprisoning and slaughtering billions of other animals within global systems of confinement is inexcusable and is to be seen as “animal genocide” (2011:39). As she argues, the relocation and extinction of infinite other animals species can be paralleled with European colonisations of African and American territories\(^\text{10}\), or even with Nazi living space territorial expansionism (2011: 40). Charles Patterson, another American researcher who was one of the first to compare abattoirs with concentration camps, cited a famous line by Theodor W. Adorno, “Auschwitz begins wherever someone looks at the slaughterhouse and thinks: they’re only animals” (as cited in Patterson 2002:53). As it has been discussed on several occasions (Patterson, 2002; Bell, 2011) the denial of the importance of other being’s suffering because he or she is “only an animal” is inherently linked to the approval of or indifference toward oppression of “only a Jew”, “only a Black” or “only a woman”.

Various apologies to the vision of nonhumans as inferior beings where provided during the span of time, including the perceived inability of the latter to use language and abstract thinking or their incapacity to make moral claims (Cohen, 1997). However, as it was consistently underlined, if we were to apply this criterion unconditionally, many humans, such as babies, mentally challenged people or the senile, would also be inevitably left out from moral consideration, their rights and interests being ignored.

Jeremy Bentham an 18th century English philosopher, jurist, and social reformer in his prominent work *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1780) famously talked about the ability to suffer, as the only decisive point, the only “insuperable line”:

> It may come one day to be recognized, that the number of the legs, the villosity of the skin, or the termination of the os sacrum, are reasons equally insufficient for abandoning a sensitive being to the same fate. What else is it that should trace the insuperable line? Is it the faculty of reason, or, perhaps, the faculty of discourse? But a full-grown horse or dog is beyond comparison a more rational, as well as a more conversable animal, than an infant of a day, or a week, or even a month, old. But suppose the case were otherwise, what would it avail? the question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer? (Bentham 1996: 235-236).

The noble passage fully quoted above (and, perhaps, the most eagerly and habitually quoted by animal advocates of all times) clearly states that already in year 1780 there was a scholastic thought that opposed to any discrimination based on race, physical abilities and, particularly, species membership. In line with this thought, American biologist Marc Bekoff (2006, 2007) argues that animal emotions and animal sentiency (i.e. the capacity to have positive and negative experiences) are the only merits worth consideration.

Gary Francione once recalled a peculiar old story of how they became friends with Ingrid Newkirk, the president of People for Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) who inspired him to become a vegan. Not a shy person, she poured the milk that she found in Francione’s fridge down the sink, inquiring angrily “What do you think happens to them [cows]? Do you think they

\(^{10}\text{Recalling countless lives taken under the assertion of some humans to have “right” to possess the land of the others and impose new rules on their lives.}\)
die of old age? How can someone obviously so smart be so stupid?” (Unferth, 2011; no pagination). To this, Francione answered that he did not see “what was wrong about drinking milk, as the cows were not killed in the process” (2011; no pagination). It is worth remembering that this conversation took place in 1982, back when the level of knowledge was much worse. Yet, almost thirty five years later and, perhaps, thanks to successful marketing strategies of agri-industries, many people still believe that it is possible to produce milk without harming the cow, assuming, that ‘dairy’ products are naturally cruelty free. However, as Joy observes, “naturally” can be seen only as an operative word here for, like all mass-produced animal foods, “contemporary milk production is anything but natural” (Joy 2010:60). Although dairy farming historically has been an indispensable part of agriculture, hardly ever it was so violent and automatized. The continuation of this chapter will consider the modern conditions of ‘dairy’ industry.

3.3.2 The ghosts of ‘dairy’

Magda Stoczkiewicz, the director of Friends of the Earth Europe in the introduction to Meat Atlas (2014) confirms that bovine animals worldwide are increasingly raised in very cruel, cramped conditions, spending their short lives “under artificial light, pumped full of antibiotics and growth hormones, until the day they are slaughtered” (Stoczkiewicz, in Chemnitz & Beecheva 2014:7).

‘Dairy’ farming becomes more and more intensive, aiming to increase the amount of milk produced by each cow. Within ‘mega dairies’, the cows, artificially inseminated, are required to give birth to one calf per year and are bred a modified diet to produce large quantities of milk. Although the natural suckling period for calves ranges between six and twelve months, the babies are usually taken from their mothers within days, if not hours of birth. This way ‘dairy’ industry maximizes the quantity of the cow’s milk to be collected for human consumption. If the cows were producing just enough to feed their calves, as nature intended, this would be about 3 or 4 litres a day. However, the daily production for the Holstein-Friesian cows in the UK solely can be as high as 22 litres of yield of milk per day (CWF, no date a).

Within three months of giving birth the cows are artificially inseminated again, and the vicious cycle of exploitation repeats. Female new-borns are reared to join the milking herd. Male calves, not being able to produce milk, are considered surplus to the ‘dairy’ industry and are either shot straight after birth, or sold to be reared for ‘veal’ or ‘beef’. Calves destined for the ‘meat’ industry, often as young as a week-old and not even able to walk properly, may be transported for several days over long distances by road or ship, to rearing facilities which may be located in other countries. They are hungry, stressed, tired, fearful, and, at this age, particularly vulnerable to disease and injury (CWF, 2012; Joy 2012:61-63).

In the UK it is not infrequent for cows to have access to grazing on pasture for part of the day in summer, but the so-called ‘zero grazing’ (keeping cows indoors for all year round) is increasingly used, especially in ‘mega dairies’. This results in an increasing number of welfare problems for dairy cows. It is well-known, that given a natural healthy life, cows can live for about twenty years or even more. (CWF, no date a). However, high-yielding ‘dairy cows’ will
typically be slaughtered after three or four lactations because their milk production drops or they become chronically lame. Lameness, which often leads to additional welfare problems such as mastitis and metabolic diseases, is very painful and represent significant welfare problem for the cows worldwide. Cows may go lame due to various conditions associated with bacterial infection, or because of poor nutrition and conditions of life (concrete floors, inadequate bedding, poorly designed cubicles) (UNCTAD, 2013). According to the statistics provided by Compassion in World Farming (no date b), “in a herd of 100 cows in the UK, there could be as many as 70 cases of mastitis every year on average”. Cows also suffer painful operations of having their horns removed and tails docked, generally, without any anaesthesia.

However, psychological suffering experienced by the bovine may be as strong – or even stronger! – as physical one. Cows, like any other females, do not want to separate with their young offspring, lamenting loudly and desperately for many days. As Joy argues, forced weaning, an extremely traumatic experiences for both a mother and her child, is recognized as a major psychological stressor by agricultural veterinarians, who even recommend the ‘dairy’ farms to ensure that the facilities that hold both mother and calf after they have been separated are strong enough to prevent the two from reuniting (Joy 2010:51). Joy also provides another example of mother-calf bond, referring to the instances of cows who managed to escape and travelled for months to find their children on other farms (2010:61). The calves, who have long-lasting effects on physical and social development due to early separation with their mothers, are scared to travel in large groups, scared of slaughter – the atrocious fortune that awaits vast majority of all farmed animals, cows, calves and bulls included.

The inspiring story of Emily, the Sacred Cow (Joy 2010:137) who miraculously escaped the kill floor minutes away from her imminent death, hiding for forty days in the forestry areas of Hopkinton, Massachusetts (while locals, moved by her plight, deliberately misinformed the police about her location), demonstrates that no animal, human or nonhuman, wants to be killed. Emily is not the only example of nonhumans desperately longing for life even (and especially!) when they smell blood and realize that those who were gone before them, never returned. David Nibert in his chapter “Nomadic pastoralism, ranching, and violence” recalls the desperate resistance of oxen (mature, castrated cows) to their enslavement as early as in the 13th century (Nibert 2013:20).

Having provided the background of ‘dairy’ farming, this chapter argued that milk of “grieving mothers”11, taken from gravely oppressed nonhumans who are prone to inevitable slaughter, has little to do with the “happy cows” representation illustrated in the beginning of the work. Yet, contrastively, the world ‘dairy’ and ‘beef’ consumption grows year after year. The possible reasons and the roots of the perceived global neglecting of the matter of nonhuman animals’ suffering will now be briefly discussed.

---

11 The expression is inspired by ‘Milk comes from a grieving mother’ (n.d.). Available at http://www.peacefulprairie.org/outreach/grievingMother.html
3.4 Apathy or Empathy

“As numbers and numbing go hand in hand.”
– Melanie Joy

“A single death is a tragedy; a million deaths is a statistic.”
– Joseph Stalin

As it has already been mentioned, worldwide over fifty-five billion land animals are slaughtered for food every year (Steinfeld at al, 2006). According to Animal Equality, international farmed animal advocacy organization, this figure is even bigger and constitutes over 56 billion farmed animals killed every year by humans with many more millions dying in biomedical research, entertainment, fur or leather industry and hunting (Animal Equality, no date). This is to say, 115,000 nonhuman animals are killed every minute. While the staggering number of sacrificed innocent lives seems barbaric, even more outrageous is the perceived negligence of the issue. Despite the emerging clearly-visible shift in the public view regarding nonhuman animals rights, which is proved by a significant number of publications, documentaries, grassroots movements and animal advocates organizations, the practices of accepting lifestyle changes (e.g. veganism) or openly speaking for and on behalf of nonhumans are still less common than one would expect them to be.

Psychologist Paul Slovic argues that one fundamental mechanism that plays major role in most of the episodes of neglective reactions to mass-murder “involves the capacity to experience affect, the positive and negative feelings that combine with reasoned analysis to guide our judgments, decisions, and actions” (Slovic 2007: 80; author’s emphasis). Moreover, Slovic’s findings presented in his charactonymous chapter “The more who die, the less we care” (Slovic, 2010) are highly distressing and suggest that many people “do not understand large numbers […] unless they convey affect (feeling)” (Slovic 2010:69; author’s emphasis).

Creating empathy for other animals through narrating their personal stories could be an extremely powerful tool of bringing public’s attention to the injustice of massive nonhuman animals’ suffering. Empathy, as Joy argues, “closes the gap in our consciousness, the gap that enables the violence of carnism to endure” (Joy 2010:138). However, as the previous research has shown, despite the growing realization that industrial farming is morally and ethically problematic, the media keep attributing to manufacturing and perpetuation of the speciesist consent, while the touching feature stories which would centre on a nonhuman’s life and appeal to empathy are very uncommon (Freeman, 2009; Khazaal & Almiron, 2014).

---

12 Veganism in Western societies rejects any use and exploitation of other animals or animal derived products, setting out a number of ethical, environmental and antiglobalization arguments (Chemnitz & Becheva 2014:57).

13 Joy defines “carnism” as a belief system, an ideology, that conditions people to eat certain animals (2010:30).
3.5 On Lobbying and the Media in Agri-Business Sector

According to the definition, provided by American nutritionist and public health advocate Marion Nestle, ‘lobbying’ is any legal attempt by individuals or groups to influence government policy or action (2007:95; author’s emphasis). Although the definition explicitly excludes bribery, Nestle argues that,

lobbying always has involved three elements: (1) promoting the views of special-interest groups, (2) attempting to influence government laws, rules, or policies that might affect those groups, and (3) communicating with government officials or their representatives about laws, rules, or policies of interest (2007:95).

As follows from this extended definition, hired lobbyists are working on behalf of the corresponding businesses and are interested in persuading government officials to ratify laws (or refrain from approving the unfavorable ones) that would potentially benefit their clients’ companies (“whether or not they benefit anyone else” (95), as Nestle put it).

Lobbies’ techniques vary, but the most common include offering expertise based on well-researched advice to the governments, regarding legislation, regulation and education, as well as personal networking during special events, and the “revolving door” – frequent job exchanges between lobbyists and government officials (2007:106). However, lobbyists for food companies, like any other lobbyists, do not solely rely on technical expertise and gaining access to officials and decision-makers.

As Almiron argues (2016:32), “virtually every agri-food sector is represented by a trade association and advocacy firm, whose job is to influence government policies and promote a positive image around consumers, professionals, and the media.” These associations exist worldwide, however, the ones that are the most prominent in the EU are three ‘chain partners’: FoodDrink Europe, Copa-Cogeca, and CELCAA – interest organizations that form the world’s largest coalition with respect to the consumer economy involved (Almiron 2016:35). The specific focus and discourse of each of these organizations will be considered in the upcoming sections, with the special attention given to promoting health benefits of consuming milk and ‘dairy’ production.

This chapter sees as essential to mention that growing evidence proves how nonhuman animals’ exploitation is tightly linked to the ecological crisis. As Boggs argues,

the animal-food economy devours massive resources in the form of water, land, and energy while consuming nearly half of all grains and vegetables produced in a world facing imminent and drastic food shortages and generating more pollution and dangerous wastes products than any other economic sector (2011:73).

According to the information suggested in Cowspiracy (2014), recent documentary about the impact of animal agriculture on the environment, “rearing cattle produces more carbon dioxide gases than any other industry” (Andersen & Kuhn, 2014). Highly detrimental for ecology ‘dairy’ and ‘beef’ businesses emanate air and water pollution and require immediate

---

14 The author’s surname is to be pronounced as in “to nestle”, and has no connection with a Swiss transnational food enterprise, which she, however, frequently refers to in her book Food Politics (2007).
reconsideration; which so far has been quite efficiently restrained by agri-business lobbies. Moreover, as Almiron argues, agri-food business is closely interconnected with at least four other giant industries (seeds, oil, chemicals and pharmaceuticals, each one with their own lobbyist army), all of which are not interested in any kind of unfavorable restructuring of agri-business sector, whose profits they severely depend on (Almiron 2016:30).

It has been widely acknowledged that social consent is constructed through language and discourse (Khazaal & Almiron 2014:4). In the continuation, this work aims to analyse whether British and Spanish media reinforce the existing ideologies of oppression, or make any steps for voicing a non-speciesist perspective. As the previous studies focusing on news stories analysis (Freeman, 2009; Khazaal & Almiron, 2014) have already revealed, the interests of ‘farmed animals’, as well as the ethics of their maltreatment, are almost completely neglected by the media. Instead, the media tend to provide an incomplete, “camouflaged” story, reassuring their readership that there is nothing wrong with treatment of the other animals, especially, it was sharply noticed by Núria Almiron, “if they are to end up on our plates” (Almiron 2016:28).

Not only are capitalistic media known to be reluctant about challenging the mainstream ideologies, but they might be thought to deliberately support them. As Nibert asserts, huge wealthy industries have a lot of influence on socially engineering public consent through media, “including the idea that humans should eat animals” (Nibert 2013:265). Indeed, it comes as no surprise that with concentrated corporate control, mass media virtually guarantee that efforts to make citizens in Western societies aware of the growing “demesecration” as well as the safety and ethics of consuming the products derived from other animals will be vastly overshadowed both by advertisements and, as Nibert put it, “by unfavorable representations in news reports on any substantial challenges to the system” (2013:267).

Although, as Nibert further argues, the agricultural complex based on the oppression of nonhumans already has an advantage over its opponents in the production and distribution of information, it continuously secures itself advocating for the concepts of “freedom” and “consumer choice” while attempting to neutralize the alternative voices that strive to promote more reasonable and informed choices about diet and its impact (2013). What is more, while a small segment of the community of scientists and educators is trying to inform the general public about the multiple harms associated with the growing use of nonhuman animals for food and resources, the corporate vision of the “place of animals” is still prevailing.

Furthermore, Marion Nestle observed that for many people it is not easy to put nutrition advice into practice, mainly because they see it as unsteady and ephemeral, changing from one day to another (Nestle 2007:20). In a way, this confusion is more than understandable. As Nestle argues, the consumers predominantly obtain information about diet and health from the media, when the media, on their side, are informed by research publications, experts (often promoting themselves as “independent experts”), and the public relations representatives of food and beverage companies (2007). Media outlets require news, so reporters tend to favor, in Nestle’s words, “simple take-home lessons” (2007:20), and controversies, rarely discussing study results in a deeper and broader context. The readership, well familiar with “eat your vegetables” narratives, seeks new facts about new benefits, and the agri-business lobbies are
quick to respond to this demand. Conveniently, unlike the long, scrupulous studies, lobbies’ “independent research” is plausibly easy to follow and almost entertaining. Besides, as Nestle wittily specifies, it is always more interesting to read “a study “proving” that calcium does or does not prevent bone loss than a report that patiently explains the other factors—nutrients, foods, drinks, exercise—that might influence calcium balance in the body” (2007:20). Casting the doubt, keeping the public puzzled, or actually providing the readers with the scientific option they like the most is a very efficient technique. As Robert “Bob” Inglis, an American congressman openly advocating for free-enterprise solutions to climate change, remarkably said in the interview for Merchants of Doubt documentary film, “the reason that we need the science to be wrong is that otherwise we will need to change” (Kenner & Robledo, 2014).

4. Methodological Framework

4.1 Critical Empirical Research

This study is designed as an empirical research, “a conscious process of comparing and evaluating” (Heitink 1999:223), and focuses on methodological model of empirical circle. This model, first suggested by Dutch psychologist Adrian de Groot in 1961 and further developed by Dutch theologian Gerben Heitink in 1999, represents the hypothetical-deductive research approach attained by testing tentative hypotheses with empirical data (Heitink, 1999). The empirical research cycle includes several phases, namely:

(a) Observation phase, which places the emphasis on the collection of empirical facts.
(b) Induction phase, which explicitly introduces the hypotheses on the basis of the observed facts.
(c) Deduction phase, which derives concrete predictions and defines hypothesis in measurable variables.
(d) Testing phase, where, the predictive statements are checked by collecting new empirical data.
(e) Evaluation phase, where the results are interpreted within the framework of the specified hypotheses and theories (Heitink 1999:235).

The theoretical framework presented in the previous section can be regarded as part of the observation phase. Based on earlier scholarship and theoretical literature, it provides a critique of speciesism, as an oppressive ideology, not merely an individual practice or attitude. It further stresses, on the example of the bovine, that nonhuman animals are highly sentient beings, although this fundamental characteristic is generally underrepresented. The abridgement of the ‘dairy’ business effects, mainly in what regards bovine animals’ exploitation and its interrelation with other oppressions, as well as the industry’s highly contravening environmental impact are also touched upon in the theoretical framework chapter.

Further on, the rhetoric of three main EU agri-business lobby associations (Copa-Cogeca, CELCA, and FoodDrink Europe) will be further analysed, developed and will constitute a
more prominent part of the *observation* phase. Critical Discourse Analysis, an interdisciplinary approach to be considered in short order, will be applied to official publications available on the webpages of the corresponding organizations. Although this work attempts to withhold from defining uncritical hypotheses, the main outcomes of the analysis shall certainly be discussed and evaluated, thus constituting the *deduction* phase. In a *testing* phase, a sample of articles originating from four national British and Spanish newspapers shall be collected and analysed, with a special emphasis put on any coincidence with the previously assessed lobbies’ discourse. Finally, the *evaluation* phase hopes to interpret the results and generate ideas for future research in the field.

At the same time, the study is framed as a critical research within Critical Animal and Media Studies emerging field, and hopes “to shed light on how particular knowledges reproduce structural relations of inequality and oppression” (Jupp 2006:51). Advocating for social justice, this critical research work strives to expose the speciesist discourses and narratives which, as social researcher Victor Jupp argues, might be influenced by structures of power and domination (2006:52). This model can be useful to gain better perspective on how the national news media of the UK and Spain are influenced (if so) by discourses continuously produced and repeated by major European ‘dairy’ lobbies.

4.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

4.2.1 A brief history and main approaches

From early 1980s to the present day, the Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) theory has been standing in favour of oppressed and discriminated groups, focusing on how language and discourse legitimize the dominance of inequalities. Among the most devoted architects and adherents of the theory, on whose theoretical thought this work is drawn, are Norman Fairclough (1991, 1995a, 1995b), who first insisted that language, dictated by power, is the primary domain of ideology; Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak (2001), who focused on historical CDA resources and attempts; and Teun A. van Dijk, who regarded ideologies as latent and hidden “worldviews” that form essential part of social cognition (1998) and developed and theory of power (2009).

4.2.2 Critical discourse and speciesism

As anti-speciesist scholars Natalie Khazaal and Núria Almiron argue, despite the growing evidence of patterns and parallelism between the oppression of humans and nonhumans, so far CDA was only rarely applied to the study of nonhumans (Khazaal & Almiron 2014:4). Norman Fairclough, whose theories, among others, are eagerly applied by the methodology of this work wrote about the importance of increasing consciousness of how “language contributes to the domination of some people by others” (Fairclough 1991:3, emphasis added); the words that he systematically repeated in his more recent publications. The rapidly emerging CAMS research field aspires to gradually change the tendency of *human-only* inclusion and encourage social sciences to broader adopt CDA framework advocating for other animals. Yet, so far there are
only few noteworthy exceptions of scholars who focused on nonhuman animals critical
discourse analysis, mainly within CAS or as a subfiled within the social science research on
oppression (Khazaal & Almiron, 2014).

One of the most prominent example of scholars who linked nonhuman animals oppression,
conventionally “erased” from our consciousness, and Critical Discourse Analysis is Arran Stibbe
(2012). He expressed his open disapproval of power to be talked about as if it “[w]as a relation
between people only”, and investigated how language, on pragmatics, semantics, syntax and
morphology levels, influences the way that “animals are socially constructed, and hence treated,
by human society, in general discourse as well as in the discourse of animal products industries”
(Stibbe, 2012; no pagination). Inspired by remarkable experience of Stibbe linking CDA and a
number of facets of nonhuman animals oppression (from industrial farms to animated films), this
work strikes to continue a positive practice of using CDA and other animals critical discourse.

4.2.3 Critical discourse: Lobbies and the media

The previous researchers working with corporate and governmental sources highlighted how
“language itself becomes marketable and a sort of commodity, and its purveyors can market
themselves through their skills of linguistic and textual manipulations” (Bourdieu 1991, qtd. in
Coupland & Jaworski 2006:5). A quantitative research of the officially published corporate and
lobbyist statements would most probably fail to detect these seemingly insignificant messages
and strategies that shape the public perceptions of corporate actions and policies, therefore, a
close qualitative study of the corporate publications with implication of CDA analysis tools will
be more accurate and beneficial.

As for the critical analysis of the news discourse, Norman Fairclough developed the
following principles to adhere to: (1) manifestation of social, cultural, and political changes in
news discourse analysis should be paid special attention to; (2) discourse analysis should include
the relations of power and ideology. (3) texts should be perceived and analysed as
multifunctional; (4) media texts should be conceived in a dialectical relationship with society
and culture (Fairclough 1995b: 34).

4.3 Sample Selection and Analysis

4.3.1 Object of study

The main object of study of this project are the messages of top European agri-food lobbies,
namely FoodDrink Europe, CELCAA and Copa-Cogeca.

4.3.2 Sample selection of lobbies rhetoric: Open-access documents

According to Bruce Berg, sample selection techniques might include: simple random
sampling, systematic sampling, stratified sampling and purposive sampling (Berg 2001:30).
Purposive sampling (i.e. the one that requires special knowledge or expertise about certain
group) was used in selecting agri-food associations to be examined in this work. The official
websites of the main European agri-food lobbies, CELCAA\textsuperscript{15}, Copa Cogeca\textsuperscript{16}, and FoodDrink Europe\textsuperscript{17}, provide open access documents, including annual progress reports, factsheets, position papers, and other relevant texts. The data gathered for this work, collected by purposive and, at times, simple random sampling (Berg, 2001), consists of a number of sources:

- a joint declaration signed by agri-business industries (CELCAA et al. 2014),
- annual reports (FDE, 2015a-c),
- a number of press releases and press invites (C-C 2015 a-s; C-C 2016 a-j),
- implementation plans (JPI HDHL 2015, 2016),
- position papers (EucoLait, 2010),
- a brochure (EucoLait, 2014),
- a bulletin (FDE, 2016),
- an appeal letter (EucoLait, 2016),
- other textual and visual information provided at the official websites of the aforementioned organizations.

Focusing on the most recent publications (with the exception of EucoLait position paper (2010), all the documents were issued between 2014 and 2016), the sample hopes to provide an up-to-date insight. Theoretical sample was selected on the basis of either explicitly or implicitly referring to the category of milk and ‘dairy’ products consumption benefits for the general population. In order to reveal the “healthy milk” discourse, Fairclough’s (1995b) CDA model will be applied, i.e. description, processing and analysis of the collected data will be provided.

4.3.3 Sample selection of news articles: Vanished animals

As it was already concluded by previous research that nonhuman suffering in the media tends to be systematically ignored (Freeman, 2009; Freeman, Becoff & Bexell, 2011), this work will have human focus when preselecting articles for further sample consideration. It aims to address the recurring media discussion of the presumably positive effects that consuming milk and ‘dairy’ products has on human health. The keywords ‘health’, ‘dairy’, ‘milk’, ‘cheese’, and ‘yoghurt’ (‘salud’, ‘lácteos’, ‘leche’, ‘queso’, ‘yogur’, for Spanish sample correspondingly) will constitute the search string to inform this sample. Following its objective, the study will analyze and compare the current media representation of ‘dairy’ products and their linkage to health in Spain and United Kingdom, two Western Europe democracies that differ in cultural and political backgrounds.

Cows, calves and bulls, scarcely ever included into the ‘meat’-and-milk stories, are excluded from the search string used for selecting the sample, and this is not coincidental. As Arran Stibbe argued, “animals are disappearing, vanishing, dying out, not just in the physical sense of becoming extinct, but in the sense of being erased from our consciousness” (Stibbe, 2012; no pagination). Omitting the word ‘animals’, as well as any other mentioning of nonhumans from implicit search tools, the study means to demonstrate the perceived total disconnectedness of

\textsuperscript{15} http://www.celcaa.eu/  
\textsuperscript{16} www.copa-cogeca.be/  
\textsuperscript{17} http://www.fooddrinkeurope.eu/
humans from the realities of other animals’ suffering. As Jenny Uechi underlines, the space between the point of production and the point of consumption is “perhaps the broadest it has been in all of human history (Uechi, 2008; qtd in Saint 2008:10).

Articles were collected from Factiva, an online archive of previously published media sources, over a 1-year period from May 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016 for British newspapers, and over a 2-year period, from May 1, 2014 to May 31, 2016 for Spanish sample (the news stories sample is consistent with the sample of lobbies’ publications in terms of a time span). A combination of a key word ‘health’ appearing in the article with at least one of the other key words (‘dairy’, ‘milk’, ‘cheese’, ‘yoghurt’) was used for British newspapers, while the key word ‘salud’ in sequence with ‘lácteos’, ‘leche’, ‘queso’ or ‘yogur’ was used to collect Spanish articles sample.

4.3.4 Newspapers choice

For British sample, the articles were collected exclusively from The Guardian and The Times (including The Sunday Times). The Guardian is the UK national newspaper, politically left of centre and generally considered as broadly socially liberal. The Times, in turn, is moderate right of centre and might maintain a more rigid perspective.

For Spanish sample, the national newspapers El País and El Mundo were chosen. Spain is often described as having a statist system of interest group representation, its level of press freedom being lower than in the UK (Chaqués-Bonafont & Baumgartner, 2013; Binderkrantz et al, 2016). In 2013, upon conducting a large-scale assessment of the content, Chaqués-Bonafont and Baumgartner demonstrated that El País and El Mundo, despite quite different ideological backgrounds, tend to cover the same topic areas, focusing attention equally on certain topics to the detriment of others (2013:84).

The countries included in this study exemplify different models of media and politics: for research design purposes, the UK shall be considered as a liberal model, while Spain can be described as a polarized pluralist country (Binderkrantz et al, 2016). However, it must be noted for both countries’ samples, that the newspapers, although representing both right wing and left wing leanings, were not chosen to be representative of particular ideologies. When a coincidental parallelism might be present, the author points out that the newspapers were chosen mainly on the merit of being among the ones most popular (according to the number of readers) and the most circulated in the respective countries. Thus, El País and El Mundo are the most widely-circulated newspapers in Spain, with 279,404 copies issued (221,390 distributed) by El País and 183,828 copies issued (126,369 distributed) by El Mundo (OJD, 2015). The Guardian and The Times, although not the biggest in terms of circulated copies, have a great amount of regular online readers. UK monthly figures from the Audit Bureau of Circulations (ABC) for October 2015 illustrate that theguardian.com had 8.15 million daily readers, surpassed only by MailOnline which had 13.24 million (ABC 2015, as cited in Murrell, 2016). The Times, according to January 2016 ABC data, is the only other national newspaper that steadily grows its circulation year on year (ABC, 2016, as cited in Ponsford, 2016).
4.3.5 Choice of lobbies

The three chain partners, CELCAA, Copa-Cogeca and FoodDrink Europe, work in close cooperation and lobby for very similar goals. As Almiron summarized, “coalition members consistently share the mantra of less regulation, more industrial growth, science, and technology to guarantee human safety, health and the need to influence the public on nutritional issues” (Almiron 2016:36). It is important to initiate the analysis by providing brief information about the lobby organizations.

4.4.5.a CELCAA and Eucolait

CELCAA (the European Liaison Committee for Agricultural and Agri-Food Trade), was founded in 1979 and is an umbrella organization that represents buyers, distribution, warehouse managers, importers and exporters. The sectors that are covered under CELCAA mainly include divisions strongly dependent on ‘livestock’ (‘dairy’ sector, ‘animal products’ sector, ‘poultry’ and egg sector, ‘butcher crafts’ sector), or related to it (‘crop sector’) (CELCAA, n.d.). It appears that CELCAA can mostly be regarded as service provider, i.e. passing on information to its members as well as to the European Commission and European Parliament (CELCAA, 2014), rather than an actual “pressure group” (Wiggerthale 2005:15). The lobbying work is generally carried out more intensively by its individual members, that cover nearly all the trade conducted with agricultural raw materials, among them: Coceral (representing the grain industry), UECBV (European Livestock and Meat Trading Union), and, particularly interesting for this analysis, Eucolait (advocating for milk).

Eucolait, the European Association of Dairy Trade, represents the interests of European exporters, importers and wholesalers of ‘dairy’ products (Eucolait, no date a). The organization consists of more than 500 members (Eucolait, 2014), stands for the interests of liberalised ‘dairy’ market (e.g. in what regards collaboration with the US) and support of ‘dairy’ trade (e.g. most recently, agitating the general public to make “the right vote” on 23 June EU Referendum). Eucolait explicitly refers to milk as “probably the richest and most nutritious raw material available to the food and feed industry” (Eucolait, no date b), elaborating that:

[Milk] offers a wide range of proteins with different properties, has a complex fatty acid composition, is rich in minerals and vitamins and contains a specific carbohydrate: lactose. Milk is a complex product that can be processed into an enormous variety of dairy products ranging from consumer products (drinking milk, cream, yoghurts, butter and cheeses) to ingredients for the food industry (in dairy products, infant formula, chocolate, confectionery, pizza, ready-to-eat foods etc.) with different compositions and applications (Eucolait, no date b).

4.3.5.b Copa-Cogeca

Copa-Cogeca, two agri-food associations often represented together, is the pan-EU farmers union, “the united voice of farmers and their cooperatives in the European Union” (C-C, no date a). COPA, the Committee of Professional Agricultural Organisations, states among its objectives: examination of any matters related to the development of the CAP; representing the interests of the agricultural sector as a whole as well as seeking solutions which are of common interest (C-C, no date b). COGECA, the General Confederation of Agricultural Cooperatives, is
a self-proclaimed lobby and a platform for inter-cooperative relationships. Among their most important goals are: representing the general and specific interests of European agricultural, forestry, fisheries and agri-food co-operatives; promoting the cooperatives and contributing to their development; influencing decisions which affect agricultural cooperatives’ activities (by lobbying the EU’s public institutions and other organisations at EU and international level); undertaking legal, economic, financial, social and other studies of interest to agri-food cooperatives (C-C, no date c).

4.3.5.c FoodDrink Europe and JPI ‘Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life’

FoodDrink Europe is an independent organizations representing Europe’s food and drink industry (FDE, no date d). As FoodDrink general director Mella Frewen stated, “FoodDrink Europe was a founding member of the EU Platform and has played a leading role in its activities over the past decade” (FDE 2015a:1). Moreover, FoodDrink Europe also holds the chair and vice chair positions of expert groups in several of the European Commission’s Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs), such as ‘Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change’, ‘Sustainable food production and consumption’ and, particularly, ‘Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life’ (FDE 2015b:14). The aforementioned JPIs were established in order “to make better use of Europe’s precious public research and innovation resources and to tackle common European challenges more effectively” (2015b:14).

4.3.6 Analytic tools for sample analysis: Critical discourse analysis

In 1995, Norman Fairclough publishes a three-dimensional model of critical discourse analysis (illustration provided below) which this work shall use for analysis of its samples. The model is based on three analytical inter-related processes and is consisted of three dimensions:

- Text analysis, which includes linguistic description of the language text.
- Processing analysis, which focuses on interpretation of the relationship between productive and interpretative discursive processes.
- Social analysis, which provides explanation of the relationship between discursive processes and social processes. (Fairclough, 1995b:97; qtd in Janks 1997).
Text analysis, therefore, will mainly focus on the analysis of lexical choices. Processing analysis implies intertextuality analysis (of news source and reporting mode). Following Khazaal and Almiron’s (2014, 2015) choice of analyzing news sample, semantic analysis (the intended meaning of the chosen words), an analysis of suppressions (what is missing) and presuppositions (what is assumed as given) shall also be applied as part of processing stage. Finally, social analysis implies explanation of political, cultural and economic context. The social analysis of news sample will be informed by the outcomes of lobbies’ publications analysis which hopes to provide political and economic context. The social analysis of lobbies discourse will be considered in relation with recent EU policies and customer consumption tendencies.

**5. Empirical Results: Agri-Food Lobbies and Milk Representation**

5.1 Agri-Food Lobbies and Milk Representation

5.1.1 Description of the documents

Following Fairclough’s (1995b) model of sample analysis, table 3 aims to provide the description of the documents that this work makes reference to. The table also demonstrates some key ideas seen in the documents. It shall, however, be acknowledged that although the publications might discuss various issues related to agri-food industry, only the key concepts, relevant for this work, are listed in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>General description</th>
<th>Key ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Joint declaration: “Food for Thought” (CELCAA at al, 2014) | A 4-page written report of a joint declaration signed by CELCAA, Copa-Cogeca, FoodDrink Europe, as well as by CEMA, Europe IFAH, ECPA, Fertilizers Europe, EuropaBio, COCEREAL, FEFAC, and ESA. The report contains a list of key challenges and opportunities for the European food sector as well as a list of policy recommendations for the EU. Written in business, easy to follow language. Main target: policymakers and the members of the aforementioned organizations. | * Maintaining Food sector’s leadership,  
* Providing access to healthy, high-quality and affordable food to consumers in Europe and worldwide,  
* Fostering innovation and resource efficiency,  
* Promoting sustainable agriculture,  
* Highlighting Europe as a major global food importer and exporter, underlining its need to feed the growing population of the world. |
| FoodDrink Europe documents: Annual Reports (FDE 2015a-c). | 2015a: “Balanced diets & healthy lifestyles” – a 56-page report on the initiatives of Food and drink industries (including ‘dairy’-related ones) in 2014. Among others, the report includes 26 articles in Promoting Healthy Lifestyles section which describes company’s successful practices towards a “healthier world”.  
2015b: “Enjoy food, today and tomorrow” – a 44-page annual report with the key milestones of year 2014 and future goals explained.  
2015c: “Data and trends: European food and drink industry 2014–2015” – a 26-page report providing some summarized and analysed information on structure and economics of the EU’s food sector. All the reports are written in Business language and provide images, graphics (particularly in 2015c), informative posters and illustrations (photographs, predominantly of children, are very common). | * Optimising the nutritional qualities (reformulating existing or innovating new products),  
* Making healthy dietary choices easier for European citizens,  
* Reducing sugar in young-child formula & other ‘dairy’ drinks,  
* Developing educational programmes, that have an impact on promoting healthy eating and drinking habits among school children,  
* Maintaining industry’s competitive position,  
* Meeting the nutritional needs of a growing world population,  
* Ensuring EU food and drink sector’s worldwide competitiveness and leveraging its growth,  
* Working towards a more sustainable business model,  
* Highlighting the increasing demand for food as a challenge for the industry. |
* Encouraging sustainable cooperation between research institutes, industry and the wider stakeholder population,  
* Developing healthy, high-quality, safe and sustainable foods,  
* Stimulating consumers to select foods that fit into a healthy diet,  
* Stimulating the farmers to produce healthier foods in a sustainable and affordable way,  
* Promoting key natural foods, |

---

18 CEMA represents the agricultural machinery trade in Europe; Europe IFAH represents the European animal health industry; ECPA stands for the European Crop Protection Association; Fertilizers Europe represents fertiliser industries across Europe; EuropaBio – the biotech industries; COCEREAL is the European association representing the trade in feedstuffs, cereals, rice, oilseeds, oils, fats and agrosupply; FEFAC stands for the European Feed Manufacturers’ Federation; ESA is the European seed trade.
including ‘dairy’.  
* Bringing public’s attention to positive health effects of ‘dairy’.  
* Defending the interests of ‘dairy’ market and trade,  
* Promoting milk as healthy and highly nutritious material,  
* Encouraging investment into ‘dairy’ research,  
* Opposing to the principle of nutrient profiling of ‘dairy’ products,  
* Calling upon voting for the UK remaining in the EU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eucolait documents:</th>
<th>Eucolait position paper on quality and labelling was issued in 2010 upon meeting of the research and innovation high level expert group on milk. Eucolait brochure urges to “keep the milk moving” (as stated in its title). The appeal letter covers Eucolait’s vision of what will be “positive” outcomes of the upcoming UK Referendum. All the documents are written in business language and aim for Eucolait members mainly. On the threshold of the upcoming Referendum, the appeal letter is also addressed for general public – that is to voting population (British, Irish and certain Commonwealth citizens).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position paper</strong> (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brochure</strong> (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeal letter</strong> (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copa-Cogeca documents:</th>
<th>The original number of Copa-Cogeca archived press releases generated under separate search with a key words “milk” and “dairy” equals 52. The corpus of press releases &amp; press invites that were found relevant for this analysis includes 29 entities. Generally 1-2 page long, written in a simple and precise language, they are mainly directed to the members of the news media, although can also be consulted by members of Copa-Cogeca and general public.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Press Releases</strong> (2015a-s; 2016a-j)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Paper</strong> (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Paper</strong> (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reporting the following messages:  
  - growing demand of milk,  
  - the need of Europe to feed the world,  
  - EU ‘dairy’ market being in the critical state,  
  - milk producer prices being below production costs,  
  - dairy’ farmers might be forced to switch to ‘beef’ production.  
* Claiming ‘dairy’ products as essential for nutritious diet,  
* Acknowledging positive contribution of milk to the EU’s trade,  
* Arguing that ‘dairy’ cooperatives ensure long-term stability,  
* Referring to the EU School Milk programs as vital,  
* Underlining the importance of automated milking technologies

Table 3 Description and key concepts of data sources  
Source: Author’s own data.
All of the documents analysed use business language, however, they are relatively easy to follow and could be understood by an experienced reader. The textual and, in some instances, visual language serves instrumental purpose, aiming to transmit and propagandize lobbies’ discourse to the wider audience and contribute to the ensuring of the pursued solutions.

5.1.2 Interpretation and explanation

First of all, it shall be mentioned that the imposed duty of Europe to “feed the world” (referring to the reportedly increasing global population) is present in all documents analysed. The use of modality is very particular and reveals a patronizing tone of the ethnocentricist message:

“[Europe] must play its part in feeding the growing population in Europe and the world as a whole” (CELCAA et al. 2014; emphasis added).

“Europe must speed up solutions” (JPI HDHL 2016:24; emphasis added).

“The EU Commission must act to improve the situation short term” (CC 2015j; emphasis added).

However, not only the necessity to feed the growing world population is claimed, but it is also continuously emphasized that this shall be done through providing high-quality and affordable food choices, which milk and ‘dairy’ are the essential part of. The idea of milk as a basic and primary product is one of the main messages articulated by all the above publications. Euclait, for instance, encourages seeking the opportunities to export “the multitude of wonderful dairy products of which the UK and the EU should be exceedingly proud” (2016; emphasis added).

‘Dairy’ products are also claimed to be vital for ‘nutritious’ diet, with their benefits for health being continuously underlined. Predictably, the discourse of “health benefits” is rather one-sided and does not include any mentioning of the consumption of ‘dairy’ products not being fully beneficial for human’s health. Even more so, Euclait openly opposes to the initiative of educating consumers on the nutrient profiles19 of ‘dairy’ products claiming that this information can be “over-simplified and misleading for the customers” (Euclait, 2010). As Euclait elaborates, including nutrient profiles “would prevent many dairy products important for a balanced diet from making health and nutrition claims” (2010). Shall the profiles be set, they admit, “dairy products should at least have specific nutrient profiles as recommended by EFSA20” (2010).

FoodDrink Europe also aims at making healthy choices ‘easier’ for European consumers, the following examples reveal the perceived superiority and certain level of pretentious of the lobbies’ voice: “The food and drink industry actively supports and often leads efforts to usher in

19 Nutrient profiling, as defined by WHO, is “the science of classifying or ranking foods according to their nutritional composition for reasons related to preventing disease and promoting health”. Available at http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/profiling/en/

20 EFSA stands for European Food Safety Authority; the organizations addressed in this paper (CELCAA, Copa-Cogeca, FoodDrink Europe) are all members of EFSA Stakeholder Consultative Platform (EFSA, 2016).
a healthier world” (FDE 2015a:39; emphasis added), as well as “enables customers to make healthier choices” (FDE 2015b:18; emphasis added).

The conditions in which milk is taken from cows and the aftermath of ‘dairy’ business related slaughters are never mentioned in the documents analyzed, except for a few cases when it was necessary to emphasize the economic losses of the industry. Paradoxically, even the “production” of milk is attributed to the ‘dairy’ industries, and not to the nonhuman females from whom the milk is taken. Furthermore, the frequent message argues that improvements in the field of animal welfare are not necessary and may lead to even more economic struggles. Besides, the lobbies tend to underline the necessity of small farmers to join bigger industrial ‘dairy’ sites to ensure their financial stability, clearly, not mentioning the consequences that these changes may bring to the nonhuman animals.

Agri-food sector sees itself as globally competitive, productive and sustainable (economically, environmentally and socially), despite experiencing growing economic problems, which are frequently referred to. The link between economic hardships of the ‘dairy’ industry21 and the risk of having less quality ‘dairy’ products is constantly underlined. One of the press releases, exemplifies how Copa-Cogeca members provided “delicious products showcasing” (including “a variety of quality blue mould cheese, litres of quality milk and quality dairy products, delicious Kerrygold butter and Irish cheese”, etc.) during an event hosted by Members of European Parliament. Notably, the press release concluded that “without action, these regional specialities won’t be there anymore for consumers” (CC, 2015f). Several examples in Copa-Cogeca publications well demonstrate what was called by previous researchers (Khazaal & Almirón, 2014) an alarmist, fear-invoking language: the press releases entitled “Copa and Cogeca warn of seriously difficult EU milk market situation” claims that “the situation is becoming unbearable in the short-term without the European Commission’s support” (CC, 2015n; emphasis added), while another press release calls the situation in the EU milk sector “seriously worrying” and expected to “deteriorate further” (CC, 2015l). Negative over-lexicalization is present all through the corpus of press releases, which are meant to serve as the reference for the media. Particularly, farmers’ situation is called “desperate”, the market is reported to be in “perilous state”, while agri-food business “cannot afford to cut the production”. Moreover, several lobbies blame European Commission in the failure to recognize “the real scale of the new challenges” that the sector faces and demand to provide support to agri-businesses through the metaphor of “safety nets” which are needed “to put an effective floor in the market”.

A discursive strategy of employment of strong, almost war related metaphors, is also evident in the documents analysed. Particularly, the EU livestock sector is said to be “hit” by increasing challenges while the EU ‘dairy’ sector is portrayed as “bleeding”.

Another example requires special attention, namely, Copa and Cogeca claiming that “globally, climate change is a threat to agriculture and food security” (CC, 2015c). Although discussing the impact of agriculture, particularly industrial farming, on climate change is beyond

---

21 Which generally imply the end of milk quotas, the prolonged Russian embargo on EU foodstuffs and price volatility.
the scope of this work, the example provided can be seen as a clear evidence of suppression: while affirming that climate change makes a negative impact on agriculture by itself is not incorrect, the unambiguous influence of agriculture on climate change is never acknowledged.

Interestingly, although none of the associations are openly calling themselves a lobby, their essence is clearly revealed through their discourse and the language they use. Thus, FoodDrinkEurope “urges world leaders”, the food and drink sector “calls upon governments”, Copa-Cogeca “warn EU Commission”, “claim that “European Commission’s support is urgently needed”, and CELCAA “urges the EU Commission to do much more”.

With this being said, the discourse of the agri-food lobbies is very business-centered, with the emphasis made on problems (mostly, economical), that occur, might occur and shall be solved by the governments. The human-focus is made on individual farmers’ interests as well as on the perceived benefits of milk and ‘dairy’ consumption for the consumers’ health. In the rare cases when they are acknowledged, nonhuman animals in lobbies’ discourse are approached in terms of their economic value and are, in general, highly commoditized. Labels such as ‘dairy cows’, ‘cattle’, and ‘livestock’ are frequent and normalized.

5.2 Empirical Results: Newspapers Sample

The following section details the findings of the newspapers research conducted. Once collected from Factiva, the total sample included 96 news stories, 26 news stories from The Times, 31 from The Guardian (collected from 1 May 2015 to 31 May 2016), 21 articles from El Mundo and 18 from El País (collected from 1 May 2014 to 31 May 2016). It shall be mentioned that the original corpus of newspapers pre-selected for British newspapers alone was larger and constituted 127 news stories (65 from The Guardian and 62 from The Times; while the first key words search produced relatively balanced results of 322 and 325 hits for The Guardian and The Times accordingly). However, since the sample of Spanish newspapers was not that populous, the work focuses only on the most representative British news stories to balance the samples. The original quantity of hits provided by Factiva upon using the key words string for Spanish newspapers sample was considerably smaller (157 hits for El Mundo and 121 hits for El País) than the corresponding The Guardian and The Times results; regardless the fact that the results for Spanish sample were collected during a two-year period. Open coding was used to pick out the main subtopics present in the articles, inductive approach was undertaken in creating the codes.

Findings reveal that the majority of the news stories tend to depict cow’s milk rather positively, mostly as relatively healthy, highly nutritious and conventional product (approximately 75% for British sample –72 % and 78% for The Guardian and The Times respectively, and about 80% for Spanish sample – 76% in El Mundo and 83% in El País). Although this work attempts to provide certain statistical data for the reader’s convenience, it is not a quantitative, but a qualitative research, which aims at determining trends in the newspapers’ ‘dairy’ discourse. British and Spanish samples shall be now approached separately.
5.2.1 British newspapers sample
Since the key word “health” was of a mandatory presence in every article, it comes as no surprise that most of the stories belonged to the sections related to wellbeing or nutrition. The healthiness of milk and ‘dairy’, from one or another perspective, is argued in the vast majority of articles. The articles from The Times predominantly belong to Features, Health, Diet & Fitness, News and other sections. The Guardian sample includes informative, as well as opinion-based articles and is mainly represented by Life and Style, as well as Environment and News sections. Furthermore, several news stories from The Guardian sample are coming from Guardian Sustainable Business or Paid Content columns.

Major topic codes within the “health” theme include, for both newspapers: milk as nutritious product, milk as everyday essential product, the advantages of organic farming, the economic struggle of ‘dairy’ industry, the comparison of various types of milk, an overview of the ‘dairy’ alternatives as well as veganism-related news stories. Clearly, the vast majority of articles analysed fails to include the nonhuman animal’s perspective, denying their identities, ignoring the emotional issues they face and not addressing the ethics of their oppression.

The topic of the type of cow’s milk, which is considered the healthiest for consumption, is often approached. The articles tend to discuss whether whole milk, low-fat milk or raw milk is a better choice. Notably, it is almost always human health that is discussed in the articles of both newspapers’ sample. On the rare cases when the health and well-being of nonhumans is addressed, it is only out of the fear that any kind of pathology that nonhuman animals suffer can be dangerous for the humans, consuming the products derived from them. Animal welfare stories, consequently, are predominantly linked to ensuring the product quality, and not to challenging the ethics of nonhuman animals’ oppression.

5.2.1a: Nutritious milk
Most of the articles agree with the presupposed idea that “whole milk and cheese are full of key nutrients we all need”. The Times suggests consumption of ‘dairy’ products “up to four or five times a day”, in the form of butter, cheese, milk or yoghurt (full of “bone-building calcium”). Several articles dedicate their attention to different elements contained in milk such as phosphate (claimed to insure slow aging), protein (supplied by a glass of milk after workout, or in a change from cereal to yoghurt in the morning), vitamin D (the importance of which many mothers and pregnant women are not aware of) and iodine (not present in human bodies and sourced by milk and ‘dairy’ products). The iodine story is a particular one – The Guardian quotes The UK Iodine Group on underlining that “conventional milk” contain much more iodine than “organic milk”. To cite the article, “ironically, organic milk, often considered by consumers to be “healthier” than non-organic, contains very little iodine because organic-reared cows feed on grass that is iodine-poor” (emphasis added). The argument cited reveals perceived distancing between what consumers consider and what The UK Iodine Group, presented by The Guardian as “the experts”, reveal. Besides, the quote above stresses that the cows are “reared” (and, hence, are inferior), and illustrates that their nutrition is something that can be modified for the sake of consumers’ health.
5.2.1b: Essential milk
Seemingly incidental inclusion of milk into the list of daily essentials is widespread in both British newspapers. “Adequate milk” is referred to as “not given to refugees’ children” (used as the headline of one of The Guardian’s newspapers), The Times on several occasions mentions the increase of prices for “food staples such as meat, milk, cheese, eggs, bread and cereals”. The parents are recommended to give their children “water or milk” instead of fizzy high on sugar drinks (sugar itself seems to be of a major concern – several articles estimate how much sugar is contained in the various ‘dairy’ products). Milk is distributed to refugees, ‘dairy’ is recommended as the efficient hangover remedy (specifying, that the probiotics “found in cheese and yoghurt” were tested on mice, with no obvious side-effects from the alcohol on their livers), every now and again the pages of British newspapers depict milk as vital and indispensable.

5.2.1c: Alternatives
The Times features articles that discuss the existing alternatives to what they call “regular, traditional, cow’s milk”. While the initiative itself seems equitable and clearly aims to be impartial, while seemingly, a lot of space is dedicated to the explanation of plant-based milk alternatives, both lexical and semantic analysis reveal that the message is quite unsupportive of any products other than animal-derived milk. Hedging, or false balance, is a strategy commonly used in several articles discussing the plant-based milk alternatives. The lexical choice demonstrates that very well: the “cardboard-tasting soya” is claimed to be the only readily available alternative, while the rest of drink varieties are called “pitiful by comparison”. The Times consistently underlines that “varieties of milk that have never been near a cow”, although not unhealthy for adults, will never have the same vitamins and minerals as actual cow’s milk, “easily obtained, cheap and nutritious”. For those who can neither tolerate cow’s milk nor put up with “cotton-tasting” plant alternatives, rich in protein and calcium “sheep, goat, or even camel milk” are readily suggested. It is worth noticing that although broadly used expression “cow’s milk” uses the Saxon genitive, acknowledging that milk was actually taken from the cow, this cannot be said about milk of other nonhuman animals which The Guardian refers to (sheep milk, goat milk, camel milk). Listed rather as varieties of the same product, they do not make any direct reference to a doe, an ewe or a female camel 22 that the milk was taken from.

Going back to the plant-based ‘dairy’ alternatives, The Times comparison explicitly underlines that most of them (including almond milk, coconut milk, hemp milk, rice milk, and oat milk) with the exception of soya milk are not suitable for babies and young children. Another The Times article reminds that “just 2% of infants in the UK have a cow’s-milk allergy”.

Both newspapers also highlight that consumption of soya milk (as argued in The Times, on March 6, 2016) and almond milk (as brought by The Guardian, on October 22, 2015) can be “quite good for you – very bad for the planet”. While acknowledging the nutritive values of almond and soya milk, their perceived negative impact on the environment is stressed. The message regarding the alternatives, therefore, clearly indicates the inclination of the authors

---

22 Curiously, a female camel is called “a cow”, so the most accurate way to refer to milk taken from a female camel would be “camel cow’s milk”.
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towards cow's milk, although none of the newspapers eagerly talks about the detrimental impact on the environment of the ‘dairy’ industry itself.

British newspapers also tend to underline that the majority of people who decide to go ‘dairy’-free do that purely because of the sugar lactose intolerance. According to The Times, people who do it for other reasons, do it “with an air of superiority and smugness”, as a result of “all the pseudo-science against dairy” or “because they believe it makes them healthier”. Distancing from those who share dairy-free life choice and erroneously presupposing their reasons, The Times demonstrates a rather hostile attitude towards veganism in general.

The Guardian’s attitude is slightly more encouraging towards ‘dairy’-free alternatives, one of the articles even recommends its readers’ to be “meat- and/or dairy-free once a week or more”, pointing out that dairy-free diet can confer significant health benefits. However, the author is very careful not to promote veganism, noting that “understandably, going completely vegetarian or vegan can be an intimidating prospect” (emphasis added). Author’s false presupposition of veganism as being very difficult if not impossible to maintain in practice clearly demonstrates the unwillingness to promote a dairy-free discourse on a permanent basis.

5.2.1d: Veganism

Furthermore, a lot of evidence of disapproving or empirically misrepresenting the experience of veganism as a conscious life choice can be found in both British newspapers samples. Since this undoubtedly worthwhile topic does not form a direct part of this work’s focus, just a few examples will be provided, focusing on illustrating the lexical choice of the adjectives used to describe veganism. The Times suggests a story of one of its authors who joined Veganuary, depicting how “wan and humourless” and “greyer than before” her life has become and how much she was longing to go back to what she called “normal diet” (Arbuthnot, 2016). The idea that vegans find some pleasure in “complaints” is stressed by the ironic tone of the journalist in The Guardian, “So veganism just got that little bit more joyless? They should be even more pleased with themselves” (Dodgers, 2016). Another example taken from The Guardian sample, narrates

If you have ever wondered why diplomatic dining in much of the developed world tends to the bland and, frankly, boring, ask yourself what remains after the cautious host has stripped out all meat from pigs and cows, all shellfish, most cheese (the Chinese tend to find it repellent) and anything too spicy (Dejevsky, 2015).

Although indirectly informing on the existing positive practice of occasionally excluding animal flesh and animal-derived products from high level dining events, the author unmistakably refers to the practice of vegan diet as “bland” and “boring”. Moreover, her mentioning of the Chinese people’s diet also deserves attention since the expansion of “healthy dairy products” to the East forms part of ‘dairy’ businesses long-terms objectives and is regularly highlighted in the media (a need to introduce healthy ‘dairy’ products – starting from yoghurt drinks – into the

---

23 As Matthew Cole and Karen Morgan revealed in their research, UK national newspapers tend to discredit veganism through ridicule, stereotyping vegans as ascetics, faddists, sentimentalists, or even as hostile extremists (Cole & Morgan, 2011).

24 A month of not eating ‘meat’ and ‘dairy’ in the UK.
Chinese market, were people traditionally do not consume milk, is addressed, for instance, by *The Times*.

5.2.1e: Organic milk:
Stories on the advantages of “organic milk” are common for *The Guardian* as well as for *The Times*. Apart from mentioning the health benefits of organic milk (in this sample they are mainly related to containing beneficial omega-3 fatty acids), and picturing favourably the sustainability of the local production (one of *The Guardian* articles provides an example of the hospital that serves only local milk to its patients), the stories repeatedly point out that the conditions that nonhuman animals have in smaller farms are better, appropriate or even completely fine. As *The Times* reports, “[cows] are treated so well, and they decide themselves when they go in to be milked” (emphasis added).

5.2.1f: Farmers and industry:
Both *The Times* and *The Guardian* tend to narrate the story of non-industrial farming as eco-friendly and sustainable practices, giving a personal touch to farmers’ struggle, fearing that the family-run businesses might not be passed over to the next generations: “What can you do if you are a dairy farmer in an embattled industry, needing to create enough income to enable your son to join the family business?” (Goulden, 2016) and “our youngest daughter will not remember anything about the dairy herd” (Stevens, 2016). Use of war-related alarmist language, of which “embattled industry” from the passage above is a good example, attributes to what Khazaal and Almiron called “the fear-mongering strategy” (2014:7), indicating that, indeed, if the economic harms that the farmers suffer are not solved, the consequences may affect consumers, that is to say, general population might be deprived of “basic foodstuff” – healthy and good quality milk. *The Times* article acknowledges “the hard work and personal sacrifices made by dairy farmers to produce their product” (emphasis added), giving credit to the farmers and failing to recognize the nonhuman females as actual creators of the milk and the protagonists of the story.

The upcoming UK Referendum\(^\text{25}\) and its positive impact on the ‘dairy’ sector also informs several news stories in both *The Times* and *The Guardian*. Big businesses, generally, tend to be in favour of Britain remaining in the EU, ‘dairy’ industry is not an exception to that. As *The Guardian* underlines, the imposed by the European Union environmental health regulations protect consumers from the unproven food. *The Guardian* also highlights the necessity of “making sure that food is fresh, healthy and affordable”, calling it “a political issue”, “a matter of public health” and “a measure of national wellbeing”.

5.2.1g Language:
Cows are generally portrayed as commodities, framed predominantly in terms of the economic value of the product that is taken from them, or, eventually, in the form of the ‘beef’ that they become. As illustrated in one of *The Guardian* articles, which quotes the words of a former farmer, “cows are dual purpose – they give great milk and at the end they give great meat”. Several widespread examples of commodification of the nonhuman females can be also seen in

\(^{25}\) United Kingdom referendum on European Union membership, to be held on 23 June 2016.
the examples of metonymy, i.e. naming cows for what is taken from them (“milk cows”, “dairy cows”), are present in The Times and The Guardian samples alike. The authors speak about the types or varieties of cows (such as Jersey and Guernsey), almost never falling into personification of the nonhumans. A particular story stands by, featuring Nessie Reid, a young artist who decided to spend several days on a “dairy parlour” to get to know better Meadowsweet and Elisa – two cows, with whom eventually “they have become BFFs, or best friends forever”. The article clearly regards Reid’s experience as sacrifice, mentioning that “throughout history, artists have suffered for their work”, but with the cow names given in the first couple of lines, one may expect the article to focus, clumsily yet well-intentionally, on the problems of other animals’ welfare or provide an insight on farmed animals’ emotions. Yet, nothing is mentioned about Meadowsweet and Elisa’s lives; instead the story means to bring the readers’ attention to the farmers’, not cows’ struggle. As the author hyperbolises, “dairy farmers are also facing oblivion along with the beasts of the African savannah and the deep ocean.”

5.2.1h Sources:
Some words shall be included about the sources informing the articles. Among others, The Times is frequently quoting The National Dairy Council (who opposes the “misconceptions” about dairy fearing that they can result in “vulnerable individuals needlessly avoiding a highly nutritious food group”, the Dairy All Party Parliamentary Group who echoes claiming that “we should be making every effort to encourage dairy consumption not taking steps to reduce it”. Hedging, or creating false balance practices, is quite common in several articles. The Guardian, for instance, is very careful about creating seemingly equilibrated stories. One of them, for instance, focuses on the debate whether low-fat or full-fat milk is “a healthier choice”. While stating that “both major health organizations and the dairy industry” agree that low-fat milk may not be as beneficial as it is perceived to be, The Guardian cites on Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Agriculture (USDA), opposes the viewpoints of different nutritionists (none of whom speaks about negative aspects of milk in general, sticking to the position of advocating either for whole milk or skimmed milk) and, peculiarly, end up quoting Marion Nestle, the author of Food Politics, on her statement that “in nutrition, there are no absolutes, only relative statements in the context of everything else someone eats”.

Besides, The Guardian sample also features three Paid Content articles, dedicated to the description of sustainable Irish ‘dairy’ farms; positively depicting artificial insemination of the cows in Bangladesh (“health” here is mentioned in terms of the healthcare benefits that the workers of BRAC enterprise receive); and “Caring Dairy” Ben & Jerry’s program. The latter, particularly, contributes to the “happy cow” discourse, proclaiming that “great milk is made up of healthy land, dedicated farmers, smart energy and a strong local community. Combine it all and happy cows result”.

5.2.2 Spanish newspapers sample
Predominantly, the articles in Spanish sample focused on underlining the healthy qualities of milk as a product that is highly beneficial for human consumption. Sixteen El Mundo articles or
76% of the sample (mostly collected from Zen section) refer to cow’s milk intake as a positive, or mostly positive practice. For El País the number is higher and constitutes 83%, or 15 articles out of 18. As exploratory research reveals, the Spanish sample articles’ range of topics is very similar to this of British newspapers. Namely, the following themes can be seen as most common: discussing the healthiness of milk in terms of the microelements that is supplies; referring to milk as basic and essential product; highlighting that economic problems of ‘dairy’ industry can lead to animal welfare problems and, correspondingly, to human health problems; comparing cow’s milk to its alternatives; controversial attempts to challenge the healthiness of milk; commenting on vegan ‘dairy’-free diets; exploring the benefits of ‘dairy’ for Asians, and, notably, revealing “the truth” about the healthiness of milk (by one of the El País articles).

5.2.2a Nutritious milk
Much like in British sample, a lot of the articles in Spanish newspapers tend to discuss the healthiness of various elements contained in milk, as well as compare the qualities of various types of cow’s milk. The tendency to stress the indispensable nutritional qualities of cow’s milk and ‘dairy’ products is present both in El País and in El Mundo. Daily and lifelong consumption of milk is said to be the main source of calcium, proteins, minerals and vitamins (particularly, vitamin D). El País calls cow’s milk “the most complete nutritionally” and states that “con la leche de vaca, (casi) todo son ventajas” (“with the cow’s milk almost all are advantages”). El Mundo recommends consumption of ‘dairy’ products for strengthening bones. One of the El País articles also states, that the best way to fight osteoporosis and to protect bone mass is to get calcium from ‘dairy’ products, for instance consuming three-four servings of ‘dairy’ products a day (“about three yogurts and a latte”). Besides, El País brings readers’ attention to the fact that apart from providing proteins, ‘dairy’ products also contribute with the intake of carbohydrates and electrolytes. Furthermore, just like in the British sample, several articles discuss the healthy qualities of whole milk versus skimmed milk, as well as the benefits of lactose-free milk (which is said to be good only for the lactose-intolerant consumers).

5.2.2b Organic milk
Most of the articles agree that no matter how good the perceived qualities of milk are, organic milk can be even healthier, especially if it “comes from a happy cow” (“una vaca feliz”) in which case, as argued by El País, milk contains “three to five times more of Omega 3 acids, a lower content of saturated fats, more vitamin E and beta-carotene”. Interestingly, however, one of the articles in El Mundo highlights that certain endorsements of organic milk can be a mere marketing, comparing the benefits of drinking litres of Omega 3-enriched organic milk with eating a portion of salmon or one banana.

5.2.2c Sources
It is also important to note that Spanish newspapers tend to quote a wide range of sources. Prominent voice is given to the representatives of ‘dairy’-related industries (Nestlé; Nutrición Infantil of Nestlé), ‘dairy’ associations (International Dairy Federation), and international organizations (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). It is very common for
El País to quote ADDINMA\textsuperscript{26} – Association of Nutritionists-Dietitians of the Community of Madrid, particularly its nutritionist Isabel Pérez, and FEDN\textsuperscript{27} – Spanish Foundation Dieticians-Nutritionists. El País also refers to animal rights advocates (who they call “animalistas”), for instance, the ones representing ADDA – the association Defending Animal Rights (la Asociación Defensa Animal) and PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals), as well as vegan associations (la Asociación Vegana Española). Alternative voices are also acknowledged, such as the one of Harvard School of Public Health, whose recent publication “Healthy Eating Plate” recommends to limit milk and ‘dairy’ intake. The latter, particularly, advocates for making nutrition healthy and “free of industry groups pressure”. El País, although carefully citing Harvard’s message, underlines that the Ministry of the US still recommends to include ‘dairy’ in every meal, “whether or whether not it is proved that it helps to prevent osteoporosis”.

Articles, sponsored by major industries, are also present in Spanish sample. Thus, the story by Pascual, one of the most prominent ‘dairy’ industries in Spain, is told in El Mundo, revealing how milk “travels” from the cow to customer’s house. Prominently, this news story makes emphasis on the cows’ welfare, stating, just like one of the articles in The Times, that cows live in suitable conditions, even deciding when they want to be milked.

5.2.2d Language
The choice of language that is adopted by introducing the position of one or another side is peculiar and quite representative. For instance, while the Spanish Ministry of Agriculture “defences” (“defiende”) milk and recommends drinking it three times a day, the animal organizations advocates “complain” (“se quejan”) that cows are regarded as “mere production machines”. Speciesist language is observed in Spanish sample just as much as it is present in British newspapers. The cows are called “vacas lecheras” (“milk cows”) which is another example of metonymy; the milk is poetically referred to as “white gold” (“oro blanco”).

5.2.2e Milk types and alternatives
El Mundo confirms that cow’s milk is the most consumed milk in Spain, followed by sheep’s milk and goat’s milk (“leche de oveja y de cabra”). As the newspaper argues, these drinks do not include lactose and casein (although they do not lack calcium and proteins), which allows people with lactose intolerance to consume them without complications. The tendency to promote milk taken from the animals is especially evident in El Mundo discourse, where it is also stressed that those who have milk-related allergies can still consume fermented ‘dairy’ products, such as yoghurts and cheeses.

El País argues that “not everything is milk” and products made of rice, barley, almond, soya, hazelnut and other plants are not “milk”, but vegetal drinks. Although alternatives to ‘dairy’ drinks are discussed in several articles of the sample, they are given much less prominence in Spanish national newspapers.

\textsuperscript{26} ADDINMA stands for Asociación de Dietistas-Nutricionistas de la Comunidad de Madrid, In Spanish

\textsuperscript{27} FEDN stands for la Fundación Española de Dietistas-Nutricionistas
5.2.2f Veganism
Three articles (two in *El Mundo* and one in *El País*), including a story of Catalan girl who opened a ‘dairy’-free bar in Los Angeles, approach the topic rather favourably – yet, mostly focusing on the health, not ethics related reasons for veganism.

5.2.2g Farmers and industry
Articles in the Spanish sample talk about the struggle of the farmers in a similar fashion that British articles do. Namely, they emphasize the effort of those who maintain smaller farms and cannot compete with bigger businesses. Bigger businesses, according to *El País* and *El Mundo*, also worry about production costs as well as about the competition with other big ‘dairy’ industries, such as the ones of New Zealand or the US, in distributing milk to the “countries with constantly increasing population and growing demand for ‘dairy’”. *El Mundo* underlines that the milk prices keep falling, with the annual decrease of 4.6%, and ‘dairy’ sector protesting against “the crisis that they suffer since milk quotas have been removed” for many months. As *El País* further underlines, the economic problem is so serious that it can affect the health of the cows, which, inevitably, can affect the health of the consumers. Without urgent solution of these challenges, warns *El País*, “a storm could break” (“podría desatarse una tormenta”).

5.2.2h Controversy
The influence of ‘dairy’ products on the risk of obesity seems to be a controversial issue. While one of the *El País* articles discusses the lower chance of gaining weight for those people who consume seven and more rations of yoghurt a week, another article of the same newspaper is entitled “The babies who drink more milk proteins, are two times more obese” (“Los bebés que toman más proteínas en la leche son el doble de obesos”). As the article with a self-explanatory title reveals, according to a study published in The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition (AJCN), there is a clear relationship between consuming protein and overweight of infants and children. After describing the findings of AJCN, the article switches to the position of Nestlé whose spokesman acknowledges that they add essential amino acids, such as tryptophan, to their ‘dairy’ products. However, as Nestlé further argues, although the amino acids form proteins, certain types of them are essential because cannot be produced by human body and need to be supplied with certain foods. *El Mundo* also argues that any variation of cow’s milk should not be given to children before they are 18-24 months, since early inclusion of cow’s milk could cause an overload of protein for digestive and metabolic systems of babies, when they are still physiologically immature. As the article claims, cow’s milk also has inadequate proportion of calcium and phosphorus.

---

28 The argument quoted (“Se llaman aminoácidos a los elementos —los 21 tipos de eslabones— que forman las proteínas.”) can be seen as dubious by anybody familiar with molecular biology, since amino acids, although used for protein formation on molecular level, by mere adding them into what is to be the final product cannot be used for building up of a specific protein or protein formation at all.
5.2.2i Essential milk

Despite a few cases when the healthiness of milk is questioned, the majority of articles, just like in British sample, clearly refer to milk as daily, basic and essential product. *El Mundo* on several instances highlights the importance of daily consumption of ‘dairy’ products high on calcium for everybody, but especially for children, reminding the parents to show an example of good eating practices. Several *El Mundo* articles also recommend regular ‘dairy’ intake to students, people working night shifts, and people with insomnia. On the World Health Day *El Mundo* refers to the story of Francisco Nuñez, the long-liver from Spain, specifying that he consumes several glasses of milk, some cheese and yoghurt as part of his daily diet.

*El País* also explicitly and implicitly confirms that milk is something of utmost importance for every person’s consumption, entitling one of their news stories, dedicated to poverty in Spain, as “It’s been more than two months since I had milk for breakfast” (“Llevo más de dos meses sin desayunar leche”). In line with that, another *El País* article explains the importance of drinking milk in the morning, as recommended by FEDN. Along with ‘meat’, fish, preserved foods and oils, *El País* calls milk a “basic” product (“artículo básico”), whereas *El Mundo* names it in its list of “indispensables” (“imprescindibles”). *El País*, however, goes even further, including milk as “one of the five foods to survive on the island” (“cinco alimentos para sobrevivir en una isla desierta”), together with broccoli, red ‘beef’, bread and apples.

5.2.2j The “truth”

An example of one of the article published in *El País* (September 21, 2014) deserves special attention. Consumption of milk, ‘meat’, sugar, gluten as well as sedentary lifestyle, were compared to tobacco-addiction. The statement of vegans, "milk is good for calves but not for us", was taken as a starting point and argued as inaccurate. The author acknowledges that several researchers found out milk and dairy products to increase the risk of breast cancer, prostate, testes or ovaries and stomach and intestinal diseases. The article also expresses concern that in Spain “milk consumption has fallen by 15% in recent years” and the average intake gradually turns into a glass of milk a day instead of two or three glasses. The author concludes with factually unsupported “truth” (“la realidad”), openly claiming that except for the rare cases of people with lactose intolerance or allergies, "there is no problem with drinking milk; it is neither addictive nor harmful, nor creates mucus, nor nothing", and recommend to have at least one to two servings of ‘dairy’ a day.

5.2.2k Milk for Asian populations

An interesting observation can be made by analyzing the way *El País* assesses the necessity in milk of Asian population that traditionally refrained from ‘dairy’ consumption. One of the articles features the interview with Nestlé’s spokesmen, who claimed that “only 5 to 10% of people in Asia are lactose intolerant, which means that 90%” are not.”29 As Nestlé shared, China is the second largest market for Nestlé, with significant sales achieved by selling such products

---

as peanut milk, infant milk, ice cream and chocolate. In another its article El Pais habitually states that “1.200 million Chinese citizens start to demand ‘dairy’ products”.

5.2.3 Alternative voices: Challenging the status quo

Certain positive and hopeful practices of providing a different perspective in the news media of both countries shall also be acknowledged.

In the British newspapers the alternative standpoint is mainly voiced through a personal position of famous individuals and public figures, such as Rosanna Davison, former Miss World, and Gwyneth Paltrow who both advocate for ‘dairy’-free diets claiming it “bizarre” to drink the milk of other animals as adults. Cowspiracy documentary (The Times acknowledges that the film was “executive produced by the vegetarian Leonardo DiCaprio”) is mentioned in a valiant attempt to explain the relation between a meat-and-dairy-heavy diet and “environmental Armageddon”. A singular, though prominent voice of Dr. Greger (2016) confirming that milk does not help to prevent osteoporosis and stating that cows’ milk consumption can be risk factor for prostate cancer is also included in The Times discourse.

Two other significant stories deserve being mentioned, both constituting part of The Guardian sample. One of them, surprisingly coming from Music section, illustrates Steven Morrissey’s position towards ‘dairy’ consumption. Reminding the readers that all the cows are eventually killed, he claims that “animals in dairy farms and abattoirs are very eager not to die” as well as rigidly states that “the abattoir is the modern continuation of the Nazi concentration camp, and if you are a part of the milk-drinking population, then you condone systems of torture”. The second story is written by George Monbiot, environmental campaigner, contributing for The Guardian with the stories “on the environment, social justice, and other things that make him angry”30. Monbiot openly opposes the idea of prevalent “fairy tale version of farming”, disapproving of people who are “wilfully unaware of the realities of industrial agriculture”, letting it pass without any challenge.

Few more important positive practices also include an article about the US school with all-vegan menu (milk, according to the head of the school, is neither necessary nor healthy); a short The Guardian article from Modern Tribes section dedicated to vegan lifestyle and claiming “if you knew the truth about dairy farming, the next sip of your latte would come spurting repulsively out of your nose as you retched in disgust”.

Moreover, there were several positive instances of Spanish newspapers acknowledging the sentience of cows. Particularly, El Pais calls them “quiet, curious and sociable animals” (“animales curiosos, tranquilos y sociales”), mentioning that people are not used to apply these adjectives to the “animals condemned to exploitation” (“animales destinados a la explotación”). El Pais also refers to the bovines as to “sybarites”31 (“sibaritas”), who like to be treated well (“les gusta el buen trato”). El Mundo talks about the cows occasionally being stressed and nervous (not specifying the reasons), and explains how the music relaxes them. On several

30 George Monbiot’s blog. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/environment/georgemonbiot.
31 According to Greek mythology, sybarites are believed to be the seekers of pleasure and luxury.
occasions cows are addressed as the living beings with not only physical, but also emotional necessities (even though the reference to their sensitiveness is given in terms of reinforcing the idea that the better cows’ emotional well-being is, the more nutritional elements will their milk have, and hence, the healthier will it be for the humans to consume).

Speaking about alternatives to ‘dairy’, *El Mundo* shares a particular story of a start-up called Muufri, funded by three young vegan Indian scientists who are aiming at producing animal-free milk without “exploitation of cows”. Although *El Mundo* underlines healthiness as the main advantage of biotechnological milk products (stating that Muufri is characterized by the absence of saturated fats, that are dangerous for the heart, and lactose, to which some people are intolerant), they also mention that the project will exclude the need to grow cows who are deemed to become ‘beef’.

Another *El País* article challenges the health impact of “industrial livestock production”. As it is argued, the excessive consumption of ‘meat’ and ‘dairy’ products contributes to the development of nutritional health problems such as obesity and cardiovascular disease. The authors also add, using rather strong epithets to voice their disapproval, that due to the resistance of industry to implementing reasonable standards of animal welfare, the “animals suffer the appalling conditions” (“las espantosas condiciones que padecen los animales”).

Although the remarkable examples provided above, constitute slightly more than 20% of the newspapers’ discourse it is still a higher percentage than was previously reported by similar studies. Both Spanish and English newspapers slowly but surely realise the need to challenge the speciesist perspective behind the other animals’ abuse, starting to address the previously “invisible” nonhuman actors and seeking for more varied references.

### 6. Discussion

The first objective aimed to investigate what is (and what is not) said on the topic of milk and ‘dairy’ products by lobbies. As empirical results reveal, milk is considered as “basic” and “natural” product with unique health benefits. The perceived healthiness of ‘dairy’ products is even more significant in the framework of consistently underlined growth of world population and “the food demand set to rise”. As the agri-food lobbies highlight, it is the duty of Europe to provide healthy and affordable milk to its citizens as well as to the malnourished population of the world. Besides, the ‘dairy’ market is said to provide a lot of jobs in rural sectors. The critical situation on the European milk market, however, is constantly mentioned, while it is underlined that if the urgent measures are not taken by the EU, the affordability of “healthy, delicious, and quality products” can be endangered for the consumers.

The second objective focused on the investigating whether nonhuman animals as such are present in the discourse of the lobbies, and if so, in which context their treatment is addressed. As the analysis reveal, the nonhumans are almost never present in any publications related to the importance and healthiness of milk consumption. Silent workers of the industry, they are invisible and unacknowledged, except for the rare collective and objectified references to them.
as ‘cattle’ or ‘livestock’. The milk is never referred to as something produced and created by cows’ bodies for their offspring, but rather as the basic industrial product made for human consumption. Moreover, the existing EU animal-welfare regulation is often protested as over-demanding and creating “unnecessary barriers”. On several occasions the nonhuman animals are mentioned as objectified beings whose bodies can be genetically modified to be “resistant to water and heat stress, as a way to adapt to climate change” (CC, 2016g), or while lobbying the EU to update the law on veterinary medicines, including “the concept of the responsible use of antibiotics in farm animals” (CC, 2016c). Clearly, these two initiatives are thought with the aim of increasing the profit of the sector, not in terms of concern for the nonhumans’ wellbeing.

The critical discourse analysis of a sample of news stories from British and Spanish newspapers, which was the third objective of this work, revealed that the discourse of both samples is very similar and predominantly focuses on the health benefits of regular milk consumption. The role of different microelements contained in milk is repeatedly discussed, while various types of cow’s milk are compared between themselves, their nutritional qualities thoroughly analysed. It shall be noted that several articles in referred to milk as unhealthy or not very healthy product for frequent consumption. However, undoubtedly, most of the news stories did not see it as such, consistently mentioning ‘dairy’ products as daily essentials. Both samples (although it is better seen in the British one) mention the existence of alternatives to cow’s milk and ‘dairy’, discussing them mostly as trendy and fashionable but assuming that although good for variety, they are never as healthy as the “normal” milk. As linked to the consumption of the “alternative” ‘dairy’, the notion of veganism is frequently addressed. However, in the vast majority of cases vegan diet is addressed in terms of its healthiness and not in terms of being an ethically grounded philosophy.

The farmers’ struggle and the roots of ‘dairy’ crisis are discussed in both samples. Remarkably, the causes of the ‘dairy’ industry crisis are seen not only in the removal of milk quotas and lack of subsidies, but also in strict animal welfare laws that are thought to be very hard to comply with. The bovine animals (namely, nonhuman females, with only one exception of mentioning the “motherless calves”) are not frequently present in the articles analysed. When acknowledged, the cows are represented as “reared” in good conditions and very well taken care of (especially within the so-called “organic” farms). Concern for nonhumans’ animals is voiced on several occasions, yet, always in the context of human health, since the cows’ wellbeing affects directly the product that they create. It is worth noting that “sheep milk”, “goat milk” and “camel milk” suggested as healthy alternatives to “cow’s milk” in both countries’ samples, do not discuss the conditions of the nonhuman females’ oppressions either. The Guardian also mentions the experiments on the rodents that were held to determine if ‘dairy’ can be efficient for battling hangovers. Disapproval or questioning of vivisection ethics does not seem to be present in the article which remarks enthusiastically that “the high-fibre-fed mice amazingly had virtually no obvious side-effects from the alcohol on their livers” (emphasis added). At first sight, very different ways of the nonhumans’ oppression, they are, in fact, intersectional and equally institutionalized in the newspapers’ discourse.
Finally, the fourth objective aimed to analyse whether there is any parallelism in the discourses of the studied lobbies and newspapers. Although a more thorough analysis of a greater number of documents and a more populous newspaper sample would be beneficial (focusing as well on the analysis of images accompanying the articles which this work did not take into account32), some preliminary conclusions can be already drawn from the samples analysed. First and foremost the tendency to speak of milk as healthy and beneficial for human consumption is prevailing in the newspapers sample just as much as in the lobbies’ discourse. The milk is claimed natural, essential and indispensable, the importance of its regular consumption being continually emphasized. In line with lobbies’ discourse, several articles express concern that due to the economic struggle of farmers, the control over the cows’ wellbeing might be lowered which would cause production of lower-quality milk. Other articles wonder whether inability of European ‘dairy’ industry to compete would lead to imports of milk, supposedly of worse quality, that is produced elsewhere. Interrelation was also found in discussions regarding sugar content of milk and ‘dairy’ products: British newspapers tend to express concern about sugar being detrimental for health, monitoring its amount in the ‘dairy’ production. At the same time, as FoodDrink Europe reports reveal, reducing amount of sugar in ‘dairy’, particularly in child formulas, is a set priority of several major ‘dairy’ businesses. The tendency of the national newspapers to refer to industries’ perspective, mention industries’ publications as their sources, and publish sponsored articles related to positive depiction of ‘dairy’ industry and animal wellbeing is evident for British as well as for Spanish sample.

All the “unpleasant” aspects of ‘dairy’ (physical restrictions of the nonhumans, continuous forced impregnation of the cows, taking away their offspring, intensive milking, mutilation and inevitable slaughter) are made invisible both in lobbies’ publications and in the media. Newspapers’ discourse can be seen as operated within power dimension of lobbies’ discourse, producing and reproducing the social beliefs that have been institutionalized in the ‘dairy’ industry and milk consumption.

As Brennen (2013:201) argued, ideology has been a central concept in textual analysis throughout the development of the methodology. Nibert’s understanding of speciesism as an oppressive ideology that justifies economic exploitation of the bovine animals was aimed to be considered throughout the analysis. Exploitation and domination over the nonhuman animals by the economically and elite-driven powers can be considered as a starting point of the oppressive dynamics. In attempt to understand to which extent the speciesist ideology is encoded in the discourse of agri-food lobbies, this work drew on the categories of healthiness and the perceived essential qualities of milk emphasized by lobbies’ efforts to encourage policymakers and consumers to make the beneficial (mostly for ‘dairy’ industry) choices. As it can be perceived through the analysis of lobbies’ publications, nonhuman animals are clearly perceived as disposable commodities, who matter in the discourse of agri-food lobbies only in terms of the industry’s revenue with the emphasis continuously made on growth, sustainable development,

32 Although the nonhuman females were generally not acknowledged in the news stories related to the perceived healthiness of milk consumption, “happy cows” photographs frequently illustrated the correspondent online articles.
efficiency and profit maximization. The work carefully analysed any references to the nonhuman animals and revealed that their well-being was rarely and fragmentary addressed in the documents, while the ethics of their exploitation was never mentioned. It can be argued from the empirical evidence of newspapers sample that despite the several positive practices of challenging the status quo and exploring the pros and cons of cow’s milk production and consumption beyond the concern of solely human health, British and Spanish national media tend to reflect the lobbies’ capitalist discourse, mirroring their beliefs and position.

Thus, answering the first research question, the work considers the major EU agri-food lobbies as promoting milk consumption, appealing to the health benefits of ‘dairy’ products as well as devoting little or no attention to the nonhuman animals’ rights and well-being. The necessity of milk and ‘dairy’ consumption is taken for given by the European agri-food lobbies, while the healthiness of milk is consistently underlined for the glocal as well as for the global population. While the matter of nonhuman rights is not raised, the importance of their wellbeing is occasionally addressed, for the major part, disapprovingly, as overvalued by European Union welfare law. Considering the above, the agri-food lobbies’ discourse can definitely be interpreted as manifesting the oppressive ideology of speciesism.

As it has already been seen, in relation to the second research question, British and Spanish national news media indeed maintain the speciesist line encouraged by the lobbies, focusing on the perceived healthiness of milk and ‘dairy’ products and promoting their consumption.

It is worth remembering, that intensive agriculture, including but not limited to ‘dairy’ industry, not only exploits millions of innocent beings but is also highly responsible for the impact on climate change. Due to the agribusiness lobbies’ influence, the fundamental damage of the industrial farming, just as the suffering of the nonhumans’ within it, predominantly remains undisclosed. Clearly, the domain of speciesist lobbies (not only of the agri-food ones, but also of the lobbies related to biomedical research, as well as entertainment, hunting and gambling sports) is very under-researched and requires further academia’s engagement. The role of the media in manufacturing consent shall be monitored with the risk of lobbies’ fraudulent influence in mind. Lastly, the emerging field of Critical Animal and Media Studies, to which this work attempted to contribute, leaves many doors open and encourages deeper analysis, research and development.
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