Georgia State University
ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Communication Faculty Publications | Department of Communication

2011

Giving Voice to the "Voiceless:" Incorporating Nonhuman Animal Perspectives as Journalistic Sources

Carrie Packwood Freeman
Georgia State University, cpfreeman@gsu.edu

Marc Bekoff

Sarah M. Bexell

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_facpub

Part of the Journalism Studies Commons, and the Social Influence and Political Communication Commons

Recommended Citation
Freeman, C. P., Bekoff, M. & Bexell, S. (2011). Giving voice to the voiceless: Incorporating nonhuman animal perspectives as journalistic sources. *Journalism Studies, 12*(5), 590-607.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

A similar version of this paper was later published as:

Freeman, C. P., Bekoff, M. & Bexell, S. (2011). **Giving Voice to the Voiceless: Incorporating Nonhuman Animal Perspectives as Journalistic Sources,** *Journalism Studies, 12*(5), 590-607.

GIVING VOICE TO THE "VOICELESS":
Incorporating nonhuman animal perspectives as journalistic sources

Carrie Packwood Freeman, Marc Bekoff and **Sarah M. Bexell**

As part of journalism's commitment to truth and justice by providing a diversity of relevant points of view, journalists have an obligation to provide the perspective of nonhuman animals in everyday stories that influence the animals' and our lives. This essay provides justification and guidance on why and how this can be accomplished, recommending that, when writing about nonhuman animals or issues, journalists should: 1) observe, listen to, and communicate with animals and convey this information to audiences via detailed descriptions and audiovisual media, 2) interpret nonhuman animal behavior and communication to provide context and meaning, and 3) incorporate the animals' stories and perspectives, and consider what is in their best interest. To fairly balance animal-industry sources and the anthropocentric biases that are traditionally inherent in news requires that journalists select less objectifying language and more appropriate human sources without a vested interest in how animals are used.

KEYWORDS animals; diversity; ethics; news; source

Introduction

One of the missions of professional journalists is to provide a voice for the voiceless (SPJ, 1996). While this tenet was primarily intended to incorporate into public discourse the perspective of marginalized *human* groups, the spirit of the code could easily be expanded to include other marginalized living beings, namely our fellow *animal species* whose voices often go unheard regarding issues that directly influence their lives. To believe the expansion of this code is important, one must accept that other animals have interests, desires, thoughts, feelings, and points of view concerning what happens to them and that we can understand and explain their cognitive, emotional, and moral lives.

Available and rapidly accumulating data support claims such as: an elk has an interest in having adequate space in which to live and forage, a mother cow wishes to nurture and nurse her calf, a fox wants to keep his fur and freedom, and a dog enjoys playing with other dogs (Bekoff, 2007, 2010). Wild and domesticated animals can appreciate the good things humans do for them as well as naturally share an interest in how they are negatively affected by their use for research, food, clothing, and entertainment, and how their lives are influenced by deforestation, pollution, militarism and landmines, and human overpopulation and consumption (Bekoff, 2010).

Empirical research has clearly shown that other animals have interests, desires, and cognitive, emotional, and moral intelligences (see for example, Balcombe, 2010; Bekoff, Allen & Burghardt, 2002; Bekoff, 2007, 2010; Bekoff & Pierce, 2009; de Waal, 2009). And while we can use scientific evidence to support claims about animal sentience and our ability to interpret accurately their behavior, it is also self-evident to people who live with a companion animal that dogs, cats, parrots, rabbits, rats, and hamsters, for example, have desires and a viewpoint they convey to us, often quite persuasively. So, in this sense, it's important to recognize that animals really are not voiceless or unable to communicate what they want and need. In many species complex systems of communication involving various modalities have evolved, but too often we simply do not pay attention to how animals are expressing their intentions and desires (Bekoff, 2010). This dismissive attitude also applies to marginalized humans.

With the exception of our companion animals, most humans will likely not pay much attention to the needs and desires of countless other animals unless conveyed to us by others, especially through media. We rely on the media, particularly journalism, to inform us of important issues and events locally and globally and to set the agenda for what we and policy-makers consider priorities (McCombs, 2005). While news is produced for and by humans primarily to help citizens become informed members of society, it has an obligation to inform us of all the ways our actions affect both humans and nonhumans so that we can make educated, responsible, and fair choices. This involves better understanding animal behavior and knowledge of how we influence the larger ecological community to which we belong and upon which our survival depends.

This essay goes beyond simply asking that journalism cover animal protection and environmental issues. We take as our premise that as part of journalism's commitment to truth and justice by providing a multiplicity of relevant perspectives, journalists have an obligation to provide the perspective of nonhuman animals (NHA) in stories that affect them. We show how this can be accomplished by allowing NHAs to speak for themselves, especially through audiovisual media, identifying how and when to provide appropriate, unbiased human sources to speak on behalf of NHAs, and selecting less biased, respectful language. To set the context for this discussion, we first provide background on media coverage of NHAs and journalism's ethical obligations, as well as considering what moral philosophy and science have to tell us about NHA cognitive abilities and our ethical obligations to them.

Literature Review

Journalism Ethics and Obligations to Animals

As professionals, journalists are obligated to seek truth, minimize harm, and be independent, fair, and accountable to the public. They must demonstrate virtues such as honesty, integrity, and courage (SPJ, 2006). Fundamental ethical issues of truth, fairness, and minimization of harm are all relevant to how journalists choose to cover the animal kingdom and human's place in this vast and diverse group of organisms. Consider how the Society for Professional Journalists' (SPJ, 1996) code of ethics discusses truth in relation to inclusion and diversity in the following codes:

- Tell the story of the diversity and magnitude of the human experience boldly, even when it is unpopular to do so.

- Examine their own cultural values and avoid imposing those values on others.
- Avoid stereotyping by race, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, geography, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance or social status.
- Support the open exchange of views, even views they find repugnant.
- Give voice to the voiceless; official and unofficial sources of information can be equally valid.

While these codes were written with humans in mind, they are relevant to helping journalists get closer to the truth about any animal individual. When one considers ideas of diversity, open exchange, and giving voice to the voiceless, these principles apply not only to allowing humans to advocate on behalf of other animals but also to embracing fully the concept of diversity by including the animal's own voice and perspective. Similarly, social movement and postcolonial scholars have advocated for increased voice and participation of "Othered" humans, or the "subaltern" (Spivak, 1988, p. 78), whose voices have historically been silenced, unappreciated, or mocked (Campbell, 1989; Charlton, 2000).

Bolstering SPJ's mandates for openness and diversity, the social responsibility theory of the press (Commission on Freedom of the Press, 1947) advocates for a "comprehensive" view of the news that fairly represents all constituent groups and serves as a "forum for the exchange of comment and criticism" (Peterson, 1956, pp. 87-88). Journalists can question if they are fairly representing the views of NHAs and their advocates, even if those viewpoints are seemingly radical or nontraditional.

Although the SPJ code prohibiting stereotyping does not indicate a category for different species, one could consider physical appearance, disability[1], or social status as categories relevant to protecting other animals from narrow and misleading portrayals. While stereotyping could have been included in the code's section on minimizing harm, it is in the section on truth where it is noted that when journalists oversimplify individuals by assuming they possess certain traits, they are possibly misrepresenting their individuality by failing to portray them accurately as who they are. Because stereotypes are so naturalized within a culture, often based on power relations in representation, they can function as taken-for-granted assumptions about groups that may impede understanding and social justice (Hall, 1997). If journalists uncritically perpetuate stereotypes and dominant perspectives about human superiority and other animal species, they are imposing their cultural values and anthropocentric biases on the public. This discrimination is so naturalized that routine NHA exploitation or marginalization can masquerade as facts that are simply indicative of "the way it is" rather than being perceived as cultural constructs for journalists to question.

In addition to truth-seeking, SPJ codes for minimizing harm also have applicability to NHAs. Consider the following code: "Treat sources, subjects and colleagues as human beings deserving of respect. Show compassion for those who may be affected adversely by news coverage. Use special sensitivity when dealing with children and inexperienced sources or subjects." While the subjects in question are specified as human, the emphasis is on showing compassion and sensitivity, presumably based on respect for sentient beings. Sentient individuals should be protected from unnecessary harm, including innocent and non-consenting beings who may be unfairly taken advantage of, such as children, people with developmental disabilities or psychological impairments, and NHAs. This view fits with and expands upon Christians' (2005) claim that ethical communicators represent universal values of protecting the innocent, avoiding

violence, and sustaining life. In an era of globalization, universalism is enhanced by multicultural sensitivity (2005) that could be conceived as including nonhuman animal cultures.

News Coverage of Nonhuman Animal Subjects

Choices made by journalists are important, as news has been shown to exert agenda-setting influence on animal-related public policy. Jones (1996) finds that passage of pro-animal ballot initiatives or humane legislation was positively correlated with the amount of supportive media coverage the issue received. Yet a content analysis of the first three quarters of the 20th century reveals that American newspapers generally support the status quo use of other animals, and, favoring humans, were less likely to cover NHA issues during wartime (Kellert & Westervelt, 1982). News most frequently expressed a utilitarian attitude toward NHAs, and although this trend declined over time in urban newspapers, the most rarely expressed attitude was moral opposition to exploitation and cruelty.

The news tends to cover NHA welfare in response to activism, such as media campaigns of the animal welfare/rights movements and counter-movements against industries in which animals are used and abused (Jones, 1996). For example, when it came to the debate over using NHAs for research, American news coverage in the 1980s and 1990s did not routinely discuss the issue within its bevy of scientific research stories but primarily only in response to anti-vivisection activism. News framed anti-vivisection activists more negatively than pro-vivisection activists or biomedical scientists (Kruse, 2001). Kruse (1998) finds that "those supporting continued experimentation were significantly more likely to be presented as professionals or experts" (para. 1), enhancing their credibility in contrast to animal activists.

In past American news studies, sources for wildlife tended to favor government officials more than environmental conservation groups (Corbett, 1992; Nelkin, 1987). Corbett (2006) explains:

> A typical news story about wildlife features a large game animal that is the focus of a management action, and a state wildlife official speaks for the animal. Again, this reflects the powerful role of state wildlife officials in defining wildlife issues, which is evident in the news emphasis on game species and hunting. (p. 206)

Urban and rural Midwest newspapers focused more on animals who are hunted by humans, rather than on endangered species in need of help (Corbett, 1995). The inclusion of wild animals, especially large mammals and birds, in reporting on the environment and outdoor recreation results in wild animals receiving more coverage than domesticated animals, outside of human interest stories (Corbett, 2006).

When it comes to national news coverage of domesticated animals and fish killed for food, Freeman (2009) finds that news organizations in the early 21st century tended to focus on bodies not beings, objectifying farmed animals via three discursive practices: commodifying them, discussing them en masse not individually, and failing to incorporate their interests or perspective (particularly in crisis coverage). When coverage did focus on animals themselves, not just human use of them, it privileged animal welfare (such as "humane farming" practices) over animal rights (such as rights for life, freedom, or ownership of one's body). Freeman concludes that the news is not serving as a diverse public forum, as they favor industry and

government perspectives and largely support anthropocentrism and status quo utilitarian views of certain animals.

News can also be anthropocentric in designating certain animals, such as pigeons, primarily as "problems," perpetuating a nature/culture dualism that defines urban spaces as human domain (Jerolmack, 2008). In general, NHAs become most newsworthy when they come in conflict with humans or cross a human/animal boundary that is supposed to separate them from humans (Corbett, 2006).

Animal Ethics and Society

Western culture reflects its historical philosophical origins heavily influenced by humanism, Judeo-Christian worldviews of human superiority and dominion, and the Cartesian human/animal dualism (Taylor, 1981). But ideologically, we are entering a posthumanist era that may no longer be defined solely by a liberal humanist outlook that privileges the human as the central subject of concern and considers all other beings as natural resources (Calarco, 2008). In this age of industrialized animal exploitation, mass extinction of species, and climate change, justice concerns that form the basis of human rights have extended to incorporate the interests of other animal species and ecosystems via the fields of animal and environmental ethics. These fields challenge anthropocentrism and its constructed binaries of human/animal and nature/culture to blend these categories and demonstrate the inherent, not instrumental, value of what David Abram (1996) calls the "more-than-human world" (Zimmerman, Callicott, Warren, Klaver, & Clark, 2005)

Western culture has historically demonstrated various levels of concern for the welfare of NHAs, depending on the species, narrowly defining cruelty as actions causing wanton suffering in excess of what is necessary to benefit human well-being (Linzey & Clarke, 2004). An animal welfare perspective can be considered mainstream, especially in showing concern for reducing the suffering of companion animals and other charismatic species, but concerns for animal rights are a greater challenge to historical humanist worldviews. Animal rights is a duty-based ethic that views other animals as fellow subjects of a life, not mere objects, and therefore grants them the right to freedom from human exploitation. Rightists seek an end to the domestication, exploitation, enslavement, and property-status of NHAs (Francione, 1996; Regan, 1983). Philosopher Peter Singer (1990) proposes that a being's moral relevance is not based on intelligence or rationality but on sentience – the ability to experience pain and pleasure and be aware of their own existence. Singer asserts that all sentient beings deserve to have their interests given equal consideration. To discriminate against other sentient animals simply because they are not human is considered speciesism.

Speciesism involves assigning individuals to general groups (in this case their own species) and ignores individual variation. Thus, speciesism is easily associated with racism and sexism, as there are strong parallels in how women and people of color have been stereotyped, discriminated against, and exploited just for failing to be white and male, often by being compared to so-called lowly and irrational animals (Adams, 1990; Singer, 1990; Spiegel, 1997). Journalism played a role in the history of anti-discrimination movements, such as women's rights and civil rights, not merely reporting on them, but often helping to shape, aid, or hinder their

success (Streitmatter, 2008), and the same is true for journalism's role in current movements to bolster respect for nature and other animals.

Animal Cognition and Communication

Rene Descartes' 17th century declaration that animals were unfeeling, soulless automatons paved the way for animal use to expand with minimal regulation or critique, especially in science (Linzey & Clarke, 2004). This false representation became a taken-for-granted assumption in science, making anthropomorphism a dirty word. Charles Darwin's theory of evolution helped to challenge the strict distinctions made between humans and other animals by demonstrating evolutionary continuity and showing that differences among species are often of degree rather than kind. Yet the prominence of behaviorism in the early 20th century, in which discussions of mental processes were discouraged, curbed some of the comparisons between humans and other animals, mandating that scientists express NHA behavior in different, more clinical terms, separate from terms used to describe humans as intelligent, emotional beings. These distinctions were based on notions of humans as "higher" and other animals as "lower" species.

Renowned scientist Donald Griffin is credited with rekindling interest in the study of animal cognition (often called "cognitive ethology") that recognizes the rich ability for animals to think, feel, and communicate with one another (Friend, 2004; Bekoff, 2007). Research over the past fifty years clearly shows that NHAs feel pain and experience many other emotions once reserved for humans. Many NHAs also show complex systems of communication, manufacture and use complex tools, use complex reasoning, and even demonstrate moral intelligence (Balcombe, 2010; Bekoff, 2007, 2010; Bekoff et al, 2002; Bekoff & Pierce, 2009; Fouts with Mills, 1997; Griffin, 1992).

Philosopher Bernard Rollin (1998) critiques the separation between the scientific viewpoint on NHA cognition and the common sense notions of people such as farmers and companion animal guardians who more openly acknowledge the emotional and intellectual capacity of nonhumans as part of their daily experience of dwelling with them. Science also prefers to look for universal characteristics, tending to group all species as a type with similar behavior. But, as with the human animal, there is much variation among individuals within all animal species, so reductionist and normative generalizing is often inaccurate and misleading (Bekoff & Pierce, 2009; Rollin, 1998).

Individuality can be seen in the realm of moral decision-making. Bekoff & Pierce (2009) argue that social animals other than humans also practice their own versions of morality that are context-specific. Members of various species exhibit various levels of fairness, empathy, compassion, kindness, and trust. Individual animals vary in how closely each chooses to honor the ethical codes of their group, indicating that animal behavior is not all instinctual and inflexible, but rather incorporates choice and agency. This is especially so when social organization and/or environmental conditions vary and individuals have to adapt to local and immediate circumstances.

NHAs communicate their own perspectives, even if we are not capable of fully comprehending them. However, when we pay careful attention to the various ways in which animals communicate, we are actually quite good at predicting what they will do in certain situations (Bekoff, 2007). Our ability to make accurate predictions is a measure of how well we

can assess what animals want and what they are feeling. As science has slowly begun to overcome its biases against NHA cognition and our ability to understand animals, Tim Friend (2004), author of the book *Animal Talk*, hopes that we will "begin to appreciate the possibility that more than one way – our way – exists to conduct a conversation" (p. 249). Friend notes that continuity among animals can help us understand each other via a universal language of sorts, where fundamental ideas and interests are commonly communicated:

> Humans and animals alike, regardless of race or species, talk about the same things every day – that is, sex, real estate, who's boss, and what's for dinner. The whole earth does have one language with few words, and all species, including humans, continue to use it every day. (p. 32)

Modern humans in industrialized nations are often trapped within purely human realms of communication, virtually illiterate to signals emanating from animals (Abram, 1996). In addition to Abram's important recognition of the more-than-human world, his work flips the mind/body dualism, asking us to privilege the senses of the body – a source of wisdom used by other animals – as an enhanced way of learning information.

Discussion

Nonhuman Animals as a News Source

How might journalists best incorporate the NHA voice as a legitimate source or perspective on a particular issue? Obviously, journalists cannot place a squirrel in front of a microphone and pummel him with questions. NHAs cannot adapt to fit the human model for how a source is interviewed and featured, so journalism must adapt to their ways of life[2]. To view the NHA as a source with their side to a story requires that journalists attempt to: 1) observe, listen to, and try to communicate with NHAs in their own environments and allow the audience to share in this experience via detailed written descriptions or audiovisual means, 2) interpret NHA behavior and communication and/or consult an expert for interpretation, and 3) consider and incorporate the NHAs' perspective and interests (sometimes by consulting human representatives). We will discuss each of these options in more detail.

1. Observe, Listen to, and Communicate with NHAs. Just as journalists would spend time with human sources and try to get a feel for their personality and the environment in which they operate, the same courtesy should be given to NHAs. The optimal situation would involve the journalist visiting the NHA's home, whether a wilderness area, human residence, or captive facility. Journalists should ask permission to observe places such as agribusinesses, zoos, or laboratories. If permission is denied, which may be common in research labs, farms, or environmental disaster areas, the rationale given for denied access must be communicated to the public. It certainly enhances a story to gain first-hand access to an animal's environment so journalists can independently verify, observe, and describe their living conditions and behavior without having to take the word of the owner. Greater access and time given to observation will yield greater depth, as some animals may not behave naturally at first due to fear or mistrust, and

their behavior will vary based on situations or routines (for example, feeding time, play time, nap time, or work time).

As activists have discovered, undercover methods of investigation may become necessary if access to animal-use facilities is repeatedly denied or severely limited, or there is evidence of illegal or abusive behavior that is denied by the people using the animals. Often stories about animal abuse are broken by animal protection organizations not by journalists, so opportunities exist for greater proactive cooperation between reporters and animal advocates in investigative reporting.

Observation of animals in the wild may be more difficult to conduct firsthand[3]. In these cases journalists can use wildlife documentaries/videos as a secondary source of observation, although the communication would only be one-way. Reporters should also be extremely cautious about using zoos and aquariums as a primary source of information about a species' natural behavior, as behavior is often dramatically altered by artificial captive environments (Bekoff, 2010; Marino, 2010; Marino, Lilienfeld, Malamud, Nobis & Broglio, 2010). In many captive situations the cages in which individuals are kept are small and impoverished and the groups in which animals live are unnatural so they are unable to express much of their normal behavioral repertoire (Bekoff, 2010).

When it comes to communicating with NHAs, it is easiest when dealing with familiar companion animals who are accustomed to human company and language (e.g., dogs, cats, parrots). With companion animals, two-way communication with the journalist is easier and may be more verbal and tactile. With non-companion animals, the journalist's communication will likely be more nonverbal or rely more on listening quietly and patiently observing, perhaps even from afar. With wild/free animals, it may not be important, advised, or humane for the journalist to communicate with the animal, as observation may suffice.

Observation, the first option in using NHAs as sources, should result in careful and detailed descriptions of behavior, whereas the next two avenues of inquiry involve interpretation and explanation, and in some cases, reasoned assumptions. Interpretation and assumption may make journalists uneasy as it might not be as factual or straightforward as description, but it can be made more credible and legitimate by acknowledging that these interpretations are based on reasonable common-sense judgment and available data. Additionally, including a variety of perspectives for audience consideration creates greater depth and context.

2. Interpret NHA Behavior and Communication. To complement the description of animal behavior, in situations where uncertainty exists, journalists should attempt to convey various interpretations of what particular behavior patterns might mean in terms of the animal's intentions or their mental and physical state. This may be made easier when human forms of communication have been taught to captive individuals, including parrots, dolphins, dogs, and great apes, some of whom have memories of traumatic experiences including capture, experimentation, or witnessing the death of friends and relatives (Fouts with Mills, 1997). For other animals, especially non-mammals who bear less resemblance to humans (i.e. amphibians, reptiles, invertebrates), we should give them the benefit of the doubt that they have some level of sentience and cognition, as accumulating scientific data support this practice (Balcombe, 2010; Bekoff, 2010; Bekoff et al, 2002). Consider also how scientists have recently come to appreciate the sentience of fish (Braithwaite, 2010) or the cognitive skills of mollusks such as squid and octopus (Mather, Anderson & Wood, 2010). Numerous examples of "surprises" stemming from

scientific research concerning the cognitive and emotional lives of animals are detailed by Balcombe (2010) and Bekoff (2010).

In many cases, the journalist's common-sense judgment can accurately assess basic animal emotions when self-evident, as much NHA communication is straightforward and extremely transparent. For example reporters can interpret the bellowing of a mother cow as mourning when she has suffered separation from her calf at the hands of dairy workers. Another example is a *New York Times* photograph showing ducks in the foie gras industry cowering against each other in the corner of their pen while a worker begins to force-feed them via pipes. It does not seem a stretch to interpret the ducks' behavior as fear and dislike, as feeding time should normally be welcomed. Yet in contrast with the photograph, the article uses clinical terminology to underestimate the ducks' response by claiming "there were no visible signs of distress" (Brown, 2003, p. D4).

In cases where a species' communication is not as easy to interpret, journalists may need to consult experts or guidebooks. Just as good journalists would educate themselves about the culture of a human community they were charged with covering, journalists should learn the cultural cues and codes of animal societies with which they are unfamiliar. For example, for a story involving dogs, chimpanzees, ravens, or bears, even consulting nonfiction children's books such as *Animals at Play* (Bekoff, 2008) can help explain the cues for distinguishing between aggression and playfulness and help avoid one-dimensional demonization of carnivores as vicious "problem" animals. To demonstrate how a journalist can use ethological data to interpret behavior, consider this example from a *New York Times* article by science writer Natalie Angier (2008) who contextualizes primatologist Jane Goodall's findings to build a case for animals' capacity to experience grief:

> Juvenile chimpanzees display signs of genuine grief when their mothers die. In one famous case in Gombe, when a matriarch of the troop named Flo died at the age of 50-plus years, her son, Flint, proved inconsolable. Flint was 8 years old and could easily have cared for himself, but he had been unusually attached to his mother and refused to leave her corpse's side. Within a month, the son, too, died. (para. 6)

Following Dr. Goodall's interpretation, the journalist: acknowledged Flint's behavior in emotional terms "inconsolable grief," allowed us to see his individuality (not portraying his act as blindly instinctual), referred to him respectfully and accurately as *he* not *it,* and used familial terms like *son* instead of the clinical term *offspring.*

3. Consider and Incorporate the NHAs' Perspective and Interests**.** An assumption implicit in our view is that it is not in any being's interest to be exploited for another's gain or to be used against their will or without their permission. When it comes to *human* exploitation or enslavement, the unjustness is more obvious to journalists and news audiences so it can be openly criticized – a point made easier when laws protect human rights. Yet human society is heavily invested in exploitation and use of other animals for the proposed benefit of humankind, and most of this is legal. Thus, NHA exploitation has largely gone unnoticed or uncriticized as it is taken for granted as routine, normal, or even acceptable (consider animals used for food, research/education, clothing, entertainment, or service).

Journalism, a human-based institution, naturally has its own biases in favor of continuing to "benefit" from the use of NHAs. However, based on moral consistency in applying ethical principles of respect and justice to fellow sentient beings, journalists must strive to overcome their human-centered bias and acknowledge that other animals have the right to have their interests in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness considered in news stories. This would involve more than just a critique of whether industry *treatment* of animals is legal or reduces their suffering to a socially-acceptable level. It requires including a more overt critique of routine animal *use and domestication*. A paradigm shift of this sort would test the bounds of journalistic objectivity and fairness more so than perhaps any other social reform.

For example, rather than framing the European foot and mouth disease outbreak primarily as an economic crisis for farmers (Freeman, 2009), these agribusiness stories could include a debate over the right to kill. Some of these stories could portray the tragedy from the perspective of a single cow slated for killing, adding a personal story and face to the thousands of animals shown dumped in mass graves. Or stories related to deforestation, development, sprawl, or hunting could incorporate the perspective of the animals who are losing their lives or homes.

To demonstrate how articles could include a critique of animal exploitation as well as tell the story of an emotional NHA individual, consider the following excerpt from *National Geographic* (Berlin, 2004) accompanying a photograph of sanctuary chimpanzees grieving the loss of an older chimp, Dorothy:

> After a hunter killed her mother, Dorothy was sold as a "mascot" to an amusement park in Cameroon. For the next 25 years she was tethered to the ground by a chain around her neck, taunted, teased, and taught to drink beer and smoke cigarettes for sport. In May 2000 Dorothy—obese from poor diet and lack of exercise—was rescued and relocated along with ten other primates. As her health improved, her deep kindness surfaced. She mothered an orphaned chimp named Bouboule and became a close friend to many others… Szczupider, who had been a volunteer at the center, told me: "Her presence, and loss, was palpable, and resonated throughout the group." The management at Sanaga-Yong opted to let Dorothy's chimpanzee family witness her burial, so that perhaps they would understand, in their own capacity, that Dorothy would not return. Some chimps displayed aggression while others barked in frustration. But perhaps the most stunning reaction was a recurring, almost tangible silence. If one knows chimpanzees, then one knows that [they] are not [usually] silent creatures. (para. 3-4)

Similarly, for a demonstration of how journalists empathetically tell the stories of certain primates used for experimentation, see Seibert (2005) and Leuders (2009).

For a positive example of many of the recommendations made in our essay, see journalist Charles Siebert's (2009) in-depth article on the plight of whales. Seibert describes his whale-watching experience as follows:

> It wasn't until I got back to our base camp on the day of my first close whale encounter that I could begin to parse what happened in a calm and coherent fashion: the seemingly undeniable fact, for example, that the mother whale's first pass that morning was a reconnaissance mission to check out our boat, and us, before offering up her calf for review: his of us and ours of him. (p. 5)

Not only does Siebert share his personal interpretations of the mother whale's behavior, he credits her with a perspective and a sense of agency, which is also apparent in the article's title "Watching Whales Watching Us."[4]

Human Spokespeople

Because we depend on humans to convey information about the lives of NHAs, the primary concern is how to determine who has the right to speak on behalf of nonhuman animals. The best choice would be someone who can represent the animals' interests with credibility, familiarity, expertise, and without any vested interest. It is important to inquire as to the funding, employer, and lifestyle of sources to help determine their level of vested interest in animal use. Appropriate sources likely will include ethologists and zoologists, animal advocates (activists and attorneys), guardians/companions, and veterinarians or animal psychologists. Notice we have included a much-needed mix of scientific and non-scientific sources. Scientists can help provide behavioral, evolutionary, mental and physical, biological, and cultural/social explanations for animal actions. The animal's human companions will likely add more personal details that can help the journalist apply a human-interest writing style to the story (expanding into a newer genre of the animal-interest news story), and activists and attorneys can provide the legal and justice angles for hard news stories.

To ensure diversity and balance in stories on animals used as a resource, journalists should consider including the philosophical perspective of vegans (humans who have made the ethical decision to boycott products taken from or tested on animals and facilities that keep animals captive). Vegan sources are beneficial not just for "activism" stories, but also for stories focusing on business, policy, health, food/lifestyle, or science. The latter stories are typically anthropocentrically one-sided, primarily discussing other animals as economic objects, resources, or en masse, largely ignoring the NHA's perspective and individual points of view. Across all news story topics, those who advocate for less exploitative/utilitarian treatment of NHAs and value them more inherently than instrumentally provide a fair balance to animal-based industry sources (i.e. CEOs, farmers, trainers, hunters, industry veterinarians, and research scientists). However, when interviewing animal-industry or government agency sources as part of a relevant story, they too could be asked to provide their viewpoint on the NHA's interests, not just human or economic interests.

Media Formats and Visual Culture

While the shift to electronic formats for news has its drawbacks for print newspapers, it may have reporting advantages for better incorporating the animal's voice. In comparison to print, audio-visual formats, such as broadcast news, are better at enabling NHAs to communicate to audiences directly via their own body language and voice. Print news requires a human to interpret the NHA's voice and translate it into a human written language, where meaning may be lost or less compelling than hearing and seeing animals speak for themselves. Consider the challenge of adequately expressing a wolf's howl, a chick's peeping, or a shark's glance in words? Some have argued that people's experience of a sublime sense of communicating with

the more-than-human world can leave them speechless, or at a loss for words, particularly in a Western cultural context (Abram, 1996; Milstein, 2008).

To complement and enhance the communicative power of a written story, print news can add still photographs to allow for some expression of NHA body language and eye contact. We suggest this at the risk of visual essentialism that rejects the efficacy of other signification systems (Bal, 2003), but for many animals this would be a valid approach. Being the object of the gaze of an animal is part of what enables humans to recognize animal individuality, perspective, and subjectivity (Balcombe, 2010; Bekoff, 2010; Derrida, 2002; Ito, 2008, Myers, 2007). Newspaper websites should also add audio-visual components that provide the advantages of broadcast news media for their readers. As opposed to still images, "the 'moving' image is embedded in the sonorous" (Cubitt, 2002, p.360) and allows the animals agency to personally speak to human audiences visually and verbally, as it is "closer to normal perception" (Kolstrup, 1997, para. 5). Its dynamism increases audience attention, emotional response, and "sympathetic arousal" (Ravaja, 2004, p.110).

Language Choices

English, like most other human languages, tends to reflect its humanist historical origins (Taylor, 1981). Therefore, even in this posthumanist era, it can be challenging to find respectful, familiar English terminology to describe the more-than-human world. The very term *animal*, when infrequently applied to a human, can be considered either an insult or merely a scientific categorical description of our membership in the animal kingdom (Ingold, 1988). A dualistic misnomer such as "people and animals" perpetuates a false human/animal dichotomy, when it should more accurately be phrased as "people and *other* animals" or "animals including humans" (Dunayer, 2001; Bekoff, 2010). If writers mean to describe all members of the animal kingdom except humans, rather than just saying *animals*, journalists should use more precise terms such as *nonhuman animals*, *other animal species*, *animals excluding humans*, or specific categories such as *farmed animals, companion animals, or wild animals*.[5]

The most egregious misrepresentation of other animals is the common practice of objectifying them via the inanimate pronoun *it* instead of the gendered *she* or *he* (Freeman, 2009; Stibbe, 2001). The AP Stylebook (Christians, Jacobsen, & Minthorn, 2009) guidelines on animals need to be updated so they no longer dictate that an animal only receives a personal pronoun (he, she, or who) if he or she has an established sex or a personal name designated by a human. We suggest if the gender of an individual is unknown, use *he/she* or pluralize the subject to be *they,* as one would with a human[6]. Additionally, other animals, like humans, should be referred to as *who/whom* rather than *that/which* (Gilquin & Jacobs, 2006), and *someone* or *somebody* rather than *something.*

Other examples of objectification occur when journalists primarily use industry terms that describe animals as products or tools, such as *livestock, poultry, seafood,* or *game*, instead of more objectively calling them by their species name *cow, chicken, fish, or deer*. Similarly, rather than defining animals solely by their usefulness to humans or their utilitarian end, such as *beef cattle, dairy cows, lab rat*, and *circus elephant*, journalists could alternately express a species' utility, when necessary, by following their name with a verb that expresses what humans do to

them: *cows raised for beef, cows used for dairy, rats used in research labs,* and *elephants kept in circuses.* This avoids industry-biased euphemisms and increases neutrality. It also infuses the phrase with proper notions of power and agency, as far as describing who is doing what to whom and who has the freedom of choice in the relationship.

Even when we attempt to flatter some species we see as "smarter" than others, we may inadvertently mislead people and diminish other species when making comparisons. Therefore, avoid using hierarchical terms such as *higher* or *lower* species or describing some as more *intelligent* or more *developed*; this is "cognitive speciesism," and it is not only misleading, but it results in potential justification for animal abuse for those deemed "lower" [7] (Bekoff, 2007; 2010). Individuals do what they need to do to be card-carrying members of their species and none is better/higher or worse/lower.

There also are within-species variations in intelligence or learning. For example, some dogs, fish, or penguins might learn something faster or with fewer errors than other members of their same species, but even then we need to be careful because animals likely show different sorts of intelligences just as there are multiple forms of human intelligence (i.e. linguistic, logical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, special, etc. See Gardner, 1999). It is also a good idea to keep one's mind open to surprises, such as the discovery of tool use by octopuses (Finn, Tregenza & Norman, 2009) or empathy in mice (Mogil, 2006). Anthropomorphism does not have to be inaccurate. People misleadingly tend to underestimate rather than overestimate NHA abilities. However, new data on a wide variety of animals show they possess cognitive, emotional, and moral capacities we previously assumed were absent (Bekoff, 2010). "Chickens, for example, have a voice of unmistakable woe or enthusiasm in situations where these responses make sense," notes *Poultry Press* editor Karen Davis (2010, p. 265). "When they are enjoying their lives and pursuing their own interests, chickens are cheerful birds, quite vocally so."

Conclusion

Given the enormous amount of press animals are receiving in what might be called the "century of the animal" (Bekoff, 2010, pp. 30-31), we should expect those who write about animals to represent them accurately as the unique, sentient beings they are, not primarily as who we want them to be, background objects, or as means to our own ends. Based on scientific data in cognitive ethology, journalism ethics, and a large and growing literature on animal protection, we have made a strong case that journalism should adapt to view NHAs as a relevant source whose perspective should be included in any story about them. Journalists can present the animals' point of view by 1) observing, listening to, and attempting to communicate with NHAs and conveying this to the audience via detailed descriptions and audiovisual media, 2) interpreting NHA behavior and communication to provide context and meaning, and 3) considering and incorporating the NHAs' perspective, stories, and interests. Additionally, journalists should use less biased, non-objectifying language and seek out appropriate human experts who do not have a vested interest in animal use and can advocate for their interests[8].

By adopting and codifying these guidelines, journalism can escape the limitations of its humanist bias and produce news that questions society's inherent speciesism so that status quo and time-worn values and views no longer masquerade as "objectivity." By incorporating the animal's voice, the press can live up to its ideals of being a socially responsible and diverse public forum, truly serving as a voice for the voiceless. Journalism can discover greater depth in

the SPJ codes of truth, independence, and minimization of harm by expanding its scope to include fellow animals as beings of our moral community – a public to whom we have an obligation. Considering our current levels of industrialized animal use and human-induced mass extinction of species, we owe animals fairer treatment now more than ever. NHA representations that are more accurate, individualized, thorough, dignified, and less belittling or "cute" will make their lives better[9].

While American journalism has begun adapting and diversifying to no longer be solely white, straight, Christian, and male, newsrooms cannot adapt to include nonhuman staff. So the era's posthumanist advancement in social justice calls upon journalists to be sensitive and accountable on behalf of those who cannot be among their ranks in producing the news, but who are certainly affected by it.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank graduate research assistant Oana Leventi-Perez for her editing help.

NOTES

1. This is an imperfect comparison. Nonhuman animals are best considered differently-abled than humans, as most adult animals are able to function at high competency levels and take care of themselves and their families.
2. For a parallel news access issue, see Matthews' (2005) study on the challenges of giving children a voice. Also note that when discussing news source equity, his study does not measure/count the voice of NHAs, even though they presumably existed in the background of environmental stories on wildlife.
3. Reasons include: If the NHA's environment is harsh/inhospitable, if they are naturally elusive when it comes to humans, if it is too dangerous (i.e. predatory or venomous animals), if they are hard to locate (i.e. endangered species), or if travel is just impractical because of financial or time constraints.
4. Note that the positive newspaper examples we provide in this essay mainly feature charismatic mammals, such as primates and whales, who tend to garner more human respect than other animals. We acknowledge this is problematic, and news stories should diversify to also share stories of less beloved animals, such as rats, chickens, reptiles, invertebrates, etc.
5. We acknowledge that these terms may seem cumbersome and imperfect, yet they are more accurate and less problematic than terms perpetuating the idea that humans are separate from all animals. Alternatively, journalists could initially clarify that by "animals" they mean nonhuman animals.
6. The pronoun *it* can become more appropriate only when discussing a species as a whole or in a more abstract sense (ex: a human parent must care for *its* children for a longer period than many other mammals).
7. For language misuse, reference the NPR story "Ants that Count" (Krulwich, 2009) which uses the tongue-and-cheek terms *makeover, stilty,* and *stumpy* as whimsical synonyms for leg amputations and additions performed by researchers on ants to suit an experiment, one

that ironically demonstrates ants' amazing capabilities to count their steps. Presumably, it is ants' perceived status as a "lower" species that allows this belittling language where journalists likely would not have used it to describe amputations on dog or chimp limbs. This is also an example of a missed opportunity for journalists to routinely question the tactics of research rather than just report its findings.

8. More openly incorporating a pro-animal viewpoint in relevant stories (often as a balance to the status quo viewpoints on animal-use) will initially likely cause pushback and flack, especially from entrenched and powerful institutions or individuals invested in the use of other animals for human gain. Many will be advertisers or news patrons. This resistance will test the journalistic principles of independence and integrity (SPJ, 1996), as financial interests will pressure the editorial content of the news to continue to privilege the status quo power structures, although it may also provide inroads to gaining new financial supporters. As professionals, journalists must evaluate how vigilant and courageous they are when investigating both routine and exceptional animal use and abuse in agribusiness and food retailers, biomedical or industrial research laboratories, breeding facilities, zoos and other captive entertainment facilities, fur farms, and hunting, fishing and wildlife management industries. Government agencies at all levels also serve as key entities exercising power over animals through the regulation of animal-use industries and hunting and fishing on public lands and oceans, funding of research grants, military destruction of animals and habitats, management of local animal shelters, and creation and enforcement of laws governing animal cruelty, protection of wildlife and habitats, and human activism on behalf of animal and environmental protection (e.g. Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act).

The increased ownership and consolidation of news organizations by corporations (McChesney, 2008) creates a more inhospitable atmosphere in which to expect news organizations to challenge paying human entities to improve their coverage on behalf of other animals who cannot pay. Therefore, media reform, grants, and subsidies are needed to ensure independence and public support for quality journalism that takes risks. In the meantime, independent, public, and non-commercial news organizations may need to take the lead on incorporating the voice of NHAs.

9. For a positive example, see Horgan's (2010) article. It acknowledges humans' animality and references science to dispel myths of innate primate violence to better understand the nature and culture of human and nonhuman primates.

REFERENCES

ABRAM, DAVID (1996) *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and language in a more-than-human world,* New York: Vintage Books.

ANGIER, NATALIE (2008) "About Death, Just Like Us or Pretty Much Unaware?" , *The New York Times,* September 1, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/02/science/02angi.html?ref=natalie_angier, accessed 17 June 2010.

ADAMS, CAROL (1990) *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A feminist vegetarian critical theory*, New York: Continuum.

BAL, MIEKE (2003) "Visual Essentialism and the Object of Visual Culture", *Journal of Visual Culture* 2(1), pp. 5–32.

BALCOMBE, JONATHAN (2010) *Second Nature: The inner lives of animals*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

BEKOFF, MARC (2007) *The Emotional Lives of Animals: A leading scientist explores animal joy, sorrow and empathy – and why they matter,* Novato, CA: New World Library.

BEKOFF, MARC (2008) *Animals at Play: Rules of the game*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

BEKOFF, MARC (2010) *The Animal Manifesto: Six reasons for expanding our compassionate footprint,* Novato, CA: New World Library.

BEKOFF, MARC and ALLEN, COLLIN and BURGHARDT, GORDON (2002) Editors *The Cognitive Animal: Empirical and theoretical perspectives on animal cognition*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

BEKOFF, MARC and PIERCE, JESSICA (2009) *Wild Justice: The moral lives of animals*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BERLIN, JEREMY (2009) "The Story Behind Our Photo of Grieving Chimps", *National Geographic*, 29 October, http://blogs.nationalgeographic.com/blogs/intelligenttravel/2009/10/behind-our-photo-of-the-grievi.html, accessed 1 July 2010.

BRAITHWAITE, VICTORIA (2010) *Do Fish Feel Pain?* New York: Oxford University Press.

BROWN, P. (2003) "Foie Gras Fracas: Haute cuisine meets the duck liberators", *The New York Times*, 24 September, pp. D1, D4.

CALARCO, MATTHEW (2008) *Zoographies: The question of the animal from Heidegger to Derrida,* New York: Columbia University Press.

CAMPBELL, KARLYN KOHRS (1989) *Man Cannot Speak For Her*, Vol. 1, New York: Greenwood Press.

CHARLTON, JAMES (2000) *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability oppression and empowerment,* Berkeley: University of California.

CHRISTIANS, CLIFFORD (2005) "Ethical Theory in Communications Research", *Journalism Studies* 6(1), 3-14.

CHRISTIAN, DARRELL and JACOBSEN, SALLY and MINTHORN, DAVID (2009) *Associated Press 2009 Stylebook and Briefing on Media Law*, New York: Basic Books.

CORBETT, JULIA B. (1992) "Rural and Urban Newspaper Coverage of Wildlife: Conflict, community, and bureaucracy", *Journalism Quarterly* 69(4), pp. 929-937.

CORBETT, JULIA B. (1995) "When Wildlife Make the News: An analysis of rural and urban north-central U.S. newspapers", *Public Understanding of Science* 4, pp. 397-410.

CORBETT, JULIA B. (2006) *Communicating Nature: How we create and understand environmental messages*, Washington, DC: Island Press.

CUBITT, SEAN (2002) "Visual and Audiovisual: From image to moving image", *Journal of Visual Culture* 1(3), pp. 359-368.

DAVIS, KAREN (2010) "Chicken-Human Relationships: From procrustean genocide to empathic anthropomorphism", *Spring: A Journal of Archetype and Culture* 83, pp. 253-278.

DERRIDA, JACQUES (2002) "The Animal that Therefore I Am (More to Follow)", *Critical Inquiry* 28(2), pp. 369–418.

DE WAAL, FRANS (2009) *The Age of Empathy: Nature's lessons for a kinder society*, New York: Harmony Books.

DUNAYER, JOAN (2001) *Animal Equality: Language and liberation*, Derwood, MD: Ryce Publishing.

FINN, JULIAN and TREGENZA, TOM and NORMAN, MARK (2009) "Defensive Tool Use in Coconut-Carrying Octopus", *Current Biology* 19(23), pp. R1069-R1070.

FOUTS, ROGER with MILLS, STEPHEN TUKEL (1997) *Next of Kin: My conversations with chimpanzees,* New York: Avon Books.

FRANCIONE, GARY (1996) *Rain without Thunder: The ideology of the animal rights movement*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

FREEMAN, CARRIE PACKWOOD (2009) "This Little Piggy Went to Press: The American news media's construction of animals in agriculture", *Communication Review* 12(1), pp. 78-103.

FRIEND, TIM (2004) *Animal Talk: Breaking the codes of animal language*, New York: Free Press.

GARDNER, HOWARD (1999) *Intelligence Reframed. Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*, New York: Basic Books.

GILQUIN, GAETANELLE and GEORGE M. JACOBS (2006) "Elephants Who Marry Mice are Very Unusual: The use of the relative pronoun who with nonhuman animals", *Society & Animals* 14(1), pp. 79-105.

GRIFFIN, DONALD (1992) *Animal Minds,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HALL, STUART (1997) *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices,* London: Sage Publications.

HORGAN, J. (2010) "Quitting the Hominid Fight Club", *Scientific American*, 29 June, http://www.scientificamerican.com/blog/post.cfm?id=quitting-the-hominid-fight-club-the-2010-06-29, accessed 6 July 2010.

INGOLD, TIM (1988) *What is an Animal?* London: Unwin Hyman.

ITO, MEMEI (2008) "Seeing Animals, Speaking of Nature: Visual culture and the question of the animal", *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(4), pp. 119-137.

JEROLMACK, COLIN (2008) "How Pigeons Became Rats: The cultural-spatial logic of problem animals", *Social Problems* 55(1), pp. 72-94.

JONES, DENA M. (1996) "American Media Coverage of Animal Protection", *Anthrozoos* 9(2-3), pp. 72 – 80.

KELLERT, STEPHEN R. and WESTERVELT, M. O. (1982) "Historical Trends in American Animal Use and Perception", Transactions of the Forty-Seventh North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, pp. 649-663.

KOLSTRUP, SØREN (1997) "The moving image and its relations to the still picture (paintings, drawings and photos)", *P.O.V.* 3, pp. 129 -159, http://pov.imv.au.dk/Issue_03/4_artcls/4_artcls3.html, accessed 18 June 2010.

KRULWICH, R. (2009) "Ants that Count!" *NPR*, Morning Edition, 25 November, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=120587095, accessed 6 July 2010.

KRUSE, CORWIN R. (1998) "Who Said That? Status presentation in media accounts of the animal experimentation debate", *Society & Animals* 6(3), http://www.societyandanimalsforum.org/sa/sa6.3/kruse.html, accessed 18 June 2010.

KRUSE, CORWIN R. (2001) "The Movement and the Media: Framing the debate over animal experimentation", *Political Communication* 18(1), pp. 67-87.

LINZEY, ANDREW and CLARKE, PAUL B. (2004) *Animal Rights: A historical anthology*, New York: Columbia University Press.

LUEDERS, BILL (2009) "My Monkey: The sad life of r04040", *The Daily Page*, 15 May, http://www.thedailypage.com/daily/article.php?article=25893, accessed 1 July 2010.

MARINO, LORI (2010) "Regarding Educational Aspects of Public Display of Marine Mammals", Testimony to the House Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, 27 April, Washington, DC.

MARINO, LORI and LILIENFELD, SCOTT and MALAMUD, RANDY and NOBIS, NATHAN and BROGLIO, RON (2010) "Do Zoos and Aquariums Promote Attitude Change in Visitors? A critical evaluation of the American Zoo and Aquarium study", *Society & Animals* 18, pp. 126-138.

MATHER, JENNIFER and ANDERSON, ROLAND and WOOD, JAMES (2010) *Octopus: The ocean's intelligent invertebrate*, Portland, OR: Timber Press.

MATTHEWS, JULIAN (2005) "Out of the mouths of babes and experts", *Journalism Studies* 6(4), pp. 509-519.

MCCHESNEY, ROBERT (2008) *The Political Economy of Media: Enduring issues, emerging dilemmas,* New York: Monthly Review Press.

MCCOMBS, MAXWELL (2005) "A Look at Agenda-Setting: Past, present and future", *Journalism Studies* 6(4), pp. 543-557.

MILSTEIN, TEMA (2008) "When Whales 'Speak for Themselves': Communication as a mediating force in wildlife tourism", *Environmental Communication* 2(2), pp. 173-192.

MOGIL, JEFFREY (2006) "New Pain Research Shows Mice Capable Of Empathy", *Science Daily,* 30 June, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/06/060630100140.htm, accessed 5 April 2010.

MYERS, G. (2007). *The Significance of Children and Animals: Social development and our connections to other species,* Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press.

NELKIN, DOROTHY (1987) *Selling Science: How the press covers science and technology*, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co.

PETERSON, THEODORE (1956). "The Social Responsibility Theory of the Press", Fred S. Seibert, Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm (Eds.), *Four Theories of the Press*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 73-103.

RAVAJA, NIKLAS (2004) "Effects of Image Motion on a Small Screen on Emotion, Attention, and Memory: Moving-face versus static-face newscaster", *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 48(1), pp.108-133.

REGAN, TOM (1983) *The Case for Animal Rights*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

ROLLIN, BERNARD (1998) *The Unheeded Cry: Animal consciousness, animal pain, and science,* Ames, Iowa: Iowa University Press.

SIEBERT, CHARLES (2005) "Planet of the Retired Apes", *New York Times Magazine*, 24 July, http://www.thedailypage.com/daily/article.php?article=25893, accessed 1 July 2010.

SIEBERT, CHARLES (2009) "Watching Whales Watching Us", *New York Times Magazine*, 8 July, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/12/magazine/12whales-t.html?pagewanted=5, accessed 1 July 2010.

SINGER, PETER (1990) *Animal Liberation,* 2nd Edn. Rev., London: Random House.

SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS (1996) "Code of Ethics", http://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp, accessed 29 December 2009.

SPIEGEL, MARJORIE (1997) *The Dreaded Comparison: Human and animal slavery*, New York: Mirror Books.

SPIVAK, GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTI (1988) "Can the Subaltern Speak?", Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (Eds.), (1994) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A reader,* New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 66-111.

STIBBE, ARRAN (2001) "Language, Power and the Social Construction of Animals", *Society & Animals* 9(2), pp. 145-161.

STREITMATTER, RODGER (2008) *Mightier than the Sword: How the news media have shaped American history,* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

TAYLOR, PAUL (1981) "The Ethics of Respect for Nature", *Environmental Ethics* 3(3), pp. 197-218.

ZIMMERMAN, MICHAEL and CALLICOTT, J. BAIRD and WARREN, KAREN and KLAVER, IRENE and CLARK, JOHN (2005) *Environmental Philosophy: From animal rights to radical ecology,* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Carrie Packwood Freeman, PhD, Assistant Professor of Communication, Georgia State University, P.O. Box 4000, Atlanta, GA 30302 USA, (cpfreeman@gsu.edu).

Freeman researches media ethics, communication strategies for social justice movements, and media coverage of nonhuman animal and environmental issues, in particular, animal agribusiness and veganism. She has published journal articles on: the role of ideology in the vegetarian campaigns of animal rights organizations (*Society & Animals)*, how environmental organizations negotiate the vegetarian issue (*Environmental Communication*), national news construction of farmed animals (*The Communication Review)*, and ethical guidelines for social movement communicators (*Journal of Mass Media Ethics)*. She has authored book chapters on the connection between meat and masculinity in fast-food advertising, and post-humanist rhetorical challenges in deconstructing the human/animal dualism. Active in the animal rights movement for almost two decades, Freeman served as a volunteer director for local grassroots groups in Florida, Georgia, and Oregon. She currently co-hosts Atlanta's "Second Opinion Radio" show on animal and environmental protection.

Marc Bekoff, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 80309-0334 USA, (marc.bekoff@gmail.com).

Bekoff taught at the University of Colorado, Boulder, for 32 years. He is a former Guggenheim Fellow and also was awarded the Exemplar Award from the Animal Behavior Society for major long-term contributions to the field of animal behavior. In 2005 he was presented with The Bank One Faculty Community Service Award for the work he has done with children, senior citizens, and prisoners, and in 2009 he was presented with the St. Francis of Assisi Award by the New Zealand SPCA. Marc has published numerous essays, books, and three encyclopedias. These include *Minding Animals, The Ten Trusts (with Jane Goodall), Encyclopedia of Animal Behavior, The Emotional Lives of Animals, Animals Matter, Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals (with Jessica Pierce),* and *The Animal Manifesto: Six Reasons for Expanding Our Compassion Footprint*. His homepage is marcbekoff.com and, with Jane Goodall, http://ethologicalethics.org/.

Sarah M. Bexell, PhD, Director of Conservation Education, Chengdu Research Base of Giant Panda Breeding, 1375 Panda Road, Northern Suburb, Chengdu, Sichuan, P.R. China 610081, Office Phone: (86) (28) 83500156, Mobile: (86) 13980042104 (sarah.bexell@gmail.com).

Bexell has worked in endangered species conservation for 18 years, with special attention toward giant pandas, golden lion tamarins, black-footed ferrets, and turtles and tortoises. She utilizes the fields of conservation education and conservation psychology to positively influence biodiversity preservation. She also teaches humane education, promoting compassion and ethical behavior toward other-than-human-animals, humans, and Earth. Another aspect of her career is combining her background in both animal behavior and education to facilitate the human-animal bond in hopes of inspiring others to contribute to a more compassionate human presence in the world.