

# Humanizing the Non-Human Animal: Framing the Analysis of Dogs' Rights Movement in Indonesia

Prisilia Resolute

Department of Sociology, Universitas Indonesia  
Email: prisiliaresolute@gmail.com

## Abstrak

Konsumsi daging anjing merupakan sebuah kebiasaan umum dalam beberapa dekade terakhir dan telah menjadi simbol bagi beberapa kelompok masyarakat di seluruh dunia. Dogs Are Not Food (DANF) adalah sebuah gerakan sosial yang ditujukan untuk menghapuskan konsumsi daging anjing. Gerakan ini diinisiasi oleh beberapa organisasi hak asasi satwa di Indonesia. Kampanye tersebut menjadi kontradiksi tersendiri: mengapa organisasi-organisasi tersebut melarang konsumsi daging anjing namun tetap mengonsumsi daging satwa lain? Bertolak dari konsep analisis framing, tulisan ini menggunakan observasi partisipatoris dan wawancara mendalam dengan informan-informan yang mengidentifikasi dirinya sebagai aktivis satwa dan/atau pendukung gerakan DANF. Berbeda dengan studi-studi sebelumnya yang cenderung mengkritik gerakan DANF, tulisan ini memberikan sebuah penjelasan sosiologis mengenai fungsi anjing dalam masyarakat dan menganalisis framing gerakan DANF. Tulisan ini berargumen bahwa framing yang digunakan oleh gerakan DANF bertujuan untuk “memanusiakan” satwa. Oleh karena itu, pelarangan konsumsi daging anjing menjadi tujuan gerakan DANF.

## Abstract

The consumption of dog meat has been a common practice in the past few decades and a symbol for certain groups all around the world. Dogs Are Not Food (DANF) is a new social movement aimed to ban dog meat consumption, initiated by several animal rights organizations in Indonesia. The campaign seems to be self-contradictory: why ban the consumption of dog meat while still allowing the consumption of meat from other animals? Drawing on framing analysis, this article uses participant observation and in-depth interview with some self-identified animal activists and/or supporters of DANF. In contrast to previous studies, which are too critical of DANF, this article gives a sociological explanation on the functions of dogs in society and analysis of DANF's framing. I argue that the framing used by the movement attempts to humanize non-human animals. Banning consumption of dog meat, therefore, is the goal of the DANF campaign.

Keywords: Non-human animal, dogs, dog meat consumption, animal activism, animal rights movement.

## INTRODUCTION

When I first decided to write this article many people laughed at me and asked the same thing: “why are dogs special?” The question rang in my head and I started to think rationally and reviewed some literature to answer it. The very first worldwide animal rights movement began in 18th century England. The movement pioneered legislations on animal protection and was successfully implemented and globally expanded. Animal rights movements gained traction following Richard Ryder’s introduction of the term speciesism in 1970.<sup>1</sup> From then on, civil organizations began to stand against both animal violence and abuse. In 1975, Peter Singer published *Animal Liberation*, which became a milestone for the emergence of various animal rights organization all around the world. Organizations such as Soi Dog Foundation in Thailand, PETA Asia-Pacific, Animals Asia Foundation, and Chinese Animal Protection Network can trace their roots to Singer’s publication. These organizations then stimulated animal activists in Indonesia to form organizations of their own, namely AD (Animal Defender), JAAN (Jakarta Animal Aid Network), AFJ (Animal Friends Jogja), GSI (Garda Satwa Indonesia), and BAWA (Bali Animal Welfare Association). In 2014, AFJ, GSI, and JAAN initiated a campaign later was known as the Dogs Are Not Food (henceforth abbreviated as DANF). Within a year, DANF has been garnered 80,000 supporters and has spread globally.

There are a number of differences in concern between Western and Eastern animal rights organizations. Animal rights organizations in the West are mainly concerned with animal violence as a whole whereas animal rights organizations in the East tend to focus on individual animal species, such as dogs. The key question is: why ban the consumption of dog meat while still allowing the consumption of meat from other animals? Previous studies found no correlation between being a vegetarian or vegan and being an animal activist. Those identifying themselves as vegetarians or vegans do not necessarily identify themselves as animal activists and vice versa (Herzog and Golden 2009). From a legal standpoint, animals cannot

---

<sup>1</sup>Speciesism refers to a concept that only certain species possesses rights and obligations thus underestimating another species. Richard D.Ryder in *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Toward Speciesism* (1991)

be considered to have rights (Duckler 2008). However, activists and supporters of DANF claimed that animals do have the right to live.

Several Asian countries and several Indonesian ethnic groups have practiced the consumption of dog meat as part of their local traditions. South Korean farmers, for instance, have been consuming dogs since 1970 to maintain their physical stamina in the summer (Podberscek 2009). Furthermore, Podberscek (2009) argued that dog meat consumption is closely related to the South Korea's national identity and its peoples. Banning the practice, therefore, may be construed as a cultural attack. To sidestep such interpretation, animal rights movements opted to change cultural assumptions by blurring the boundaries between humans and animals through universalizing strategies and physically crossing the boundary between human and non-human animal (Cherry 2010). For instance, the suffering of slaughtered animals corresponds to the suffering of humans as if they are actually being slaughtered. Crossing the boundary in this instance refers to the lack of distinction between humans and non-human animals, i.e. "with rights come responsibilities, thus with animal rights come animal responsibilities" (Duckler 2007). Yet, the lack of responsibility on the animals' part is a major flaw of the animal rights movement since rights cannot exist without responsibilities (Duckler 2008). I agree with the Duckler (2008) as well as the studies mentioned above which showed that animal activism is an exercise in futility.

Nevertheless, I disagree with the assertions of previous studies, which primarily focus on the rationality of why animals should have rights when they lack the ability to understand the meaning of rights. I will also focus on the strategies of the social movement organizations, which are influenced by how they frame their case. Breaking away from previous studies, I offer a social movement framing analysis to understand this type of animal activism. In this study, I will show how activists and supporters of DANF frame their cause: humanizing the non-human animal, in this case, dogs, based on their societal functions. First, I will describe the functions of dogs in society. Afterward, I will analyze how DANF frames the issue within the context of why it humanizes dogs. My intention here is to break down the framing of DANF movement by focusing on collective action and collective identity in the DANF social movement

using its four elements: values, norms, attitudes, and goals. To analyze the data, I use Melucci's and Goffman's framing analysis theories.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This article was written based on a qualitative research, focusing on interpreting social reality following interaction with informants (Neuman 2004). The aim of this study is to explain the framing used by DANF by means of participant observation, in-depth interviews with the activists and supporters of DANF, and through articles produced by the movement. Despite temporal and financial constraints, field observation lasted for one year from January 2014 to November 2015. This is a cross-sectional study which takes place at a single point in time. The field observation took place in Indonesia where I have actively involved and a member of an animal rights organization based in Jakarta, Indonesia.

There are two types of informants in this study: those who are actively involved in DANF organizations; and those who support DANF but are not actively involved in the organizations. The informants are classified in such manner due to the need to analyze the same framing within different actions taken by select informants. The triangulation method is used to validate the collected data. Interview transcripts, for instance, will be cross-referenced with documents or literature concerning the informant or information on the organizations.

## FRAMING ANALYSIS IN SOCIAL MOVEMENT

Discussions on social movements mean discussing collective actions following a common eagerness to overthrow the status quo. Indeed, collective actions do not take spontaneously; there are multiple processes leading to a collective action. A person has to be able to define herself and to define her relationships with her environment (Melucci in Opp 2009). Self-definition is produced by cognitive processes, consisting of interaction, negotiation, and opposition. Such definition then determines collective actions and vice versa. Those involved in collective actions share a collective identity in which they share common definitions such as cognitive frameworks, means

and ends in the negotiation process, beliefs, values and norms, and emotional investment.

Collective action and collective identity take form in a group of people with similar experience and purpose who banded together. Their experiences are then organized into norms and values which drive their future attitudes (Opp 2009). Goffman called this organization of experiences as a frame, which guides the action of an individual or a collective (1974). By this definition, Goffman implied that frame in social movement functions as a “schemata of interpretation,” i.e. enabling individuals “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” every event that she experiences. A frame has four main elements: 1) values; 2) norms; 3) attitudes; and, 4) goals.

Firstly, scholars have debated the definition of values. Macionis defined values a cultural standard of goodness, badness, or beauty which serves as guidelines for social life (1997). A society’s values may differ from another based on its cultural constructs. Sociologists often define values as ideas that owned by a person or group concerning what is desired, what is feasible, and what is good or bad (Giddens 2009). For instance, honesty is a value desirable in individuals or groups. Dishonesty, on the other hand, is also a value albeit an undesirable trait. In general, a society replaces its values gradually over time. From a symbolic interactionist perspective, the shift of certain values is facilitated as a society interact with other societies. Values are usually developed into norms. As such, values are the cornerstone and inherent justification of norms itself. In social movements, its supporters act and behave in accordance with the demarcation of its common values.

In its simplest form, norms are defined as the guidance of society’s behavior in the form of rules and expectations (Macionis 1997). Norms’ functions and purpose in society are based on values, which answers why norms function differently from one another. Functions of norms include converging people’s attitudes, upholding order and justice, helping people achieve common goals, and sanctioning for those who act or behave beyond the agreed norms. Norms shift following shifts in values. Interaction becomes important as values and norms are created by the interaction among the members of society. In social movements, their supporters tacitly agree to a set of common values which in turn determines the groups’ attitude on an issue. On the whole, norms and values constitute the goals of a

social movement organization. Goals may be the purpose, change, or ideal situation which social movement organizations wish to be implemented.

Campbell (1950) defined attitude as particular actions taken by an individual in particular situations. Attitudes are socially constructed by certain values and norms in the society and are commonly used by psychologist to analyze a person's behavior. In social movements, attitudes may manifest in 1) the subculture of the member or organization; 2) the movement's activities; and, 3) literature by the activists. Values, norms, and attitudes affect and being affected by goals.

#### THE SOCIETAL FUNCTIONS OF DOGS: WHY ARE DOGS SPECIAL?

Sociology discusses at length the functions, roles, and statuses of individuals or collectives in society. An object or being is as functional as long as it provides utility to a society. As a social movement, DANF is proof that dogs have notable functions and play important roles in society, in addition to being a form of reaction to the consumption of dog meat. There are four major functions of dogs in society: 1) affection; 2) protection; 3) recreation; and, 4) consumption.

Affection. Hart (1995) argued that there are several reasons of why dogs are special including for displays of affection. Darwin (1872) in Hart (1995) noted that dogs have specific behavior patterns to express affection, such as wagging their tails when their owner comes, licking them, lowering their head and body, or following their owner. Such behaviors indicate dogs' pleasure to see their owners. By exhibiting such behavior patterns, dogs elicit to their owners that their presence are expected. A dog's function as companion animals is best reflected by the homeless, such as Novi (Liputan6 2013), who lived with cats and dogs under the Kampung Melayu overpass. Many homeless people rely on their companion animals for protection, affection and sometimes even more importantly, companionship (Huffington Post 2012). The homeless believe that their pets are the only creatures that love them unconditionally. Dogs' unconditional loyalty and devotion to their masters are why dogs are special (Hart, 1995). There are many stories across the world that showed dogs' loyalty and devotion, such as Balto's serum run across Alaska in 1925 and Hachiko's ten-

year wait for his owner. Another function of affection is dogs as friends or family.

Previous studies found that pet owners often regard their pets as friends (Stallones et al. in Hart 1996) and family (Cain 1983). Such regard may explain why people and animal activists feel the need to protect their companion animals as they would friends or family.

*Protection.* Both animal activists and supporters of DANF realized that their companion animals make them feel safe. All of the informants stated that dogs have an innate ability to recognize disaster, illness, and other harms against their owners. Dog owners, in turn, relied on their pet's abilities to assist them in unideal situations. In Indonesia, stories of dogs helping their owners have never gained popular attention due to a lack of interest in human-animal relations. This is in contrast to the West, where dogs may be awarded for their heroic deeds in rescuing their owner's life. Belle, a beagle, for instance, was touted a hero following her call to 911 to report that her owner suffered from seizure attacks (NBC News 2006). The deed made won her the VITA Wireless Samaritan Award<sup>2</sup>. Max, a basset hound puppy saved her owner from a wildfire and became the first non-human to be featured on the cover of Time (2015). These are among the few examples where dogs are publicly recognized as their owners' saviors. It is, therefore, unsurprising that people keep dogs as pets to protect their homes and families from danger.

*Recreation.* Adell-Bath et al. (1979) in Hart (1995) found that 80% of 259 respondents agreed that dogs are one source of playfulness. In a study by Turner (in Hart, 1995) found that people spent more of their time playing with dogs rather than cats. Ryan<sup>3</sup>, an informant who supports DANF said that he loves to play and spend time with his dogs. He also said that seeing them makes him happy. Dogs as pets in society helps people to reduce stress and anxiety in today's high-pressure society (Fediaf ...).

*Consumption.* Dog meat has been consumed in Asia since the Neolithic era (Eberhard 1997). In China, for example, dogs were

---

<sup>2</sup>Award given to someone who used a cell phone to save a life, prevent a crime or help in an emergency (NBC News 2006).

<sup>3</sup>Ryan is a 21-year-old student university who used to be a member of Garda Satwa Indonesia. As he doing his thesis then he decided to resign from the organizations and become the supporter of DANF social movement.

sacrificed and their meat consumed in ceremonies. Chow chow is Chinese breed which was bred for human consumption. In approximately 400 BCE, beef supply in China dropped significantly due to the lack of land for cattle and population boom. To satisfy demands for beef, pigs and dogs were bred as meat substitutes since they are easy to breed and not land-intensive. In Korea, dog meat is thought to be healthy and is consumed during the hottest days of the year (Kim 2007). Dog meat is consumed at such times so as to reduce the undesired effects of hot weather, derived from Yin-Yang and Chang (five elements) theories. The Mexican Olmecs saw dogs as their main source of food. Peasants fed and bred their dogs to be used to pay taxes to their lords. The Aztecs bred the Xoloitzcuintle, a hairless dog breed for consumption. Certain peoples in West Africa and the Congo consider dog meat a delicacy. Other parts of Africa rarely consume dogs except in stringent times. Dogs are also used for sacrifices although they are not always consumed afterward.

Humans have coexisted and benefitted from dogs since prehistoric times. History shows that dog meat consumption is integral to the cultures of a number of ethnic groups. Before and after the Industrial Revolution, dogs have served as human helpers. Modernization and thought changes shifted the way dogs are perceived by man. While it is true that such functions are performed by dogs – thus reducing its societal functions, activists and supporters of DANF oppose the consumption of dog meat based on emotional bonds between dogs and human. The first three societal functions of dogs as described above show why dogs are special. The fourth function – consumption – is deemed by animal rights activists as irrelevant in today's society – and as such a call to ban the consumption of dog meat. Those functions have been the experiences of human and non-human animal for years. Putting it in Goffman's view, the sum of all experiences are organized into values, which in turn are developed into and institutionalized as animal rights or animal welfare.

Unsurprisingly, the notion of animal rights and animal welfare swiftly gained traction in the West, e.g. the United States and (Western) Europe. However, such rights and welfare are strongly opposed in the East, primarily due to their inherent incompatibility with traditional values and beliefs. Such opposition may be linked with the rate of modernization and globalization of individual regions. Developed Western countries tend to readily accept the notion of



equalizing humans and animals as reflected in their societies. In addition, they are more likely to adopt the terms “human animal” and “non-human animal” - humans are, after all, an animal species. In practical terms, the West’s general perception and behavior towards animals are that animals, in particular dogs, are part of the general society themselves. It thus follows that Westerners perceive the consumption of dog meat as primitive - a view diametrically opposed by Easterners, who generally see animal rights and welfare as attempts to modernize or westernize their Eastern way of life.

## DOGS ARE NOT FOOD: ITS EMERGENCE AND FRAMING

Animal activism especially dog activism is a relatively new social movement in Indonesia and Asia. The Industrial Revolution brought changes to the relationship between dogs and humans as well as the former’s function in human life. Before the Industrial Revolution, dogs were used to herd cattle, hunt, or pull sleds. Afterward, humans used a car and other machines to help them in their daily activities. The function of dogs then changed into being either pets or food. Certain elements of the Indonesian and global public perceive the practice of consuming dogs as a violation of animal rights. Some animal activists and animal rights organizations in Indonesia then formed a social movement called DANF (Dogs Are Not Food). The movement was informally organized by Garda Satwa Indonesia in 2012.

### *Emergence*

Initially, the main concern of DANF activists was dog fight gambling in Bali. Activists raided the gambling locations since gambling is against the Indonesian Criminal Code. The raid became a cornerstone of the social movement. Following increased awareness of the dog fighting scene, social movement organizations began expanding on animal welfare and animal rights issues. In the following year of 2014, DANF activists uncovered dog meat trading in one of the slaughterhouses in Jogjakarta. Their observation was recorded on video and spread globally through YouTube (Guntoro 2014). Since the discovery, DANF is focused solely on the dog meat trading.

In 2014, the idea to establish a National Commission on Animal Protection was proposed with DANF as its central agenda. The movement was formally hosted by Garda Satwa Indonesia, Animal Friends Jogja, Jakarta Animal Aid Network and Bali Animal Welfare Association. The wording Dogs Are Not Food was chosen as a way to educate the public that dogs are, indeed, not for consumption.<sup>4</sup> When asked “Why dogs?”, Jo, co-founder of Garda Satwa Indonesia, stated that

[DANF] started out from irrationality, we only have emotion but then we thought and realized that emotion cannot be the reason for banning this practice. Because of that, we tried to approach this from health perspectives. The consumer and the dog’s health. (Interview with Jo, founder of Garda Satwa Indonesia on October 4th, 2015)

The statement that the movement was founded on emotions managed to weaken the DANF movement. In 2014, an online petition entitled Stop dan Ilegalikan Perdagangan Daging Anjing untuk Konsumsi di Indonesia (Change.org 2014) (Stop and Ban Dog Meat Trade for Consumption in Indonesia) was launched and signed by more than eighty thousand supporters.

*The Framing: Values, Norms, Attitudes, and Goals in Humanizing the Non-human Animal*

Due to certain local cultures and myths, it is difficult to ban dog meat consumption in Indonesia. For those who self-identified as animal activists or dog enthusiasts, this is in stark violation of their principles (i.e. dogs are not food) and experiences with dogs. Jo, for instance, has been living with dogs since he was a child and is involved in the GSI for the past decade. Having rescued numerous dogs, many of which are have been adopted, he believes that dogs deserve a better life, that they are pets, and as such are unable to live

---

<sup>4</sup>Interview with Jo (34), co-founder of Garda Satwa Indonesia, October 4th, 2015. Jo is currently GSI’s operational director. He is a dedicated dog rescuer. Jo renounced his church following its legalization of consuming dog meat.

without humans. For Jo, it is inhumane for dogs to be abandoned, or worse, served as a menu item in a restaurant (interview with Jo, founder of Garda Satwa Indonesia, October 4th, 2015).

The activists' hold the value that dogs are pets which should not be consumed as food. Such value, in turn, becomes their norm towards dogs. Nevertheless, banning the dog meat trade and consumption is not an individual act. Jo stated that he wouldn't be able to achieve much without the GSI. He needed credible people and a credible organization which can accommodate his needs and interests the issue. In this sense, Jo and others who share similar values and norms band together in Garda Satwa Indonesia so as to push for the changes they have an interest in. The collective values ushered activists and supporters to form the DANF. Melucci (1988) in his theory of collective action criticized the deficiencies of social movement analyses which only take into consideration collective action, resource mobilization, and structural political opportunities, without regard to the actors involved nor emotional bond between individuals and their environment.

Francione (1996) defines animal rights as a condition which requires the abolition of animal exploitation whereas animal welfare regulates its exploitation more humanely. DANF adopted both the values of animal rights and animal welfare. The term 'animal' here refers to domesticated animals such as cats and dogs. Activists and supporters of DANF focus on dog meat consumption because they believe that dogs are man's best friend and as such are too "social" to be served as food. Recall that dogs have four functions in the society whose first three functions, according to the activists and the proponents of DANF, are crucial and has to be maintained.

On an abstract level, dogs' functions of affection, protection, and recreation are analogous to that of the family. Thus, the activists and the proponents are humanizing dogs because dogs have the same functions as a family member - a view expressed by Guntur, a DANF activist. Guntur, along with other dog owners, calls and sees his dogs as his children and friends rather of pets. His definition and understanding of dogs is constructed by his experiences with dogs since he was a child. Although a Muslim, Guntur believes that dogs are the best non-human animal in the world (interview with Guntur on September 29th, 2015).

DANF adopts values of animal welfare issues by condemning the treatment of dogs before they were served as food in restaurants serving dog meat. Davina, an activist and CEO of Garda Satwa Indonesia, stated in a DANF press conference that dogs for consumption are tortured before killed to release adrenaline in their blood, allegedly making their meat more flavorful. Restaurant owners admitted of the torture in DANF's investigation video which is slaughtered inhumanely (Guntoro 2014). The torture subjected to the dogs is seen as a violation of their welfare. In its petition statement, DANF pointed out that such practice violates the principles of animal welfare set out by the World Organization for Animal Health (Office Internationale des Epizooties, OIE) and Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC). Furthermore, both organizations stated that dogs are not livestock but pets.

On the other hand, opponents of DANF (dog meat producers and consumers) saw DANF's adoption of the values of animal rights and animal welfare as irrational. For dog meat producers, dog meat has material value, offers large profit margins with low capital. Dog meat consumers see it differently: some see that dog meat as a delicacy while others believe that dog meat can cure illnesses maintain stamina. Given the adherence of dog meat's mythical properties, activists and proponents of DANF attempt to address such misinformation by educating the public of the values of animal rights and animal welfare in society. Based on such values, DANF has formulated its own norms regarding the treatment of dogs.

Norms are defined as a guide for the societies' behavior, existing in forms of rules and expectations. Despite having a law on animal welfare, DANF activists and supporters pushed for their values and norms to be adopted into the current law. According to Guntur Romli, a DANF activist, dog meat consumption is against the Law Number 18 of 2009 on Husbandry and Animal Health, which stipulates the categorization of animals: farm animals, pets, and wild animals. Implicitly, the law stipulated that dogs are considered as pets because they are wild animals domesticated prior to adoption as pets. The law, however, explicitly stipulated that dogs may be bred for particular purposes such as bloodhound breeding, but not for consumption (Garda Satwa Indonesia's press conference on September 30th, 2015).

The activists also noted that the Regional Regulation of Jakarta Number 8 of 2007 concerning the restriction of distributing contraband meat. Dog meat, in this case, does not meet the health requirements and is unsuitable for consumption. Despite the legislations and corresponding punishments, its enforcement are subpar. DANF, in this sense, is a reactionary movement to the incongruence of written law and its expectations. The movement itself is an attempt to uphold its adopted values and norms. The movement's attitude towards its environment – dogs and opponents – reflects its values and norms.

By way of its values and norms, DANF activists and supporters treat their dogs as humans rather than as pets. The values and norms they hold on the treatment of dogs are similar to that of treating humans. They engage in verbal communication with their dogs and clothe them. They believe that dogs are able to understand human language because they are able to understand what humans want them to do. They also believe that dogs – just like humans – are able to feel cold and hot, thus the clothing. The treatment, however, may be seen as irrational by others on the basis that dogs are animals without sufficient cognitive capacities to comprehend language and weather. Regardless, DANF activists and supporters dogs like their own children who need affection, care, and love.

### *DANF Strategies: Above and Below the Line*

Framing in social movements serve to influence mobilized individuals or groups to actively participate in the movement (Opp 2009). To that end, framing strategies are essential in every social movement. Previous studies on the subject have found that animal rights organizations employ either structural or cultural strategy. Structural strategies refer to any methods or activities focusing on changing structural conditions, such using political opportunities to formulate public policies or regulations on animal issues. Cultural strategies, on the other hand, focus on ingraining the desired behavior in the public's treatment of animals. An example of cultural framing is PETA's strategy to ban animal slaughter (Cherry 2010). Bershad (2006), however, criticized PETA's animal rights strategy for the unreasonableness of its frame – that the slaughtering of non-human animal is essentially identical to slaughtering humans. He went on to

say that the strategy annoyed the general public somewhat instead of influencing them to participate in the social movement. Based on his findings, he concluded that animal rights activists, in general, have to develop alternative means to influence immobilized individuals or groups (Bershad 2006). PETA is seen to be too extreme and nonsensical in transmitting its frame and mobilizing the public. So far, the movement has yet to succeed.

In transmitting their frame to the immobilized people, DANF uses above the line and below the line strategies. Above the line is a public-facing strategy which uses advertisements in mass media and campaigns on social media so as to share its values. Above the line strategy indirectly transmits the movement's values to the immobilized public. Online petition is an example of this strategy in motion and as a result, the movement has significantly gained new supporters. The strategy also benefitted from Davina Veronica's, CEO of Garda Satwa Indonesia, position as a public figure, easing access to mass media coverage and public attention. Online platforms such as Twitter and Facebook are used to spread the petition and gain new supporters. To strengthen their petition, DANF activists are currently planning to conduct a judicial review of the legislation on domestic animals.

Below the line strategy uses face-to-face socialization to transmit their values directly. An example of this strategy is a six-day bicycling campaign from Jakarta to Jogjakarta for the campaign in May 2014. Along the way, the three DANF activists educated fellow road users of the DANF movement, the reason to ban dog meat consumption, and its side effects. This strategy is quite successful considering that not everyone has access to the online petition. Another below the line strategy is by producing DANF merchandises such as T-shirts, rubber band bracelets, mugs, and stickers. The movement has raised further awareness as reflected by the increased requests from both primary and high schools to be visited by the DANF movement. DANF framing strategies employ both cultural and structural transmissions. The below the line strategies are cultural approaches whereas the above the line strategies are structural. Nina<sup>5</sup>, a proponent of the DANF movement, said that these strategies are important because

---

<sup>5</sup>Nina (29) used to be a volunteer in Garda Satwa Indonesia's event and she is currently dedicated to the organization and DANF.

rules only mean as much as their implementation (interview with Nina on December 5th, 2015).

At several points of the campaign, DANF faces ambiguity for approaching the health aspects of humanizing non-human animals. While the movement calls itself Dogs are Not Food to convey the idea that dogs should be treated as friends and family, its online petition is based on assumptions which seem to be not relevant to the campaign itself. The petition pitch mentioned that dog meat consumption should be banned on the basis of the lack of proper vehicle registration to transport dogs, the criminal treatment of dogs, unease of the public in the vicinity of the dog slaughterhouse, and unhygienic nature of areas around the slaughterhouse. The health approach, according to Davina Veronica, serves to converge the mindsets of animal activists and non-animal activists. While the former feels agitated by the inhumane treatment of dogs, the same might not apply to the latter. However, both sides can see the health risks involved in consuming dog meat.

Social movement strategies are about socializing, negotiating, and interacting with the immobilized public to introduce the movement values in order to push for changes in the status quo. Norms are only as effective as the values they are based on, without which it may be ignored. Individuals with similar values and norms will form a collective identity. The individuals sharing a collective identity need to be able to define themselves and their relationship to their environment (Melucci in Opp 2009). DANF activists and supporters define themselves as human animals of equal standing to those non-human animals (e.g. dogs). Guntur<sup>6</sup>, an animal activist from Animal Defender has supported DANF since the beginning. He identified himself as an animal activist since he joined Animal Defender two years ago. His definition and understanding of dogs is constructed by his experiences with dogs since he was a child. Although a Muslim, Guntur believes that dogs are the best non-human animal in the world. Guntur has never purchased a dog since the nature of pet shops conflicts both animal welfare and animal rights. This belief was formed from a conversation with a dog breeder. The breeder admitted that the dogs were abducted and forced to breed. The pups were

---

<sup>6</sup>Guntur (35) is an animal activist and the proponent of DANF movement who was actively involved in Animal Defender in the last two years.

then selected for its traits, where the “good-looking” ones were sold and others sent to restaurants serving dog meat (e.g. lapo). He never agreed to pet shop and dog meat consumers ever since (interview with Guntur on September 29th, 2015). The experiencing of an event is when an individual’s identity is constructed (Melucci in Opp 2009).

Lena’s experience is broadly similar to Guntur’s. An unmarried woman, Lena lives with 20 former stray dogs in her house. She is a patron of several animal rights organizations and kept stock of dog and cat food in her car so that she could feed strays at any time. In a discussion at Garda Satwa Indonesia’s office, she is planning to build her own stray shelter since she loves dogs more than herself (fieldnotes on July 10th 2015). Her love for dogs manifested in her pledge to fully support DANF. Lena and Guntur’s choice to identify themselves as animal activist are constructed by their experience with dogs. Both consider their relationship with dogs as family – their children, even. Guntur’s shares his values on the meaning and position of dogs in his life to his wife through daily. He stated that “My wife used to be a cat person, but I had been poisoning her to be a dog person and now she loves dogs more than cats. We have seven dogs in our house now and all of them used to be strays” (interview with Guntur on September 29th, 2015). The values are transferred as a consequence of communication, negotiation and interaction processes of the collectives’ in order to disseminate their values and norms. The processes are also supported by social relationship between Guntur and his wife.

Having defined themselves and their relationship with their environment, the mobilized individuals then decide that participating in an organization which shares their concern as the next logical step. Guntur’s position in the organization and Lena’s support of DANF are an example of individuals forming a collective identity, i.e. animal rights activists. As their identities are convergent, it follows that their near-identical values and norms on the treatment of dogs guide their behavior towards dogs, e.g. collective decision to feed strays, to refer to dogs as children, and to adopt instead of purchasing dogs. These set of similar behaviors lead to the formation of collective action, in this case establishing DANF to ban dog meat consumption in Indonesia and around the world.



## OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

As a social movement, DANF has had many opportunities and challenges. In 2015, a year following the launch of the petition, a response from the Governor of Jakarta paved the opportunity to for the Marine, Agriculture and Food Security Agency to formulate a regulation on distribution of dog meat in Jakarta (The Jakarta Post 2015). The Governor's response was unpredicted since the primary focus of the petition is on the sanitation of dog slaughterhouses rather than rational reasons to ban its trade. The proposed regulation plans to authorize the regional government to oversee dog meat trade in Jakarta. Government control of the trade thus ensures that its hygiene and distribution is within acceptable limits. Regardless, DANF still maintains that dogs, regardless of function, should be humanized and considered as non-human animals. While the response is welcomed, it is far from the initial goal of banning dog meat trade.

Currently, DANF faces two challenges. First is structural challenge. An investigation by Garda Satwa Indonesia activists in Ende, Flores, found that the locals consumed dog meat due to limited supplies of other meats (Garda Satwa Indonesia 2015). Scarce sources and unaffordable chicken, beef and pork meats in Ende forced the locals to consume dog meat. Dogs are scavengers which are easily bred and able to feed themselves. The scarce supply of other meats explains why certain peoples in developing countries choose to consume dog meat whereas those in developed countries see dogs as pets. Dog meat consumption is an issue which concerns both its consumers and producers. Trading dog meat is a high-profit business in both Indonesia and elsewhere. For DANF activists and supporters, human welfare has to be developed prior to proposing to ban dog meat consumption.

The second is cultural challenge. Dog meat consumption is usually associated with the Batak Toba, thanks to a dish called saksang or RW that is like a dog-meat stew (Daily Mail 2012). Although not every Batak Toba consume dog meat, this custom has spread and adopted by non-Batak Tobas. Garda Satwa Indonesia investigations found that the consumers of dogs meat are not only Bataks but also non-Bataks, usually truck drivers. The outsider adoption is due to the myth that dog meat is rejuvenating health and stamina despite not being scientifically proven. Culture, habit, myth, and belief regarding

the consumption of dog meat are commonly found in multicultural Indonesia. DANF is sometimes seen as an assault on modernization and Western culture for certain ethnic groups and peoples. For the movement to succeed, DANF activists and supporters have to change the immobilized public's mindset, which is easier said than done.

In Indonesia, consumption of dog meat is a custom of the minority – to which the DANF addresses – given that the majority of the country's citizens are Muslims. Islamic law strictly prohibits Muslims from contacting dogs as they are seen as impure. Departing from this view, some Muslims see the prescription as grounds to abuse or neglect dogs, which in itself contradicts Islam's view against animal cruelty. Given this view, DANF supporters accuse those who see dogs as ritually unclean as too conservative. In addition, DANF's view is supported by myths, such as the haram nature of owning dog despite not being explicitly mentioned in the Qur'an and having to wash one's hand seven times with soil after touching a dog. These conservative views are seen by DANF supporters as too ignorant in the context of modern society and the fact that technology, discovery, and thus norms and values change over time. Assuming that dog meat consumers are not Muslims means that those people who consume dogs are minority.

However, compared to dog meat consumers, DANF is, paradoxically, the minority movement. This is in part due to the established nature of the custom of consuming dog meat, long before the advent of animal rights and welfare discourses. For the movement to achieve its goals, it has to conduct concrete studies on the function of dogs in Indonesia. Reliance on a seemingly nonsensical argument of emotional bond in human-animal relation may prove to be futile. What needs to be highlighted is that DANF is a usurper of traditional cultures and economic activities of those it opposes. In Tomohon, dog meat is commercially available as food and medicine. In other parts of Indonesia, dog meat is consumed as an alternative meat due to the unaffordability of other meats, such as beef and chicken.

## CONCLUSION

I conducted a research on framing analysis and applied it to DANF, whose activists have attempted to a sense of humanity in non-human animals in the immobilized public's conscience. The question

of why dogs are special for DANF supporters or activists is because dogs have societal functions, despite not being recognized by others. DANF frames their issues by using below the line and above the line strategies, wherein social movement organizations challenge traditional practices to be replaced with novel ethical discourses on dogs.

The activists and supporters of DANF have been humanizing dogs through experiences, emotions, and cognitive knowledge. They blur the boundary between human and non-human animal (Cherry 2010). These mobilized public has different experiences, emotions, and cognitive knowledge compared to those who are immobilized. In general terms, animal welfare and rights movement organizations attempt to change the values in its society. Melucci (1988) argued that the actors involved in structural perspective – collective action, resource mobilization, and political opportunity – tend to be ignored. Melucci's theory of collective identity described that each actor involved in collective action has experienced multiple thought processes before participating in collective action. Goffman (1974) labels the thought processes as "schemata of interpretation" which includes norms, values, attitudes, and goals. Analysis of the DANF movement using the four elements of framing shows that activists and supporters humanize the non-human animal due to the emotional, rather practical, based relationship to such creatures. This view, however, ignores the fact that dogs have societal functions. The activists and supporters adherence to the thought that dogs behave similarly to humans more than other animals affect their attitudes and strategies. The movement's supporters, on the other hand, saw no value of banning the consumption of dog meat based on the flaws in DANF's framing. I would suggest the DANF activists and supporters to further acknowledge that their movement is a plea to emotion without sufficient regard to the rational opposition used by its detractors. For the movement to survive, it needs to develop convincing frames on why dogs should, indeed, not be consumed as food, in addition to them being pet animals.

As a movement which traces its roots to Western animal rights movements, DANF is seen as an act of Westernization – an attempt to deconstruct local practices – which is DANF's main challenge. The success of the challenge is open to question, since society's norms and values may change gradually over time. To increase its odd of success, DANF has to offer alternative and convincing arguments

in favor of animal rights and animal welfare. This may come as an obstacle since the Indonesian Government's current priority is to ensure social welfare before developing animal welfare. Compared to its opportunity, DANF

Future studies should include the dynamics of individual animal rights organizations and countries in where they operate. The organizational analysis should find the subcultures co-existing with the primary culture of each organization, thus an understanding of the different values held by its supporters. Specific country studies would provide the history and future projection of the direction of animal rights activism in detail. In-depth interviews with activists in various organizations are also needed since this study's informants are limited only to those intimately involved in DANF.

#### REFERENCES

- Ascione, Frank R., and Kenneth Shapiro. 2009. "People and Animals, Kindness and Cruelty: Research Directions and Policy Implications". *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 65, No. 3, pp. 569-587. Retrieved April 28, 2015 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01614.x/epdf>).
- Cain, A. O. 1983. "A Study of Pets in the Family System". In A. H. Katcher and A. M. Beck (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Our Lives on Companion Animals* (pp. 72 – 81). Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Campbell, D. T. 1950. "The Indirect Assessment of Social Attitudes". *Psychological Bulletin*, 47, 15-38.
- Castells, Manuel. 1997. *The power of identity*. Oxford:Blackwell.
- Cherry, Elizabeth. 2010. "Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement". *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 450-475. Retrieved March 20, 2015 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1573-7861.2010.01191.x/pdf>).
- Cresswell, John W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mix Method Approach*. USA: Sage Publication.
- Daily Mail. 2012. "Saved From The Dinner Table: Activists Rescue More Than 500 Caged Dogn Destined For Restaurants in China". Retrieved December 10, 2015 (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/>

- article-2133151/Saved-dinner-table-Activists-rescue-500-caged-dogs-destined-restaurants-China.html).
- Derrida, Jacques. 1974. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: The University of Chicago Press.
- , 1978. *Writing and Difference*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- , 1981. *Dissemination*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Duckler, Geordie. 2007. "Animal Wrongs: On Holding Animals To (And Excusing Them From) Legal Responsibility For Their Intentional Acts". *Journal of Animal Law & Ethics*, 2:92, 91-121. Retrieved July 10, 2015 (<http://law.lclark.edu/live/files/9494-duckler--animal-wrongs>).
- , 2008. "Two Major Flaws of The Animal Rights Movement". *Animal Law*, 14:2, 179-200. Retrieved July 10, 2015 (<http://law.lclark.edu/live/files/9495-duckler--two-major-flaws-of-the-animal-rights>).
- Eberhard, W. 1977. *A History of China*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Einwohner, Rachel L. 1999. "Gender, Class, and social movement outcomes: Identity and Effectiveness in The Animal Rights Campaigns". *Gender & Society*, Vol. 13, No. 1, Special Issues: Gender and Social Movements, Part 2 (Feb 1999), pp. 56-76. Retrieved June 2, 2015 (<http://gas.sagepub.com/content/13/1/56.full.pdf+html>).
- Francione, Gary L. 1996. *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of The Animal Rights Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of The Oppressed*.
- Garner, Robert. 2003. "Political Ideologies and The Moral Status of Animals". *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 8:2, 233-246. Retrieved June 13, 2015 (<http://www.trincoll.edu/Academics/centers/TIIS/Documents/Robert%20Garner,%20Political%20ideologies.pdf>).
- , 2008. "The Politics of Animal Rights". *British Politics (2008)* 3, 110-119. Retrieved June 13, 2015 (<http://www.tier-im-fokus.ch/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/garner08a.pdf>).
- Giddens, A. 2009. *Introduction to sociology*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Gladwell, Malcolm. 2000. *The Tipping Point*.

- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Hart, Lynette A. 1995. "Dogs as Humans Companions: A Review of the Relationship" (pp. 161 - 178) in *The Domestic Dog: Its Evolution, Behaviour, and Interactions with People*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Herz, R. S. 2011. PROP Taste Sensitivity is Related to Visceral but Not Moral Disgust, 4:72-79. Retrieved May 9, 2015 (<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.465.303&rep=rep1&type=pdf>).
- Herzog, H. A., and Golden, L. L. 2009. "Moral Emotions and Social Activism: The Case of Animal Rights". *Jurnal of Social Issues*, Vol. 65, No. 3, 2009, pp. 485-498. Retrieved March 23, 2015 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/josi.2009.65.issue-3/issuetoc>).
- Herzog, H., and Knight S. 2009. "All Creatures Great And Small: New Perspectives On Psychology And Human-Animal Interactions". *Jurnal of Social Issues*, Vol. 65, No. 3, 2009. Retrieved March 23, 2015 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01608.x/epdf>).
- Huffington Post, 2012. "Homeless Pets: 3 Nonprofits That Help People Living on The Streets Feed Their Animals". Retrieved November 17, 2015) ([http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/04/homeless-pets\\_n\\_1402900.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/04/homeless-pets_n_1402900.html)).
- Kim, R. E. 2007. "Dog meat in Korea: A socio-legal challenge". *Animal Law* 14: 221-236. Retrieved May 26, 2015 ([https://www.animallaw.info/sites/default/files/lralvol14\\_2\\_201.pdf](https://www.animallaw.info/sites/default/files/lralvol14_2_201.pdf)).
- Lobell, J. A., and Powell, E. 2010. "More than man's best friend". *Archaeology*, September/October, Vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 26-35. Retrieved August 2, 2015 (<http://archive.archaeology.org/1009/dogs/>).
- Macionis, John J. 1997. *Sociology: Sixth Edition*. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- NBC News. 2006. "Dog Makes Cell Phone Call to Save Owner's Life". Retrieved November 17, 2014 (<http://www.nbcnews.com/id/13439261/#.VksvmnYrLIU>).
- Neuman, W. Lawrence. 2004. *Social Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*.
- Olson, Mancur. 2002. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Groups and The Theory of Groups*. USA: Harvard University Press.

- Opp, Karl D. 2009. *Theories of Political Protest and Social Movements: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Critique, and Synthesis*. USA: Routledge.
- “Pets in Society: Overall Benefits.” Fediaf.org Retrieved November 17, 2015 (<http://www.fediaf.org/pets-in-society/overall-benefits/>).
- Ritzer, George and Goodman, Douglas J. 2010. *Sociological Theory*. USA: McGraw-Hill .
- Serpell, James. 1996. *The Domestic Dog: Its Evolution, Behaviour, and Interactions with People*. US: Cambridge University Press.
- Simoons, F. J. 1961. *Eat Not This Flesh: Food Avoidances from Prehistory to the Present*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Snyder, L. M., and Klippel, W. E. 2003. “From Lerna to Kastro: Further Thoughts on Dogs as Food in Ancient Greece: Perceptions, Prejudices and Reinvestigations”. *British School at Athens Studies* 9: 221-231. Retrieved May 16, 2015 ([https://www.jstor.org/stable/40960350?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/40960350?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)).
- “Stop dan Ilegalikan Perdagangan Daging Anjing untuk Konsumsi di Indonesia.” 2014. Change.org Retrieved September 15, 2015 (<https://www.change.org/p/basuki-btp-suswono-sri-sultan-hb-x-stop-dan-ilegalikan-perdagangan-daging-anjing-untuk-konsumsi-di-indonesia>).
- The Jakarta Post, 2015. “Activists See Regulation As Step To Prohibit Dog As Food”. Retrieved October 10, 2015 (<http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2015/10/01/activists-see-regulation-step-prohibit-dog-food.html>).
- Time. 2015. “For National Dog Day, Meet a Hero Dog From 1928”. Retrieved November 17, 2015 (<http://time.com/3995030/national-dog-day-heroes-history/>).
- Tito, R. Y., Belknap III, S. L., Sobolik, K. D., Ingraham, R. C., Cleveland, L. M., and Lewis Jr, C. M. 2011. “Brief Communication: DNA From Early Holocene American Dog”. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 145: 653-657. Retrieved August 24, 2015 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ajpa.21526/pdf>).
- Turner, Jonathan H., Stets, Jan E. 2006. *Sociological Theories of Human Emotions*. USA: University of California Press.
- Udell, M. A. ., and Wynne, C. D. 2008. “A Review of Domestic Dogs’ (Canis Familiaris) Human-Like Behaviors: Or Why Behavior Analysts Should Stop Worrying and Love Their Dogs”. *Journal of*

- the *Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 89(2), 247–261. Retrieved August 30, 2015 (<https://asu.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/a-review-of-domestic-dogs-canis-familiaris-human-like-behaviors->).
- “Video Petisi Stop Perdagangan Daging Anjing.” 2014. Rian Guntoro Retrieved Januari 10, 2015 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zFP0RMpAAsA>).
- Vila, C., Maldonado, J. E., and Wayne, R. K. 1999. “Phylogenetic Relationships, Evolution, and Genetic Diversity of The Domestic Dog”. *Journal of Heredity* 90: 71-77. Retrieved August 13, 2015 (<http://jhered.oxfordjournals.org/content/90/1/71.full.pdf+html>).
- Weber, Max. 1936. *Social Action*. US: Sage Publication.
- “Konsumsi Daging Anjing di Flores dan Jakarta” 2015. Garda Satwa Indonesia Retrieved September 30, 2015 (<http://www.gardasatwaindonesia.org/2015/10/flores-jakarta-dan-daging-anjing/>).