



Asceticism and hedonism in research discourses of veg*anism

Matthew Cole

City and Regional Planning, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to critically examine the dominance of an ascetic discourse of veg*anism in social research literature, and to relate it to a dominant hierarchical ordering of Western diets (to refer collectively to veganism and vegetarianism).

Design/methodology/approach – A review of the extant social research literature on veg*anism was undertaken in order to discern whether a consistent type of descriptive language existed. This facilitated an understanding of the way in which that language is constitutive of research generated understandings of veg*anism.

Findings – An ascetic discourse of veg*anism is dominant in social research. This is reflected in the phraseology used by authors. Typical descriptive terms of a veg*an diet include “strict”, “restrictive”, or “avoidance”. This ascetic discourse reproduces the hierarchical ordering of Western diets such that veg*anism is denigrated and made to seem “difficult” and abnormal.

Research limitations/implications – Veg*anism arguably promises multiple benefits for human, environmental, and nonhuman animal well-being. The potential to realize those benefits is hampered by the perpetuation of an understanding of veg*anism as an ascetic practice.

Originality/value – This paper provides the first comprehensive examination of the language used to describe veg*anism within social research. It can enhance reflexivity on the part of social researchers interested in veg*anism, and help inform research design. In providing an alternative hedonic discourse of veg*anism, this paper also makes a contribution towards realizing the potential benefits of veg*anism through making it a more attractive dietary practice.

Keywords Veganism, Diet, Western hemisphere, Hierarchical control, Sociology

Paper type Conceptual paper

Introduction

Vegetarianism, and more so veganism, are typically referred to as forms of asceticism within social research. Beardsworth and Bryman (2004, p. 321, emphasis added), for instance, write of the “*demanding* observances of veganism”. Morris and Kirwan (2006, p. 204, emphases added) describe vegetarianism as existing on “a spectrum of animal product use ranging from *least restrictive*, where some meat is still consumed, to *most restrictive*, where *only* vegetable-derived products are consumed, that is, veganism”. This kind of phraseology is suggestive of a unity of understanding of veg*anism[1], a unity that focuses on veg*anism as difficult, as involving a process of giving things up, as impoverished in terms of the range of gustatory experiences available to the adherent, in short as a form of asceticism. A discourse of veg*an asceticism is consonant with the hierarchical ordering of diets in Western societies. Schleifer (1999, p. 224) argues that “meat has become a symbol for status . . . it is universally related to wealth, and its absence from the diet is regarded as voluntary or involuntary privation”. Similarly, Beardsworth and Bryman (2004, p. 313) state that “meat . . . is perhaps the most universally valued and sought after the source of human nutrition”. Hamilton (2006, p. 166) argues that “[a] vegetarian diet is sometimes thought to induce



passivity, weakness and lassitude”, with meat consumption concomitantly associated with the converse states. A thorough examination of the Western hierarchy of foods in relation to vegetarianism comes from Twigg (1979, p. 17), who situates red meats at the top of the dominant food hierarchy, then white meat, followed by dairy products and eggs, with vegetables at the bottom, “regarded as insufficient and merely ancillary in the dominant scheme”.

There is a diversity of interpretations of the meaning of this hierarchy, but many centre on the symbolic importance of meat eating in terms of power relationships. Adams (2000, p. 43; see also Lupton, 1998, pp. 104-11) draws attention to the role of meat consumption in the perpetuation of patriarchy: “meat is a symbol of male dominance”, while Patterson (2002) connects the history of human domination over other animals, especially animal farming, with the history of racism and genocide. Fiddes (1991) argues that human domination of nature is symbolized by meat, while Spencer (1994, p. 170) points out the ideological importance of meat-eating in the historical suppression of Christian heresies: “[e]vidence that you were a meat eater . . . was . . . felt to be proof of orthodoxy”. In each case, not eating meat entails association with the inferior side of a power relationship. Discourses of veg*an asceticism therefore imply a symbolic renunciation of power, for instance in relation to gender, “race”, religion, or “nature”, as well as the renunciation of a particular class of foodstuffs.

In this paper I argue that discourses of veg*an asceticism are one-sided in their characterisation of veg*ans and veg*anism. They systematically reproduce the lowly hierarchical position of veg*an diets through obscuring the possibility of thinking of veg*an diets as aesthetically (and not just morally) superior or equal to diets including animal products. Furthermore, the perpetuation of an image of asceticism may play a role in inhibiting the positive role that veg*an diets and lifestyles have to play in reducing serious contemporary social harms. Advocates for veg*anism focus on three themes, respectively pertaining to human health, environmental sustainability, and animal rights or welfare (Maurer, 2002, pp. 71-7; Wicks, 2004, pp. 268-79). In relation to human health, potential harms of diets high in animal products and low in plant foods include elevated level of risk of serious degenerative diseases including heart disease, breast, colon and prostate cancer and type 2 diabetes (Messina and Burke, 1997; Sabaté, 2003). In relation to environmental issues, veg*an diets may play a role in: ameliorating the rate of greenhouse gas emissions (Steinfeld *et al.*, 2007); arresting the decline in biodiversity (Fox, 2000); reducing pollution (Leitzman, 2003); making more efficient use of land and water resources (Pimentel and Pimentel, 2003); and enhancing the sustainability of human societies (Reijnders and Soret, 2003). In relation to animal welfare or rights, veg*anism offers substantial benefits in relation to reducing the suffering of farmed animals (Singer, 1995; Marcus, 2001, 2005; Mason and Finelli, 2006).

In light of these issues, the next section of the paper identifies and describes how ascetic discourses of veg*anism are circulated in social research. The language used to describe veg*ans and veg*anism is partly constitutive of research-generated understanding. Ascetic discourses implicitly reproduce a hierarchical ordering of Western diets that place veganism in particular at the bottom. By reconstituting veg*ans as ascetics and veg*anism as a form of abstention, social research situates veg*anism beyond the scope of “normal” food practices, and thereby replicates a

commonsense understanding of veg*anism as too difficult to maintain for many people, and of veg*ans as in some sense exceptional. By way of alternative, the next section of the paper explores the resources for constructing a hedonic discourse of veg*anism and a concomitant ascetic discourse of meat and dairy consumption. Not only does this provide a useful counterweight in future social research into the issue, but it also facilitates the symbolic valorisation of veg*anism, which might make it a more attractive proposition, and one more easily promoted by health care professionals and accepted by a sceptical omnivorous public.

Ascetic discourses of veg*anism in social research

Social research on veg*anism is thin on the ground (McDonald, 2000, p. 2; MacNair, 2001, p. 63). In itself, this is indicative of the extent to which veg*anism is largely absent from the research agenda, which, given the range of well documented harms which it may play a part in reducing, is striking. A possible explanation is the status of veg*anism as “a major change from the normative practice and ideology of human dominance over nonhuman animals” (McDonald, 2000, p. 1; Adams, 2000; Spencer, 1994), at least in contemporary Western societies. If veg*anism remains outwith dominant societal norms, this is likely to be reflected in a low profile of veg*anism within social research too. Beyond this however, evidence of the extent to which veg*anism represents an ideological challenge can also be found in the way that it is discussed in the research that does exist. In this section of the paper therefore, I argue that the discursive construction of veg*anism as asceticism within social research serves to reproduce the dominant ideological framework within which meat and dairy consumption are “normalized”. This inhibits a full understanding of the meaning and experience of veg*anism, and therefore, inhibits the potential contribution of veg*anism to ameliorating harms.

A survey of the extant social research on veg*anism reveals a striking similarity of terminology used to describe it. The following example is indicative:

The *omission* of meat from the diet is known as vegetarianism. This broad definition includes subsets, where practices vary according to the *degree of restriction* of animal products in the diet. At the *mild* end of the scale are semi-vegetarians who *omit* red meat and poultry from the diet. The *more extreme practice* of vegetarianism, carried out by vegans, *requires* the consumption of no foods of animal origin. This *excludes* all dairy products from the diet and often the use of animal products such as leather is *avoided* (Neale *et al.*, 1993, p. 24, emphases added).

Veg*anism is discursively constructed in this paragraph as a form of asceticism. As one progresses towards veganism, the embedded assumption is that an ever-greater level of self-denial is involved in maintaining the diet. By the use of typical descriptive terms that include “omission”, “exclusion”, “avoidance”, “restriction”, or “extremism”, veganism, in particular, is tautologically inscribed as a demanding regime of abstemiousness. The example just given is by no means unusual. Beardsworth and Bryman (1999, p. 291, 296) posit “a continuum from most strict (i.e. veganism) to much less strict forms” of veg*anism, and go on to describe veganism as “this exacting and uncompromising form of meat avoidance”. In a later paper, the same authors argue that:

... vegetarian “careers” may move through stages of increasingly restrictive avoidances. It is possible that most of these younger respondents who reported themselves as vegetarian had not yet considered a move towards the much more demanding observances of veganism (Beardsworth and Bryman, 2004, p. 321).

A similar formulation appears in Beardsworth and Keil (1992, p. 263): “a scale from least strict to most strict” and again in Beardsworth and Keil (1993, p. 229): “[v]egetarianism consists of a spectrum of inter-related food selection and food avoidance patterns, ranging from strict veganism at one end to much looser forms at the other ...”. Janda and Trocchia (2001, p. 1216) postulate a “tension” in veg*ans between “abstinence and pleasure” as regards their dietary practices, while Twigg (1979, p. 31) describes vegetarians as individuals who ‘take up structured and restricted forms of eating’. Hamilton (2006, p. 160, 161) discusses veg*an respondents’ attitudes to meat: “[s]ome had never really liked or enjoyed it much and for them adopting a vegetarian diet was no sacrifice at all”, but nevertheless, veg*an dietary practice is described as “abstention from meat consumption”. There are numerous other examples that could be cited (see for instance, Beardsworth and Keil, 1992, p. 256, 258, 264, 266; Beardsworth *et al.*, 2002, p. 480; Hamilton, 2006, p. 160, 161; Janda and Trocchia, 2001, p. 1206; Morris and Kirwan, 2006, p. 198; Neale *et al.*, 1993, p. 25, 26; Rozin *et al.*, 1997, p. 67, 68, 70; Twigg, 1979, p. 19, 20). In summary then, social research generates an understanding of veg*anism as a form of asceticism through the terminology it selects.

This terminology is revealing as regards embedded assumptions about dietary practice. This can be explored further by drawing an analogy with Hamilton’s paradoxical description of veg*anism as “abstention”, alongside his research finding of veg*anism as “no sacrifice” for some respondents. Would “abstention from tobacco consumption” seem an elegant description of the experience of non-smokers who did not enjoy the experience? It seems unlikely, as this would be an unnecessarily complicated way of describing the experience of not smoking, implying that smoking was inevitably pleasurable, convenient, beneficent or normal, thereby imputing some level of asceticism to non-smokers. Of course, tobacco smoking is currently viewed as a problematic form of behaviour that stands in need of explanation (see Rozin *et al.*, 1997), but in the era of Marlboro Man (especially male) non-smokers may have been viewed as ascetics. We may currently be moving through an analogous transitional stage as regards perceptions of the consumption of animal products. That is, veg*anism only looks ascetic from the perspective of an assumption of the automatic pleasurable, convenience, beneficence or normality of consuming animal products. The framing of research questions in terms of exclusion, avoidance, omission and so on can therefore be seen as reiterations of these kinds of assumptions, rather than empirical descriptions of the experience of veg*ans and veg*anism.

The dominant theme of social research has been to look for reasons why individual veg*ans choose a veg*an diet. Consistent themes have been identified which focus on perceived benefits to health, animal welfare, the environment, spiritual well-being, or eating experience (i.e. a taste preference for plant-based foods), as well as to peer influence (see Twigg, 1979; Beardsworth and Keil, 1992; Beardsworth and Keil, 1993; Neale *et al.*, 1993; Dietz *et al.*, 1995; Leneman, 1999; McDonald *et al.*, 1999; Janda and Trocchia, 2001; Smart, 2004; Hamilton, 2006). The relative importance of ethical over

aesthetic concerns for veg*ans compared to meat and dairy consumers is generally stressed by researchers. While attention has been given to the symbolic reordering of diets enacted by veg*anism (Twigg, 1979; Adams, 2000), this typically privileges the relative moralization of veg*an diets vis-à-vis omnivorous diets (Rozin *et al.*, 1997). For instance, Lindeman and Väänänen (2000, p. 27) report that “[a]mong female vegetarians, the most important food choice motive was ecological welfare” (a composite of animal and ecological welfare). Beardsworth and Bryman (2004, p. 316) report that “respondents who selected ‘tastiness’ as their main criterion [of food choice] were more likely to be maintaining their level of meat eating”. In other words, veg*an diets are argued to be chosen when ethics (belief in animal rights for instance) triumphs over aesthetics (the desirability of animal products), and vice versa. Social research thereby downplays the aesthetic reordering of diets, and discursively minimizes research findings that do point to aesthetic motivations for veg*anism, such as a taste preference. Beardsworth and Bryman’s finding makes it easy to assume, as presumably the meat eating respondents did, that plant based diets “really are” less “tasty”. But the finding that reasons other than taste are more important for veg*an respondents in determining self-reported food choice does not mean that they experience their own meals as less “tasty” than they would experience a meal based on animal products. In other words, a false dichotomy is established between the morally problematic satisfaction of taste preferences (meat-eating) and the morally valorised sacrifice of satisfaction of taste preferences (veg*anism). This is unwarranted – there is no reason to assume that aesthetic preferences for veg*an diets cannot and do not coincide with ethical choices.

In fact, this argument is supported by Beardsworth and Keil’s (1992, p. 275) identification of a “pro-vegetarian theme” among some of their respondents, in which “[v]egetarian diets are seen as more varied and therefore more appealing than meat based dishes”, while “[a] meat-based diet is seen as one which is restricted by tradition to a relatively small number of well established formulae”. Given this kind of finding, framing discussion in relation to a discourse of asceticism does not fully capture the phenomenon under investigation. Amato and Partridge report that “82 per cent of vegetarians say there is no way they would consider eating flesh again” (cited in Rozin *et al.*, 1997, p. 68). Rozin *et al.* (1997, p. 71) go on to interpret this finding in relation to the level of disgust with which vegetarians view the thought of eating meat. Ascetic discourses of veg*anism are therefore inaccurate descriptive frameworks: avoiding something that arouses disgust does not qualify as asceticism.

Assumptions as to the beneficence of diets based on animal products are currently subject to robust challenges that are increasingly entering mainstream debate. For instance, Sabaté (2003, p. 505) argues that a paradigm shift has occurred with plant-based diets now being viewed by nutritionists as health improving and disease preventing, with the converse being the case for meat-based diets. If long standing assumptions about animal-based diets begin to unravel, meat and dairy consumption will begin to stand in need of explanation instead of veg*anism. However, while the assumption of the aesthetic superiority of animal-based diets remains, moving towards a veg*an diet still looks like a perhaps laudable, but without doubt effortful, journey of self-sacrifice: “[e]liminating all animal products for ethical reasons is an extreme dietary change” (McDonald *et al.*, 1999, p. 8). The reiteration of veg*anism as ethical

work as opposed to the aesthetic ease of consuming a “normal” meat and dairy based diet within social research contributes to the perpetuation of the dominance of the latter. Amusingly, Neale *et al.* (1993, p. 27) take this to extremes when they hypothesize that their finding of a higher incidence of smoking among vegans may be a result of vegans being “more susceptible to ‘stress’ because of the severity of their dietary restrictions”.

In this section, I have argued that an ascetic discourse of veg*anism predominates within social research. However, alternative discourses do exist within the literature, and the next section will explore these and suggest ways to build on them in order to construct a hedonic discourse of veg*anism and an ascetic discourse of omnivorism.

Towards a hedonic discourse of veg*anism

Discourses of veg*an asceticism assume and reproduce a view that veg*anism is a struggle, because it is predicated as a form of voluntary deprivation. However, without empirical evidence, that assumption remains merely an assumption, and serves to obscure a more nuanced understanding of the experience of veg*anism. In particular, the assumption that veg*ans are ascetics feeds (no pun intended) into stereotypes of veg*ans as under-nourished weaklings, because the practices of omission, exclusion, avoidance and so on do not provide an account of what veg*ans are eating if they are not eating animal products. In order to begin reconstructing a hedonic discourse of veg*anism, it is necessary to be cognizant of what veg*ans are eating.

Morris and Kirwan (2006, p. 198) point out that “[v]egetarian diets entail the relatively greater use (compared with a conventional omnivorous diet) of other food products such as seeds, fruits, pulses, nuts and grains”. Haddad and Tanzam (2003, p. 626) provide a detailed account from a sample of both self-defined vegetarians and nonvegetarians in the USA: “[s]elf-defined vegetarians ... consumed more grains, legumes, vegetables (green leafy and yellow), fruit, and wine”. Furthermore:

... self-defined vegetarians who reported eating no meat had significantly higher intakes of cereals and pasta, rice, vegetables, dark green vegetables, deep yellow vegetables, dried fruit, and other fruit; as well as tofu, hummus, almonds, and flax seeds (Haddad and Tanzam, 2003, p. 626).

In summary, the authors state that self-defined vegetarians eat a more diverse and healthier diet than the general population (Haddad and Tanzam, 2003, p. 629). Nonvegetarians by contrast made up for their lack of plant-based foods with higher intakes of meat, potatoes and sweets (Haddad and Tanzam, 2003, p. 630). These findings are consistent with the testimonies of long-term vegans, who often discuss an increasingly diverse consumption of foods, as well as an increased hedonic sensitivity to food in general: “[a]fter being vegan for a couple of months, I started to taste wonderful things in the food I ate that I had never tasted before” (in Rosenfield, 2002, p. 137). Writing in the 18th century, Goldsmith (1999, p. 62) wrote of the dulling effects of animal-based diets, and hyperbolically contrasted the refinement of the meat-free palate: “[you] distinguish every element with the utmost precision; a stream untasted before is new luxury, a change of air is a new banquet”. Smart (2004, p. 88) describes the efforts of the UK Vegetarian Society to erode the “stereotype of bland food and abstemious self-denial”. Aesthetic celebrations of veg*an cuisine are not limited to activist or exhortative literature however. The research literature does reveal a

consistent strand of respondents preferring veg*an meals on the grounds of taste (Beardsworth and Keil, 1992, p. 269, 275; Beardsworth and Keil, 1993, p. 233; Neale *et al.*, 1993, p. 26; Smart, 2004, p. 81; Hamilton, 2006, p. 160). This though, can be confounded by the provision for veg*ans in social settings. For instance Janda and Trocchia's (2001, p. 1221) respondents reported that "vegetarian food served in restaurants was often bland, tasteless, and inauthentic. At social gatherings such as parties, picnics, and barbecues, informants complained of the rather bland nature of these [veg*an] foods". However, the lack of provision of imaginative and appetizing food in the mainstream does not entail that veg*an food is tasteless per se, although it does play a role in the perpetuation of stereotypes of aesthetically inferior diets among non-veg*ans. The lack of convenient commercial provision of veg*an food may contribute to such findings as Neale *et al.*'s (1993, p. 25) that "90 per cent of [vegan] respondents cooked for themselves".

Two general themes may be drawn out here that are of relevance to constructing a hedonic discourse of veg*anism. First is that veg*ans tend to eat a wider variety of plant foods than omnivores. Second is that veg*ans tend to spend more time preparing their own food. The first point has health implications: if veg*arians, and especially vegans, tend to eat a wider variety of plant foods than omnivores, increasing "restriction" of animal foods may be expected to have clear health benefits: "[c]heeses and other highfat dairy foods and eggs should be limited in the diet because . . . their frequent use displaces plant foods in some vegetarian diets" (Messina and Burke, 1997, p. 1,318). In this light, meat eaters might be described as vegetable and fruit avoiders, abstemiously restricting themselves to a limited range and quantity of plant foods. The fact that such a formulation jars is indicative of the extent to which asceticism is so firmly entrenched as a property of plant based, rather than animal based, diets. Given evidence of the health benefits of plant based diets then, we may argue that veg*ans, given a nutritionally sound diet, might reasonably expect better health, especially in relation to a lower risk of serious degenerative disease. From this perspective, a typical Western diet including animal products begins to appear more ascetic. If it is the case that poorer health and reduced life expectancy (Key *et al.*, 2003, p. 533) are consequent to an animal based diet, then choosing that diet may be interpreted as, literally, self-sacrifice. It may be argued that enhanced quality of life is an aesthetic good, as it permits a greater range of experience and opportunities to pursue pleasures. However, it might still be countered that the immediate gratification obtainable from consuming animal products outweighs any longer term costs. This leads to consideration of the second point, that veg*ans may be "forced" by circumstance to assume greater responsibility for preparing their own food.

As pointed out in the introduction to this paper, the pleasures of flesh eating include not only aesthetic judgements, but also pleasures of power and domination. However, meat and dairy consumption may be argued to be illusory forms of domination for the majority of consumers. The business of hunting, capturing, breeding, raising, killing, butchering, and increasingly, cooking, packaging and serving animal protein, are increasingly carried out by specialised industries (see Schlosser, 2002; Singer and Mason, 2006). Veg*anism therefore presents an opportunity to reassert control over one's own food practices and to develop creativity in the kitchen. The enhancement of practical culinary skills also offers the promise of an enhancement of sensual pleasures

of consumption. This is not to argue that creative cooking is the sole province of veg*ans, but given that veg*ans are largely free of the bland offerings of processed “fast” and convenience food (Wicks, 2004, p. 284), they are perhaps more likely to be. As Twigg (1979, p. 29) argues, “vegetarian food is typically chopped up, mixed together, undifferentiated; it is destructured”. The ubiquity of combining ingredients in veg*an cooking, as opposed to meals differentiated into segments (meat and two veg for instance), entails an infinite variety of possible combinations of flavours and textures.

Ultimately, a rational argument cannot arbitrate between a preference for the taste of meat or the taste of plant foods. However, as noted by Rozin *et al.* (1997, p. 68) experience as a veg*an often brings with it a “hedonic shift” through which meat ceases to be a thinkable food item. As one respondent puts it, “*I see a pile of fruit and think, ‘Oh I don’t like the look of that’ . . . It’s got to change its image*” (Goode *et al.*, 1996, p. 294, emphasis added). That change of image may be an aspect of becoming veg*an, such that ethical and aesthetic choices move in parallel. The reiteration of an ascetic discourse of veg*anism in social research obscures the possibility of exploring this issue. A more neutral language to describe veg*ans and veg*anism does exist in the research literature. McDonald (2000, p. 5), herself a declared ethical vegan, discusses how her respondents “adopted a vegan lifestyle”, and she sums up the experience of vegans as one of transformation towards becoming “self-directed, goal-directed learners” (McDonald, 2000, p. 12). This form of description does not implicitly invite judgments as to whether vegans ought either to be lauded or pitied for their dietary choices. The assertion of a hedonic discourse of veg*anism, based in its potential for affording aesthetic pleasures such as an improved quality of life, culinary inventiveness and variety of taste experiences, denies the applicability of the ascetic discourse of veg*anism.

Conclusion

This paper has illustrated the dominance of ascetic discourses of veg*anism in social research. It has also been argued that these discourses reveal more about assumptions about the relative aesthetic value of diets that are hierarchically structured in Western food cultures, than it does about the experiences of veg*ans. A hedonic discourse of veg*anism, based on the greater variety of plant foods eaten by veg*ans, and the greater level of culinary autonomy experienced by veg*ans, was then advanced as a counterweight to ascetic discourses. Further research is needed to investigate more precisely the comparative variety of veg*an and omnivorous diets, as well as the way in which the aesthetics of food are experienced differently over the course of dietary changes. In the mean time, automatic deployment of ascetic descriptions of veg*ans and veg*anism ought to be avoided. Much extant research employs rather loose definitions of vegetarianism and perhaps unsurprisingly finds evidence of difficulties adjusting to a meat-free diet among consumers who still eat some animal products, yet define themselves (or are included by researchers) as “vegetarians”. An ascetic discourse of veg*anism could only be legitimated by evidence of experiential sacrifice of aesthetic pleasure among long-term veg*ans. Without that legitimation, descriptive terms like “strict”, “restrictive”, “exclusion” or “omission” are best avoided.

Ethical veg*anism contains the challenge that eating meat (and other animal products) is a form of moral asceticism, a stunting of compassionate sensibilities, a form of ethical impoverishment. This paper further argues that a hedonic discourse of veg*anism reverses the taken-for-granted polarity of indulgence and denial in Western food cultures. This counter-discourse asserts the possibilities for enhanced pleasures that potentially flow from veg*anism. Given the mounting evidence of the benefits of veg*an diets: to human health, to the environment, to the well being of other animals, there is a pressing need to rectify the discursive disparagement of veg*anism as asceticism if it is to play a more prominent role in breaking the hold of meat and dairy over the stomachs of the Western world. A hedonic discourse of veg*anism may play a part in that process.

Note

1. I use the term “veg*an” to refer collectively to vegetarians and vegans and “veg*anism” to refer collectively to veganism and vegetarianism throughout.

References

- Adams, C. (2000), *The Sexual Politics of Meat (10th Anniversary Edition)*, Continuum, New York, NY.
- Beardsworth, A. and Bryman, A. (1999), “Meat consumption and vegetarianism among young adults in the UK: an empirical study”, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 101 No. 4, pp. 289-300.
- Beardsworth, A.D. and Bryman, A. (2004), “Meat consumption and meat avoidance among young people: an 11-year longitudinal study”, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 106 No. 4, pp. 313-27.
- Beardsworth, A.D. and Keil, E.T. (1992), “The vegetarian option: varieties, controversies, motives and careers”, *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 253-93.
- Beardsworth, A.D. and Keil, E.T. (1993), “Contemporary vegetarianism in the UK: challenge and incorporation”, *Appetite*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 229-34.
- Beardsworth, A., Bryman, A. and Keil, T. (2002), “Women, men and food: the significance of gender for nutritional attitudes and choices”, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 104 No. 7, pp. 470-91.
- Dietz, T., Frisch, A.S., Kalof, L., Stern, P.C. and Guagano, G.A. (1995), “Values and vegetarianism: an exploratory analysis”, *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 533-42.
- Fiddes, N. (1991), *Meat: A Natural Symbol*, Routledge, London.
- Fox, M.A. (2000), “Vegetarianism and planetary health”, *Ethics and the Environment*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 163-74.
- Goldsmith, O. (1999), “They pity, and eat the objects of their compassion”, in Walters, K.S. and Portmess, L. (Eds), *Ethical Vegetarianism: From Pythagoras to Peter Singer*, State University of New York Press, New York, NY, pp. 61-3.
- Goode, J., Beardsworth, A., Keil, T., Sherratt, E. and Haslam, C. (1996), “Changing the nation’s diet: a study of responses to current nutritional messages”, *Health Education Journal*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 285-99.
- Haddad, E.H. and Tanzam, J.S. (2003), “What do vegetarians in the United States eat?”, *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 78 No. 3, pp. 626-32.

- Hamilton, M. (2006), "Eating death: vegetarians, meat and violence", *Food, Culture and Society*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 155-77.
- Janda, S. and Trocchia, P.J. (2001), "Vegetarianism: toward a greater understanding", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 12, pp. 1205-40.
- Key, T.J., Appleby, P.N., Davey, G.K., Allen, N.E., Spencer, E.A. and Travis, R.C. (2003), "Mortality in British vegetarians: review and preliminary results from EPIC-Oxford", *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 78 No. 3, pp. 533-8.
- Leitzman, C. (2003), "Nutrition ecology: the contribution of vegetarian diets", *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 78 No. 3, pp. 657-9.
- Leneman, L. (1999), "No animal food: the road to veganism in Britain, 1909-1944", *Society and Animals*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 1-5.
- Lindeman, M. and Väänänen, M. (2000), "Measurement of ethical food choice motives", *Appetite*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 55-9.
- Lupton, D. (1998), *Food, the Body and the Self*, Sage Publications, London.
- McDonald, B. (2000), "Once you know something, you can't not know it: an empirical look at becoming vegan", *Society and Animals*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- McDonald, B., Cervero, R.M. and Courtenay, B.C. (1999), "An ecological perspective of power in transformational learning: a case study of ethical vegans", *Adult Education Quarterly*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 5-23.
- MacNair, R.M. (2001), "McDonald's 'empirical look at becoming vegan'", *Society and Animals*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 63-9.
- Marcus, E. (2001), *Vegan: The New Ethics of Eating*, 2nd ed., McBooks Press, New York, NY.
- Marcus, E. (2005), *Meat Market: Animals, Ethics and Money*, Brio Press, Boston, MA.
- Mason, J. and Finelli, M. (2006), "Brave new farm?", in Singer, P. (Ed.), *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp. 104-22.
- Maurer, D. (2002), *Vegetarianism: Movement or Moment?*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.
- Messina, V.K. and Burke, K.I. (1997), "Position of the American Dietetic Association: vegetarian diets", *Journal of The American Dietetic Association*, Vol. 97 No. 11, pp. 1317-21.
- Morris, C. and Kirwan, J. (2006), "Vegetarians: uninvited, uncomfortable or special guests at the table of the alternative food economy?", *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 192-213.
- Neale, R.J., Tilston, C.H., Gregson, K. and Stagg, T. (1993), "Women vegetarians: lifestyle considerations and attitudes to vegetarianism", *Nutrition and Food Science*, Vol. 93 No. 1, pp. 24-7.
- Patterson, C. (2002), *External Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust*, Lantern Books, New York, NY.
- Pimentel, D. and Pimentel, M. (2003), "Sustainability of meat-based and plant-based diets and the environment", *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 78 No. 3, pp. 660-3.
- Reijnders, L. and Soret, S. (2003), "Quantification of the environmental impact of different dietary protein choices", *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 78 No. 3, pp. 664-8.
- Rosenfield, J.H. (2002), *Vegan Stories*, The Vegan Society, St Leonards-on-Sea.
- Rozin, P., Markwith, M. and Stoess, C. (1997), "Moralization and becoming a vegetarian: the transformation of preferences into values and the recruitment of disgust", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 67-73.

- Sabaté, J. (2003), "The contribution of vegetarian diets to health and disease: a paradigm shift", *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 78 No. 3, pp. 502-6.
- Schleifer, H. (1999), "Images of death and life: food animal production and the vegetarian option", in Walters, K.S. and Portmess, L. (Eds), *Ethical Vegetarianism: From Pythagoras to Peter Singer*, State University of New York Press, New York, NY, pp. 221-31.
- Schlosser, E. (2002), *Fast Food Nation*, Penguin, London.
- Singer, P. (1995), *Animal Liberation*, 2nd ed., Pimlico, London.
- Singer, P. and Mason, J. (2006), *The Way We Eat and Why Our Food Choices Matter*, Rodale, USA.
- Smart, A. (2004), "Adrift in the mainstream: challenges facing the UK vegetarian movement", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 106 No. 2, pp. 79-92.
- Spencer, C. (1994), *The Heretic's Feast: A History of Vegetarianism*, Fourth Estate, London.
- Steinfeld, H., Gerber, P., Wassenaar, T., Castel, V., Rosales, M. and de Haan, C. (2007), *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options*, Food and Agriculture Association of the United Nations, Rome.
- Twigg, J. (1979), "Food for thought: purity and vegetarianism", *Religion*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 13-35.
- Wicks, D. (2004), "Humans, food and other animals: the vegetarian option", in Germov, J. and Williams, L. (Eds), *A Sociology of Food and Nutrition: The Social Appetite*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford.