

Introduction

Denialism in Environmental and Animal Abuse

Tomaz Grušovnik, Reingard Spannring,
and Karen Lykke Syse

Despite readily available facts and figures on climate change, environmental degradation, species extinction as well as animal suffering and death, we are still faced with the disbelief and inaction with respect to the existence, extent, and implications of the anthropogenic impact on the environment and non-human lives. The question about the barriers to pro-environmental behavior calls for complex answers. Although a copious amount of empirical and theoretical work has been carried out, the phenomenon remains difficult to grasp.

The oldest model explaining pro-environmental behavior, the “information deficit model,”¹ was developed in the early 1970s. It assumed a linear relationship between environmental knowledge, awareness, and concern on the one hand, and corresponding behavior on the other hand. From this rationalist perspective, lack of pro-environmental behavior would be remedied by education about environmental issues. This model was soon disproved by studies showing that an increase in knowledge and awareness did not lead to pro-environmental behavior. In their meta-analysis of the literature on pro-environmental behavior, or rather the lack of it, Kollmuss and Agyeman list internal factors such as biographic experience, motivation, environmental knowledge, attitudes, values, and awareness, as well as external factors such as institutional, economic, social, and cultural norms.² There can be various cognitive limitations to environmental awareness and behavior such as non-immediacy of many ecological problems, the protracted time frame of environmental change, and the complexity of systems. The affective side of environmental awareness, the emotional involvement that makes us care, depends on the ability to respond emotionally to an environmental problem. However, a caring response can be thwarted by resistance against information that does not fit our beliefs and mental frameworks and by information

that triggers troubling emotions such as fear, pain, sadness, anger, guilt, and helplessness. Strategies to manage this conflict and emotions include denial, rational distancing, apathy, and delegation.³ They imply the refusal to accept reality and one's own involvement and responsibility in the respective dilemma and prevent people from responding to it in an appropriate way.

The present collection focuses on "denialism" as an umbrella term for social, cultural, and psychological mechanisms that help individuals and societies continue with their lifestyles despite facts and figures that point to detrimental consequences of their actions for both the environment as well as lives of animals. While the first reflections of the phenomenon of willful ignorance appeared already in antiquity and were an important part of the philosophy of such thinkers as Saint Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Rousseau, Kant, and many others, the topic of denial started to feature prominently in the humanities, psychology, and other related disciplines only with Sigmund Freud. Freud used two terms for what is generally referred to as "denial," namely "Verleugnung" (disavowal) and "Verneinung" (negation). Even though his reflections still form an important part of the knowledge base in psychoanalytic theory,⁴ other authors and their work on denialism have received more attention in sociology and other branches of psychology, for instance the cognitive paradigm. Undoubtedly, Leon Festinger's *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*⁵ reframed how we understand "denialism" in the light of avoidance of sensitive information that threatens to undermine the consistency of our conceptual webs. Indeed, "cognitive dissonance" became an important theoretical vehicle for the explanation of environmental and animal denialism, as will become clear later in this volume, especially in Susanne Stoll-Kleemann's chapter. However, the interest in the concept of "denialism" has been rekindled in recent decades from a more sociological perspective with the publication of Stanley Cohen's classic *States of Denial*⁶ and Eviatar Zerubavel's *The Elephant in The Room*,⁷ to which Reingard Spannring and José De Giorgio-Schoorl's chapter title alludes. Cohen's analysis became prominent because of its political import and social implications. In it, Cohen famously analyzes three distinct forms of denial, literal (the claim that something is not true), interpretive (the facts are not denied but given a different meaning, for example, through euphemisms), and implicatory (failure to acknowledge the implications and to respond appropriately). They also play an important role in John Sorenson and Atsuko Matsuoka's chapter, as well as Opi Outhwaite's analysis in the present volume. Similar to Cohen, Zerubavel dedicated his research to social and political dimensions of denial, focusing specifically on the genesis of the conspiracy of silence about what is in front of everybody's eyes. In addition to that, social and evolutionary biology also attempted to shed light on denialism in our everyday lives: Robert Triver's *The Folly of Fools* is one such

brilliant example of explaining the roots of our self-deception that, according to Trivers, grow out of our evolutionary inclination to deceive others. In short, his argument is that by being self-deceived, a deceiver's behavior is less likely to give away typical clues that can be picked up by others.⁸

Because it is such an important vehicle to explain a wide variety of phenomena, it is unsurprising that denialism has also become prominent in environmental and critical animal studies. The history of denial of environmental problems is long and encompasses campaigns against the protection of natural areas and wilderness, the banning of synthetic pesticides such as DDT, and anti-science campaigns such as the cases denying acid rain and the ozone hole.⁹ Several fields have contributed to our understanding of the phenomenon.¹⁰ In the following section, we will briefly turn to four publications we deem particularly important.

Together with *Merchants of Doubt* by Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway, focusing on parallels between tobacco smoking and climate change, Kari Norgaard's *Living in Denial* is one of the most substantial monographs published on environmental denialism. Analyzing implicatory denial, Norgaard found people in Norway believed in climate change and expressed concern about it, yet they lived their lives as if it was not happening. This allowed people to protect themselves from troubling emotions such as the fear of loss of ontological security, helplessness, guilt, and the threat to their individual and collective identities.¹¹ Individual emotion management, however, is always embedded in a social context that prescribes norms of emotion and cognitive scripts of "thought prevention," "perspectival selectivity," and "selective interpretation." Accordingly, collective denial functions both as a "cultural tool kit" to keep disturbing information at bay, and also secures non-mobilization that contributes to reproduce political and economic power structures and dominant ideologies.¹²

Environmental scientist Haydn Washington and cognitive scientist John Cook's book, *Climate Change Denial. Heads in the Sand*, also provides an influential analysis of denialism with respect to climate science.¹³ They identify five types of denial arguments which claim that (a) scientific consensus on climate change is a "vast conspiracy to deceive,"¹⁴ (b) there is no scientific consensus based on statements of nonexperts, (c) climate models are unreliable, (d) climate change occurs naturally, and (e) there is scientific evidence for the deniers' view ignoring the mainstream thrust of evidence. Science denial and the denial industry squarely fit Cohen's concept of literal denial, while Cohen's interpretative denial is exemplified by governments and business that pretend to take or limit action to the "politically feasible."¹⁵ Drawing on discourse analyses, Washington and Cook further address the role played by the media that in the interest of sales figures and viewing rates project extreme minority opinions¹⁶ that allow readers and audience to turn

their gaze away, and cover up their ignorance of ecological complexities, dynamics, and values.

Arne Johan Vetlesen's book, *The Denial of Nature*, takes a more philosophical approach to environmental denialism, exploring, among other topics, the misplacement or misformulation of several theoretical dichotomies, including debates about instrumental versus intrinsic value of nature or culture versus nature. When pondering the "denial of nature," Vetlesen also points to a common misunderstanding, present also in some of the most prominent nature philosophers, such as J. Baird Callicott, namely that appropriate environmental action is not undertaken because "most of us are simply ill-informed."¹⁷ To the contrary, Vetlesen observes that the media attention given to environmental problematics seems to:

fail spectacularly when it comes to both (1) effecting a change in interest in environmental policies in general, and (2) effecting a change in people's behaviour. The researchers do find a correlation, but it is not the one Callicott would have us expect. Rather, it is the correlation between the expected increase in global temperature reported from the scientists and the increase in average holiday-related flights among, for example, Norwegians.¹⁸

Indeed, for Vetlesen it is hard for us to change our ways, especially if we have invested so much of who and what we are in our lifestyles that are now proclaimed unsustainable and consequently undesirable. As Vetlesen sees it, both theory as well as practice will have to be redefined and brought together to solve issues connected with this phenomenon. We invite readers to scrutinize the latest development in Vetlesen's thinking through his contribution to this volume.

When assessing the research in environmental denial in general, an overview of the literature prepared by Karin Edvardsson Björnberg, Mikael Karlsson, Michael Gilek, and Sven Ove Hansson is very helpful, showing that more than 100 papers were devoted to the issue in the last three decades. Nevertheless, there is still more work to be done to conclude and understand the peculiarities of denial, especially on environmental issues beyond climate change, particularly issues such as land and water, and biodiversity.¹⁹ Indeed, the identification of global warming as the most urgent ecological crisis could push other ongoing ecological and ethical disasters, their interconnections and underlying causes into the background. By allowing a focus on technical solutions and the salvation of humankind, it conveniently supports the denial of the role of the anthropocentric and speciesist industrial-consumer society that claims entitlement to the entire planet in the demise of the Earth—as Helen Kopnina, Joe Gray, Haydn Washington, and John Piccolo explicate in this volume.²⁰

This line of thinking is supported by a growing literature on the ceaseless commodification and exploitation of nonhuman animals. Authors rooted in animal ethics, critical animal studies, animal philosophy, and related fields use the concept of denialism, in particular to account for our increasing meat consumption and lack of empathy for the animals slaughtered in the industries despite the efforts of educators, activists, and academia²¹ to raise the awareness of the harsh realities of the “Animal Industrial Complex.” Indeed, several books have exposed the drastic consequences of ignorance, alienation, and distancing within the meat-processing industry and analyzed individual and collective denialism that help sustain our meat-intensive diets. In the mid-1980s, Noëlie Vialles’s pivotal work, *Le sang et la chair* (1987), offered her reflections on the separation of animals from the end product of the slaughterhouse, providing ample space for reflection of denialism in these contexts.²² In *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture*, Deborah Fitzgerald explains how preindustrial farms were turned into complex industrial systems, partly due to the harsh economic terms in the period between the World War I and the Great Depression.²³ Understanding the history of how animals have been commodified is important to comprehend how the alienation of animals and slaughterhouse workers has taken place, as Amy Fitzgerald later reflected.²⁴ Jennifer Dillard and Jocelyne Porcher exposed the devastating consequences that the alienation from animals can have for humans, especially those who for one reason or another are engaged in the slaughtering process.²⁵ In trying to explain the functioning of our meat-eating societies, Melanie Joy has established the concept “carnism,” thus labeling the carnivorous ideology that facilitates denialism and the management of cognitive dissonance.²⁶ In the present volume, John Sorenson and Atsuko Matsuoka, as well as Karen Lykke Syse and Kristian Bjørkdahl elaborate on the different aspects of denial related to meat production and consumption. Martin Lee Mueller and Katja Maria Hyde provide insights into denial in the salmon industry. While different forms of animal exploitation are widely criticized and analyzed as an interconnected phenomenon, not much research has explicitly used the concept to look into cases other than meat production and consumption.²⁷ Reingard Spanning and José De Giorgio-Schoorl therefore address the denial of horse subjectivity in a critical analysis of social science literature on human–horse relationships in this volume and Opi Outhwaite analyzes denialism among judges in habeas corpus cases on behalf of individual chimpanzees.

There are different discourses and movements grappling with the phenomenon of denialism with respect to climate change, conservation, and animal rights that do not always relate to one another without friction. However, many authors argue for a common vision of an ecologically just world and meaningful life in more-than-human communities²⁸ and for an intersectional

approach to social, ecological, and species justice.²⁹ The long history of the denial of animal minds, for example, is causally related to the destruction of the biosphere.³⁰ Presented in the mainstream discourse as stimulus-response-driven or genetically programmed automatons, who lack agency and experiential perspective, animals are the archetypal Other, inferior to humans and an object that can be exploited for work, consumer goods, entertainment, science, or killed and displaced at liberty. This instrumental relationship served as a blueprint for the subjection of Nature, which transformed “fish into fisheries, forests and trees into timber, animals into livestock, wildlife into game, mountains into coal, seashores into beachfronts, rivers into hydroelectric factories”³¹ and converted the animals’ homes into resources for unlimited human use and capitalist profit.

Denialism is an apt concept to scrutinize what and how human individuals and collectives ignore, marginalize, or actively foreclose in the realms of environmental and animal ethical issues. Following this line of thought, this volume seeks to provide a cutting-edge contribution to our understanding of denial with chapters from researchers in the natural and social sciences as well as the humanities, disclosing the multifaceted appearance of the concept by approaching it from different perspectives and in different settings. Since social, ecological, and species justice are so intimately interrelated, the chapters are not ordered along this differentiation, but rather according to disciplines, thereby foregrounding a variety of denialism processes and the richness of perspectives from which they can be illuminated.

The contributions start with Susanne Stoll-Kleemann’s (social-)psychological chapter. It explores altering forms of denial, which extend as far as moral disengagement, in relation to not shifting high-carbon lifestyles in light of the exacerbating climate crisis. Recent and earlier studies on the “psychology of denial” have shown that individuals regard such behavioral shifts toward a low-carbon lifestyle as extremely daunting and, therefore, deploy a number of moral-disengagement mechanisms. The chapter dives deeper into various theories, mainly from (social) psychology, which explain well why denial is still so persistent, particularly in relation to action denial. The majority of theoretical insights demonstrate convincingly the central but so far widely neglected role of emotions and self-interest in explaining continuing denialism and moral disengagement vis-à-vis established facts on damaging effects of high-carbon behavior. Further, key psychological concepts pertinent to denial are moral disengagement and motivated reasoning, which contribute to engendering a confirmation bias as well as a failure to achieve higher stages of moral development.

Taking the response (or lack of such) to climate change in Norwegian society as a case in point, Vetlesen’s chapter argues that the defense mechanism

of denial plays out among individual citizens in ways that are deeply structurally as well as culturally shaped. Examples are given to show how the Western culture of entitlement, in general, and powerful commercial players, in particular, shape, channel and exploit the individual's need to keep at bay the anxieties prompted by ongoing environmental degradation. The upshot is that expression in public of the anxieties in question (including anger and sadness) are suppressed for lack of support within the community. Mechanisms of relativization and alienation are shown to be key to how, say, the oil industry and international airliners manipulate the concerned citizen's attempt to cope with living in a society of organized denial.

Tomaž Grušovnik presents an argument that stresses the importance of existential anxiety with finitude as one of the factors of denialism of animal morality. The main argument of Grušovnik's chapter exposes how our uneasiness with our own mortality taints our reflection of animal morality and helps to deny it. Indeed, the problem of the existence of animal morality turns out to be largely an existential question, not a behavioral or even a psychological problem, as animals are namely culturally associated with finitude and remind humans of their own contingent and fragile existence. To avoid this awareness, we are prone to draw a conceptual demarcation line between "humans" on the one side of the ontological divide and "animals" on the other. This line then serves as what Grušovnik coins an "existential buffer zone," by offering humans an escape route when faced with awareness of impermanence: the notion of our belonging to "humanity" offers us an intellectual safe haven when faced with the impending end of our individual existence. His analysis of the notion of "uncanny proximity" argues that it is precisely because animals are so uncomfortably close to us that we seek to avoid awareness of our mortal animal existence. Grušovnik's chapter then exposes how "ethics" serves as that crucial concept which inaugurates and preserves the conceptual human–animal divide: by possessing the ability to lead an "ethical" life humans become beings of "spirit" and supposedly escape their animality which holds them captive in the world of mortals. Ascribing "moral life" to animals is thus to many theoreticians a sacrilegious idea that threatens to destroy cultural defense against premonitions of finitude and this is why the idea of animal morality may become unbearable.

Adam See provides a further philosophical analysis of denialism in the context of animal ethics. While comparative psychologists and philosophers of animal minds have traditionally been concerned with the threat of anthropomorphic bias, the twenty-first century has ushered in renewed emphasis on a related type of bias: *anthropodenial*, an epistemic predisposition to discredit evidence for mental continuity hypotheses. See's chapter references the philosophical and scientific literature on the theory of mind and shared intentionality to critically evaluate our argumentative strategies commonly used

to deny humanlike cognitive capacities to animals. The chapter concludes by critically addressing the tenacious influence of the “logical problem” as a de facto mode of animal minds skepticism, particularly in the literature on human cognitive uniqueness.

Craig Taylor’s chapter offers an explanation to why many of us seem impervious and unmoved by the enormous suffering of animals being raised for slaughter, the issue that both wounds and isolates the writer Elizabeth Costello in J. M. Coetzee’s *The Life of Animals*. As Taylor shows, it is not the fact that they suffer that we miss. Indeed, our sense of other humans is not founded on any thoughts we might have about cognitive capacities or nociception of our fellow humans. On the contrary, that another person is a human being, something that may become an object of moral concern, is founded on all of those immediate, natural, ways one reacts to others, ways of reacting that are not themselves based on prior thoughts we might have about others, but which partially constitute the conception of what it is to be a fellow human being. Drawing from Ludwig Wittgenstein’s later philosophy, Taylor shows that our attitude toward each other as moral beings is an attitude toward a soul. That is, we do not believe or have an opinion that others possess some magic “thing” like a soul, but we respond to them in such a way.

These natural modes of responsiveness partially constitute our conception of a shared kind of fellowship that might both ground and sustain moral relations between us. In this respect, Taylor argues that much of our sense of what it is to have a shared moral life with others is taken for granted, in ways rarely reflected upon. However, to reflect on them in the way that Taylor’s chapter encourages, let us understand what is missing in our moral relations with other animals; our shared (but importantly different) fellowship with them. The facts concerning our suffering and theirs rather than establish such fellowship obscure and deflect it.

Martin Lee Mueller and Katja Maria Hyde discuss denialism on the basis of an anthropological study on the salmon industry in Norway. Through the lens of the paradigm shift between Enlightenment and Enlivenment theory and practice, they interpret the organization of salmon farming and its epistemological and ontological implications, and argue that an industry marketed as “the future” of human–animal relationships—spearhead of the so-called blue revolution said to be currently underway—shows symptoms of a comprehensive, structural denial of lived reality. They document practices of denying the fishes’ outer and inner nature, of denying the commonwealth of ecological entanglements, and of denying nature’s tendency for steady-state housekeeping. Such practices alienate the human–animal life world both technologically and conceptually. What is at stake in contemporary farming practices is not merely a question of our attitude toward other living beings,

but more fundamentally, who these others are allowed to be. Against this background, the authors develop the tenets of future enlivened economic practices, practices that successfully disentangle, reject, and ultimately overcome the multiple structural denials of contemporary feedlot industries.

Karen Lykke Syse and Kristian Bjørkdahl offer historical insights into the changing presentation of meat in Norway between 1950 and 2015 and its implications for denialism in the context of meat consumption. Today's consumers meet meat in shapes that look nothing like the animal from which it was carved. In short, the removal of a reminder of origin allows us to forget, conceal, neglect, and deny the animal that this meat once was part of. How and why did we end up denying our consumption of animals at the point of retail? What was the significance of the transition from the butcher's shop to the supermarket? Lykke Syse and Bjørkdahl's chapter presents snapshots from the history of how meat has been presented and sold in the case of one particular country, Norway, from 1950 to 2015. Based on primary and secondary historical sources, they document how meat has been presented at various stages of this period, why and how changes were made, how those changes made themselves felt in the advertising of meat, and how the public responded to these changing forms.

John Sorenson and Atsuko Matsuoka's chapter contributes to the political economy of denialism by examining strategies of the animal industrial complex, using examples from the United States and the United Kingdom. Understanding institutionalized denialism means identifying vested interests with direct financial stakes in perpetuating exploitation and commodification of nonhuman animals. Ideas about consuming animals are shaped by massive agribusiness interests that invest billions of dollars in advertising and marketing efforts to influence consumers' attitudes and understanding, as well as lobbying and political spending to ensure that their activities can continue unimpeded by exposure from animal and environmental activists. Drawing on the work of sociologist Stanley Cohen, the authors identify rhetorical techniques and stories that mobilize preexisting cultural attitudes and practices and recast the endless killing as part of the natural order as primary vehicles of denial. In this way, animal suffering and death disappear as a problem and hindrance to further consumption. The chapter concludes that it is important to include animal rights in the imagining of "an alternative ethical landscape" shaped by "a sense of responsibility for the safety of others" and a commitment to justice—regardless of species.

Helen Kopnina, Joe Gray, Haydn Washington, and John Piccolo critically turn to a growing discourse in conservation and sustainability, which claims that, despite the clear evidence of human-caused biodiversity loss, and rapidly declining environmental indicators, nature is, in fact, thriving. They argue that there are many reasons to be skeptical of optimism

when it comes to conservation, and show that techno-eco-optimism is both misplaced and counterproductive for addressing society's great environmental challenges. Hence, they critique the ecologically dystopian future that would result from the strategies championed by techno-eco-optimists. Eco-optimism also disregards the broader ethical ramifications of species extinctions, being a strategy of denial. At the end the authors turn to an eco-realistic vision, presenting arguments for conservation grounded in ecological ethics.

Reingard Spannring and José De Giorgio-Schoorl examine how deep-rooted the objectification of horses is in the social science literature of horse-human relationships. Bringing the perspective of a critical and activist ethology into dialogue with the disciplinary approaches, concepts, and research practices applied in these studies of human-horse relations, a number of obstacles will be unveiled that reproduce the denial of horses as protagonists of their own life. These obstacles range from more visible anthropocentric and speciesist attitudes to some research-specific factors such as disciplinary blinkers, the concept of agency in itself and the lack of critical engagement with power relationships and their consequences. Together they corroborate a picture of horses who are tailored to fit our society and our desires as natural. The chapter sheds light on the necessity for a broader horizon, both intellectual and in terms of a practical ability to experience otherness and to create space for animal subjectivity. Subjectivity is thus not primarily a theoretical concept but an ethical foundation of what it means to be a subject and of the coexistence between horses and humans.

Finally, Opi Outhwaite draws attention to the increased engagement between law and "the question of the animal." As a discipline, law has tentatively recognized the "animal turn" while in legal practice an emerging jurisprudence addresses the position of animals in law, most prominently the possibility that animals be recognized as legal persons to afford individual nonhuman animals' certain legal rights. While an existing body of work has critiqued the merits and flaws of the legal and moral arguments raised, there has been little analysis of the ways in which judges in these cases approach these issues. This analysis is important because the law, including through judicial decision-making, has direct implications for the individual parties involved but also plays a role in shaping wider societal attitudes. At the same time, critical legal scholars recognize that law is not merely a neutral objective organizing force but can be a means of maintaining oppressive structures and hierarchies. This chapter brings new analytical insights to the field by applying the lens of denial to judicial decision-making in a series of related cases in which the writ of habeas corpus was sought on behalf of individual chimpanzees in order that their confinement may be challenged in court. An analysis indicates that three particular forms of denial can be

identified—legalism, distancing, and an appeal to higher authority. These tactics prevent the petitions from succeeding, even where the legal merits of the arguments are at times recognized and where individual judges have expressed their sympathy (but, ultimately, helplessness) to the situation.

NOTES

1. Jacquelin Burgess, Carolyn M. Harrison, and Petra Filius, “Environmental Communication and the Cultural Politics of Environmental Citizenship,” *Environment and Planning A* 30 (1998): 1445–60.

2. Anja Kollmuss and Julian Agyeman, “Mind the Gap: Why Do People Act Environmentally and What are the Barriers to Pro-Environmental Behavior?” *Environmental Education Research* 8, no. 3 (2002): 239–60.

3. Ibid.

4. For a detailed presentation of the concept of “denial” in psychoanalytic theory and practice, see Eli L. Edelstein, Donald L. Nathanson, and Andrew M. Stone, eds., *Denial: A Clarification of Concepts and Research* (New York, NY: Plenum Press, 1989). Also, Slavoj Žižek’s reflections of contemporary society and politics draw heavily from “disavowal” (see, for instance, the chapter “The Political and Its Disavowals” in his *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology* (London: Verso, 1999)).

5. Leon Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957).

6. Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial: Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001).

7. Eviatar Zerubavel, *The Elephant in The Room: Silence and Denial in Everyday Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

8. See Robert Trivers, *The Folly of Fools: The Logic of Deceit and Self-Deception in Human Life* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2011).

9. Paul Ehrlich and Anne Ehrlich, *Betrayal of Science and Reason: How Anti-Environmental Rhetoric Threatens Our Future* (New York, NY: Shearwater Books, 1998); Haydn Washington and John Cook, *Climate Change Denial: Heads in the Sand* (New York, NY: Earthscan, 2011).

10. Social psychology: see, for example, Susanne Stoll-Kleeman, Tim O’Riordan, and Carlo C. Jaeger, “The Psychology of Denial Concerning Climate Mitigation Measures: Evidence from Swiss Focus Groups,” *Global Environmental Change* 11, no. 2 (2001): 107–17; philosophy: see, for example, Arne Johan Vetlesen, *The Denial of Nature: Environmental Philosophy in the Era of Global Capitalism* (London: Routledge, 2015); Tomaž Grušovnik, “Environmental Denial: Why We Fail to Change Our Environmentally Damaging Practices,” *Synthesis Philosophica* 27, no. 1 (2012); sociology: see, for example, Kari Marie Norgaard, *Living in Denial. Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2011); linguistics: see, for example, Arran Stubbe, *Ecolinguistics: Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2015); ecocriticism: see,

for example, Brian Deyo, “Ecophobia, the Anthropocene, and the Denial of Death,” *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 26, no. 2 (2019): 442–55; ecofeminism: see, for example, Val Plumwood, “Ecofeminist Analysis and the Culture of Ecological Denial,” in *Feminist Ecologies. Changing Environments in the Anthropocene*, ed. Lara Stevens, Peta Tait, and Denise Varney (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); natural sciences: see, for example, Washington and Cook, *Climate Change Denial*; science studies: see, for example, Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway, *Merchants of Doubt. How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming* (New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press, 2010).

11. Norgaard, *Living in Denial*, 80.

12. *Ibid.*, 91–95.

13. Washington and Cook, *Climate Change Denial*.

14. *Ibid.*, 44.

15. *Ibid.*, 96.

16. *Ibid.*, 93–94.

17. Vetlesen, *The Denial of Nature*, 8.

18. *Ibid.*, 8.

19. See Karin Edvardsson Björnberg, Mikael Karlsson, Michael Gilek, and Sven Ove Hansson, “Climate and Environmental Science Denial: A Review of the Scientific Literature Published in 1990–2015,” *Journal of Cleaner Production* 167 (2017).

20. See also: Eileen Crist, “Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse,” *Telos* 141 (2007); Lynn White, “The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis,” *Science* 155, no. 3767 (1967).

21. Reingard Spannring and Tomaž Grušovnik, “Leaving the Meatrix? Transformative Learning and Denialism in the Case of Meat Consumption,” *Environmental Education Research* 25, no. 8 (2018).

22. Noëlie Vialles’s *Le sang et la chair*, was originally published in French in 1987 and appeared in English translation in 1994 as *Animal to Edible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

23. Deborah Fitzgerald, *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

24. Amy Fitzgerald, *Animals as Food: (Re)connecting Production, Processing, Consumption, And Impacts* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2015).

25. See Jennifer Dillard, “A Slaughterhouse Nightmare: Psychological Harm Suffered by Slaughterhouse Employees and the Possibility of Redress through Legal Reform,” *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy* 15, no. 2 (2008); Jocelyne Porcher, “The Relationship Between Workers and Animals in the Pork Industry: A Shared Suffering,” *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Ethics* 24 (2018).

26. Melanie Joy, *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows: An Introduction to Carnism* (Cork: Red Wheel Weiser, 2011).

27. On denialism in other areas of the instrumentalization of animals, for example laboratory experiments, fur farming, as well as leisure industry, see Tomaž Grušovnik

and Maša Blaznik, “Denied Relationship: Moral Stress in the Vocational Killing of Non-Human Animals,” in *Animals and Business Ethics*, ed. Nathalie Thomas (Dordrecht: Springer, forthcoming).

28. Paul Waldau, “Venturing beyond the Tyranny of Small Differences. The Animal Protection Movement, Conservation, and Environmental Education,” in *Ignoring Nature No More. The Case for Compassionate Conservation*, ed. Marc Bekoff (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2013); Josefine Donovan, “Sympathy and Interspecies Care: Toward a Unified Theory of Eco- and Animal Liberation,” in *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation*, ed. John Sanbonmatsu (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001).

29. David Nibert, *Animal Oppression and Human Violence. Domeseccration, Capitalism, and Global Conflict* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2013); Anthony J. Nocella II, John Sorenson, Kim Socha, and Atsuko Matsuoka, eds., *Defining Critical Animal Studies. An Intersectional Social Justice Approach for Liberation* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2014).

30. Eileen Crist, “Ecocide and the Extinction of Animal Minds,” in *Ignoring Nature no More. The Case for Compassionate Conservation*, ed. Marc Bekoff (London: University of Chicago Press, 2013).

31. *Ibid.*, 55.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Björnberg, Karin Edvardsson, Mikael Karlsson, Michael Gilek, and Sven Ove Hansson. “Climate and Environmental Science Denial: A Review of the Scientific Literature Published in 1990–2015.” *Journal of Cleaner Production* 167 (2017): 229–41. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.08.066.
- Burgess, Jacquelin, Carolyn M. Harrison, and Petra Filius. “Environmental Communication and the Cultural Politics of Environmental Citizenship.” *Environment and Planning A* 30 (1998): 1445–60.
- Cohen, Stanley. *States of Denial: Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.
- Crist, Eileen. “Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse.” *Telos* 141 (2007): 29–55.
- Crist, Eileen. “Ecocide and the Extinction of Animal Minds.” In *Ignoring Nature no More. The Case for Compassionate Conservation*, edited by Marc Bekoff, 45–63. London: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Deyo, Brian. “Ecophobia, the Anthropocene, and the Denial of Death.” *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 26, no. 2 (2019): 442–55.
- Dillard, Jennifer. “A Slaughterhouse Nightmare: Psychological Harm Suffered by Slaughterhouse Employees and the Possibility of Redress through Legal Reform.” *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy* 15, no. 2 (2008): 391–408.
- Donovan, Josefine. “Sympathy and Interspecies Care: Toward a Unified Theory of Eco- and Animal Liberation.” In *Critical Theory and Animal Liberation*, edited by John Sanbonmatsu, 277–94. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.

- Edelstein, Eli L., Donald L. Nathanson, and Andrew M. Stone, eds. *Denial: A Clarification of Concepts and Research*. New York, NY: Plenum Press, 1989.
- Ehrlich, Paul, and Anne Ehrlich. *Betrayal of Science and Reason: How Anti-Environmental Rhetoric Threatens Our Future*. New York, NY: Shearwater Books, 1998.
- Festinger, Leon. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Fitzgerald, Amy J. *Animals as Food: (Re)connecting Production, Processing, Consumption, and Impacts*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2015.
- Fitzgerald, Deborah. *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Grušovnik, Tomaž. "Environmental Denial: Why We Fail to Change Our Environmentally Damaging Practices." *Synthesis Philosophica* 27, no. 1 (2012): 91–106. https://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=139410&lang=en.
- Grušovnik, Tomaž, and Maša Blaznik. "Denied Relationship: Moral Stress in the Vocational Killing of Non-Human Animals." In *Animals and Business Ethics*, edited by Nathalie Thomas. Dordrecht: Springer, forthcoming.
- Joy, Melanie. *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows: An Introduction to Carnism*. Cork: Red Wheel Weiser, 2011.
- Kollmuss, Anja, and Julian Agyeman. "Mind the Gap: Why Do People Act Environmentally and What Are the Barriers to Pro-Environmental Behavior?" *Environmental Education Research* 8, no. 3 (2002): 239–60.
- Nibert, David. *Animal Oppression and Human Violence. Domesecration, Capitalism, and Global Conflict*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2013.
- Nocella, Anthony J. II, John Sorenson, Kim Socha, and Atsuko Matsuoka, eds. *Defining Critical Animal Studies. An Intersectional Social Justice Approach for Liberation*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Norgaard, Kari Marie. *Living in Denial. Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2011.
- Oreskes, Naomi, and Erik Conway. *Merchants of Doubt. How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press, 2010.
- Plumwood, Val. "Ecofeminist Analysis and the Culture of Ecological Denial." In *Feminist Ecologies. Changing Environments in the Anthropocene*, edited by Lara Stevens, Peta Tait, and Denise Varney, 97–112. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Porcher, Jocelyne. "The Relationship between Workers and Animals in the Pork Industry: A Shared Suffering." *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Ethics* 24 (2018): 3–17.
- Spanning, Reingard, and Tomaž Grušovnik. "Leaving the Meatrix? Transformative Learning and Denialism in the Case of Meat Consumption." *Environmental Education Research* 25, no. 8 (2018): 1190–99.
- Stibbe, Arran. *Ecolinguistics: Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2015.

- Stoll-Kleeman, Susanne, Tim O’Riordan, and Carlo C. Jaeger. “The Psychology of Denial Concerning Climate Mitigation Measures: Evidence from Swiss Focus Groups.” *Global Environmental Change* 11, no. 2 (2001): 107–17.
- Trivers, Robert. *The Folly of Fools: The Logic of Deceit and Self-Deception in Human Life*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2011.
- Vetlesen, Arne Johan. *The Denial of Nature: Environmental Philosophy in the Era of Global Capitalism*. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Vialles, Noëlie. *Animal to Edible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Waldau, Paul. “Venturing beyond the Tyranny of Small Differences. The Animal Protection Movement, Conservation, and Environmental Education.” In *Ignoring Nature No More. The Case for Compassionate Conservation*, edited by Marc Bekoff, 28–43. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Washington, Haydn, and John Cook. *Climate Change Denial: Heads in the Sand*. New York, NY: Earthscan, 2011.
- White, Lynn. “The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis.” *Science* 155, no. 3767 (1967): 1203–7.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. *The Elephant in The Room: Silence and Denial in Everyday Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Žižek, Slavoj. *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. London: Verso, 1999.