Meat Your Enemy
Animal Rights, Alignment and Radical Change

Whelan, Glen; Gond, Jean-Pascal

Meat Your Enemy: Animal Rights, Alignment and Radical Change

Glen Whelan and Jean-Pascal Gond

Journal article (Post print version)

Meat Your Enemy: Animal Rights, Alignment and Radical Change

Forthcoming in *Journal of Management Inquiry*

Glen Whelan*
Copenhagen Business School
gwh.ikl@cbs.dk

Jean-Pascal Gond
Cass Business School
Jean-Pascal.Gond.1@city.ac.uk

* Corresponding author.

Abstract

Radical change can be conceived in terms of the reconceiving of ontological distinctions, such as those separating humans from animals. In building on insights from French pragmatism, we suggest that, whilst no doubt very difficult, radical change can potentially be achieved by creating 'alignment' between multiple 'economies of worth' or 'common worlds' (e.g., the market world of money, the industrial world of efficiency). Using recent campaigns by animal rights organizations as our case, we show how the design of 'tests' (e.g., tests of profitability, tests of efficiency) can help align multiple common worlds in support for radical change. Our analysis contributes to the broader management and organization studies literatures by conceiving radical change in terms of changing ontological categorizations (e.g., human/animals vs. sentient/non-sentient); and by proposing that radical social change agents can be helpfully conceived as opportunistically using events to cumulatively justify the change they desire overtime.

Key-words: Alignment, Animal Rights, Common Worlds, Economies of Worth, Social Change.

Meat Your Enemy: Animal Rights, Alignment and Radical Change

It has recently been lamented that, despite being a key goal of many individuals and organizations, social change, and the moral and political understandings important thereto, remains largely ignored by management and organization scholars (Cloutier and Langley, 2013; Lawrence et al., 2013: 1029; Martí and Fernández, 2013). Accordingly, and given recurrent calls for recognizing French pragmatist sociology as a relevant 'lens' for organizational analysis in its own right (Diaz-Bone, 2009; Brandle et al., 2014; Gond, Cloutier & Leca, 2015a: 200), we seek to redress this lacuna by extending insights from Boltanski and Thévenot's (2006) 'economies of worth' framework. Most generally, we propose that rather than being limited to raising conflicts or seeking compromise between common worlds, as Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) suggest, organizations (and networks or individuals) that aim at radical change can also seek the 'alignment' of common worlds.

Different common worlds are characterized by different values and principles, different notions of (un)worthiness, different types of tests and phenomenal evidence, and by different sets of agents and subjects (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006: 216-346). The market, industrial and civic common worlds for instance, respectively measure success in terms of money, efficiency and social welfare, and respectively include such key actors as customers, engineers and citizens. Whilst common worlds are different, the presumption that they are "largely incompatible" (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006: 216; see also Boltanski, 2011: 28; Stark, 2011) has resulted in a general failure to recognize that, in addition to common worlds potentially being brought into relations of conflict and compromise, they can also potentially be brought into relationships of 'alignment'. Alignment emerges when different common worlds agree, or are "provoked" (Boxenbaum, 2014: 321-322) to agree by those with the requisite "competences" (Pernkopf-Konhäuser, 2014), that a given set of empirical developments is desirable in their own, unambiguous, terms.

When a film is a commercial success and the subject of critical acclaim for example – such as Francis Ford Coppola's *The Godfather*: which cost $6 million to make and grossed over $101 million within eighteen weeks of its 1972 release; and which also received three academy awards (Horne, 2009) – it brings the market and inspired common worlds into alignment. When, on the other hand, a film is only a commercial success, such as the 2009 release *Transformers: Revenge of the Fallen* (Sciretta, 2009); or only a critical success, such as the 1982 release *Blade Runner* (Keaton, 2013), then it does not bring the market and inspired worlds into alignment. As these simple examples illustrate, and further to their being different from both conflictual and compromised relations, relationships of alignment also differ from the monstrous or awkward common world "composite setups" that Boltanski and Thévenot (2006: 225-228) lampoon.

Key to our overall argument is the suggestion that, if a change is to be considered radical, then it needs to result in deeply or thoroughly habitualized (e.g., Bourdieu, 1977) practices and understandings undergoing some sort of ontological change or shift. Such shifts relate to transformations to what can be termed the "fiat boundaries" (Smith and Varzi, 2000: 403) that enable entire societies to make such distinctions as those between humans and animals (Latour, 2004) or humans and nature (Descola, 2013a). Historical examples of what we mean by radical change include the 16th century Valladolid controversy, in which Spanish Dominicans struggled with the rights of Indians in the colonies (Tierney, 1997: Chapter 11); the effective movement to abolish slavery in the 19th century (e.g., Ray, 1989); and the transformations brought about by women's suffrage in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Gullace, 2014). More currently, we propose that the animal rights movement should be conceived as having a radical agenda: for in undermining distinctions between humans and animals it upsets "the constitution of individual and collective identity; at least in the Western world" (Descola, 2013b: 82).

It is with the activities of animal rights organizations being used for illustrative purposes, then, that we here make four overlapping contributions to the organization and management literature on justification inspired by French Pragmatist Sociology, and, more generally, to institutional understandings of radical change. First, we propose that aligning common worlds comprises a central yet thus far overlooked type of "justification work" (Jagd, 2011; Oldenhof et al., 2013; Patriotta et al., 2011; Taupin, 2012) or "competence" (Dodier, 1993; Pernkopf-Konhäuser, 2014). More specifically, we propose that a key reason for the aligning of common worlds being so important is that it enables radical agents to diminish their opponents' capacity to use conflict or compromise between common worlds to maintain existing social policies and practices (Oldenhof et al., 2013; Taupin, 2012).

Second, we shed light on how radical agents mobilize 'tests' and material developments (Boltanski, 2012; Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006; Dansou and Langley, 2012) in what we conceive as their efforts to align common worlds in an opportunistic and cumulative manner. In doing so, however, we do not seek to prove that animal rights activists are consciously engaging in alignment work. Nor do we seek to show that such work has led, or will ultimately lead, to the radical transformation that animal rights activists' desire. Rather, we more modestly propose that the activities of animal rights activists will often be helpfully conceived in terms of the 'aligning', rather than the 'conflicting' or 'compromising', of common worlds.

Third, we advance the recent recognition that French pragmatic sociology can supplement existing perspectives on institutional pluralism and conflicts (e.g., Dansou & Langley, 2012; Patriotta et al., 2011). Most notably, we show how economies of worth can be mobilized as 'toolkits' (Thornton et al., 2012: 9, 42) to undermine, and potentially construct, a given set of norms (e.g., those regarding the appropriate treatment of animals) that are supported by a plurality of value perspectives, and that thus saturate a given society.

Fourth, we advance a social, broad and deep conception of radical change that we believe more accurately represents general understandings of radical, and that differs from alternative and influential conceptions of radical that are more 'narrowly' focused on the field/professional level (e.g., Greenwood and Hinings, 1996). In doing so, we also suggest that, rather than conceiving the analysis of changing ontological categories as lying at the extremes or margins of institutional and organizational analysis (Martí and Fernández, 2013), such changes should be conceived as lying at its heart: for it is such distinctions and categories that underpin, and contribute to interactions between, otherwise diverse and different institutional and organizational outlooks.

Regarding the paper's structure, we use the next section to quickly introduce the pragmatic turn in French sociology. In particular, we note that Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) propose that common worlds can be related in conflict, composite setups, and compromises, and that such relations are often actualized through "justification work" (Patriotta et al., 2011) or "tests" (Dansou & Langley, 2012). We then propose that by increasingly aligning common worlds, radical social change agents strengthen their own position, and weaken that of their opponents by reducing the number of common worlds that can be used to inform direct conflicts or ambiguous compromises directed against them.

So as to demonstrate the import of these theoretical developments, we then construct a case that shows how animal rights organizations can be helpfully conceived as having commonly sought to align their radical critique with the civic, industrial, fame and green common worlds. We also use this case to demonstrate that animal rights organizations can be helpfully conceived as using various opportunities to cumulatively justify the alignment of their radical critique with the green and industrial common worlds in particular. In concluding, we provide a discussion of our analysis and its limitations, and make some suggestions for future research.

FRENCH PRAGMATIC SOCIOLOGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

To more fully realize the potential of French pragmatist sociology for organizational analysis (Brandle et al., 2014; Diaz-Bone, 2009; Gond et al., 2015a), and in recognizing the risks of "conceptual borrowing" and of "blending" with institutional analysis (Boxenbaum, 2014; Bullinger, 2014; Cloutier and Langley, 2013; Gond and Leca, 2012), we undertake two tasks in the present section. First, we distinguish French pragmatism from 'critical sociology'. Second, we consider its implications for theorizing radical change.

The French pragmatic 'sociology of critique' differs from the French tradition of 'critical sociology' (e.g., Bourdieu, 1977) in three ways of particular importance for the present paper (Boltanski, 2012). First, it resists the assumption that sociologists are significantly more capable than non-sociologists (e.g., managers, mothers and fathers) when it comes to understanding everyday life (Boltanski, 2011: 21; Latour, 2004: 225). Contra the likes of Bourdieu (e.g., 1977: 164-165, 1984: 471), then, the sociology of critique does not consider everyday actors to suffer from some sort of doxa that (necessarily) prevents them from understanding the shape and limitations of the habitus informing their conceptual and practical activities (Boltanski, 2012). Thus, the sociology of critique suggests that Bourdieu (1977: 168-169) overstates the point when he proposes that the dominated (e.g., the proletariat, workers under neoliberalism, females suffering patriarchy) generally lack the "material and symbolic means of rejecting the definition of the real that is imposed on them through logical structures reproducing… social structures".

Second, the sociology of critique has descriptively focused on "situations where people engage in critique – that is, *disputes*" (Boltanski, 2011: 24, emphasis in original). This has involved identifying, observing and documenting 'critical moments' such as public denunciations of scandals or complaints (Boltanski, 2012; Boltanski et al., 1984; Boltanski

and Thévenot, 1999). Critical sociologists, on the other hand, have tended to focus on those critiques that they themselves engage in (for example, Bourdieu, 1998).

Third, and whereas critical sociologists emphasize that fields result in their participants sharing a more or less similar and generic habitus that limits and frames the forms of capital they value (Bourdieu, 1977), the sociology of critique has emphasized that actors are "competent" (Pernkopf-Konhäuser, 2014: 334-335) in that they can draw upon as many as eight 'common worlds'– i.e. the market, industrial, civic, domestic, inspired, fame, green and network worlds – in an effort to critique or defend existing policies and practices in the context of public disputes (e.g., Gond, Barin-Cruz, Raufflet & Charron 2015b; Guggenheim and Potthast, 2012; Patriotta et al. 2011). These 'common worlds' enable the 'same' phenomena – e.g., a managerial decision making process – to be (de)valued or (de)legitimated in different ways.

In presuming that common worlds are horizontally equivalent (i.e., no common world necessarily 'trumps' any other), and in presuming that they tend towards incompatibility (Boltanski, 2011: 28; Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006: 216; Stark, 2011), French Pragmatic Sociology has also emphasized that common worlds can be related in terms of conflict, composite setups, or compromise. Relationships of conflict (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: Chapter 7) involve discordance and disagreement, and are readily illustrated : e.g., the value the green common world places on environmental friendliness and future generations can easily be brought into conflict with the value the market world places on short-term financial gains (e.g., Gond et al., 2015b; Patriotta et al., 2011: 1810).

When common worlds are related in terms of "composite setups", on the other hand, they are less in conflict with each other than they are grouped in an "*awkward*" or "incongruous" fashion that results in the creation of such "monstrous hybrids" as the decision to "offer (domestic) a political tract (civic) as a gift to an employee", or the decision "to allocate

(civic) bouquets (domestic) to one's grandparents" (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 226). Composite setups, then, are often marked by either a naivety regarding context, or by a hubris regarding one's capacity to draw upon multiple common worlds to achieve one's ends.

Finally, French pragmatists have also suggested that common worlds can be melded together, rendered equivalent, and formed into a compromise, as when arguments from the domestic and market world are combined to propose that "a faithful friend is a solvent client" (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 277). Importantly, such "an equivalence is treated as self-evident; it is not made explicit. [For] In a compromise, the participants do not attempt to clarify the principle of their agreement…" (Ibid.). Furthermore, compromises effectively result in new common worlds being created: e.g., elements of the civic and industrial world can be used to construct a civic-industrial hybrid (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 285-292).

Given the presumption that social arrangements are uncertain, that reality is fragile (Boltanski, 2011: 54), work in the French pragmatist tradition posits that a major task of "justification work" is to contribute to the maintenance of existing, or the construction of new, and constantly shifting, compromises (Patriotta et al., 2011; Taupin, 2012). Whilst it is (implicit) ambiguities that make such compromised relations possible in the first instance (Huault & Rainelli-Weiss, 2011; cf., Flyverbom, 2011: 81; Stark, 2009: 191-195), it is also what results in the possibility of their dissolution (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 278-281).

Prominent recent examples of common world compromises are corporate social responsibility (CSR) (e.g., Blowfield, 2005): a market, industrial, civic and (shallow) green common world hybrid; and environmental management (e.g., Prasad & Elmes, 2005) and sustainable development (e.g., Banerjee, 2003): both of which are market, industrial and (shallow) green common world hybrids. All three of these common world compromises are the result of a melding of the actors, norms, tests, and so on, of the common worlds they respectively combine. CSR policies and practices, for example, commonly bring together

businesses concerned with profitability (from the market common world), non-governmental organizations concerned with human rights and social welfare (from the civic common world), non-governmental organizations concerned with sustainability and the environment (from the (shallow) green common world), and other organizations concerned with ensuring accountability and transparency (from the civic common world once again).

Such compromises are also marked by the emergence of hybrid measures of success. Thus, the emergence of CSR is associated with a significant range of slightly different metrics that help to determine the relative (un)worthiness of different corporate actors (e.g., Déjean, Gond & Leca, 2004; Waddock, 2008). In the terminology of French pragmatism, these metrics act as "reality" or "reformist" tests (Boltanski, 2011: 103): for they reinforce and develop the notion of the common good central to the CSR common world compromise.

The ambiguity at the heart of common world compromises like CSR (Kamzi, Leca & Naccache, 2015), however, means that they can also be made the subject of "existential" or "radical" tests (Boltanski, 2011: 103) that 'purely' draw upon the common worlds they combine. Those that identify with a (deep) green common world outlook (e.g., Naess, 1989), for example, can employ notions of worth that value the natural world in and of itself to conflictually undermine the common world compromises of CSR, environmental management or sustainable development: all of which only superficially engage with a green common world ethic (Prasad & Elmes, 2005).

What the French pragmatism literature suggests, then, is that the beneficiaries of an existing social order will try to maintain it by creating compromises that meld multiple common worlds or normative agendas (e.g., financial, efficiency and social considerations), and that they simultaneously hope will reduce the number of common worlds that can be conflictually deployed against them (e.g., Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: Boltanski, 2011;

Blokker, 2011; Gond et al, 2015b; Patriotta et al., 2011). This basic recognition provides a starting point for the analysis of radical social change agendas.

ALIGNING ORDERS OF WORTH FOR RADICAL SOCIAL CHANGE

Radical social change is here conceived as involving beliefs, values and conceptions that are both 'deep' and 'wide'. In writing of phenomena being 'deep', we follow the 'critical sociology' literature more than the 'sociology of critique' literature, and refer to the fact that different beliefs, values and conceptions can be strongly habitualized (Bourdieu, 1977), and can remain more or less unquestioned by both the scholarly and non-scholarly communities. Prior to the Copernican revolution, beliefs regarding the earth's centrality within the universe appear to have been very deep (e.g., Kuhn, 1996: Chapter 7). And in present day Western societies, beliefs regarding differences between (sentient) humans and (unthinking) matter are also very deep (e.g., Descola, 2013a).

By writing of 'wide', on the other hand, we refer to the fact that different beliefs, values and conceptions can also be more or less popular. Christian fundamentalists within the United States, for example, have been very deeply opposed to the theory of evolution over the last thirty years (Miller, Scott & Okamoto, 2006). The fact, however, that 71% of adults aged under 30 in the United States now think that evolution is true, suggests that creationist beliefs are having an increasingly narrow influence (Gross, 2015). Beliefs regarding differences between (sentient) humans and (unthinking) matter, by way of contrast, appear to remain both 'deep' and 'wide': e.g., both Christian fundamentalists and the rest of Western society tend to unthinkingly presume that the internal experiential reality of human kind is superior to whatever experiences matter, nature, or animals, are presumed to have.

This deep and basic assumption underpins the widespread practice of using animals as means for human ends: e.g., the use of beagles and cats in cosmetic and medical experiments; the eating of cows, pigs, ducks and fish; the skinning of animals to produce fur and leather;

the racing of greyhounds; the 'petting' and 'zooing' of animals. On the other hand, it is also why (most) humans find slavery, rape and murder (of other humans) abhorrent.

In trying to change such wide and deep conceptions – and the policies and practices that they inform (and that subsequently inform them) – animal rights activists face considerable difficulties. In everyday practice, this is revealed by the suggestion that the worst criminals dehumanize their (human) victims or treat them like animals (Martí and Fernández, 2013; cf. Patterson, 2002; Spiegel, 1996). Moreover, it is revealed by the manner in which children are taught to make important distinctions between animals and humans before they can clearly articulate them: e.g., they are taught that biting (into) dead animals and eating them is ok, but that biting, let alone eating, other (dead) humans, is not. As they get older, children are also taught, more formally and explicitly, that animal products are part of a healthy diet (e.g., the United States Department of Agriculture's current 'MyPlate' initiative).

As radical can be defined in different ways, we emphasize that our conception is broadly consistent with dictionary definitions of the term: e.g., as "thoroughgoing or extreme" change (dictionary.com). Moreover, we note that our definition resonates with Hache and Latour's (2010: 313) suggestion that radical critics seek to make "an extension of the class of [morally valuable] beings", and that it also resonates with the manner in which Boltanski (2011: 109) writes of existential change: e.g., of a woman who murders her son being transformed into a woman who commits euthanasia. On the other hand, we note that our conception of radical is more thoroughgoing than that advanced by institutional theorists, who have tended to write of radical with regard to relatively narrow transformations in such fields as the business service professions (e.g., Greenwood and Hinings, 1996; Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings, 2002).

By definition, then, we conceive of radical change agents as confronting a popular force that perceives a strong interest in maintaining the status quo. More pointedly, and in addition to being able to create conflicts and compromises, we propose that radical activists can try to

align common worlds to achieve their ends. As noted in the preceding section, common worlds are brought into conflict when they are used to generate different value judgements about the same phenomena (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006: 218), and into compromise when clashes between them are suspended or overlooked to enable their compositional support of the same phenomena (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006: 277-288). By way of contrast, we propose that common worlds are brought into alignment when they simultaneously value the same phenomena in accord with their own, separate, internal logics. Moreover, and as table 1 summarizes below, we propose that the alignment of common worlds differs from the construction of composite setups on the basis of their being marked by unanimity between common worlds, and not their mismatch.

Table 1: Four Types of Common World Relations

Relations	Descriptors
Common World Conflicts are characterized by *antagonism* between two or more common worlds. For example, the 'inspired world' of art can conflict with the 'market world' due to the latter's "subjection to money" (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 239), and the obscuring of creative inspiration associated with being a 'sell out'.	confront, tension, resistance , different nature, foreign, disagreement, clash, denunciation (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 216-217, 223-225).
Common World Composite Setups are characterized by a *mismatch* between common worlds. A "machine operator" offering a gift to an "expert" that has come to analyse the machine the operator works on, provides a clear illustration of an 'ugly' combination of the 'industrial world' and the 'domestic world' (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 239).	monstrous, awkward, anxiety, disparate, incongruous, troubling, strange (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 216-217, 225-227, 277).
Common World Compromises seek to avoid conflicts between common worlds by refusing to privilege one common world over another, and by agreeing to *negotiate some sort of fragile agreement* between them. Compromises between the 'domestic world' and 'market world' are commonplace. For example, a bank employee is likely to suggest to 'clients/friends' that "a faithful friend is a solvent client" (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 278). 'Clients/friends', on the other hand, might respond that a a good friend 'pulls strings' to overcome any such concerns.	come to terms, suspend a clash without settling it, equivalence, ambiguous, general interest, common good, work out, stabilize, build bridges (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006: 277-281).
Common World Allignments are characterized by unforced *unanimity* between common worlds; by harmonious agreement between common worlds in their own terms. A good example of such alignment is when a work produced entirely within the 'inspired world' (e.g., an album relased by a hitherto underground musician) or 'industrial world' (e.g., an electric car produced by a devoted and single-minded engineer) subsequently proves to be very, very profitable (and thus consistent with the 'market world').	overdetermined justification, common world agreement, plural consensus.

Through aligning common worlds, radical agents can increasingly minimize the capacity for incumbent beneficiaries of a status quo to conflictually deploy specific common worlds against their critique on the one hand, and to (re)create complex common world compromises that help maintain the status quo on the other. This second capacity in particular, is of fundamental importance to the maintenance of extant policies, practices and normative values (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006). Accordingly, we suggest that there are good reasons for thinking that the activities of radical activists will often be helpfully conceived in terms of the alignment of common worlds, and in terms of their diminishing the ability of incumbent beneficiaries to ambiguously combine common worlds in variable compromises.

Whilst it is possible to imagine a given task of alignment occurring instantaneously, the nature of radical change means that it will only ever be concretely realizable *overtime*. Indeed, we propose that, as the 'weight of history' favours reproduction of the status quo (e.g., the notion of path dependency), agents of radical change will often need to wait for, seek out, or enable, material developments that change the results of common world 'tests' (Cloutier and Langley, 2013; Gond et al., 2015b).

The Napoleonic Wars and the emergence of industrial capitalism, for example, provided material developments that diminished the worth of British colonial slave labour, relative to free wage labour, when subject to civic and market tests in the early nineteenth century (Davis, 1987). In a broadly similar fashion, the First World War made it easier for suffragists to demonstrate the equal worth of women (to men) through various civic and market tests in the early twentieth century (Gullace, 2014).

Given such considerations, we propose that radical change agents can be helpfully conceived as seeking to align common worlds in an opportunistic and cumulative manner. In writing of an opportunistic element, we simply note that radical change agents can make use of events or world happenings that they have not designed (Hoffman & Occasio, 2001). For

example, the Napoleonic Wars and First World War were not designed by abolitionists and suffragists respectively, but nevertheless provided them with opportunities by which to further their respective radical agendas. The cumulative element, on the other hand, refers to how radical change agents can use opportunities to successively build up a collection of tests within a given common world. The history of science, which shows that it is a critical mass of tests, rather than 'one black swan', that leads to the development of a paradigm changing scientific theory (Kuhn, 1996), points towards the importance of such accumulation.

In light of such, we propose that agents of radical change similarly need to construct and undertake, a succession of "state of worth tests" (Dansou and Langley, 2012: 511-512) or "truth tests" (Boltanski, 2011: 106) within a given common world if they are to prove capable of aligning it with their radical agenda. Most simply, we suggest that one 'state of worth' test will in effect never result in a given set of deep and wide social practices being deemed illegitimate from the perspective of a given common world.

AN ILLUSTRATIVE CASE: ANIMAL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

To illustrate that agents of radical change can be helpfully conceived as seeking to align common worlds in an opportunistic and cumulative manner, we now detail a case on animal rights organizations and their radical social change objective. Before doing so, however, we emphasize a number of methodological considerations that contextualize and help explain the case that follows. First, the case has contributed to, and is used to illustrate, the above described conceptual developments. This admittedly 'circular' role of evidence is generally consistent with abductive approaches to theorizing: for abductive conceptual developments are motivated by the need to explain empirical developments that extant conceptual developments struggle with (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007).

Second, the evidence we have collected does not seek to prove that animal rights activists have or will successfully bring about the changes they desire, and does not aim to show that animal rights activists have hitherto conceived of what they are doing in terms of alignment. Rather, the evidence we have collected is meant to show that the activities of animal rights activists can be revealingly conceived in terms of alignment. This concern with concept illustration is widespread throughout management and organization studies (e.g., Schoeneborn, Blaschke and Kaufmann, 2012: 439-446). Moreover, it is entirely consistent with the 'soft' theoretical developments that one finds in French pragmatist writings (e.g., Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006): which are more concerned with conceptualization than they are with constructing 'hard', falsifiable, causal analyses (e.g., Eckstein, 1975).

In gathering our data – and as is common in both discursive and historical research (e.g., Lawrence and Phillips, 2004; Prasad et al., 2014), and in work informed by French Pragmatist Sociology (e.g., Gond et al., 2015b; Patriotta et al., 2011; Ramirez, 2013) – we first collected secondary data from various sources, including the websites of animal rights organizations. This enabled us to identify key events of particular significance to the present analysis. With such events providing our focus, we were then able to collect additional secondary data – e.g., newspaper reports, artefacts used in campaigns – to obtain more detailed empirical evidence about alignment work.

Animal Rights Organizations as Radical Change Agents

Animal rights organizations have a radical agenda. They seek to disrupt the deeply institutionalized (Western) distinction that is drawn between humans and (other) animals (Descola, 2013a, Latour, 2004), and propose that in most important ways, humans and animals are morally equivalent. In particular, they emphasize that just as humans have experiential realities (Regan, 2004) within which they can experience pain and pleasure (Singer, 1995), so too do animals.

These core arguments for animal rights take various forms and are informed by various (and commonly opposed) philosophical traditions. Regan (2004) for example, adopts a broadly Kantian line when he argues that animals are "subjects of a life" that have inherent value and "rights", whereas Singer adopts a utilitarian line in arguing that animals need to be "liberated" from pain and suffering (Singer, 1995). Despite the often considerable and, depending on the context, very important, philosophical differences between these and other arguments for animal rights – e.g., Adams' (1990) feminist and critical perspective, or Patterson's (2002) and Spiegel's (1996) more anthropological and discursive arguments – what all such variously styled arguments have in common, is that they can be situated within what Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) conceive of as the civic common world. The reason why is that they all construct a community within which humans and animals have equal moral standing in fundamentally important regards. Thus, and just as humans cannot be killed or enslaved for food, clothing, or entertainment, actors for animal rights – such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), a non-government organization with more 3 million members and supporters; and the "by any means necessary" Animal Liberation Front (ALF) – generally emphasize "that animals are not ours to eat, wear, experiment on, or use for entertainment" (PETA, 2014a).

In constructing this community, animal rights organizations such as PETA and Vegetarians' International Voice for Animals (Viva!) act as 'spokespeople' (Callon, 1986; Latour, 2004: 64) for animals who cannot speak by themselves. Whilst this inability of animals to speak for themselves points towards an important distinction between (many) humans and animals in general, it should not be overstated (Callon, 1986; Callon and Latour, 1981; Latour, 2004: 70). Indeed, it is commonplace for humans to speak for other humans that currently cannot, or will never have, the capacity to speak at all (e.g., those suffering

from severe physical or mental disturbances). Nevertheless, we also recognize that spokespeople can betray those they claim to represent (Latour, 2004: 65).

Whilst there can be overlap between what are referred to as the animal rights and animal welfare movements respectively, it is important to distinguish between them. As already indicated, the animal rights movement has a radical agenda: it is (categorically) opposed to the use of animals for human ends. This means that animal rights activists like ALF, PETA and Viva! are opposed to the consumption of meat, fish and dairy, the use of leather and wool, and are (generally) opposed to vivisection. The animal welfare movement, by way of contrast, has a reformative agenda: for it only seeks to ensure that animals are treated better or more 'humanely', and is non-abolitionist when it comes to animals being used as means for human ends (e.g., Marcus, 2005). The RSPCA (the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) is a classic example of an animal welfare organization, in that it only encourages people to be 'kinder' to animals (that will often get killed). Indeed, the RSPCA (2016) supports a range of 'RSPCA Assured' meat products (e.g., beef, chicken, veal), and lists McDonalds as one of its partners. Suffice it to note that PETA considers such an assurance scheme "meaningless as far as animal welfare goes" (PETA UK, 2016).

Further to the above noted tools of philosophical and theoretical reasoning that animal rights organizations deploy to morally justify the equality of humans and animals within the civic common world, animal rights organizations also commonly seek to align their radical agenda with at least three other common worlds: i.e. the industrial, fame and green worlds. In terms of the first of these worlds, we quickly note that animal rights organizations have continuously emphasized that the production and consumption of animals for food and clothing is inefficient. Most generally, animal rights organizations continuously emphasize that animal products are inefficient in terms of human health (e.g., by emphasizing links

between animal products and heart disease) and resource usage (e.g., by emphasizing the purportedly huge levels of water consumption that are required to turn animals into food).

The common world of fame, on the other hand, is often appealed to through the advertising, marketing, and public relations activities of animal rights organizations. PETA for example, are currently endorsed or supported by such celebrities as Paul McCartney of the Beatles, comic and TV host Ellen Degeneres, comic Ricky Gervais, actress Pamela Andersen, and actor Joaquin Phoenix. In arranging such endorsements, PETA act on the widespread belief that people wish to replicate the values and practices of celebrities they identify with (e.g., Basil 1996; Cashmore 2006; Fraser and Brown 2002). Nevertheless, we also note that PETA's infamous use of female celebrities and (naked) 'attractive' women has its critics (e.g., Papon, 2012).

Finally, we highlight that animal rights organizations also commonly deploy tests and notions of (un)worthiness from the green common world to justify their objectives. As PETA (2014b) succinctly put it:

> …raising animals for food damages the environment more than just about anything else that we do. Whether it's… global warming, massive water or air pollution, or soil erosion, raising animals for food is wreaking havoc on the Earth.

THE WORK OF ALIGNING COMMON WORLDS

We now present some of the alignment activities that animal rights organizations have undertaken, focusing in particular on how they have mobilized material developments, artefacts and tests. As animal rights organizations are most clearly associated with the civic common world (and the philosophical arguments associated therewith), we outline some of the alignment work they have undertaken with regard to the industrial and green common worlds, two worlds they are less obviously associated with.

Aligning Orders of Worth from the Industrial World

According to Boltanski and Thévenot (2006: 204-205), the "ordering of the industrial world is based on the *efficiency* of beings, their *performance*, their *productivity*… *Waste*, *spoilage*, *rejects*, *pollution*, *deterioration*… are all *negative* signs of worth…" As PETA's 'Feeding the Future' (2011a) poster illustrates for example, animal rights activists commonly propose that the production and consumption of animal products is grossly inefficient, and thus incompatible with 'orders of worth' in the industrial world.

Like Singer's (1995) argument for "animal liberation", contemporary arguments opposed to the inefficiencies of meat production are utilitarian in form. Furthermore, they are often traced back to the publication of *Diet for a Small Planet* by Frances Moore Lappé in 1971. In this work, Lappé castigated meat production for being wasteful and for contributing to food scarcity. Animal rights organizations continue to advance broadly similar arguments in an opportunistic and cumulative manner. Further to their 'Feeding the Future' poster, then, PETA (2014c) currently use their website to note that:

> Raising animals for food is grossly inefficient, because while animals eat large quantities of grain, soybeans, oats, and corn, they only produce comparatively small amounts of meat, dairy products, or eggs in return. This is why more than 70 percent of the grain and cereals that we grow in… [the United States] are fed to farmed animals.

In making such claims, PETA commonly reference both individuals and organizations that others would consider experts. Regarding the issue of water for example, they write that:

> Nearly half of all the water used in the United States goes to raising animals for food. In 2008, John Anthony Allan, a professor at King's College London and the winner of the prestigious Stockholm Water Prize, urged people worldwide to go vegetarian because of the tremendous waste of water involved with eating animals.

> It takes more than 2,400 gallons of water to produce 1 pound of meat, while growing 1 pound of wheat only requires 25 gallons. You save more water by not eating a pound of meat than you do by not showering for six months! (PETA, 2014c)

And in referring to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization this time (Steinfeld et al., 2006), PETA employs a similar tactic by noting that:

According to the United Nations, raising animals for food (including land used for grazing and land used to grow feed crops) now uses a staggering 30 percent of the Earth's land mass. More than 260 million acres of U.S. forest have been cleared to create cropland to grow grain to feed farmed animals, and according to scientists at the Smithsonian Institution, the equivalent of seven football fields of land is bulldozed worldwide every minute to create more room for farmed animals. (PETA, 2014c)

A less intuitive effort that PETA has made to align their agenda with the industrial order of worth involves their promotion of *in vitro* meat (PETA, 2014d), or shmeat (sheets of lab-grown meat). Shmeat builds upon developments in tissue engineering, and has advanced rapidly since the turn of the century. Further to other actors, e.g. NASA, the Dutch Government (Macintyre, 2007), PETA has played a role in actively encouraging the development of shmeat through "the ongoing promotion of the technology; a $1 million prize to whoever first sells a significant quantity… in the United States; and its funding of a three-year post-doc research post at an American university [the University of Missouri]" (Stephens, 2013: 175). Although PETA's efforts to promote the commercialization of shmeat clearly involves market orders of worth, there is a general consensus that – as the commercialization of shmeat is still some time off (perhaps 20 years); and because the scientists involved are less motivated by business than they are research – these specific efforts are best conceived as promoting science (Engber, 2008; Schwartz, 2008).

Within this broader context, PETA's founder Ingrid Newkirk (2013) has suggested that the 5th of August 2013 will be remembered as a momentous day. The reason being that it was on this day that Professor Mark Post of the University of Masstricht first cooked, served to others, and himself ate, "the world's most expensive hamburger, made from meat grown in Petri dishes in his lab" (Jha, 2013a). The hamburger cost £250,000 pounds, was the culmination of five years of research, and provided a "proof of concept" (Jha, 2013b).

This hamburger provides a fundamentally important "state of worth" (Dansou and Langley, 2012: 511-512) or "truth" (Boltanski, 2011: 106) test: for it demonstrates the

material viability of *in vitro* meats. To borrow some famous words from Winston Churchill, it points towards humanity's possible escape from "the absurdity of growing a whole chicken in order to eat the breast or wing, by growing these parts separately under a suitable medium" (Churchill, 1931, para. 12).

Aligning orders of Worth from the Green World

In 2006 the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) released a report entitled *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options* (Steinfeld et al., 2006). As evidenced by their continuing reference to it, this report has proven a watershed moment for animal rights organizations (e.g. PETA, 2014e; Viva!, 2014). The report states that:

> The livestock sector emerges as one of the top two or three most significant contributors to the most serious environmental problems, at every scale from local to global…. it should be a major policy focus when dealing with problems of land degradation, climate change and air pollution, water shortage and water pollution and loss of biodiversity. (Steinfeld et al., 2006: xx)

By clearly linking so many environmental concerns to the livestock sector, the FAO report proposes that the use of animals for human food is inconsistent with the environmental 'mode of evaluation' associated with the green common world (Thévenot et al., 2000). Whilst, all of the environmental concerns raised by *Livestock's Long Shadow* are important for the green common world, the report's suggestion that the "livestock sector is …responsible for 18 percent of greenhouse gas [GHG] emissions … a higher share than transport" (Steinfeld et al., 2006: xxi), has garnered the most attention and controversy (e.g., Fairlie, 2008).

Although the FAO has subsequently revised their headline figure down to "14.5 percent of human-induced GHG emissions", they continue to acknowledge that "the livestock sector plays an important role in climate change" (Gerber et al., 2013: xii). More broadly, a variety of studies suggest that greenhouse gas emissions would be significantly reduced by the widespread adoption of a vegan diet. Eshel and Martin (2006) for example, conclude that if a

person eating the 'mean US diet' (comprised of meat, dairy and other food products) were to adopt a vegan diet, then they would reduce their GHG emissions by 6.2%.

It is within this broader context that PETA has taken the opportunity of subjecting a number of prominent individuals and organizations that are purportedly committed to addressing climate change to "state of worth tests" (Dansou and Langley, 2012: 511-512) or "truth tests" (Boltanski, 2011: 106). Perhaps most notably, and following on from his 2006 climate change 'call to action' film and book, *An Inconvenient Truth*, PETA has subjected former US Vice-President Al Gore to an on-going test of his Green credentials.

The test began in 2007 when PETA proposed that Gore's own inconvenient truth was that the quickest way by which to reduce GHG emissions was through diet change, and subsequently asked in a graphical and well publicised manner, whether or not Gore was 'too chicken to go vegan?'.

PETA subsequently deployed a "sexy mother earth" to a Gore book signing in 2009, and remonstrated that Gore's "hypocritical addiction to meat is getting in the way of his call to go green". And following Gore's (2011) critique of President Obama's climate change policies, PETA's Executive Vice President Tracy Reiman wrote a letter to Gore stating that:

> As you know, going vegan will help reduce animal suffering, your waistline, *and* your impact on the planet, so it's a win-win situation for everyone… After all, it wouldn't do to challenge the president's 'climate of denial' while ignoring your own book's excellent advice. (PETA, 2011b)

Finally, PETA congratulated Gore on his recent decision to go vegan (Eilperin, 2013) when they wrote that:

> We knew it would happen. No one who cares about climate change as much as Al Gore does can continue to support one of the leading causes of the phenomenon: factory farming. His Live Earth benefit concerts promote going vegan, and now Al Gore himself has made the switch to a plant-based diet. (Kretzer, 2013)

Importantly, PETA have long applied similar tests to other actors (e.g. PETA, 2008). Most recently, they have publicly endorsed the 2014 film *Cowspiracy*, which, much like *Livestock's Long Shadow*, emphasizes that:

> Animal agriculture is the leading cause of deforestation, water consumption and pollution, is responsible for more greenhouse gases than the transportation industry, and is a primary driver of rainforest destruction, species extinction, habitat loss, topsoil erosion, ocean "dead zones," and virtually every other environmental ill. Yet it goes on, almost entirely unchallenged.

Furthermore, the film documents filmmaker Kip Andersen as he:

> …approaches leaders in the environmental movement… [and] increasingly uncovers what appears to be an intentional refusal to discuss the issue of animal agriculture…

PETA's endorsement of the film, in this last regard in particular, is loud and clear when they note that Andersen and the film producer, Keegan Kuhn, were entirely justified in their concern:

> …to know why the high-profile environmental groups that should be challenging the meat and dairy industries were essentially ignoring them… and put representatives from Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and other well-known environmental groups in the hot seat and ask… them. (Moore, 2014)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this article we have proposed that radical change is helpfully thought of in terms of ontological shifts and conceived the possibility of aligning common worlds. In doing so, we have clearly distinguished the work of alignment from the previously noted work of relating common worlds in terms of conflict, composite setups, or compromise. Furthermore, we have used the case of animal rights activism to show that the idea of aligning common worlds helps reveal new insights with regard to the task of radical change. In concluding, we discuss the paper's more general importance for the management and organization studies literatures, identify a number of its limitations, and make some suggestions for future research.

Aligning Common Worlds in an Opportunistic and Cumulative Fashion

Hitherto, the French pragmatism literature has *a priori* emphasised the "incompatibility" (Boltanski, 2011: 28) or "insurmountable opposition" (Taupin, 2012: 533) of common worlds. For reasons detailed in the above case, we consider this presupposition overstated and unhelpful. In particular, it has tended to obscure the recognition of common worlds being aligned.

Whilst the alignment of common worlds is harmonious in that a group of common worlds need to unanimously agree, in a fashion consistent with their own varying criteria and agendas, that a given set of (potential) empirical developments are of positive worth, such common world alignment is not necessarily peaceful. Indeed, the above described efforts that PETA and other animal rights activists have made in aligning common worlds are marked by controversy and disruption, and are both conflictual and sensational. Neither Al Gore nor the environmental non-governmental organization Greenpeace for example, invited animal rights activists to subject their own policies and practices to the sort of environmental tests that they commonly seek to impose on others.

On the other hand, the initial contesting of assumptions underpinning the FAO's claim that the livestock industry was responsible for a massive 18% of global greenhouse emissions (e.g. Fairlie, 2008), highlights that whenever a test suggests that a common world should no longer support a status quo (e.g., the livestock industry), these tests will be perceived as controversial and disruptive. In light of such, it is unsurprising that those with a vested interest in various forms of animal exploitation will not simply accept that their activities are inconsistent with the technical efficiency mode of evaluation associated with the industrial common world. Thus, and at the same time that animal rights activists have sought to promote the efficiency of a vegan diet, shmeat, and so on, the livestock industry, and other

interested parties, have proposed such things as 'pig towers', or what amounts to a more efficient method of intensive pig farming (Driessen, 2012).

The point we are making is that, although the act of aligning common worlds seeks to avoid, or minimize the possibility, of conflict *between* common worlds, it nevertheless has to create conflict *within* each of the common worlds it seeks to align. Indeed, if radical activists, individuals or organizations did not have to identify or create evidence or tests designed to undermine or destabilize a common world's support for a given status quo, then they would not be radical. Furthermore, we note that the act of aligning common worlds can also involve tactics that many would find repugnant. PETA's 2003 campaign/exhibit, 'Holocaust on Your Plate', for example, juxtaposed pictures of (intensively) farmed animals with pictures of Holocaust victims, and proved very upsetting for some (Snaza, 2004). Moreover, PETA is routinely criticized for their highly sexualized/pornographic campaigns on the basis that they degrade women (and men) (e.g., Bindel, 2010).

Whatever the instrumental merit of such shock tactics, our case has shown that PETA and other animal rights activists can be conceived as employing them, alongside other less controversial tactics, in a manner that align common worlds in an opportunistic and cumulative manner. In terms of the Green common world, for example, our analysis has shown how the likes of PETA opportunistically made use of the UN FAO report in 2006, *Livestock's Long Shadow*, to highlight the multitudinous ways in which the livestock sector is destroying the environment; and how they subsequently subjected Al Gore to an environmental test following his release of *An Inconvenient Truth*. Whilst neither of these events was created by animal rights activists, they were opportunistically and cumulatively used to further their agenda.

As animal rights activists are yet to prove successful in their aims, in that the use of animals as a means for human ends remains widespread throughout a great many parts of the

world, we do not suggest that the work of aligning common worlds is easy, or some sort of radical panacea. Nevertheless, our writing of radical social change as being opportunistic and cumulative is supported by institutional theorists who dialectically propose that radical actors need to make the most of normative and material contradictions as and when they arise (e.g., Benson, 1977; Seo and Creed, 2002). Additionally, our showing that animal rights activists can be understood as working on, or as working within, multiple common worlds simultaneously, empirically echoes more conceptual work in moral philosophy: which suggests that (radical) social change will need to be legitimated within multiple justificatory (Habermas, 1990: Chapter 1) or ethical (Nickel, 2007) spheres or traditions if it is to prove robust and sustainable.

Pluralism and Radical Social Change

A recent critique of French pragmatism suggests it is limited to perceiving values as a tool for justification, and not as a motivating factor (Thornton et al., 2012: 9). Whilst there is some sense to this critique, our case suggests it is ultimately misdirected. In particular, it seems difficult to deny that the various arguments that animal rights activists make regarding the moral equality of humans and (many) other animals, and that are broadly associated with the civic common world, motivate their daily existence. The decision of philosophers such as Regan (2004) and Singer (1995) to avoid consuming meat for example, seem fairly obviously motivated by tests of equality and solidarity, by notions of rules and rights, and so on. More generally, we note that, as motivations are consciously justified in many instances, the distinction that Thornton et al., (2012: 9) wish to make between motivation and justification is easily strained (cf., Vaisey, 2009).

More importantly, the case has shown how a plurality of economies of worth and common worlds can be mobilized by radical activists whose ultimate aim is to make currently marginal moral positions or normative values mainstream. As noted throughout the paper, the

notion of aligning common worlds, rather than relating them in conflict or compromise, has hitherto been overlooked by French pragmatist writings. It has also been ignored by writings on organization and radical change more generally, which have tended to emphasize that radical activists mobilize one set of values against another when seeking to replace, rather than reform, a given status quo (den Hond & de Bakker, 2007; Whelan, 2013). Similarly, the general idea of alignment has not received a great deal of attention in works informed by the institutional logics tradition: for it also tends to emphasize that diverse logics can be related in terms of replacement and conflict, blending and compromise, or separation and segregation (e.g., Thornton et al., 2012: Chapter 7).

A major reason for this is that all these literatures tend to analytically focus on specific sectors, or fields, of society. The ultimate aim of radical activists as we have conceived them, however, is not to change one part of society, but to change society in full. In particular, we note that animal rights activists and organizations want governments and businesses, (other) activists and non-government organizations, schools, families, citizens, church-goers, consumers and so on − i.e., individuals and collectives more generally − to *all* agree to the import of respecting animal rights, and of refraining from treating animals as simple means.

Clearly, the conception of radical change we are advancing is much broader, and much more 'social', than the conceptions one finds amongst leading works in institutional theory. Thus, and whereas institutional theorists suggest that changing combinations and roles of accounting and legal firms can be considered radical (e.g., Greenwood and Hinings 1996), we suggest they are better conceived as relatively narrow (field level) and shallow (superficial): for they do not upset core distinctions that structure society-wide phenomenal existence.

Nevertheless, recent work that draws on institutional theory, and that relates to the Holocaust (Martí and Fernández, 2013), has explored changes that we would consider radical: for the changes explored in this work relate to fundamental ontological distinctions

(e.g., who is, and is not, human) that underpin a huge range of social policies and practices. Although French pragmatists would likely suggest that the tragic actuality of the holocaust, and the more progressive possibility of animal rights, illustrates the "uncertainty that threatens social arrangements and hence the fragility of reality" (Boltanski, 2011: 54), we suggest that such extreme examples point more towards the relative robustness of many social norms and practices. In particular, we emphasize that, despite the best efforts of animal rights activists, the eating of meat remains well entrenched.

In addition to benefitting from revisiting the likes of Bourdieu (e.g., 1977), then, who is often presented as their *bête noir*, our work suggests that French pragmatists would benefit from increased engagement with the likes of Descola (2013a, b). Just as we have done in the present work, Descola's work points to the importance of ontological distinctions that, in many ways, come before the economies of worth that have hitherto interested French pragmatists (cf., Boltanski, 2013). Most Western people, for instance, simply presume that all animals are in an ontologically separate category to all humans, and only think of using a common world's values to justify such an ontological distinction when engaged in a conflict there over. As a result, it seems that if we are to understand why such distinctions exist, then it might be helpful to supplement, or look beyond, the economies of worth framework. Whilst other perspectives by which to generate understanding of ontological distinctions exist (e.g., Cumpsty, 1991), we think that Descola's work could prove particularly helpful.

Limitations

Given our relatively broad conceptual purposes, this essay is necessarily limited in a number of regards. In the first instance, the paper is propositionally limited. Thus, and whilst we do suggest that radical social change will be significantly enabled by the alignment of an increasing number of social worlds, we do not suggest when, if ever, such alignment will

reach a 'tipping point', and actually result in the change desired. Similarly, we do not explain whether or not conflict or compromise could ever prove sufficient for radical change.

Our general concern to conceive alignment has also resulted in us not paying full and clear attention to the micro-means by which this might be achieved. Perhaps most notably, we have not been able to fully engage with the science and technology studies literature's focus on the practical and pragmatic considerations that shape the generation, gathering and presenting of evidence (e.g., Swiestra & Rip, 2007), or provide a detailed examination of the ways in which PETA construct 'tests of worth'.

Furthermore, we note that the paper is limited in that it does not seek to critically appraise the various normative arguments associated with animal rights, and due to its focusing on PETA. As Peta was founded in the US (by the British born Ingrid Newkirk), and as PETA has a distinct reputation for controversy, we recognize that our findings are shaped by cultural and organizational specifics that arguably encourage us to emphasize the importance of controversy and debate. A related limitation is that we have not sought to identify whether or not the mainstream of donors to animal rights organizations like PETA would agree with the alignment activities that we propose they are engaging in, or whether they would be deemed consistent with their identity (Rowley and Moldoveanu, 2003).

Whilst the preceding limitations relate to the conceptual aims of our paper being relatively broad, another set of limitations emerge when our conceptual aims are viewed as not broad enough. Most obviously, in primarily building upon French pragmatism, we have been constrained by this literature's explicit focus on common worlds and economies of worth of Western origin. When this constraint is relaxed, it becomes clear that the sort of radical change that animal rights activists seek can also be brought about from within, or with the aid of, other ontological traditions (e.g., Descola, 2013a, b). Buddhist thought, for example, which aims at the realization of 'no-self' through the eradication of desire, and which is

difficult, but arguably not impossible, to conceive with Western conceptual tools (Whelan, 2012), suggests that our use of animals as means gets in the way of this (non-)objective. Suffice it to note that it is not clear how French pragmatists can easily accommodate such a foreign point of view given that all eight of the common worlds appear founded on a strong notion of individual selves. Whilst other non-Western originating ways of thought present similar challenges, these challenges will often prove less extreme. Confucianism, for example, can be equated with the domestic common world outlined by French pragmatism (Whelan, 2007).

Future Research

Given the paper's substantive focus, we obviously think that management and organizational scholarship will benefit from an increased focus on the hitherto largely neglected relationship of animals and humans. More theoretically, and as the paper's contributions and limitations combine to suggest, we believe that the idea of alignment work opens up various lines of research. Four in particular stand out.

First, historical work that investigates the role of alignment, and conflict and compromise, in prior radical transformations is clearly warranted. For example, what, if any, similarities, link the justificatory work efforts of abolititionists and suffragists? Did they predominantly employ conflict, compromise, or alignment? Did they use these different common world relations at different points in time? Efforts at providing answers to such questions, we propose, can significantly advance our understanding of radical social change, and the role of organizations and activists therein.

Second, more explicitly normative work into the benefits of conflict, compromise, and alignment, also seems in need of attention. Although work in business ethics and corporate social responsibility has recently touched on such issues (Whelan, 2013), these literatures

remain more or less isolated from discussions in French pragmatism. Accordingly, future work that increasingly links these literatures will likely prove of benefit.

Third, and more specifically, descriptive research is needed with regard to the ways in which radical activists use 'tests of worth' to align common worlds, or to create conflict or compromise between them. Amongst other schools of thought that could be drawn upon, we suggest that work in Actor-Network Theory (e.g., Latour, 2004) can increasingly be integrated with work in French pragmatism (Guggenheim and Potthast, 2012) to shed light on such concerns.

And finally, we note that, although our approach can help unpack the content of the 'orders of worth' and 'tests' mobilized to trigger radical change through alignment, it does not fully account for the broader processes within which these 'orders of worth' and 'tests' are actually engaged. Social movement scholars, on the other hand, have developed processual analyses and suggested that 'framing' is central to the success of social movements (Benford and Snow, 2000). Nevertheless, they have rarely documented the moral and normative 'force' of framing (Ansari and Reinecke, 2015). Accordingly, we propose that future research could cross-fertilize our analysis of alignment inspired by French Pragmatist Sociology with social movement concepts to develop a processual approach accounting for the role of alignment processes work within the context of social movements.

REFERENCES

Adams, C. J. 1990. The sexual politics of meat: A feminist-vegetarian critical theory. New York: Continuum.

ALF (Animal Liberation Front). (2014). Manifesto. Retrieved from: http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Manifesto-TotalLib.htm

Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2007). Constructing mystery: Empirical matters in theory development. Academy Management Review, 32(4), 1265–1281.

Ansari, S. & Reinecke, J. (2015). Taming wicked problems: The role of framing in the construction of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Studies*. doi: 10.1111/joms.12137.

Banerjee, S. B. (2003). Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature. Organization Studies, 24(1): 143-180.

Basil, M. D. (1996) Identification as a mediator of celebrity effects. Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 40(4), 478-495.

Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. Annual Review of Sociology, 26: 611-639.

Benson, J. K. (1977). Organizations: A dialectical view. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22: 1-21.

Bindel, J. (2010). Let's make PETA history. The Guardian (28 October). Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2010/oct/28/peta-women-meat

Blokker, P. (2011). Pragmatic sociology: Theoretical evolvement and empirical application. European Journal of Social Theory, 14(3), 251-261.

Blowfield, M. (2005). Corporate social responsibility – The failing discipline and why it matters for international relations. International Relations, 19(2), 173-191.

Boltanski, L. (2011[2009]). On critique: A sociology of emancipation. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Boltanski, L. (2012[1990]). Love and justice as competences. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Boltanski, L. (2013[2004]). The foetal condition: A sociology of engendering and abortion. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2005[1999]). The new spirit of capitalism. London, UK: Verso.

Boltanski, L., Darré, Y., & Schiltz M.-A. (1984). La dénonciation. Actes de la Recherche and Sciences Sociales, 51(1), 1–40.

Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (1999). The sociology of critical capacity. European Journal of Social Theory, 2(3), 359–377.

Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006[1991]). On justification: Economies of Worth. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984[1979]). Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). On television. New York, NY: The New Press.

Boxenbaum, E. (2014). Toward a situated stance in organizational institutionalism: Contributions from French pragmatist sociology theory. Journal of Management Inquiry, 23(3): 319-323.

Brandle, J., Daudigeos, T., Edwards, T., & Pernkopf-Konhäuser, K. (2014). Why French Pragmatism matters to organizational institutionalism. Journal of Management Inquiry, 23(3), 314-318.

Bullinger, B. (2014). Family affairs: Drawing on family logic and familiar regime of engagement to contrast "close-up" views of individuals in conventionalist and institutitonalist reasoning. Journal of Management Inquiry, 23(3), 328-332.

Cashmore, E. (2006). *Celebrity/Culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law (Ed.). Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge? (pp. 196-223). London, UK: Routledge.

Callon, M., & Latour, B. (1981). Unscrewing the big leviathan: How actors macro-structure reality and how sociologists help them to do so. In K. Knorr & A. Cicourel (Eds.). Advances in social theory and methodology (pp.277-303). Boston, MA: Routledge.

Churchill, W. (1931). Fifty years hence. Strand Magazine, 82, 549-558. Retrieved from: http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/fifty-years-hence/

Cloutier, C., & Langley, A. (2013). The logic of institutional logics: Insights from French pragmatist sociology. Journal of Management Inquiry, 22(4), 360-380.

Cowspiracy. (2014). Cowspiracy. Retrieved from: http://cowspiracy.com/

Cumpsty, J. S. (1991) Religion as belonging: A general theory of religion. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Dansou, K. & Langley, A. (2012). Institutional work and the notion of test. M@n@gement, 15(5): 502-527.

Davis, D. B. (1987). Reflections on abolitionism and ideological hegemony. The American Historical Review, 92(4), 797-812.

Déjean, F., Gond J.-P. & Leca, B. (2004). Measuring the unmeasured: an institutional entrepreneur strategy in an emerging industry. Human Relations, 57(6), 741-764.

den Hond, F. & de Bakker, F. G. A. (2007). Ideologically motivated activism: how activist groups influence corporate social change activities. Academy of Management Review, 32(3): 901-24.

Descola, P. (2013a [2005]). Beyond nature and culture. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Descola, P. (2013b). The ecology of others. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Diaz-Bone, R. (2009). Convention, organization and institution. The contribution of the "economics of convention" to institutionalism. Historical Research/Historische Sozialforschung, 34, 235-264.

Diaz-Bone, R. (2014). Methodological positionings and perspectives: Comparing economies of convention with the institutional logics approach. Journal of Management Inquiry, 23(3), 324-327.

Dodier, N. (1993). Review article: Action as a combination of "common worlds." Sociological Review, 41, 556-571.

Driessen, C. (2012). Pig towers and in vitro meat: Disclosing moral worlds by design. Social Studies of Science, 42(6): 797-820.

Eckstein, H. (1975). Case study and theory in political science. In F. I. Greenstein & N. W. Polsby (Eds). Strategies of inquiry (pp. 79-137). Reading, UK: Addison-Wesley.

Eilperin, J. (2013). Al Gore goes vegan, with little fanfare. The Washington Post (25 November). Retrieved from: http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2013/11/25/al-gore-goes-vegan-with-little-fanfare/

Engber, D. (2008). The bogus $1 million meat prize. Slate.com (23 April). Retrieved from: http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2008/04/the_bogus_1_million_meat_prize.html.

Eshel, G. & Martin, P. A. (2006). Diet, energy and global warming. Earth Interactions, 10(9), 1-17.

Fairlie, S. (2008) A load of hot air? The Guardian (Society Liftout). (30 January), p. 8.

Flyverbom, M. (2011). The power of networks: Organizing the global politics of the Internet. Cheltnham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Fraser, B. P., & Brown, W. J. (2002). Media, celebrities, and social influence: Identification with Elvis Presley. Mass Communication and Society, 1(2), 183-207.

Gerber, P.J., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., Falcucci, A., & Tempio, G. (2013). Tackling climate change through livestock – A global assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Gond, J.-P., & Leca, B. (2012). Theorizing change in a pluralistic context: What can the economies of worth and new-institutionalism learn from each other? Document de travail du LEM 2012-15, Lille, France, University of Lille.

Gond, J.-P., Leca, B., & Cloutier, C. (2015a). An 'Economies of Worth' perspective on strategy as practice: Justification, valuation and critique in the practice of strategy. In D. Golsorkhi, L. Rouleau, D. Seidl & E. Vaara (Eds.) The Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice (2nd ed.), pp. 200-219.

Gond, J.-P., Barin-Cruz, L., Raufflet, E., & Charron, M. (2015b). To frack or not to frack? The interaction of justification and power in a sustainability controversy. *Journal of Management*. doi: 10.111/joms.12166.

Gore, A. (2011). Climate of denial: Can science and truth withstand the merchants of poison? Rolling Stone (21 June). Retrieved from: http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/climate-of-denial-20110622

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. Academy of Management Review, 21(4), 1022-1054.

Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. Academy of Management Journal, 45(1), 58–80.

Gross, R. E. (2015). Evolution is finally winning over Creationism. Slate (November 19). Retrieved from: http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2015/11/polls_americans_believe_in_evolution_less_in_creationism.html

Guggenheim, M., & Potthast, J. (2012). Symmetrical twins: On the relationship between Actor-Netowrk Theory and the sociology of critical capacities. European Journal of Social Theory, 15(2): 157-178.

Gullace, N. F. (2014). Christabel Pankhurst and the Smethwick election: Right-wing feminism, the Great War and the ideology of consumption. Women's History Review, 23(3), 330-346.

Habermas, J. (1990). Moral consciousness and communicative action. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Hache, E., & Latour, B. (2010). Morality or moralism? An exercise in sensitization. Common Knowledge, 16(2), 311-330.

Hoffman, A. J., & Ocasio, W. (2001). Not all events are attended equally: Toward a middle-range theory of industry attention to external events. Organization Science, 12(4), 414-434.

Horne, P. (2009). The Godfather: 'Nobody enjoyed one day of it'. The Telegraph (September 22). Retrieved from: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/starsandstories/6189162/The-Godfather-Nobody-enjoyed-one-day-of-it.html

Huault, I., & Rainelli-Weiss, H. (2011). A market for weather risk? Conflicting metrics, attempts at compromise and limits to commensuration. Organization Studies, 32(10), 1395–1419.

Jagd, S. (2011). Pragmatic sociology and competing orders of worth in organizations. European Journal of Social Theory, 14(3): 343–359.

Jha, A. (2013a). First lab-grown hamburger gets full marks for 'mouth feel'. The Guardian (August 5). Retrieved from: http://www.theguardian.com/science/2013/aug/05/world-first-synthetic-hamburger-mouth-feel

Jha, A. (2013b). First hamburger made from lab-grown meat to be served at press conference. The Guardian, (August 6). Retrieved from: http://www.theguardian.com/science/2013/aug/05/first-hamburger-lab-grown-meat-press-conference

Kamzi, B. A., Leca, B. & Naccache, P. 2015. Is corporate social responsibility a new spirit of capitalism? Organization, doi: 10.1177/1350508415619239.

Keaton, B. (2013). Which film was the best box-office flop? The Guardian (January 16). Retrieved from: http://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2013/jan/16/best-film-box-office-flop

Kretzer, M. (2013). A convenient truth: Al Gore goes vegan. PETA Blog (November 27). Retrieved from: http://www.peta.org/blog/al-gore-goes-vegan/

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). The structure of scientific revolutions (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lappé, F. M. (1971). Diet for a small planet. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Latour, B. (2004). Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lawrence, T. B., Leca, B., & Zilber, T. B. (2013). Institutional work: Current research, new directions and overlooked issues. Organization Studies, 34(8), 1023-1033.

Lawrence, T. B., & Phillips, N. (2004). From Moby Dick to Free Willy: Macro-cultural discourse and institutional entrepreneurship in emerging institutional fields. Organization, 11(5), 689–711.

Macintyre, B. (2007). Test-tube meat science's next leap. Weekend Australian (Jan 20). Retrieved from: http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/test-tube-meat-sciences-next-leap/story-e6frg8y6-1111112859219?nk=49be8486cfdbab6e9a0a48d0908ca090

Marcus, E. (2005). Meat market: Animals, ethics and money. Ithaca, NY: Brio Press.

Martí, I., & Fernández, P. (2013). The institutional work of oppression and resistance: Learning from the Holocaust. Organization Studies, 34(8), 1195-1223.

Miller, J. D., Scott, E. C., & Okamoto, S. (2006). Public acceptance of evolution. Science, 313, 765-766.

Moore, H. (2014). 'Environmentalists' called out in Cowspiracy. PETA Blog (June 16). Retrieved from: http://www.peta.org/blog/environmentalists-caught-in-cowspiracy/

Naess, A. (1989). Ecology, community and lifestyle. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Newkirk, I. (2013). Why lab-grown meat is the future of food. Huffington Post (August 1). Retrieved from: http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/ingrid-newkirk/artificial-meat-lab-grown_b_3688992.html

Nickel, J. W. (2007). Making sense of human rights (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Oldenhof, L., Postma, J., & Putters, K. (2013). On justification work: How compromising enables public managers to deal with conflicting values. Public Administration Review, 74(1), 52-63.

Papon, A.-M. (2012). PETA's porn charade: To return to tried-and-true misogyny and sizeism? Adios Barbie (August 16). Retrieved from: http://www.adiosbarbie.com/2012/08/PETAs-porn-charade-to-return-to-tried-and-true-misogyny-sizeism/

Patriotta, G., Gond J.-P., & Schultz, F. (2011). Maintaining legitimacy: Controversies, orders of worth, and public justifications. Journal of Management Studies, 48(8), 1804-1836.

Patterson, C. (2002). Eternal treblinka: Our treatment of animals and the holocaust. New York: Lantern.

Pernkopf-Konhäuser, K. (2014). The competent actor: Bridging institutional logics and French pragmatist sociology. Journal of Management Inquiry, 23(3), 333-337.

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). (2007). PETA to Gore: Too chicken to go veg? PETA Blog (August 29). Retrieved from: http://www.PETA.org/blog/PETA-gore-chicken-go-veg/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). (2008). An interview with Sir Paul McCartney. PETA Blog (April 21). Retrieved from: http://www.peta.org/blog/interview-sir-paul-mccartney/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). (2009). Vegan mother earth reigns over Gore's book signing. PETA Blog (November 13). Retrieved from: http://www.peta.org/blog/vegan-mother-earth-reigns-gores-book-signing/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). (2011a). Feeding the future. PETA2 Blog (October 31). Retrieved from: http://www.PETA2.com/blog/feeding-the-future/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). (2011b). A convenient truth: Al Gore goes vegan (November 27). Retrieved from: http://www.peta.org/blog/al-gore-goes-vegan/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). 2014a. The issues. Retrieved from: http://www.PETA.org/issues

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). 2014b. Meat and the environment. Retrieved from: http://www.PETA.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/meat-environment/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). 2014c. Meat production wastes natural resources. Retrieved from: http://www.PETA.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/meat-wastes-natural-resources/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). 2014d. PETA's 'in vitro' chicken contest (March 4). Retrieved from: http://www.PETA.org/features/vitro-meat-contest/ (accessed 20 October 2014).

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). 2014e. Fight global warming by going vegetarian. Retrieved from: http://www.PETA.org/issues/animals-used-for-food/global-warming/

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) UK. (2016). 8 disturbing things you didn't know about eating chicken. Retrieved from: http://www.peta.org.uk/blog/disturbing-facts-eating-chicken-meat/

Prasad, P., & Elmes, M. (2005). In the name of the practical: Unearthing the hegemony of pragmatics in the discourse of environmental management. Journal of Management Studies, 42(4), 845-867.

Prasad, P., Prasad, A., & Baker, K. (2014). Smoke and mirrors: Institutional entrepreneurship and gender identities in the US Tobacco Industry, 1920-1945. Organization, Epub ahead of print 7 September 2014. DOI: 10.1177/1350508414547148

Ramirez, C. (2013). "We are being pilloried for something we did not even know we had done wrong!" Quality control and orders of worth in the British audit profession. Journal of Management Studies, 50(5), 845–869.

Ray, J. L. (1989). The abolition of slavery and the end of international war. International Organization, 43(3): 405-439.

Regan, T. (2004). The case for animal rights. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rowley, T. J. & Moldoveanu, M. 2003. When will stakeholder groups act? An interest- and identity-based model of stakeholder group mobilization. Academy of Management Review, 28(2): 204-219.

RSPCA (the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals). (2016). RSPCA Assured. Retrieved from https://www.rspcaassured.org.uk/

Schoeneborn, D., Blaschke, S. & Kaufmann, I. M. (2012). Recontextualizing anthropomorphic metaphors in organization studies: The pathology of organizational insomnia. Journal of Management Inquiry, 22(4): 435-450.

Schwartz, J. (2008). PETA's latest tactic: $1 million for fake meat. New York Times (April 21). Retrieved from: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/21/us/21meat.html?hp

Sciretta, P. (2009). The worst reviewed highest-grossing movies of all-time. Film: Blogging the Reel World (July 8). Retrieved from: http://www.slashfilm.com/the-worst-reviewed-highest-grossing-movie-of-all-time/

Seo, M.-G. & Creed, W. E. Douglas. 2002. Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. Academy of Management Review, 27(2), 222-247.

Singer, P. (1995). Animal liberation (2nd ed.). London, UK: Pimlico.

Smith, B. & Varzi, A. C. (2000). Fiat and bona-fide boundaries. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research. 60(2): 401-420.

Spiegel, M. 1996. The dreaded comparison: Human and animal slavery. New York: Mirror Books.

Stark, D. (2011). The sense of dissonance: Accounts of worth in economic life. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Steinfeld, H., Gerber, P., Wassenaar, T., Castel, V., Rosales, M., & de Haan, C. (2006). Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Stephens, N. (2013). Growing meat in laboratories: The promise, ontology, and ethical boundary-work of using muscle cells to make food. Configurations, 21(2), 159-181.

Swierstra, T., & Rip, A. (2007). Nano-ethics as NEST-ethics: Patterns of moral argumentation about new and emerging science and technology. Nanoethics, 1(1): 3-20.

Taupin, B. (2012). The more things change… Institutional maintenance as justification work in the credit rating industry. M@n@gement ,15(5), 528-562.

Thévenot, L., Moody, M., & Lafaye, C. (2000). Forms of valuing nature: Arguments and modes of justification in French and American environmental disputes. In M. Lamont & L. Thévenot (eds.) Rethinking comparative cultural sociology: Repertoires of evaluation in France and the United States (pp. 229-272). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure, and Process. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Tierney, Brian . 1997. The idea of natural rights. Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans.

Vaisey, S. (2009). Motivation and justification: A dual-process model of culture in action. American Journal of Sociology, 114(6): 1675-1715.

Viva! (Vegetarians' International Voice for Animals). (2014). The environment. Retrieved from: http://www.viva.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work/environment

Waddock, S. A. (2008). Building a new institutional infrastructure for corporate responsibility. Academy of Management Perspectives, 22, 87-108.

Whelan, G. (2007). Corporate social responsibility in Asia: A Confucian context. In S. May, G. Cheney & J. Roper (eds.) The debate over corporate social responsibility (pp. 105-118). New York: Oxford University Press.

Whelan, G. (2012). A Buddhist perspective on rational action. Homo Oeconomicus, 29(1): 119-134.

Whelan, G. (2013). The value of radical dissent within corporate constructed public spheres: Differentiating consensual from dissensual corporate social responsibility. Journal of Business Ethics, 115(4), 755-769.