

## ENGLISH: LANGUAGE ANALYSIS

### Live Animal Exports

---

The controversial issue of live animal exports has aroused disparate and diverse opinions throughout the nation. Ed Gannon's witty yet direct article in *The Herald Sun*, targeting young adults to an older audience, argues that the ban on live exports will increase cruelty, Stephanie Coombes' relatable article in *The Daily Telegraph* arguing that live export promotes animal welfare, her piece targeting young adults. These two ideas contrast with the advertisement on website 'We are what we build', evidently arguing for live export to cease through the clear message presented. The target audience for this advertisement is all ages involved with the issue, as it is simple yet effective through its clear argument.

Through rhetorical questions and inclusive language, both Ed Gannon's and Stephanie Coombe's articles involves readers directly, positioning them in a state of agreement with the author's arguments and emphasising to the audience that the ban of live exports will affect them directly. Coombes discusses how Australia funds the promotion of animal welfare overseas, and that without live export, publicity would be lost; *'...we spend our money improving animal welfare in overseas countries...'* The involvement of readers directly through the inclusive language of 'we' positions the audience to feel valid in the controversial situation. The statement makes readers feel as if they are playing a role in the awareness of animal welfare, and that they have a personal stake in the issue of live exports. Ed Gannon's piece argues that the ban on live exports will increase animal cruelty, touching on audience patriotism and conscience as he asks *'So, would we rather the best system in the world monitor [live exports] or ignore it because it is not our problem anymore?'* Inclusive language is also present, engaging the audience from the start of the question by addressing them directly. The rhetorical question positions the reader to agree with Gannon by assuming that the answer is obvious and impossible to disagree with. Gannon suggests that although we are not exporting livestock anymore, we are letting down other exporters around the world by not playing a role in monitoring the welfare of animals. This idea positions readers to feel somewhat guilty at the fact that we are one of the best monitoring systems, but yet we are not helping in the export cruelty situation. These two pieces that offer space for audience reflection contrast with the confronting and bold advertisement for the ban of live export, which clearly states what they believe the public should think in regards to the ban of live export. The lack of questions and minimalistic, direct statements enhance the importance of what the advertisement is saying, 'LIVE EXPORT CAUSES UNNECESSARY SUFFERING.' These qualities in the advertisement, as well as capitalisation, positions the audience to feel as though the ideas are being forcefully stowed upon them, almost yelled at them, in order to drill one idea and one idea only into their minds. This advertisement contrasts with the other two articles that position the reader to question what they believe through persuasion and questioning *'Think about it, and make up your own mind'*, rather than a vigorous instruction.

All three materials incorporate a recognisable/familiar element to them through generalisation, symbols and reason/logic, enhancing their arguments, as the audience is able to understand and relate further. Coombes' article uses reason and logic through her objective statement, *'Live export will continue, with or without Australia.'* Her reason and logic gives her the credibility of being objective and rational. Coombes' clear and true statement positions readers to feel as though Australia would be left behind in the world of animal welfare and export, as well as the benefits associated with both of those categories, as the safety of distributed animals becomes more globally recognised thanks to this issue. The advertisement on 'We are what we build' contains a globally recognised prohibitive sign, with the word 'EXPORT' under it. This symbol is known as having exclusive/banning connotations associated with it, enhancing the advertisements contention that live export needs to be eradicated. These connotations arouse feelings and attitudes within a reader, to dislike the idea of export and the opinion that it should continue, through these negatively known ideas presented through the prohibited symbol. Edward Gannon presents the idea that even if Australia bans live export, a demand for meat will still be evident, and meat consumers will look to

other countries for their supply; countries that have lower animal welfare standards and a higher rate of animal cruelty. Through generalisation, Gannon appeals to community held prejudices and attitudes, positioning the reader to judge others according to stereotypes, *'Man is a meat eater. Always has been, always will be, despite the best intentions of vegetarians.'* Through this generalisation of human kind, Gannon makes the audience feel as though there is no other option in the world of export but to keep Australia in the action, as he states that we are all predominantly meat eaters as well. Gannon makes readers question what would happen as a result of the *'world's most efficient production system'* having a non-existent view or insight into the world of animal export, and what would happen to the welfare of other animals in different countries with the continuing demand for meat.

The 'We are what we build' advertisement focuses on the direct effect live export has on livestock; confronting readers with the reality of what they believe the export industry does to animals, where as the other two articles not only discuss the effects of export, but the economic, financial and political impact the industry has on the public by appealing to the hip pocket nerve of readers and using exaggeration/overstatement. The advertisement places a dark cow in the foreground, contrasting against the white background, and standing out as the main focus of the advertisement. The cow's vulnerability is evident through its isolated state and tail between its legs, and bone is evident; making it appear to be malnourished. Through colour tone and image positioning, readers are exposed to the clear reality of what exporting our livestock is doing to the animals themselves, positioning them in a state of guilt that they are letting this occur. It also makes readers question the act of export; if it is worth the visible evidence before them. Coombes' article states that *...the live export industry is worth a lot of money...it provides a lot of jobs...it underpins the domestic livestock market prices to support our farmers.'* She positions readers to feel threatened by the suggestion to stop export, due to the economic revenue and job positions it creates for many Australians. Most people desire financial security and an abundance of resources, this statement highlighting the benefits of the exportation industry, which could be abolished very soon. This instils fear and worry into readers, and makes them question if in fact keeping live export has more positive aspects than negatives. Gannon states that the livestock industry seems to *'...be losing the PR war badly.'* This exaggerated take on the situation, classifying it as a 'war', arouses heightened emotions within readers, as Gannon places the issue on the same scale as a terrifying, unthinkable situation. It plays on reader's fears, as Gannon states the positive effects of live exports, his opinion that the industry is losing the battle still lingers in every readers mind. Through this overstatement, Gannon makes a point that this industry dispute is nothing to look at carelessly, and that this 'war' will continue until one outcome has been achieved, instilling a sense of worry within readers that Gannon's view, that ban on live exports increases cruelty, will be overlooked and overpowered.

Each article displays a contrasting view on the controversial issue of live animal exporting, although all three display similar techniques in which to get their argument across to an audience. Through involving readers directly, appealing to community values and exaggerating the industries situation, Ed Gannon produces an honest and sound argument that the ban on live export would increase cruelty. Stephanie Coombes uses inclusive language, reason and logic as well as appealing to the public's hip pocket nerve to deliver a direct article that argues that live export promotes animal welfare and should not be abolished. The advertisement on website 'We are what we build' displays confronting, minimalistic yet powerful images and statements that highlight the harsh reality of what kind of effect the export industry is having directly on the animals that are involved. Through the choice of colour tone, slogan positioning and size, the advertisement brings across to viewers its view that live export needs to be stopped.