

**Nonhuman Animal Legislation and Speciesist Discourse.
Argentina's Pet Responsibility Act: Anti-cruelty Law or Death Row Pardon?**

Diego L. Forte
University of Buenos Aires
dforte@filo.uba.ar

Introduction

As Stibbe (2012) points out, the main reason why animals are excluded from discussions about the relationship between language and power, is that they are not themselves participants in their own social construction through language. Due to its Marxist roots, mentions Stibbe, Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on the concept of "hegemony", where oppression is conducted ideologically. In the case of animals, power is exercised exclusively in a coercive way; they are not manipulated ideologically. But this coercive manipulation depends exclusively on humans that are themselves convinced to accept a position in this ideological frame, as for example, thousands of people in Nazi Germany who supported the Third Reich, or civilians who supported military dictatorships in many places in Latin America and other regions. Social representations included in the common sense of a given society (Gramsci, 1971) are meanings considered absolute and unquestionable within that particular society.

The role of language in structuring power relations, in particular, has come under close scrutiny (...) Most of this work on language and power focuses on the role of discourse in oppression and exploitation. For example, the journal *Discourse and Society* is dedicated to "power, dominance and inequality, and to the role of discourse in their legitimization and reproduction in society, for instance in the domains of gender, race, ethnicity, class or world religion". However, with rare exceptions, the role of discourse in the domination by humans of other species has been almost entirely neglected in the field of critical discourse analysis. Power is talked about as if it is a relation between people only; for example, Fairclough (1992) describes the way that "language contributes to the domination of some people by others" ... Because of the neo-Marxist roots of critical discourse analysis, analysis focuses on hegemony, where oppression of a group is carried out ideologically rather than coercively, through the manufacture of consent. In the case of animals, the power is coercive, carried out by a small number of people involved in organizations that farm and use animals. The animals do not consent to their treatment because of an uncritical acceptance of the ideology of the oppressor, and they cannot be empowered to resist the discourses that oppress them (Stibbe, 2012: 19).

As in any other type of oppression, language plays a significant role, but in this case the relationship between oppressor and oppressed seems to be different.

Critical Discourse Analysis and Systemic-Functional Grammar

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a multidisciplinary approach to discourse studies that focuses in how language builds and reproduces power relations. Its foundations come from Marx, Gramsci, Althusser and Foucault, but mostly from Habermas' communication theory. This perspective considers language as practice in direct relation with social practices, each determining the other. In other words, analysts investigate the way in which ideology is codified in language to shape the world around us, as well as the ways language influences ideology.

Being a multidisciplinary perspective, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has no fixed method; due to its aim to evidence the structure of power relations CDA, adopts different tools to approach the texts. In this paper analysis will take Systemic-Functional Linguistics as a main frame (Halliday, 1975) and the tools provided by Critical Linguistics (Hodge & Kress, 1993).

Systemic-Functional Linguistics considers language as a network of systems, or interrelated sets of options for making meaning. The term *functional* refers to the idea of language being what it is because of what it has evolved to do. Thus, what Halliday (1961: 241-292) refers to as the *multidimensional architecture of language* reflects the multidimensional nature of human experience and interpersonal relations. In other words, for Systemic-Functional linguistics, language is a system of potential choices and the text is built by the options taken by the user in real context.

Critical Linguistics is the name given by a group of researchers to what later was called Critical Discourse Analysis. Its members - Roger Fowler, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress and Tony Trew - inscribed their later work in CDA perspective. This group placed its roots in Systemic-Functional Linguistics and their first work in collaboration, *Language and Control* (1979), is considered the cornerstone in Critical Discourse Analysis. Although their main framework is taken from Halliday's work, Critical linguistics developed its own tools to analyze thematic roles and processes in the construction of the texts.

Defining the types of processes involved means to assign duties and responsibilities. According to Systemic-Functional Linguistics the world can be classified in terms of

processes and participants. Participants develop different processes and hold different levels of responsibility in each one of them. In the construction of a legal text, as a Law or an Act, thematic roles, processes and responsibilities become fundamental. According to Halliday (1975) language as three main functions: 1. Ideational function, 2. Interpersonal function and 3. Textual function. Ideational function is related to speakers' personal experience of the world. Language organizes personal experience and helps to build a personal view of the world. Interpersonal function refers to the capacity of language to establish and maintain social relationships, and to express social roles in communication. This function helps to construct the identity of the speakers. Textual function describes the coherence of text with itself and context. Language provides the necessary resources to make texts as fabric structure that correlate with context.

Speciesist Speech

Current Western culture has its roots in the Judeo-Christian discourse post World War II. Although there are many exceptions and this tradition has included elements of Native American, Germanic, Eastern, and other origins, many conceptions come from classical Greco-Roman antiquity and the Judeo-Christian world, which were reworked and / or reinterpreted after the war (Romero, 2011: 22).

The Judeo-Christian discourse of war, as every hegemonic discourse, builds precise boundaries between individuals included in it and excluded ones. Thus, the "Other", the excluded, is always built as something bad or dangerous because it questions, directly or indirectly, the limit values of society. Thus, the speciesist speech is no different from racist, misogynistic or anti-Semitic speech. They all contribute to perpetuation of the oppression of several groups by the same oppressor: White, Western men.

As already mentioned, animals are subject to a different kind of oppression, since they are immersed in an alien symbolic system (Stibbe, 2012). The text we will analyze in this paper builds animals as objects, denying not only identity but also recognition of their characteristics as beings. In this regard Peter Singer has argued that:

We tolerate cruelties inflicted on members of other species that would outrage us if they were performed on members of our own species. Speciesism allows researchers to regard the animals they experiment on as items of equipment, laboratory tools rather than living, suffering creatures. In fact, on grant applications to government

funding agencies, animals are listed as "supplies" alongside test tubes and recording instruments (1975: 69).

Nonhuman animals have been defined by their utility to the human race: companionship, diversion, food and clothing, and the discourses related classify them by such categories.

Legislation

According to Steven Wise (2003), over the last half-century law has developed an important and growing role in animal protection. Wise mentions three main perspectives adopted by the regulations issued during the mentioned period of time: Anti-Cruelty, Animal Welfare and Animal Rights. These three perspectives seem to be related even though they are far from being synonymous.

Most of the Anti-Cruelty laws in the Western world protect cats and dogs, usually called, "pets" or "companion animals" (Morgan, 2009: 149). Many non-profit organizations support and lobby to pass laws that protect domestic animals from being beaten, tortured, abandoned or mistreated in many ways. But these laws do not question nonhuman animal status in society; they just protect an object that is dear for many humans. In other words, they prevent us from seeing pain and suffering in our daily lives. Animal Welfare legislation, on the other hand, is mainly oriented to the food industry and how the cattle must be managed in order to apply a "humane sacrifice" to them. This usually means, the more relaxed the animal is before his/her death, the better the meat quality it provides (Gregory, 2008). Finally, an Animal Rights perspective presents a strong case against the low status Western societies give to nonhuman animals.

Even though no law in the Western world has yet granted legal rights to nonhuman animals as beings, during 2014 two cases caught the public attention: French Civil Code modification and the case of orangutan Sandra in the Buenos Aires Zoo. Both cases are emblematic because, with different levels of commitment and success, they both grant a new legal status to nonhuman animals. The first case, the new French Civil Code, is perhaps the first step in terms of legal conceptions of nonhuman animal status, since – for the first time – a national regulation differentiates nonhuman animals from properties. In force by law since 1804, it is considered the first modern legal code and a strong influence for many countries. With 2015 amendments, the Code now considers in its articles 515-14 that *les*

animaux sont des êtres vivants doués de sensibilité (animals are living beings that possess sensitivity), differentiated from things and property, recognizing them with autonomous juridic status. The case of Sandra, the orangutan in Buenos Aires Zoo, seems to go hand in hand with the French Code case. After a long legal fight to set her free carried on by several protectionist organizations, the Argentine Supreme Court stated she is a subject of rights and therefore, those rights must be observed. We will resume this case later.

As mentioned before, while anti-cruelty legislation imposes restrictions on how animals can be treated, none of it – nor indeed, any enacted subsequently – changes the traditional legal status accorded to animals by the courts (Radford, 2001; cited in Wise, 2003). The maximum penalty that a statute allows is a benchmark. It signals to a judge the ultimate punishment for a wrongdoer. This is the mark for the worst crime. But a judge never imposes the maximum punishment for a first offense, so the typical penalization for cruelty will remain low so long as the maximum penalty remains low (Wise, 2003). As in Roman law, mentions Wise, “persons” have legal rights, and “things” are the objects of the rights of the persons. All those beings who were believed to lack free will (e.g. women, children, slaves, the insane, and nonhuman animals) were considered as property. Therefore, because of their lacking of legal personhood and legal rights, nonhuman animals are invisible to justice.

In Argentina, the first protectionist legislation passed at the national level is Law No. 2786 dated in 1891. Commonly referred to as “Ley Sarmiento” (named after former president Domingo Faustino Sarmiento) it is the first milestone in animal legislation in the country. This law was born from the work of Sociedad Argentina Protectora de los Animales (Argentine Society for Protection of Animals), created in September 24, 1881. Their founding members were, among others, former president Sarmiento, promoter of animal protectionism, and Ignacio Albarracín, who later became Secretary of the Society until his death in 1926. They campaigned in favor of working animals and against the taming of horses, the *asado con cuero* (literally, “BBQ with fur”), cockfighting, bullfighting, and pigeon shooting.

The regulation reads:

ARTÍCULO 1.- Declárase actos punibles los malos tratamientos ejercitados con los animales, y las personas que los ejerciten sufrirán una multa de dos a cinco pesos, o en su

defecto arresto, computándose dos pesos por cada día.

ARTÍCULO 2.- En la capital de la República y Territorios Nacionales, las autoridades policiales prestarán a la Sociedad Argentina Protectora de los Animales, la cooperación necesaria para hacer cumplir las Leyes, reglamentos y ordenanzas dictadas o que se dicten en protección de los animales, siendo de la competencia de las mismas, el juicio y aplicación de las penas en la forma en que lo hacen para las contravenciones policiales.

ARTICLE 1. - Hereby is declared as punishable any act of bad treatment inflicted to animals, and people who exercise them will suffer a penalty of two to five pesos, or will be arrested, computing two pesos per day.¹

ARTICLE 2. - In the capital of the Republic and National Territories, police authorities will provide Argentine Society for Protection of Animals, the means to enforce the laws, regulations and ordinances issued or to be issued in animal protection being its responsibility the trial and execution of sentences in the way they do for law violations.

In 1891, the price of a beer in Buenos Aires was of 0,45 pesos. Having this information in mind, it is possible to think the punishment was not that severe. From then on legislation was mainly dedicated to protect cattle as trading goods, congress issued many norms to protect investments in nonhuman animals raised for food. On October 5, 1900 the congress passed law No. 3959 that created an Animal Sanitation Police. In its articles 24 to 28 this law regulated the compensations to the owner in case of “destruction” of animals due to official procedures. According with the farming and meat-exporting model, nonhuman animals were (and still are) treated as commercial objects. In that sense in the year 1990 law No. 23899 was passed. This law reconverted the sanitary police model creating the Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Animal (SENASA, National Service of Animal Sanitation). The main mission of this agency was to assure the sanitariness of animal-origin food, not the well being of animals although. In 1995 the control of vegetable origin was

1

English translations of the Act are the author's.

given to the agency and it continues operating until today having federal jurisdiction.

Other laws that are more “animal safety” oriented were issued alongside with the above mentioned, such as No. 22421/1981, known as the wildlife protection law and No. 25052/1998 that forbids whale hunting. Law No. 2786 was strengthened in 1954 by law 14346, currently in force. This norm is part of the supplementary laws to the Criminal Code of Argentine Republic and it sets penalties of fifteen days to one year imprisonment.

In recent times, another discussion came into consideration: the case of Sandra the orangutan. As mentioned above, she was declared as a subject of rights by the Supreme Court, setting a precedent in Argentine and international jurisprudence for recognizing a nonhuman animal as a subject of rights. Steven Wise points out that the most important point in this verdict is:

... it is necessary to recognize the animal as a subject of rights, because non-human beings (animals) are entitled to rights, and therefore their protection is required by the corresponding jurisprudence (Wise, 2014:1).

According to de Baggis (2015), this could mean that from now on, nonhuman animals could be considered as “nonhuman persons” instead of “furniture” applying Argentine Civil Code in a more dynamic way.

The Pet Responsibility Act

National Argentine Constitution, Article No. 99, defines a Presidential Act (*Decreto de Necesidad y Urgencia*; DNU) as a type of norm that even though issued by the Executive Power, the President, has the full validity of a law approved by the Congress. Nevertheless Congress must analyze the Act and determine its being in force. But the Constitution specifies that this is a kind of norm that must be used only when it is impossible to bring a project under consideration of the Congress representatives.

The Pet Responsibility Act was passed as a measure to reduce diseases spread by stray dogs and cats. These diseases are not to be found in the big cities but in the countryside, which means they pose a risk not only to human animals, but cows and sheep are susceptible, too. Being a Presidential Act, it is not wrong to think the situation in the countryside was terrible enough to deserve urgent measures, measures that cannot wait for

Congress approval. But the Act was issued in 2011, and until now in 2015, only the head of the program has been designated and the procedures have not been developed. So, why not rush?

Processes and participants: the ideational meta-function

Because the text is part of a discourse genre with strict building regulations, what we call "legislative genre", thematic roles are previously defined: actors, objects and patients. The legislative genre clearly defines who is able to fill the thematic role of agent, which processes can be developed and who or what will receive the effects of these processes. Thus, the prototypical agents in such texts presently are usually institutions and abstract entities, as in the examples in Table 1. Following that scheme, animals are the affected ones, they receive the effects of the processes as shown in Table 2.

Objectification procedures

The prototypical procedure of objectification is grammatical metaphor. This procedure is directly related to the lexical density. If a text has a high degree of lexical density, it is sure to contain a high degree of grammatical metaphor. Colombi (2006: 147) mentions that grammatical metaphor is a linguistic means to create "condensed information to convey experiences and events and its purposes are the objectification and abstraction". This author distinguishes three types of grammatical metaphor: the ideational, the interpersonal and the logical.

The ideational metaphor, or transitivity metaphor, is associated with the experiential meaning. It is used to convert lexical items in a single noun or noun construction. Generally, the processes and the qualifiers become entities, although the processes and circumstances can also become qualifiers, and connectors can be converted in circumstances. The logic metaphor is associated with the textual meaning. Colombi said that "when the conjunctions occur through processes, allowing two or more clauses to become one, are embodiments called logical metaphors" (2006: 157). Finally, interpersonal metaphor is associated to, as its name implies, the interpersonal meaning. Within this text, ideation metaphor is the most used, as nominalization.

Nominalization is the most common form of ideational metaphor. According to Halliday (1975: 353), "nominalization is the most powerful resource to create grammatical

metaphors". This involves converting processes, qualifiers, or even whole bodies of clauses, as in "the book was read" repackaged as "reading the book". Once the event has been nominalized, one can delve into it: Reading the book was a great experience. Apart from being able to delve into an event, Colombi identifies three other functions of a nominalization: to hide agents, to convert processes into things, and to give life to things.

Nominalization is typical of written discourse. The writers prefer it because it is a way to give objectivity and abstraction to the text, plus it creates a distance between speaker and interlocutor. Also, the nominalization shows prestigious adult language, reflecting the ability of the writer to create abstract mental representations and describe in more tangible terms. Therefore it is expected that official/legislative writing will frequently use nominalization. Besides, nominalization helps to convert not just verbs but beings into things.

In the text, nominalizations present several cases: sometimes participants are elided, hidden inside the construction, and they can be recovered completely or they do not entail greater responsibility:

El dictado de una norma resulta propicio. (The issue of a regulation is favorable). Inside the nominalization is hidden the agent who dictates the norm. Although it doesn't hold much importance because it is of public knowledge that in most Western countries, as in Argentina, the institution entitled to approve, pass or put in force legislation is, typically the government, this is, president, prime minister, congress, parliament, etc.

But in other cases, agents that have direct responsibility for the processes are not as clear as they should be and the text eludes its manifestation:

Aplicar el tratamiento adecuado. (Apply the appropriate treatment). It is not clear, not specified what the appropriate treatment is, what means "to apply it" and who must apply it.

Practicar la eutanasia. (Practice euthanasia). The agents involved in the practice of euthanasia are not detailed. The concepts of "tenencia responsable", "eutanasia"

and "sacrificio" ("responsible ownership", "euthanasia" and "sacrifice") are not explained as it must be in an official document that is regulating a social practice related to a so-called national problem. This lack of specification implies some dilution of the meaning in the act. In other words, if the law does not state who should be the actor for the regulated processes then it is not assigning that duty to anyone. Therefore it cannot regulate anything and becomes useless.

La superpoblación de animales. (The overpopulation of animals). It does not specify which situation is referred to by the concept of "overpopulation". The problem seems to be homeless animals, those would be the ones involved in the lack of sanitary controls, as the norm reads. It is noteworthy that, in Buenos Aires, the term "homeless" (the literal *sin hogar* or *en situación de calle*) is applied only to human animals. Nonhuman animals are referred to as "strays" (literally *callejeros*). In the text animals are not named as "homeless" but are said to experience "overpopulation", which means the Act was not conceived for the health interest of dogs and cats but from the discomfort they cause to humans. If we consider the definition of overcrowded, we should say that the human race is the only example of a species that has growth out of control. And it is not likely for governments to talk about overpopulation unless it involves the distribution of resources. There is a situation of overpopulation when the available resources do not seem to be enough to fulfill the demand for food. As mentioned above, this is the point that binds speciesism with other forms of discrimination such as racism, misogyny, anti-semitism, etc. The border of discursive identity, the point in which the "Other" becomes a threat is the moment in which we start to think this Other wants our resources, even though it is not true. In our case nonhuman animals *are* the resource.

Cualquier desequilibrio biológico. (Any biological imbalance). Nature does not become imbalanced by itself. The concept of imbalance involves human intervention and environmental changes that humans have made.

Situaciones que se derivan de la convivencia entre los seres humanos y los

mencionados animales. (Situations arising from the coexistence of humans and animals mentioned). The Act mentions "species traditionally living in the environment of man". This implies a blurring of responsibilities. The species treated here, dogs and cats, traditionally (not naturally) live with man because man has altered its environment, thus they can no longer enjoy the conditions of life and freedom that once were considered proper, as the text reads. This change was imposed by man and, if we consider Marxist analysis, for commercial purposes. Thus, the "situations" which the text refers, are not derived from the coexistence of humans and animals but, once again, from the modifications humans have made to the environment.

Some contradictions

The killing of animals is described as a "despicable procedure" but then, in Article 5, it is approved for special cases without specifying what those cases are:

- *Que al mismo tiempo, se ha comprobado que la prevención es el método idóneo para controlar la superpoblación de animales de compañía, siendo la esterilización quirúrgica —aceptada en el mundo y cada vez más en muchas partes de nuestro país— la técnica más eficaz y correcta de control de la población animal, además de ser la más adecuada para una utilización razonable de los recursos públicos, evitando cualquier desequilibrio biológico en contraposición al procedimiento deleznable que implica utilizar la matanza de animales como herramienta de control demográfico canino o felino.* (At the same time, it has been shown that prevention is the best method to control overpopulation of pets, with surgical sterilization -accepted in the world and increasingly in many parts of our country the most effective and correct technique control of animal populations, as well as being the most appropriate for a reasonable use of public resources, avoiding any biological imbalance in contrast to despicable procedure that involves killing animals used as a tool for canine or feline population control).

- e) *Impedir que se realice la práctica de la eutanasia y el sacrificio indiscriminados de perros y gatos. En caso de que, como último recurso, deba recurrirse a la eutanasia, ésta deberá practicarse del modo más inmediato e indoloro posible.* (Prevent the practice of euthanasia and indiscriminate slaughter of dogs and cats is made. If, as a last resort, be resorted to euthanasia, it must be carried in the most immediate and painless way as possible).

Processes

As mentioned above, the text belongs in a genre with a high degree of rigidity regarding the distribution of participants and processes. Thus, three types of processes are identified:

The mental processes that appear in the text are mostly related to the semantic field delimited by the legislative genre: *considerar, responsabilizar, impedir*, etc. (*to consider, to make responsible for, to prevent*). The material processes are those that directly involve an effect on patients and have their agents elided: *sacrificar, esterilizar, convivir, proteger, maltratar, establecer, profundizar* (*to sacrifice, to sterilize, to live, to protect, to abuse, to establish, to deepen*). Existential processes relate both patients and animals with the resources of legal discourse: *ser, realizar, consistir* (*to be, to perform, to consist*).

Ordering information: textual meta-function

Textual function of language, according to Halliday (1978), manifests in the clause structure by the theme and the rheme. The theme is the pillar that supports the message. The rheme is the body of it. The theme occupies the initial position in the clause and constitutes the psychological subject. The function of “given” belongs to the information treated as recoverable, information the speaker expects the listener can get from the text or the context without further assistance. The opposite is called “new”, not recoverable information, what is brought by the speaker.

The thematic structure shows that the text manifests interest in the program that is created through the Act rather than in the health of dogs and cats. The expressions that refer to animals just seem to function mostly as subject of clauses in the passive voice. In

other cases they act as complements, as seen in Tables 3-7.

When the theme matches the given, the text usually refers to things or processes related to the Act and the *Programa* (*los métodos empleados para controlar la superpoblación, ningún animal, etc.*). When the theme matches the new, it is referring to problems and situations that call for a regulation (*no de los problemas más importantes que atañe a la salubridad pública producto de la superpoblación de animales en un medio urbano, resulta necesaria, etc.*). This type of thematic structure contributes to building the idea that the concept of the *Programa Nacional* was already present in the society before the Act were issued and, therefore, the only thing left was to make it a law.

Final words

From the foregoing discussion it can be said that the Pet Responsibility Act is not only based on speciesist representations but also it does not regulate what it claims to regulate. Several marks can be done in this sense: a potential offender is not described, only expressed as defined by the National Law 14.346 / 54, which is the only previous national legislation, in strict sense, to this Act. Neither does it describe which authorities should implement the measures proposed. The norm is defined as "suitable" instead of "necessary". Also, it does not define why it is so and for that reason we can infer that not only animal life is considered in terms of "suitable" but also public health, since the text mentions that animals born in urban areas represent a serious risk for human health. "Responsible ownership" is not defined, neither how this "contributes to the welfare of the community".

It seems essential to remember that problems related to nonhuman animals and human animals do not arise from the coexistence but from the change man makes in the environment and the place given to nonhuman animals. To presume that problem situations arise from the coexistence involves an erasing of man's responsibility in modifying the environment without considering the consequences. Looking at things this way we can say man is creating a problem that today continues to be solved by sacrifice and euthanasia. Moreover, it should be noted that, dogs and cats, like many other animals in urban environments, are dominated by the human race. They cannot exist outside of human rules. They can not walk alone down the street without being considered "overpopulation", they need a guardian or legal representative to not be considered

marginal, just as women and black persons did until not long ago.

References

- Code civil (2015). http://gallica.bnf.fr/VisuSNE?id=oai_logistic.book-vision.com_3_17912&r=civil+code+2015&lang=ES (Consulted 03/30/2015).
- Colombi, C. (2006). Grammatical Metaphor: Academic Language Development in Latino Students in Spanish. In H. Byrnes (Ed.) *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*. London: Continuum.
- Constitución Nacional Argentina. <http://www.senado.gov.ar/delInteres> (Consulted 03/23/2015).
- Decreto 1088/2011. Créase el "Programa Nacional de Tenencia Responsable y Sanidad de Perros y Gatos" Retrieved February, 2015.
<http://www.infoleg.gob.ar/infolegInternet/anexos/180000-184999/184639/norma.htm> (Consulted on 02/01/2015).
- De Baggis, G. (2015). Solicitud de Habeas Corpus para la orangutan Sandra.
<http://www.derechoanimal.info/esp/page/3694/solicitud-de-habeas-corpus-para-la-orangutan-sandra-comentario-a-proposito-de-la-sentencia-de-la-camara-federal-de-casacion-penal-de-la-ciudad-autonoma-de-buenos-aires-de-18-de-diciembre-de-2014> (Consulted on 12/03/2015).
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *El materialismo histórico y la filosofía de Benedetto Croce*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.
- Gregory, N. (2008). *Meat Quality and Animal Welfare*.
<http://www.thecattlesite.com/articles/1454/meat-quality-and-animal-welfare/> (Consulted on 9/25/2015).
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1961). Categories of the Theory of Grammar. *Word*, 17(3), pp 241–92.
- Halliday, MAK. (1975). Estructura y función del lenguaje, en John Lyons (ed.), *Nuevos horizontes de la lingüística*. (pp. 145-173) Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Halliday, MAK. (1978). *Language as social semiotics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Morgan, C.A. (2009). *Stepping up to the plate: Animal Welfare, Veterinarians and Ethical Conflicts*. PhD Thesis. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Radford, M. (2001) *Animal welfare law in Britain- Regulation and responsibility*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Romero, J. L. (2011). *La cultura occidental*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Serra, J. I (2013). Derecho animal en la legislación de la república argentina.
<http://www.derechoanimal.info/esp/page/2938/derecho-animal-en-la-legislacion-de-la-republica-argentina> (Consulted 03/10/2015).
- Singer, P. (2002)[1975]. *Animal Liberation*. New York: Harper & Collins.
- Stibbe, A. (2012). *Animals Erased. Discourse, Ecology, and Reconnection with the Natural World*. USA: Wesleyan University Press.

Wise, S.M. (2003). The evolution of animal law since 1950. In D.J. Salem & A.N. Rowan (Eds.), *The state of the animals II: 2003* (pp. 99-105). Washington, DC: Humane Society Press.

Wise, S. M. (2014). Reviewing the Case of Sandra the Orangutan in Argentina.

<http://www.nonhumanrightsproject.org/2014/12/24/reviewing-the-case-of-sandra-the-orangutan-in-argentine/> (Consulted on 03/10/2015).

Tables

Table 1

Clause	Agent	Process	Affected entity	Benefited entity
15	La Organización de las Naciones Unidas y la UNESCO	adopta	La declaración Universal de los derechos de los animales	
16	La declaración Universal de los derechos de los animales	dispone	que	
21	El artículo 5	establece	que	
29	La Organización Mundial de la Salud	elaboró	Las Guías para el manejo de la población canina	
52	La provincia de Buenos Aires	Ha dictado	La ley 13879	
60	La tenencia responsable y el cuidado sanitario	No sólo conlleva	El mejoramiento del estado sanitario	De perros y gatos

Table 2

Clause	Agent	Process	Affected entity	Benefited entity
62	X	mejora	El estado sanitario	De perros y gatos
65	La tenencia responsable	Implica proveer	Los requerimientos básicos para su bienestar	Al animal
66	<i>Animal</i>	requiere	La salud, alimentación adecuada, espacio de descanso protegido de las inclemencias del tiempo, etc.	
67	X	provee	Salud, alimento adecuado, espacio de descanso, espacio para eliminar sus residuos, recreación, etc.	
68	X	Protege		Al animal
69	X	mantiene	La sanidad	Del animal
72	X	controla	La reproducción indiscriminada	De animales
74	X	controla	La superpoblación canina y felina	
75	X	sacrifica	Perros y gatos	
76	X	eutanasia	Perros y gatos	
17	Ningún animal	Será sometido	A malos tratos ni a actos crueles	

Table 3

los métodos empleados para controlar la superpoblación canina y felina –el sacrificio y la eutanasia-	Han demostrado carecer de fundamentos éticos y técnicos
Theme	Rheme
Given	New
Suject	Predicate

Table 4

El programa	Tendrá como objetivo principal favorecer y fomentar la tenencia responsable de perros y gatos
Theme	Rheme
Given	New
Suject	Predicate

Table 5

uno de los problemas más importantes que atañe a la salubridad pública producto de la superpoblación de animales en un medio urbano	es la transmisión de enfermedades como la rabia, la leishmaniasis visceral, la hidatidosis, la toxocariasis, la leptospirosis, la brucelosis y la toxoplasmosis
Theme	Rhem
New	Given
Suject	Predicate

Table 6

resulta necesaria	la inclusión en los programas de enseñanza de los temas referentes a la protección de perros y gatos mediante la tenencia responsable y el cuidado de la sanidad de los mismos
Theme	Rheme
New	Glven
Predicate	Suject

Table 7

Ningún animal	Será sometido a malos tratos ni a actos crueles
Theme	Rheme
Given	New
Suject	Predicate

