

The State-Society Relationship in Dog-Eating Movement: A Comparative Analysis on South Korea and Mainland China

Li Yuting, Zhu Zheliang, Seong Yeji, Lee Jinwoo

Mentor: Lee Sungtae

Abstract: In this article, the roles of government, organizations and citizens that play in the issue about dog eating are interpreted in different perspectives. In addition, the reason for each side in the debate has various reasons in culture, custom and ethics. However, the most crucial part among these perspectives is the relationship of state and society, which is different between Korea and China. Although, the concept of “strong state and weak society”, which is compared to Korean’s situation, is concluded in the content, and remains a question for further study.

Keywords: Dog eating culture, State-society relationship, South Korea, Mainland China

1. Introduction

Dog eating and animal protecting are big issue that will usually arouse public discussion. What is abstracting is these topics will never come to an agreement, and both sides have their reasons to strongly support their points. Meanwhile, people in some parts of china or sporadic population are still consuming dog meat and have been limited in some extent because of the debate about it. When we are researching for material about this, it is interesting that the government’s attitudes towards this topic or protesting from public is unclear. Moreover, the government claims that staff in government system is not encouraged to eat dog meat, but eating dog meat is citizens’ rights, so that they cannot set official regulations to forbid or permit dog consuming. Since, the government cannot approve the protesting or movement of animal protecting organizations. The position of government seems obliquity in this situation.

Focusing on this topic, we found that no matter the debate towards dog meat consuming, or the government’s attitude are different between Korean and China. In Korea, there are special dog meat industry and market, which indicates that consuming dog meat is legal in some extent. On the other side, the voice of animal protection will never be absent in this kind of circumstances. What is different in Korea is that their proposal and protestation will form a pressure, pushing the government to put forward

anti-abusing regulations for animals. In this way, dog consuming is not only a topic around culture, folk or custom, moral and law; it can also be a mirror, which will clear the relationship between state and society.

2. China: The role of government, organization and citizen

2.1 Government and Organization

Chinese governments, especially local ones, were faced with direct and huge pressure from anti-dog-eating organizations. Different local governments in different district took different strategies to relieve the conflicts between dog meat festival and dog protection movements. Two typical examples are Yulin, which lies in southwestern China and is very famous for the dog meat festival, and Jinhua, a city in Zhejiang Province, in the eastern part. While Jinhua government made local stipulation to thoroughly ban the ‘dog meat festival’ in 2012, Yulin government took a more avoidant and indirect policy towards this issue (Luo, 2017). In 2012, when the boycott of dog meat just began, Yulin government refused to cancel the ‘festival’. It even organized local media to counterattack animal-protection organizations by manipulating public opinion. In 2014, as the conflicts became much more fierce, and upgraded to a bloodshed (Chen & Wu, 2014). Yulin government started to prohibit civil servant and officers from eating dogs. Slaughtering dogs and selling dogs in there also banned. In order to irritate animal protectors, the local government stipulated that the word ‘dog’ must not appear in shop signs. However, these measures are very infirm. They appear only as internal documentations in the governmental system, or oral announcements. Strictly speaking, these stipulations, lacked legitimacy, and might be not sufficient to relieve the conflict. On June 7th 2014, Yulin government announced that the ‘dog meat festival’ was a folk autonomous event, and was never organized by the government. It also emphasized the importance of food safety and requires officers to monitor dog meat market strictly¹. This attitude is conspiracy of avoiding the responsibility and leadership in this issue (Zhang, 2012).

It is enlightening to compare political and economical environments in the two cities. Jinhua government has already planned to cancel the ‘commodity fair’, which

¹ “Several explanations on the so-called ‘mid-summer Litchi and Dog Meat Festival’ by the people's Government of Yulin Municipality”, 玉林市人民政府关于所谓“夏至荔枝狗肉节”的几点说明. 玉林市人民政府门户网站. <http://www.yulin.gov.cn/info/271198>.

is a part of the ‘dog meat festival’. This tendency provided a suitable political environment for the cancelling of ‘dog meat festival’. Compared to Yulin, Jinhua had a more developed and robust economy, which did not need to rely on the ‘festival’ to stimulate local economy. On the contrary, Yulin planned to promote the ‘festival’ to attract tourists and raise popularity of the city (Luo, 2017). This comparison indicates that local political and economical environments are critical factors in local legislature. It also suggests that local stipulations, rather than nation-wide laws, may be more effective and reasonable for this dog-eating issue.

In China, apart from governments themselves, there are also some official (or ‘main-stream’) medias, which propagates opinions of central governments in an indirect way, and usually, more sensitive and ahead of time. Many official medias, including Xinhua Net and Zhongxin Net, CCTV (Yuan, 2014; Cai, 2014; Meng, 2016), responded to the conflicts about dog-eating culture promptly. These medias avoided showing any obvious standpoint. They only presented some facts, and encouraged people, including multiple parties involved in the conflict, to keep rational and take a diverse vision, to discuss this issue from various aspects, and to take different measure to solve different problems. This balanced attitude is expected to guide public opinion away from conflicts, but to a more normal state (Yuan, 2014; Cai, 2014; Meng, 2016).

Animal protecting organizations, exhibited excessively radical, and even violent performance in the conflicts, both online and in the off-line demonstration. In 2014, there were severe misbehavior in Yulin. The demonstrators, from animal protecting organizations all over China, assaulted and threatened dog-sellers and dog-eaters.² They even hurt some dog meat consumers, upgrading the demonstration to a bloodshed (Yuan, 2014; Cai, 2014; Meng, 2016). They exaggerated the ‘festival’, claiming there was a large-scale dog slaughtering all over the Yulin City, which is contradictory to the truth. They also expressed provincial discrimination to Yulin. On the Internet, demonstrators broadcast wrong information about ‘dog slaughtering’, and quickly spread through several popular social media of China. Some famous figures were also involved in the spreading and greatly magnified the effect of those misleading propa-

² “Several explanations on the so-called ‘mid-summer Litchi and Dog Meat Festival’ by the people's Government of Yulin Municipality”, 玉林市人民政府关于所谓“夏至荔枝狗肉节”的几点说明. 玉林市人民政府门户网站. <http://www.yulin.gov.cn/info/271198>.

ganda (Yuan, 2014; Cai, 2014). However, these strong demonstration, did not reach the expectation of animal protectors. On the contrary, many people feel disgusted about overdriven actions of those animal protectors. Many of them who originally hold a neutral opinion, turned to stand by dog eating culture and dog eaters' individual rights. This adverse effect is proved by the obvious increase of dog meat sales in 2014 (Cai, 2014).

Sociologists and jurists also engaged in the discussions of this issue. Most of discussions focused on legislation of moral values. In China, dog-eating culture is now trapped in a dilemma. As a kind of traditional custom, it is protected by Act for Intangible Cultural Heritage of PRC (中华人民共和国非物质文化遗产法). The behaviors of selling and buying dog meat, can be further protected by Law of Property (物权法). There is no law prohibiting people from eating dog meat. However, in real life, Act for Intangible Cultural Heritage of PRC and Law of Property are not adequately implemented, while some other laws and acts about animal protection, for example, Laws of Wildlife Protection (野生动物保护法), are excessively executed, or even abused for opposing dog eating culture, especially by those demonstrators during 'dog meat festivals' (Meng, 2016). This kind of abuse is also relevant to the difference of structures between laws related to cultural protection and animal protection. Relative to Laws of Wildlife Protection, Act for Intangible Cultural Heritage of PRC and Law of Property has an equal position. However, cultural protection usually has local characteristics, and is commonly executed according to some inferior laws. Animal protection, on the contrary, is often put into practice with many equal laws (relative to Laws of Wildlife Protection), such as Animal Epidemics Prevention Laws of PRC (动物防疫法) and Law of PRC on the Entry and Exit Animal and Plant Quarantine (进出口动植物检疫法). In a word, the structure of laws for animal protection, leads to a more direct, widespread and powerful implementation of animal protection, and may be easy to be abused to issues that are actually not incorporated into the law (Meng, 2016).

The dispute about dog eating can be seen as a case of environmental ethics (Gong, 2017). Therefore, this case about dog eating, can be generalized into a paradigm: legislation of environmental ethics. Some principles of this legislation process has been proposed (Gong, 2017). First, classical legislation is human-centered, conservational, compromising and attempts to be general. These properties are very incompatible with environmental ethics, which is inter-species, ahead of time, specific

and even religious, in some extent. Second, environmental ethics is also full of diversity. Different ethics should compete but also coexist with each other, within limits of laws. In the legislation process, competition should be introduced, in order to ensure plasticity of newly-founded laws. Thus different ethics all have equal chances to be considered and taken into the law, and the law can be unceasingly optimized. Third, ethics and laws are cooperative. This is to say, not all the ethics are necessary to become a part of law. Laws only give a lower limit. If this lower limit is impractically high, laws will lose social basis and cannot be smoothly implemented. Any specific legislation process of environmental ethics, need to follow these principles. Looking back to the dog-eating problem that we are analyzing, some animal protecting organizations are neglecting legislation, but demonstrating and even ‘fighting’ blindly. They have already been dangerous to legal rights and even safety of other people. So they are severely deviating from law and legislation. Dog eating is only a provincial phenomenon in China. In order to balance demands from different groups of people, local laws, rather than nationwide laws, should be extracted from environmental ethics, then optimized and implemented.

2.2 China: Citizens

Although dog meat can be a source of meat consuming has become a public topic long before, it became widespread and bombing overnight with the progress of The Yulin Festival. Yulin is a city in Guangxi province, which has traditions like eating dog meat in the mid-summer for some medical use. From 2012, many animal protectors went Yulin to call for the cancellation of dog eating. A behavior artist Pianshankong and some dog lovers are gathering at Yulin dog-meat market, kneeling down and begging for forgiveness of dogs, to express their protest of Yulin festival in June 2012. Moreover, many dog lovers visit restaurant or shops, where dog meat is sold or cooked and call for protection until some of the restaurants have to close. The next wave came because some animal lover treat dog meat restaurant with violence which arouse more people to think about the original question: Is dog meat really can not be eaten? The public has divided into different opinions, which is indicated in some scholars’ research and explanation that what is their various points and basis.

Different positions with various reasons: According to the content of long lasting debate, scholars and reports summarize and extend the topic to several perspectives like history, folk or custom, moral or ethics and culture. All of them have complex background to explain what the argument in this field is.

The most interesting perspective is to seek for basis in the history of China. According to supporters for dog eating: Dog started to be regarded as an important livestock in the Neolithic. Although some people at that time consumed dog meat, but it only limited in the upper class. Compared to other meat like pork, dog meat in the upper level. In addition, dog acts as an offering, which often appears in the tomb or some ceremonies. In one term, it follows its master into the tomb. In another term, its meat will be set on the table for the deities in China. To the Chunqiu and Han Dynasty, the population of eating dog meat expanded from the upper class to the whole society. In Qing and Han Dynasty, dog meat is one of the essential resources for meat, of course, many cooking methods and dishes was developing with the trend. Unless different altitudes appeared in Sui and Tang Dynasty, eating dog meat has its position and seems reasonable. Dog meat is in the list of the cheapest meat, which is still luxury for people in poverty. Since, if people in the lower class want to improve their dishes after a long time single vegetables and grains meal, dog meat is their best choice.

However, the history can be interpreted into another side. The northern part of china brought the habits about consuming dog meat to the southern part. Meanwhile, they began to increasingly turn to other resources of meat, like sheep. The comment of eating dog turned to more negative like only chair warmer or idler will eat that. Dog meat become something people only ate it with no choices. There are some reasons why this attitude will occurred according to some scholars speculating. Affected by the emotion of treasuring from nomad in the northern part, the development of breeding sheep result from the spread of some religions, like Buddhism. The upper class in china rejected dog meat becoming food. After Sui Dynasty and Tang dynasty, the dog meat is a kind of low-effective animal food resource. With the fading of traditional dog breeding, dog were usually bred for house keeping without people, pets or hunting. However, the cost in breeding is higher than the return when eating them. In the same time, they could consume pork, sheep and aquatic products instead of dog meat. Moreover, dog meat was regarded as a kind of “problem meat” with suspect obtain channel like stealing and risks of health (Liu, 2016; Xia, 2017).

The second perspective is folk and custom in dog eating. Dog eating refers to the topic about animal using in Intangible Cultural Heritage (like monkey shows and “di-ancui”). Dog eating is as a lifestyle inherited from ancestor, hoping for better future, and a method for incoming for people that make living on it. As to some Chinese

medical theory, the efficacy of dog meat to add ‘yang’ that is beneficial to the body health, which is essential way to prove the body resistance and harmony.

In addition, others claim that inheriting the tradition can be practiced in more environmental-friendly way. For example, looking for other type of foods, which can also means adding yang like some plants in Chinese medicine (or the sheep meat) to replace the consuming of dogs? Moreover, dishes looks like dog meat but is not made from it can also represent the meaning of tradition (Xia, 2017, Qin, 2014).

Referring to moral/ethics and culture, opponents of dog eating asked: Why dog needs to be protected not pig or sheep? And why those who are cried for dogs still eating other kinds of meat? Is dog really a pet not livestock in China? (Xia, 2017) Both of the generalization and specialization in judging dog eating are depends on human being’s rights or requirements in mental and material (Luo, 2017; Cui, 2014). In the debate or in the movement towards Yulin Festival, how to deal with the relationship between citizens’ personal appealing, behavior and the rights of society and government become a rock and a hard place.

3. Relationship between government and society in China

In this dog-eating culture issue, relationship of government, social organization, media, and citizens, can be explained by some theories of state-society relationship.

State-society relationship is becoming more and more cooperative and equal these years, which provides prerequisite for the anti-dog-meat campaign. It is helpful to look back on the changes of state-society relationship in a few past decades. NGO (Non-governmental Organization), which reflects social power in some extent, provides a suitable viewpoint of state-society relationship. After the foundation of PRC, almost all the NGOs, including religious organizations, were cancelled by the government. Even if some of them remained to exist, they were entirely controlled by the government, and had no free space to work independently (Wang, 2014). After the Reform and Opening-up in 1978, state power began to shift and transfer to social organizations, and NGO became agents of government. A new type of NGO, called GONGO (Government Organized NGO), appeared in a top-down manner, under the supervision of government. These NGOs, can be deemed as extensions of the power of government. Around 2000, NGOs were seeking for more freedom and independency. But it was not until 2004 that the relationship between the government and NGOs became cooperative, with modifications of some policies and laws for NGOs (Wang,

2014). Industrial Organizations, is also an important indicator of state-society relationship (Bell, 1996). It is proposed that Chinese government has taken a strategy of 'Interests matching' to handle its relationship with industrial organizations. (Jiang et al., 2011) The government has the responsibility to promote economic growth, but the first goal of the government must be consolidating its power. Weak management of society leads to higher growth rate of economy, but it may be risky for the regime. The government needs to find a balance between these two effects. It must choose a policy that stimulates economy and consolidates its regime at the same time. Thus the government will support industrial organizations, which have the same interests, or namely a win-win mode with the state; while restrict or even eliminate industrial organizations, which may threaten the government's benefit. However, we should note that this strategy is only taken in recent years, when Chinese society is under transformation. In a word, Chinese government loosened restrictions on social organizations very recently, which enables various social activities against dog-eating culture.

Apart from opener social policies of the government, 'Fragmented Authoritarianism' (Lieberthal & David eds., 1992) is also a necessary factor for emergence of anti-dog-eating movements. Fragmented power indicates a less concentrated power system, with more power decentralized to local governments. This ensures central governments cannot make strong policies to interfere with the anti-dog-eating campaign. 'Fragmented Authoritarianism' also links local governments to local benefits. Once local governments got their power from the central government. They will use the power to gain benefits for themselves (Yang, 2011). Recall that we have discussed the 'Interests matching' above. It is straightforward that different local governments may have different attitudes towards identical or similar issues. Their attitudes and policies do not necessarily depend nature of issues only, but may also varies due to different interests of different places. This explains why Yulin and Jinhua, two cities in China, had contrary attitudes towards similar 'dog meat festival'. It might be a reason that Yulin economy relies more on dog meat business.

Some other theories can also provide explanations for the campaign. There was a popular state-social theories of 'Classifying control' (Kang & Han, 2005) which states that the government will be more strict with organizations that may threatens their regime, and will be tolerant and permissive with organizations that are not dangerous at all. We think this rule not only pertains to difference of organizations, but also can be used to compare different levels of governments. In the case of anti-dog-meat

campaign, those demonstrators have no influence to the central regime, so central government of China almost have no involvement in this issue. On the contrary, the dog protecting organizations, held the demonstration, which has a great impact on local social stability, thus threatening local government in some extent, especially in Yulin. As a result, Yulin government had to give some response, but mainly negative, because the campaign threatens local economical development and social tranquility, or namely, interests of the local government.

It is noteworthy that media played important role in the outburst and expansion of the anti-dog-meat movements. Since official or governmental media only gave descriptive comments on this dispute over dog meat culture, here we mainly refer to free social media. This kind of free media is very similar to NGOs, in the relationship between the government and society. Before 1980s, Chinese media was firmly controlled by the government. Only after late 1990s, most of Chinese media acquired their freedom (Kang & Han, 2005). In 1998, most of them did not need financial support from the government, which makes their independency more natural and granted (Yu, 2009). Besides anti-dog-movement, Chinese media has already catalyzed many social movements. For example, media pushed the nationwide environment protection, and even promoted legislation, cooperating with some NGOs. Media, as a catalyst of social movements, can also be incorporated into the framework of state-society relationship.

4. South Korea: The role of government, organization and citizen

4.1 Government

On dog dining issue, the South Korea government is on the neutral side, not only partly recognizing having dog meat but at the same time giving a sanction by banning the illegal breeding of dogs or brutal killing methods.

The government in South Korea admits dog-dining culture to some extent, admitting to establish dog-breeding facilities legally.³ South Korea is the only country in the world known to have intensive dog breeding farms throughout the peninsula to supply the demand for dog meat and associated products, ranging from small ‘back-yard’ enterprises housing dogs, to large-scale facilities housing thousands of dogs.

³ Change for Animals Foundation. Jul 23, 2018.
<http://www.changeforanimals.org/southkoreascrueldogmeatindustry>

On the other hand, on the dog dining issue, it is true that the government has gradually taken practical actions to impose sanctions to this culture by legislating law. They issued the law to ban the killing of dogs for meat. And it is literally effective⁴. For example, a ruling from the city court in Bucheonin this year July fined 3m won (£2,050) to accused man who killed animals without proper reasons and violating building and hygiene regulations. In addition, It is very significant in that it is the first court decision that killing dogs for dog meat is illegal itself.

The important role of South Korean government is to maintain the social stability. As this controversial issue can polarize the society, it is essential for government to take proper action to ease the mood. However, each government department's vague definition on dog meat makes ongoing controversies severe. While the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs categorizes dogs as livestock, the Ministry of Food and Drugs does not officially identify it as food. Accordingly, to reduce current social conflicts, making the definition clear and unify the opinions through peaceful negotiation between each department is a crucial task to build up social stability.

4.2 Organization

In terms of organization, their ultimate goal is to prohibit dog dining culture. And most groups related to animals rights take a huge role to banning on the sale and consumption of dog meat. To express and realize their goal, they use special chances particularly when the attention from the world is gathered. Recently⁵, ahead of the PyeongChang Winter Olympics in South Korea, the Korea Association for Animal Protection demanded the prohibition both out of compassion for the animals and to bolster Korea's reputation on the world stage, as the practice of eating dogs might alarm some international visitors. In addition, there are precedent examples. In the 1988 Olympic Games and 2002 World Cup as well, groups of NGOs were demanding on the dog meat issue.

There are many ways of protesting. Many organizations gather together, march on the streets, and hold boards, reading banning dog meat or they have signature-seeking campaigns not only encouraging other citizens' participation but also growing

⁴ Killing dogs for meat ruled illegal by South Korean court. Jul 23, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jun/21/killing-dogs-for-meat-illegal-south-korea-court-rules>

⁵ Animal Rights Activists in South Korea Want Dog Meat Banned Before the Winter Olympics. 4th Jan 2018. <http://time.com/5087207/south-korea-olympics-dog-meat/>

power to strengthen their assertion. Their efforts literally paid off later and affect government to revise the current law or issue new one, which can protect the right or animals.

4.3 Citizen

Dog dining culture was once deeply rooted in one of the Korean traditions in the society but nowadays, it is on the blink of the collapse, as the young generations are reluctant to consume dog as a meat.

Over the issue, at first, the public is widely divided.⁶ The poll conducted by Realmeter on Monday revealed that about 51.5 percent of South Koreans were not in favor of criminalizing dog meat here. Conversely, nearly 40 percent of respondents back the ban, with only 8.8 percent of respondents having no strong opinion. The figures represent a deep divide in the country over the controversial consumption of dog meat between varying age groups, though not all young people hold a favorable view of a dog meat ban. Around 57 percent of people in their 20s disagree with banning dog meat while nearly 37 percent showed support. Similar patterns were found among people in their 40s and 50s, while opinions are more equally divided among those in their 30s and 60s. Broken down by gender, 36.5 percent of South Korean men supported the dog meat ban, while 42.9 percent of women showed approval.⁷

The generational divide is evident when it comes to dog eating in South Korea, along with the rise of pet ownership. Those in their teens to thirties mostly see dogs as companions, naturally disapproving of eating dogs. On the other hand, the older generations, in their fifties and above, who grew up eating dog on *boknal*, is generally more accustomed to the culture that has been around for centuries in the region.

Most dog-meat restaurants today are hidden in back-alleys, without explicit signs. In the past, it was common to see eateries advertising “*bosintang*,” which literally means nurturing soup, but is understood to mean dog meat soup. More restaurants use vaguer, less common terms like *yeongyangtang* (nutritious soup) or *sacheoltang* (four seasons soup), which include soups made from other meat like chicken. Today

⁶ Majority of Koreans Don't Support Dog Meat Ban : Poll. Jun 25, 2018.
<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20180625000852>

⁷ Before Criticizing South Koreans Eating Dog, Know the Context First. Mar 16, 2018.
<https://www.koreaexpose.com/eating-dog-meat-industry-south-korea/>

in South Korea, it's not hard to get your hands on dog meat soup, which means as the time goes by it renders into the part of the culture only the minority enjoys.

5. The relationship of the government, organization, and citizen in South Korea

It is time for the government to take action to resolve the conflict about dog meat. The issue of dog meat has been a conflict since the 1988, Seoul Olympics though, as the number of pet dogs goes up every year, the problem is getting worse. In fact, the government received 1,027 complaints against dog meat for a year. In addition, according to the BBC. A petition in the U.K. was submitted to the British Parliament with more than 100,000 signatures and urged Korea to ban dog meat.

At the petition committee, Allog Sharma, vice minister of Asian and Pacific Affairs said " We will press Korea to change the distribution of dog meat. An animal rights group (HSI) mentioned "The British government should support Korean politicians and people who insist on banning dog meat. ", however Korea government remains neutral.

5.1 Citizens and organization

A group of dog breeders is protesting, saying it is violation of the right to live to disturb their business. They insist breeding place for dog has been reduced from 15,000 to about 6,000 by animal rights groups and government apathy and there are over a million people who make a living through raising and selling dog. If it will be going on for few years, they could lose their jobs. According to the livestock law, dogs are registered as livestock. However, the livestock processing law does not include dogs as livestock products.

Since it is not registered under the Processing Act, animal rights groups criticize dog breeders and disturb their businesses. There is something that needs to be fixed, but it has not yet been resolved in the indifference of the government. When it comes to eating dog meat, they want it to be officially legal. Group of dog breeders said even there is not much difference in the process of slaughtering a dog, such as a cow, a pig, a chicken, or a duck. slaughter electric needle injector are used for all butchering When they slaughter a dog, They don't use the same ways that beat them up or hanging their necks in order to make meat softer anymore.

Currently, dog meat consumption has decreased a lot in younger generations. However, dog meat is a traditional Korean food that we have eaten since prehistoric

times. Therefore, they insist it is wrong to press them to change our tradition by foreign and animal rights groups' pressure. According to dog breeders, it is more unhygienic now because it is not legalized. The sooner the dog meat is legalized, the cleaner it is to keep it clean, in a more hygienic environment, and use it for food.

On the other hand, animal rights groups mentioned, if it is legalized, it becomes stuck and it is very difficult to replace it. These days, eating dogs is not suitable for the national image, and it is not appropriate when over 10 million people are raising dogs in Korea. Therefore, they mentioned that as we are a global member of the international community, we should decide that the industry would disappear rather than legalize and solidify eating dogs. Now, for other livestock, pigs and chickens are within the legal boundary, and the animals are not being raised or slaughtered in any sanitary way.

5.2 Dog law enforcement is a double-edged sword

Recently in Korea, public opinion about dog meat has changed negatively and will eventually disappear naturally at the end, but it will take a few more years for that day to come.

While dog meat eating culture remains a hot issue, it is estimated that approximately 2 million dogs are slaughtered a year for food in Korea. However, there are no exact figures or statistics related to consumption of dog meat, and no legal basis has been provided to regulate the butchering or distribution of dog meat.

According to the Livestock Act, dog is defined as livestock, but the livestock processing law does not include dogs in the animals subject to slaughter. Despite the fact that dog meat slaughter and distribution are still taking place, there is no legal basis to crack down on it, so it is highly likely that the process is unethical and unhygienic.

On the other hand, if dogs are included in the categories "livestock processing law" to prevent this, the distribution process and slaughter will be standardized and controlled accordingly. This would be considered to be the legalization of dog meat which recognizes dogs as food.

This complex problem, the dog meat eating culture, is in conflict with cultural diversity and interpretation of animal protection, and is in a blind spot of policy.

6. Comparison

After explaining the situation both in China and in Korea, we found some common and differences in two countries. It is obvious that there always have contradic-

tion in the topic about whether dog meat can be consumed both in both countries. Moreover, complex reasons and groups of people are involved in the whirlpool. Dog eating can be a custom, which has a historical basis that has been challenged by the lifestyle of new generations. Meanwhile, dog consuming is a dilemma in different perspectives of culture and culture, which is both existed and discussed in most Asia countries. Besides, from the common that is clear in the elaboration in former and separate part for both countries, what is more essential is the different behavior in each country.

The first expression that is about Chinese state-society relationship in this issue indicates “strong state and weak society”, which is mentioned and used in many essays about this relationship. Moreover, the rules that government plays in the process seems vague but is complex in various perspectives. Firstly, the government did not set it clear in every reasons in the development of the debate, and tried to solve the conflict in some external extends, like limiting the expression and setting rules to officials but not public. Secondly, local government or grassroots government responded to the objection and conflicts. Thirdly, the government had controlled the organizations that played important roles in the issue far before it came out. Controversially, in Korea, the government does not control organizations like animal protecting ones, resulting the central government need to reply for the objection like setting regulations or shutting down dog meat industry. As far as we can conclude, the relationship in China appears less free than Korea, but the government in China can have more space and flexibility than Korean government. In China, the different economic and social environments among different areas have drastic impact on the government policy towards dog eating culture as well as animal protection movements. It is hard to infer that whether the strong state and weak society contributes to the different actions in this case according to the relationship, but it is meaningful for us to study more for it.

7. Rethinking

Regarding to the essay, there are some critical points. At first, we do not conduct any survey or research in site, only relying on other articles or books. As our essay is mainly about comparison between China and Korea on dog meat issue, if we ask each citizen about personal thinking on neighboring country, it would add the level of completion.

Secondly, there is tendency to choose and write down over broad issue. As our topic does not set specifically, it affects to our contents as well and the overall contents are lack of detailed information. For readers, it may hard to understand sufficiently.

In addition, the comparison between two different countries is the crucial part in the essay though, the comparison and analysis are quite insufficient when compare with the former explanation parts. We find it difficult to decide what factors should be discussed and what should not be.

（李玉婷，南京大学社会学院社会学系 2015 级本科生）

联系方式： 151080022@smail.nju.edu

（朱哲良，南京大学社会学院社会学系 2015 级本科生）

联系方式： skyehole02180914@hotmail.com

（Seong Yeji，韩国东亚大学公共行政专业本科生）

联系方式： qwertyui1013@naver.com

（Lee Jinwoo，韩国东亚大学经济专业本科生）

联系方式： wpsjff94@naver.com

References

- Bell, S. (1995), *Between the Market and the State: The Role of Business Associations in Public Policy*. Comparative Politics. 28(1).
- Cai, Yurong. 蔡雨容. (2015). 2014 年“玉林荔枝狗肉节”媒介事件的网络舆论走势研究. 《危机管理与传播策略》. 2015(9), 178-183.
- Chen, Xingwang. & Wu, Yuewei. 陈兴王、吴跃伟. 玉林狗肉节发生伤人流血事件. 《东方早报》2014 年 6 月 22 日, 第 A05 版: 时事·中国.
- Cui, Yifei. 崔逸飞. (2014). 广西玉林狗肉节事件新闻扫描. 《中国工作犬业》2014(07), 52-54.
- Feng, Xiucheng. 冯秀成. (2014). 玉林“狗肉节”之争. 《决策》, 2014(08), 79-81.
- Gong, Gu. 巩固. (2017). 生态文明建设中的环境伦理法治化探析——以“狗肉风波”切入. 《浙江学刊》, 2017(2). 60-68.
- Jiang, Hua. Zhang, Jianmin. Zhou, Ying. 江华, 张建民, 周莹. (2011). 利益契合: 转型期中国国家与社会关系的一个分析框架——以行业组织政策参与为案例. 《社会学研究》, 2011(3). 136-152
- Kang, Xiaoguang & Han, Heng. 康晓光, 韩恒. (2005). 分类控制: 当前中国大陆国家与社会关系研究. 《社会学研究》, 2005(6). 73-89
- Lieberthal, K. & David Lampton eds., (1992). *Bureaucracy, Politics and Decision Making in Post-Mao China*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liu, Pubing. 刘朴兵. (2006). 略论中国古代的食狗之风及人们对食用狗肉的态度. 《殷都学刊》, 2006(01), 102-106.
- Luo, Xi 罗茜. (2017). 整合与争夺: “抵制狗肉节”运动框架分析. 《青年研究》, 2017(3), 82-93
- Meng, Lingfa. 孟令法. (2016). “动物保护”视域下的非物质文化遗产传承——来自“狗肉”“猴戏”与“点翠技艺”的法律思考. 《非物质文化遗产横向问题研究》. 2016(1), 54-62.
- Qin, Qingbi. 覃青必. 动物保护伦理及其实践困境——以玉林“狗肉节”引发的争议为例. 《中州学刊》, 2014(10), 98-102.
- Wang, Yang. 王杨. (2017). 中国政府与非政府组织 (NGO) 关系的演变与特征思考——基于国家与社会关系视角. 《理论月刊》, 2017(1), 151-156
- Xia, Xunxiang. 夏循祥. (2017). “狗肉好吃名声丑”: 民俗遗产化的价值观冲突——以玉林“荔枝狗肉节”为中心的讨论. 《文化遗产》, 2017(05), 95-102.
- Yang, Xueping. 杨雪萍. (2011). 中国环保运动生长的外部条件: 国家-社会关系视角. Master Thesis, Shanghai Jiaotong University.
- Yu, Guoming 喻国明. (2009). 中国传媒变化已很大 [EB/OL]. 南都传播研究院, 2009. http://nanyuan.oeeee.com/zjt/files/200905/t20090515_1062404.html.
- Yuan, Suwen. 苑苏文. 玉林狗肉节: 跨文化传播的一道“难题”. International Communications, Xinhua Net, June 2014.
- Zhang, Haiwen. (2012). *The Research on Network Public Opinion Spread and Coping Strategies in Public Event: The Dog-meat Festival Event of Guangxi Yulin as A Case Study*. Master Thesis, Guangxi Teachers Education University, China.