

**International Progress and Regress on Animal Rights**

by *Bonnie Berry*, Social Problems Research Group, Gig Harbor, Washington

**Abstract**

This paper addresses the social forces, such as cultural traditions, economic structures, and legal systems, affecting animal (human and nonhuman) rights. Also considered are the cross-cultural degrees of societal advancement on rights, as illustrated by cultures that are stagnant on rights, progressive on rights, and regressive on rights. The definition of “advanced” versus “primitive” cultures is somewhat complicated with the argument being that technologically and materially advanced cultures can be primitive on rights issues, as found in the present-day US. The right-wing Bush administration, greatly aided by the “war on terrorism,” has devolved human rights by reducing civil liberties, freedom of assembly, educational opportunities, and economic equality. This repression of human rights has repercussions for environmental protection and nonhuman rights, as demonstrated herein.

**Introduction**

The term “animals” covers human and nonhuman species; in this context, then, the term “animal oppression” refers to the oppression of human and nonhuman animals. When examining oppression across time and culture, as we will see, the link between nonhuman and human oppression is a close one. This analysis addresses general trends in animal oppression and rights across cultures, explains the social forces that allow for animal oppression as well as the more progressive forces that encourage equal treatment across species, describes the present-day US as a rights-regressive society, and concludes with a prediction for reversal of animal oppression.

**Worldwide Forces on Human and Nonhuman Rights**

No society is free of animal (nonhuman or human) oppression. All societies oppress human and nonhumans historically and to date, as demonstrated by ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, the US refusal to fund women’s health care in other countries if “choice” is involved, Africa’s mass murder of primates, fox hunting in England, whaling in Iceland, etc. Some societies do better

than others on the whole, with individual societies fluctuating over time on the protection of rights, and generally it can be said that human and nonhuman rights expand as societies progress toward democracy. There are no known quantitative measures of how societies rank on oppression. One could count the number of rights organizations set up to protect against oppression, laws enacted, number of known abuses, and so on; but thus far, such cross-cultural comparisons are absent and may not be all that helpful in any case in terms of eliminating rights abuses.

The social forces affecting nonhuman rights (NHR) and human rights (HR) are numerous, with some forces (such as economics), even within an individual society, affecting rights more at some times than at other times. These forces affecting rights can be broad, longstanding forces, such as religion — with religion, for instance, viewing nonhuman animals variously as sacrifices or as objects of reverence and religion providing “divine” justification for homophobia, sexism, and other human oppressions. Social forces can also be more temporally and culturally limited, specific to time and conditions, such as SARS and Mad Cow diseases, both having turned out to increase nonhuman oppression.<sup>1</sup> Social forces, as a rule, are interactive; they affect each other directly and indirectly, and these interactions influence social outcomes. For example, a poor economy can reduce educational opportunities that can affect rights activism.

There are many social forces determining how a society protects or impinges on rights but I will not wander too far afield and will, regrettably, give only brief mention to a very few of the many important rights-related forces.

### **Traditions**

Tradition has long been an explanation (a “reconstruction,” in sociological terms) for nonhuman abuse. Because “things have always been this way,” some would say they should remain so. The fact that some practices are traditions is taken to mean that they are intrinsically good and serve important social functions; thus, they must be allowed to continue. Nonhuman-abusing traditions common to the US include hunting, cockfighting, and coyote killing. Other countries practice their own brands of traditional non-

human abuse, as illustrated by fox hunting in England and camel-fighting in Turkey (British Broadcasting Corporation, 2002; Kinzer, 2000). The same rationales, resting on prejudicial attitudes taken as fact, operate in traditional human abuse as well. Once upon a time, in the US and elsewhere, it was tradition to deny women all manner of rights and for husbands to beat them if they disobeyed. It was a US tradition during and after slavery to deny African Americans rights and to abuse them in unthinkable ways. In short, species-ism, sexism, racism, homophobia, and many forms of bigotry have all fallen under the protection of "tradition." Where matters get a little sticky is when human rights and nonhuman rights come into conflict. For example, the Makah Indians in Neah Bay, Washington have been hoping to resurrect a long-forgotten tradition of whaling, which was once a means of sustenance as well as cultural transfer (involving artistry, preparation of food and other products). The desire for carrying on tradition was questioned when the Makahs failed to use traditional whaling methods and, instead, gunned down the whales from motorized craft and were reluctant to prepare and use the whale products. A federal court order later prohibited the practice (New York Times, 2000). Similarly, Emberley (1997) rationalizes, against NHR logic, the continuing murder of fur-bearing nonhumans by First Nation people in Alaska and Canada because the killing, processing of fur, and sale of fur is economically necessary and ensuring of tradition.

### **The Search for Health, Beauty, and Virility**

In the U.S., Great Britain, and elsewhere, corporate structures continue to test health, hygiene, and beauty products on nonhuman animals, although laboratory testing is increasingly recognized as cruel and unnecessary. Non-human animals are subjected to large-scale and hideously painful tests to ensure that humans can safely use shave creams, deodorants, cosmetics, and all manner of products. In the medical field, surgeries are tested on nonhumans and some medicines are derived from nonhumans, such as Premarin, a treatment for menopausal symptoms painfully extracted from mares' bladders. Less-formalized enterprises, often in the form of street vendors and commonly found in Asia (Thailand, China, Taiwan), abuse nonhuman animals in the name of increasing male virility; witness, men drink snake

venom and eat tiger penises in hopes of enhancing their strength and sexual prowess.

### **Economic Structures**

Nonhuman oppression is frequently an outcome of capitalist venture.<sup>2</sup> The pharmaceutical industry, meat industry (particularly factory farming), hunting (“canned,” fox, etc.), the fur industry, entertainment (circuses, zoos, dog and horse races), and the like are evidence of capitalist-level abuse of nonhuman animals that ordinarily proliferate in “advanced” societies. These industries have paid off immeasurably, in monetary terms, at the expense of nonhuman well-being. This is true, of course, for human exploitation as well. Indeed, interlocking oppression of nonhumans and minority (women, nonwhites, children, the aged, and other disenfranchised) humans speaks to power — specifically the power to exploit, the power to profit from oppression — derived from a myriad of motives, from culinary to scientific to sexual access to cheap labor and beyond (Kappeler, 1995; Pluhar, 1995).

The effects of money on nonhuman oppression are rife with market-value considerations, with the less monetarily valuable being more vulnerable to destruction. Spotted owls are deprived of habitat because they get in the way of timber industry profits. Wolves are murdered because they harm livestock; the livestock are also assuredly oppressed, but wolves are killed because they threaten a more economically viable product (Lopez, 1978; Antonio, 1995).

The environmental assault in search of oil and mineral wealth, as in the case of proposed destruction of national parks and wildlife preserves, is clearly an affront on nonhuman life and is explained by capitalism. In similar fashion, the allowance, under the Bush administration, for snowmobiling in national parks makes snowmobile manufacturers (who lobby and financially support the Bush administration) profitable and happy. Abuse at the corporate, military, and governmental level is more deadly, unnecessary, and devastating than individual-level abuse; it is simply more covert. And when environmental damage is (falsely) couched in national-interest terms, the destruction can seem “legitimate.” The Bush administration’s plan to destroy the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge and nonhuman habitat and

thereby destroy nonhuman lives has been justified as keeping us safe from terrorist countries and our reliance on their oil reserves. In fact, the administration's desire to drill in a fragile environment has to do with energy profits. Moreover, if the administration were truly interested in making the US less dependent on foreign oil, it would seriously suggest that US auto manufacturers make energy-efficient cars; political leaders do not do this because they do not want to disrupt auto manufacturers' huge profits from the sale of SUVs.

With power and money being inseparable, both permit access to the political and legislative wherewithal to win favorable governmental and legal decisions. That is, decisions by the powerful are often ruled in favor of the powerful, permitting them to (in the case of a profit-motivated, environmentally-unfriendly government) destroy environments and wildlife, and to support animal-oppressive pharmaceutical companies, factory farms, and the like. The U.S. is not alone in the search for profit at the expense of nonhumans, obviously. If seal fur were not profitable, Canada would not murder seals. If whaling were not profitable, Japan, Norway, and Iceland would halt whaling operations. In sum, "The oppression of humans and other animals is entangled and ... exploitation is motivated primarily by economic interests" (Nibert, 2002: 15). This oppression is more rampant, Nibert finds, in affluent cultures like the U.S., with a disproportionate number of powerful and privileged members.

### **Laws**

Advanced and complex cultures, such as European societies and the U.S., are more likely than simpler cultures to have elaborate legal definitions of animal abuse, delineating what constitutes human and nonhuman animal rights violations and the resultant penalties. Changes in law are always under consideration, as demonstrated by England's proposed ban on fox hunting, a long and dearly held tradition of the elite, with fox hunting successfully coming under legal fire and a hunting ban in sight by 2005 (Tempest, 2003; Reuters, 2003). The US has recently made some headway on declaring some nonhuman abuses as criminal and on setting harsher punishments, such as prison sentences for these offenses (Berry 2001a).

As has been argued elsewhere, victimization (criminal victimization, all victimization) itself brings about power loss and this is especially true for oppressed human minorities and nonhuman animals (Berry, forthcoming a). Human minorities and nonhuman animals are more likely to find themselves in the victim role because they already occupy a minority status. The minority status itself is replete with indicators of powerlessness, such as unsafe living environments, few economic resources, and little influence with protective social agencies. That is, minorities and nonhumans start out with a massive disadvantage, as they have few (in the case of minority humans) or no (in the case of nonhumans) rights, with disproportionately little legal recourse.

Analysis of crime definitions applied to nonhumans delivers the unsurprising finding that offenses against nonhumans are not viewed in the same light as offenses against humans. The US has advanced, slowly and minimally, against criminal offenses as perpetrated against nonhumans (see Alger and Alger, 2003), yet crime definitions and penalties remain starkly unequal across species.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, comparing criminal penalties for the same offenses (murder, assault, sexual abuse, etc.) committed against nonhuman and human animals shows vast inequities (Berry, 2001a). Not only are there disparities in penalties exacted for human and nonhuman violations, but also disparities exist depending on the identity (specifically socio-economic status) of the perpetrators. People who abuse their nonhuman companions, or who run small-scale but heinous cockfighting operations, are more likely than large-scale corporate violators to be arrested and face criminal penalties. The penalties are not onerous, usually fines and community service, but, when applied, are applied to individual-level and small-scale abusers, rather than large-scale abusers — slaughterhouses, testing corporations, fur producers, factory farms, and so on.

Civil sanctions have, compared to criminal ones, different rules for determining fault and different punishment outcomes. The Animal Legal Defense Fund champions the use of civil remedies for nonhuman abuse (Wise, 2000). The ALDF strategy couches civil law definitions in objectifying terms, referring to nonhuman animals as property and the harm done to

them as property loss to the human “owner.” Civil definitions depicting non-humans as property may not sit well with staunchly egalitarian-minded NHR activists, but this same curious remedy is used when we set an economic value for violating human rights. Witness the Southern Poverty Law Center’s successes at bankrupting the White Aryan Resistance, the Aryan Nation, and various Ku Klux Klan organizations via criminal and civil routes (Berry, 2001a). Likewise, NHR advocacy groups, such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Humane Society of the United States, and (especially pertinent to this paper) the International Fund for Animal Welfare, press civil and criminal cases against nonhuman oppression.

### **The Invisible Nature of Animal Oppression**

Worldwide, oppression is made possible, according to Wolch and Emel (1998), by hidden and unacknowledged desires of humans. In their book, *Animal Geographies*, Wolch and Emel describe the unintentional, invisible, almost unknown oppression of nonhumans as depicted in various cultures around the globe. The reality of animal oppression, they write, “is mostly obscured by the progressive elimination of animals from everyday human experience, and by the creation of a thin veneer of civility surrounding human-animal relations, embodied largely by language tricks, isolation of death camps, and food preparation routines that artfully disguise the true origins of flesh-food” (p. xi). Nonhumans have become indispensable to humans, they write, becoming “tied up with our visions of progress and the good life,” and thus we have become unwilling to view them as viable, worthy beings. Unfortunately, animal-oppressive practices “now threaten the animal world and the entire global environment as never before” (p. xi).

Dwelling on the suffering of nonhumans is inconvenient and uncomfortable and thus not an activity that all humans would want to pursue. Oppressive practices (abuse, homelessness, neglect, starvation, humiliation, etc.) against nonhumans are easier if one can be convinced that nonhumans do not feel or think as humans do. Evidence has mounted over many years of research that they indeed do feel and think, as humans do. But even if it were allowed that nonhuman animals feel and think, they may still be subject to exploitation because, as Singer (1990) asserts, species-ists believe that their

most trivial interests outweigh the vital interests of other (nonhuman) species. Humans are superior, according to the homocentric view, thus condemning nonhumans to be sacrificed for human needs and desires (see also Rachels, 1990). Likewise, Stephen Jay Gould (1999) wrote of the human refusal to see ourselves as other than “separate and superior” to nonhuman animals. Homocentric humans have an unfortunate tendency to dichotomize, to divide human and nonhuman animals as good versus bad, higher versus lower, and (I would add) powerful exploiters versus powerless exploiters. These dichotomies, with nonhumans being far less equal and less deserving, justify oppression.

### **Interlocking Oppression**

Human and nonhuman oppression so overlap that the concept is expressed by Adams and Donovan (1995) as “interlocking oppression,” referring to the relative powerlessness experienced by both nonhumans and human minorities. Carol Adams (1995; 1999) has focused specifically on the interlocking oppression of female humans and animals, and I would add that, in an international context, we might consider shared oppression across rights-less humans and nonhumans in rights-repressive cultures such as China, Thailand, and temporarily but increasingly the U.S.

Shared oppression can provide the catalyst for sympathy as well as activism on the part of unlike victims of oppression, as has been observed on international, national, and local levels. This has been true for human-human rights activism (with unlike humans, such as whites and blacks, aiding each other in rights causes) and it is true for human activism on the part of nonhumans. As the world has become more of a global community, the actions of one culture are deeply felt by other cultures. When one culture engages in animal (human and nonhuman) oppression, there is a strong, disapproving reaction from rights advocates in other cultures, which takes the forms of boycotting, petitioning, and other strategies. Globally, human cooperative efforts, such as the world panel created to conserve the whale population, move NHR forward<sup>4</sup> (Pohl, 2003).

This brings us to a discussion of societies and their varying states of “advancement”. Let us consider societal descriptors, such as “advanced,”



“primitive,” “modern,” “progressive,” and so on, in a new light. Occasionally, a society can be technically- and materially-“advanced” without being progressive on rights, the topic to which I now turn.

### **The U.S. as a Devolving Society**

Nonhuman rights and human rights, generally, evolve over time in a linear fashion, such that as time passes toward “modernity,” rights increase (Berry, 2001b). Terms such as “modern,” “primitive,” and “advanced” have value-laden qualities, probably wrongly so, with advanced and modern seeming good and primitive seeming bad. More objectively, these terms describe a society’s place on a continuum of progress toward technological advancement and other material changes but also (and significantly for this analysis) toward equal rights and democracy. This evolution, the continuum of progress, and the terms that define it are complicated. Not only can a society be modern on some dimensions (say, technology) and primitive on others (such as rights), individual societies can fluctuate over time between progress and regress. As to the former, Japan, Iceland, and Norway are considered modern societies, yet they engage in nonhuman rights-violating whaling. As to the latter, the best example, presently, of a society regressing away from modernity, specifically away from rights, is the United States.

Some societies progress faster than others on NHR as well as HR; for example, England, Germany, Netherlands, and France have progressed more rapidly than other societies in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In “primitive” cultures, such as Afghanistan where time seems to stagnate in the 8<sup>th</sup> century, oppression is obvious and rampant, notably but not exclusively in the treatment of women. In parts of the Middle East and Africa, women continue to be denied rights to education, continue to be stoned to death for adultery, and continue to be subject to genital mutilation. On nonhuman oppression, it is true that all societies oppress nonhumans, and even though some societies have moved forward in reducing this form of oppression, some societies progress very little on that score, to remain quite static on nonhuman oppression. For example, above-mentioned Asian cultures traditionally are exploitative and cruel to nonhuman animals. In the Western hemisphere, small tribal cultures culturally iso-

lated from more “advanced” cultures, such as First Nation societies in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest, stubbornly adhere to exploitative practices, as illustrated by fur trading and whaling (Emberley, 1997; Berry, 2002). All this is not to say that these non-modern societies are necessarily more animal oppressive than the modern ones. For example, the US, a modern if momentarily a rights-repressive society, participates in enormous amounts of nonhuman oppression, as illustrated by factory farming and environmental destruction.

Modernity is dependent upon, if not defined by, social forces (politics, education, the economy, rights movements). In modern societies, we find that HR are highly interactive such that as one category of humans gains rights, other categories are increasingly likely to gain rights, evidenced by conjoined involvement of minorities in civil rights, women’s rights, gay rights, immigrants’ rights, and so on. Human rights are also a strong correlate of progress on nonhuman rights, with humans providing the voice for nonhumans, and succeeding in abolishing a number of oppressive practices (leghold traps and bear-baiting, product-testing, etc.).

The reverse is also true, that setbacks to human and nonhuman rights vary depending upon the social, economic, and political occurrences ongoing in their respective cultures, such that if HR are infringed upon so is the advancement of NHR. For example, a reduction in human rights to assemble, to lawfully belong to civic and activist organizations, to be gainfully employed, and to participate in higher education leads to a reduced ability to improve the lot not only of humans but also of nonhuman animals. Likewise, when humans are free to be employed, to be educated, to assemble lawfully and to serve activist causes, HR and NHR will be facilitated. We already know that HR advocates, who are more likely to be middle class and educated, are not uncommonly NHR advocates; they possess the social power to be so (Pluhar, 1995; Nibert, 1994). An infringement on their social power is an infringement on nonhuman power for self-determination.

The willingness of the public, and NHR advocates specifically, to challenge NHR violations varies by international scope (Berry, 2002; 2001a), with this willingness dependent upon how “open” the society is to

public protest. England and Western European countries (France, Belgium, Germany) are relatively tolerant of social activism, and more open to allowing public voice challenging human and nonhuman oppression, compared to the present-day US.

### **The U.S. as a Case of Rights-Regression**

The US is usually considered a modern society— along material indices as technology, education, and medical science and along more humanist indices as human rights and democratic governing styles. At this very specific and probably temporary point in time, however, the US has regressed in guaranteeing rights. As John LeCarre (2003) put it, US rights and democracy were once, but are no longer, the “envy of the world.” It can be proposed that the US, lately, has regressed under the far-right Bush administration and thus, though modern in terms of material modernity, has reverted to a more primitive state in terms of protecting human and human rights. Under the direction of its far-right political leaders, the US has become more like the “primitive” cultures it criticizes, as indicated by human rights removal and sweeping violent reactions to any questioning of its agenda (Berry, forthcoming b).

As proposed above, a regression on HR causes a regression in NHR. Under the Bush administration, humans are threatened with losing their rights and their civil liberties, most notably via the USA Patriot Act. Rights-respecting humans are also losing their influence because of much poorer educational opportunities (with education being strongly related to rights awareness), because of economic ruin inhibiting contributions to NHR charities, because US citizens have less voice in environmentally-disastrous events like the feared destruction of Alaska National Wildlife Reserve, and because NHR civic organizations are being redefined as terrorist organizations (Cole, 2002; Barcott, 2002).

As David Cole (2002) has plainly stated, and as the editors of the New York Times (2003) agree, the USA Patriot Act is “unpatriotic..” This Act can be “used against domestic political protestors, such as environmentalists ... with no link to international terrorism” (New York Times, 2003: 20). The USA Patriot Act, enacted after 9/11, gives the government unprecedented

powers to monitor citizens. The Act allows libraries to track who borrows what books, allows bookstores to track who buys what books, asks businesses to “hand over electronic records on finances, telephone calls, e-mails and other personal data,” and permits investigators to “subpoena private books, records, papers, documents, and other items” ... all in the name of anti-terrorism (Nieves, 2003). None of this snooping on private citizens, granted in the wake of 9/11, plays any effective role in preventing terrorism. It merely allows monitoring, with threatened punishment, of civil rights groups, anti-war groups, and other “dissident” organizations that do not support a neo-conservative agenda (Cole, 2002).

Members of the public are increasingly derisive of over-application of “terrorism” as a scare tactic to keep the public compliant. They are increasingly reluctant to apply the “terrorist” label to progressive activists, including NHR advocates, even when the public disagrees with NHR. Two letters to the editor of the Seattle Times (2003) say as much, referring to a recent Animal Liberation Front (ALF) release of minks from a mink ranch, with one letter-writer calling the activists “knuckleheads” but retaining the opinion that these activists are by no means terrorists. The second letter finds that the word “terror” applies to states of intense fear and violence, not to trespassing and vandalism, as was the case in the mink release by ALF.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

No society is free from human and nonhuman animal oppression, although some societies do better than others on ensuring rights. There are paradoxes within societies, with contradictory patterns on rights, as illustrated by Canada’s 2003 decision to permit gay marriages while continuing to murder seals for their fur. And societies may fluctuate in their rights protection depending upon the social (economic, political, etc.) conditions they are operating under at any given time.

The U.S. and, to a lesser extent, the rest of the world was thrown into a state of flux, most dramatically by the events of 9/11 but more consequentially by the hard right turn taken by the Bush administration. The U.S. and many other societies, especially European societies, were moving toward greater equality between human and nonhuman animals, but since 2001, in

the US, several factors have slowed this forward, rights-propelled movement. Among the oppressive economic conditions set in motion were the immense tax cut for the wealthy and tax breaks for corporations, coinciding with the general lack of concern for laborers. The consequential poor economic state for the majority has reduced educational opportunities as well as funds available for rights-protecting organizations. Furthermore, civic protest has been limited by the USA Patriot Act. Public protest has been affected not only by governmental monitoring but also by fear of being labeled “unpatriotic” or, worse, “terrorists.” In other words, since 9/11, the current administration, already hell-bent on destroying human rights and on destroying the environment (habitat to humans and nonhumans), are now using the present state of crisis, fear, and confusion to quell progressive social protest.

On a brighter note, recent indications show that the US public will not forever be distracted by the “war on terrorism” and will resume the focus on environmental and other domestic issues. The public has not been entirely silenced and has been able to say that it is not pleased with the administration’s regressive policies on rights and on the environment. The J-curve theory of revolution suggests that movement activity is more likely to occur when progress, as we saw in the 1970s through 2000 on animal and environmental rights, is suddenly threatened. When hopes of movement forward are dashed, when the movement suffers a political reversal, social movement activity may become more radical (Barcott, 2002; Garner, 1996; Davies, 1962). With the approval of snowmobiles in national parks, proposals to drill for oil in national parks, relaxation of rules on air and water pollution, and refusals to consider the scientific validity of global warming and to do anything about it, we might anticipate a backlash by the proponents of non-human rights and environmental protection. As Goldstone and Tilly (2001) point out in their discussion of threats and opportunities in social movement activity, social movement organizations may “decide to risk protest, even if opportunities seem absent, if the costs of not acting seem too great” (p. 183). True, the costs that an activist group incurs from protest are significant, particularly now when progressive activists are labeled “terrorists.” Yet the dangers of engaging in activism may predictably take a backseat to the dam-

age from inaction and the further decay of rights (Goldstone and Tilly). In other words, activists will engage in progressive action toward NHR and HR perhaps especially under such repressive circumstances.

Many of the US public do not agree with the policies and practices of the Patriot Act, and over a hundred cities are refusing to implement it. The US public is beginning to question the overuse of words like “threat” and “terrorist,” and, in short, are resisting the right-wing definition of all progressive organizations and activities as terrorist (Berry, forthcoming b). Repressive forces have experienced success, but erosion of human and nonhuman rights are likely not permanent. Consciousness has been raised, and as long as there is a public voice, rights will expand.

**Endnotes**

1. Disease has had an odd relationship to nonhuman animals, worldwide. Mad Cow has affected cows and the humans who consume them; the humans who eat infected cows become ill, the cows then are destroyed in massive numbers, and all of it is due to the human practice of feeding cows ground-up dead nonhumans. SARS, affecting large parts of the world but particularly Asia, seems to have a great deal of mystery to it as to its origin and remedies. For a time, some in Asia believed, and still believe, that SARS is transferred by cats to humans. Thus, cats were destroyed in large numbers. More recently, China determined that cats were safe again... to consume. Cats are considered a delicacy in some parts of China and are now available once again for sale and consumption (*Chicago Tribune*, 2003).

2. Non-capitalist politico-economic arrangements, such as socialism, are not cruelty-free, but the scale of oppression is less because (a) non-capitalist philosophies have greater emphases on egalitarianism and (b) the pay-off is less.

3. Prison sentences for nonhuman abuse and murder are noteworthy because of their rarity. They are applied, but extremely infrequently.

4. The International Whaling Commission, "historically concerned with the development of the whaling industry," has overcome stiff opposition from pro-whaling countries and voted "to make whale conservation one of its main functions" (Pohl, 2003:11).

## References

- Adams, Carol J. 1995. *Neither Man nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Adams, Carol J. and Josephine Donovan. 1995. *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Perspectives*. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Adams, Carol J. 1999. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Alger, Janet M. and Steven F. Alger. 2003. *Cat Culture: The Social World of a Cat Shelter*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.
- Antonio, Diane. 1995. "Of Wolves and Women." pp. 213-230 in *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*, edited by C.J. Adams and J. Donovan. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Barcott, Bruce. 2002. "From Tree-Hugger to Terrorist." *New York Times Magazine*, April 7, pp. 56-59, 81.
- Berry, Bonnie. 2001a. "To Punish the Punishers: The Animal Rights Advocates' Dilemma." Presented at the American Society of Criminology, annual meetings, Atlanta, GA, November 8.
- Berry, Bonnie. 2001b. "On Intolerance: Social Emotions, Behaviors, and Biases." *Humanity and Society* Vol. 25, No. 1: pp. 19-30.
- Berry, Bonnie. 2002. "Cumulative Constructions of Animal Rights: Different Routes to Equality." Presented at the American Sociological Association, annual meetings, Chicago, IL, August 17.
- Berry, Bonnie. Forthcoming a. "Nonhuman Animals as Victims: Victimology and the Animal Rights Movement." Forthcoming in *Victimizing Vulnerable Groups: Images of Uniquely High Risk Crime Targets*, edited by C. T.M. Coston. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Berry, Bonnie. Forthcoming b. "Right-Wing Ideology, Terrorism, and the False Promise of Security." Forthcoming in *Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: Criminological Perspectives*, edited by M. Deflem. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.



British Broadcasting Corporation News. 2002. "Passions Rise Over Hunt Bill." *BBC News* (<http://news.bbc.co.uk>), February 13.

Chicago Tribune. 2003. "China Lifts Ban on Sale of Cats Tied to SARS." *Chicago Tribune* (<http://chicagotribune.com>), August 15.

Cole, David. 2002. "Misdirected Snooping Doesn't Stop Terror." *New York Times*, June 4, p. A23.

Davies, James. 1962. "Toward a Theory of Revolution." *American Sociological Review* 27: pp. 5-19.

Garner, Roberta. 1996. *Contemporary Movements and Ideologies*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Emberley, Julia V. 1997. *The Cultural Politics of Fur*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Goldstone, Jack A. and Charles Tilly. 2001. "Threat (and Opportunity): Popular Action and State Response in the Dynamics of Contentious Action." Pp. 179-194 in *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, edited by R.R. Aminzade, J.A. Goldstone, D. McAdam, E.J. Perry, W.H. Sewell, Jr., S. Tarrow, and C. Tilly. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Kinzer, Stephen. 2000. "In These Prizefights, Camels Wrestle for Carpets." *New York Times*, January 19, p. A4.

Gould, Stephen Jay. 1999. "The Human Difference." *New York Times*, July 2, p. A19.

Kappeler, Susanne. 1995. "Speciesism, Racism, and Nationalism... or the Power of Scientific Subjectivity." pp. 320-352 in *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*, edited by C. J. Adams and J. Donovan. Durham, NC: Duke University.

New York Times. 2000. "Court Overturns a Tribe's Whaling Rights." *New York Times*, June 10, p. A28.

New York Times. 2003. "An Unpatriotic Act." *New York Times*, August 25, p. A20.

- Le Carre, John. 2003. "The United States of America Has Gone Mad." *Times of London* (<http://timesonline.co.uk>), January 15.
- Lopez, Barry Holstun. 1978. *Of Wolves and Men*. New York, NY: Scribners.
- Nibert, David. 1994. "Animal Rights and Human Social Issues." *Society and Animals 2*: pp. 115-124.
- Nibert, David. 2002. *Animal Rights/Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Nieves, Evelyn. 2003. "Local Officials Defy the Patriot Act." *Washington Post* (<http://msnbc.com>), April 21.
- Pohl, Otto. 2003. "World Panel Will Now Act to Conserve the Whale Population." *New York Times*, June 17, p. A11.
- Pluhar, Evelyn B. 1995. *Beyond Prejudice: The Moral Significance of Human and Nonhuman Animals*. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Rachels, James. 1990. *Created from Animals*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University.
- Reuters. 2003. "U.K. Moves Closer to Fox-Hunting Ban." Reuters (<http://msnbc.com>), July 1.
- Singer, Peter. 1990. *Animal Liberation*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Seattle Times letters to the editor. 2003. "Let's Apply Label of Ecoterrorists to Those Who Have Earned it" and "Crime, Not Terrorism." *Seattle Times* (<http://seattletimes.com>), August 28.
- Tempest, Matthew. 2003. "Hunting Ban in Sight for 2005." *The Guardian* (<http://politics.guardian.co.uk>).
- Wise, Steven M. 2000. *Rattling the Cage: Toward Legal Rights for Animals*. New York, NY: Perseus Books (Harper Collins).
- Wolch, Jennifer and Jody Emel (ed.). 1998. *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics, and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*. New York, NY: Verso.