



Summer 2006

**Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights Advocacy in the Age of Terror, by Lee Hall**

Chris Supik

**Recommended Citation**

Chris Supik, *Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights Advocacy in the Age of Terror*, by Lee Hall, 46 Nat. Resources J. 832 (2006).

Available at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nrj/vol46/iss3/10>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Natural Resources Journal by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [amywinter@unm.edu](mailto:amywinter@unm.edu), [lsloane@salud.unm.edu](mailto:lsloane@salud.unm.edu), [sarahrk@unm.edu](mailto:sarahrk@unm.edu).

and is, advocated by the elite. Far from it. I was pleasantly surprised to read accounts of construction workers, fishermen, hunters, and ranchers doing the hard work of fostering and applying the act.

Finally, the last third of the book is especially useful in illustrating the more recent battles and clarifying, once and for all, why almost no new wilderness has been protected since 1994. Citizen proposals have made little headway, but it hasn't been for lack of trying—and that's because, as this book confirms, wilderness politics are anything but simple.

And that's because of national politics, of course. Though for a while, things were looking pretty good for wilderness advocates. The idea of wilderness grew as the discipline of conservation biology did. In the 1990s, ecology was fully integrated into wilderness proposals—the idea being to create large ecoregion-based visions. Then-President Clinton announced the Roadless Area Conservation Rule, which placed 58.5 million acres of roadless national forest lands off-limits to road-building, logging, and oil and gas development—and that was something.

But new wilderness areas? No. There was a lack of cohesive national support, and the political climate was changing. In the 1994 elections, the Republican party won a majority in the U.S. Senate and House and, as Matt Jenkins notes, “wilderness went into a state of suspension.” Later, Gale Norton (then secretary of the Interior under George W. Bush) signed an agreement that allowed states to claim ownership of backcountry roads and later scrapped the interim protection of areas that had wilderness proposals pending. Then, in 2004, the Bush administration announced what was essentially a repeal of Clinton's roadless rule. Since then, for advocates of wilderness protection, it's been downhill ever since.

But the debate and the push are not over—and this book goes a long way in reviving the conversation. We need to know where we've been so that we might influence the direction we're heading.

Laura Pritchett

Ph.D. Purdue University

Author and co-author of several books, including *Sky Bridge*  
and *Home Land: Writings for a West That Works*, respectively

*Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights Advocacy in the Age of Terror.*  
By Lee Hall. Darien, CT: Nectar Bar Press, 2006. Pp. 162. \$14.95.

Political and spiritual leader Mahatma Gandhi once said, “However much I may sympathize with and admire worthy motives, I am an uncompromising opponent of violent methods even to serve the noblest of causes.” Further, the pioneer of Satyagraha (the philosophy of

nonviolent resistance) argued that “[v]iolent means will give violent freedom.” These are the sentiments echoed in Lee Hall’s *Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights Advocacy in the Age of Terror*, a critique of modern animal rights advocacy. Like Gandhi, Hall argues that to achieve enduring and positive social change, advocates must eschew violence and coercion. Instead, it is crucial that animal rights advocates use education to create understanding and evoke compassion.

Animal advocates must acknowledge that humans will always play a fundamental role in how animals are treated and should therefore seek to persuade the public with a simple request and moral argument. The request is that we allow ourselves to be aware of how our society has gradually and pervasively come to treat animals more and more as commodities and this shift has created horrific animal suffering on an enormous scale. The argument is simpler still: inflicting suffering on any creature is wrong. We must cease being inured to this suffering and to accepting it. From this new awareness and refusal to inflict suffering, a consumer revolution can arise that, in turn, will lead to a corporate response and a shift in our inhumane practices.

Those of us entrenched in the struggle to legitimize animal sentience to the public-at-large are well-acquainted with the methods of both violent and non-violent protest. Like every political, social, or ethical movement, there exists a spectrum of activism amid the membership: ranging from those adopting peaceful resistance to those willing to apply illegal measures to ensure their voices are heard by coercion. While the vast majority of people who identify themselves as animal advocates follow the route of nonviolent resistance, those few who use violence to force a change in the status quo are counterproductive to advancing the interests of animals. Although such a result may seem obvious, Hall further underscores the extent of the damage these actions can cause when viewed through the eyes of the average person unfamiliar with the intricacies of animal advocacy. Instead of using educative means to expose the public to the real horrors of such institutions as animal testing and factory farming, the use of coercion to advance an ideology will only be met with active resistance by the public. As a result, the consequences of sending death threats to senior officials at a major pharmaceutical corporation or the firebombing of a meat packing plant will not only carry potential criminal liability, it also will shift the focus away from the protection of animals and to the actions of extremists.

Not only does this negative publicity give a black eye to all nonviolent animal advocates, it also creates additional impediments to developing a cruelty-free society. For each violent act that occurs in the name of animal rights, the easier it is for governments to usher in

legislation aimed at silencing activism. Certain politicians and lobbyists representing prominent animal-based industries use instances of militant activism to advance their own causes and silence the opposition; the fact that these groups employ violent means makes it much easier for their legislation to be passed. Coining terms such as “eco-terrorism” and referring to animal rights activists as one of America’s greatest domestic terror threats gained popular acceptance not because society is indifferent to the plight of animals or the environment, but as a reaction to the fear militants had engendered. In turn, the media coverage, which focuses on these few extremists while largely ignoring the actions of peaceful activists, creates a false portrayal of the animal rights movement. Therefore, the rank and file, who turn to these corporate monoliths for information, derive a negative impression of all animal activists making it exceedingly difficult for both groups to engage in peaceful debate.

So what can be done to clear the good name of animal advocates around the world? Hall, like Gandhi, argues that we must separate ourselves from all forms of violence. What animal advocates seek is to relieve animals of human-induced suffering; it is a movement that aspires for peace on all levels. To achieve this goal, animal advocates must transcend the avenger role and become harbingers of peace. Instead of demonizing those who do not ascribe to the animal rights movement, advocates must maintain nonviolent resistance that focuses on advancing a moral and ethical argument. Moreover, animal advocacy should seek to break down notions of social hierarchy and create “the most comprehensive peace movement ever known.” If there are no longer any lines drawn between race, sex, gender, religion, and class, modern civilization must also recognize that there cannot be a division between humans and non-human animals. Thus, by relinquishing our dominion over animals and granting them autonomy, we will be helping to free ourselves of socially prescribed systems of inequity.

Chris Supik

JD University of New Mexico School of Law

*It's All for Sale.* By James Ridgeway. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004. Pp. 209. \$18.95 paperback.

Consider these facts and implications that are at the heart of investigative reporter James Ridgeway’s *It’s All for Sale*: By 2025, at least 3.5 billion people will face water scarcity. From one to five million Bangladeshis will die from arsenic poisoning from the water they drink. Water is not the only resource that is becoming increasingly scarce and therefore progressively more expensive. Every resource comes at a price, whether that price is measured in dollars and cents or environmental