

## ANIMAL RIGHTS IN POST-SOVIET SPACE

Gulmira Taituleyeva

**Suleyman Demirel University**

### **Abstract**

The purpose of the research is to examine the concept of animal rights, identify problems and suggest the ways for the solution. The first phase of the project involves background information, specifically the birth of Animal Rights Movement. Additionally, concepts of self-consciousness, rationality, pain and suffering are examined. The second phase involves legal regulation of protection of animals in post-Soviet states and other countries, animal rights movements and their tactics are examined. The final phase involves problems on the animal rights issues and the ways for the solution.

**Keywords:** animal rights, morality, Animal Rights Movement, animal protection, prevention, regulation.

## **1. Introduction**

In accordance with specified goal this research states the following problems:

- demonstrate relevance of the problem of proper provision of animal rights protection in the modern world;
- identify specifics of international legal regulation, research legal nature of international documents which protect animal rights;
- assess the significance and role of existing control mechanisms in animal rights;
- develop proposals on increase of effectiveness of international control mechanisms in investigated area

Object of diploma research is to show the importance and relevance of animal rights issues in post-Soviet space and creation of regulatory framework, which determines legal status of animals.

Research questions:

1. How animals differ from humans?
2. On what basis animal deserve rights?
3. How Animal Rights Movements work?
4. How animals are protected in post-Soviet countries?
5. How to prevent violations of animal rights?

## **2. Birth of Animal Rights Movement**

People have been considered animals as working partners and companions for thousand of years. Furthermore, animals were considered as “things” that can be used by people to satisfy their needs in food, clothing, entertainment, science and so on.

The Animal Rights Movement was firstly born in England, when Queen Victoria reigned the country. Aristocrats created the animal protection movement in order to end the poor treatment of urban horses and stray dogs. Other important thing was a book written by Upton Sinclair in 1906, named *The Jungle*. He wrote about obscured slaughterhouse operations and shed some light on this situation. In addition, contemporary movement is believed to be

found in the United Kingdom (UK) in the early 1970s by a group of Oxford university post-graduate students, known as the “Oxford Group”. This group is associated with about sixteen names. The group raised the issue with leading Oxford moral philosophers. Their approach was based not on sentimentality, but on the moral rights of animals.

The member of this group has significantly changed the whole movement in 1975. Peter Singer is an Australian moral philosopher and Professor of Bioethics at Princeton University wrote a book *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*. It is widely considered as the Bible of the animal liberation movement (Yount, 5). The author argues that people should not “oppress” animals (Singer 1). He states that the interests of animals should be considered because of their ability to experience pain and pleasure. He is utilitarian, therefore, the main goal of all beings is to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. Moreover, he states that people should just stop discriminating animals because they are not members of a human species. Singer compares animal discrimination with racism: *“This book is about the tyranny of people over animals. It has caused and still causes so much pain and suffering that it can only be compared with the centuries-old tyranny of white people over black people. The struggle against this tyranny is just as important as the other moral and social problems that are now being dealt with”* (Singer, 1). As a utilitarian, Singer accepts causing a little pain if it brings much pleasure. For example, using animals in medical research is okay for him if there is no alternative ways to conduct research. And if this research saves many lives, it outweighs the harm done to the animals. But killing animals for meat or to test cosmetics is not moral because the good resulting from those uses is relatively insignificant and can be achieved in other ways (Singer,8).

The second member of the Oxford Group, who developed animal rights movement and specialized in animal rights theory is Tom Regan. In his book written in 1984, *The Case for Animal Rights*, he explicitly uses the term “rights” in connection with animals. Furthermore, unlike Singer, Regan argues that all human’s using of animals that cause their suffering are morally wrong and should be abolished, and it does not matter how much benefit the people get: *“It is not larger, cleaner cages that justice demands in the case of animals used in science, but empty cages; not traditional animal agriculture, but a complete end to all commerce in the flesh of dead animals”* (Yount, 6). Unlike many other philosophers who state that animals do not need rights because they

do not even understand the concept of right, Regan believes they do not have to understand it, their lives are valuable at the same level as humans' lives. Therefore, he is considered to be more radical than Singer. Although two philosophers have theoretical differences, both of them agree that humanity should cardinaly change attitudes toward animals (Guither, 22).

### **3. Difference between humans and animals**

First and foremost, it is worth mentioning the difference between a human and an animal. Are they really fundamentally separate species or not? For instance, Darwinism argues that humans and animals are fundamentally the same. Charles Darwin believes that humans share almost the same DNA with other organisms. Evan Eichler, a specialist from the University of Washington, proved this theory by comparing humans and the chimpanzees. He found out that humans and chimps share 96 percent of DNA (Sherry, 1).

Roger Scruton, an English philosopher also states that humans are animals, but of a very special kind. In his book *Animal Rights and Wrongs* he writes that humans are animals, who have rights, responsibilities and duties. They are conscious, rational and able to extend their sympathy to other species (Scruton, 10).

Nevertheless, the main difference between animals and humans occurs in the brain. Especially in the cerebral cortex. It is the largest region of the cerebrum in the brain. Furthermore, it plays a key role in memory, attention, language, thought, perception, and so on (Sherry, 1). Animals do not possess all these abilities as humans do. However, does this mean that animals should have limited or full rights? Scruton argues that people do not even consider species that are radically differ from us. For instance, we have little sympathy towards insects like worms, fleas, spiders and so on. We admire reptiles and fish but feel no affection to them. Meanwhile, mammals cause our warm concern. He calls it as "*favoritism*", and says that this kind of discrimination exists, but it is not wrong.

Concept of self-consciousness. First of all, it is important to distinguish consciousness from self-consciousness. Consciousness is the feature what makes the mind so important, being aware of an external object or something within oneself. In this case animals *are* conscious, because they feel things like pain, fear, hunger, etc. While self-consciousness means self-awareness, in other words, humans are aware of themselves, they distinguish themselves from

others; they refer to themselves as ‘I’. Scruton believes that animals do not possess these abilities; therefore, they *are not* self-conscious (Scruton, 22). Dr. Clifford J. Sherry, an American neuroscientist agrees with Scruton’s point of view. As an example he writes about dogs. People who own dogs assure that they are “little people” in fur. They claim that dogs understand them, think, imagine and do everything as humans do. Yes, individual dogs can be distinguished from other dogs by their responses to their environment and their unique responses to the wants and needs of their owner. They also experience emotions, they can feel sad or happy. However, this is a consciousness, but not self-consciousness (Sherry, 14).

Moreover, the practice when people (like dog owners) attribute to animals or insensate objects human-like characteristics is called “*anthropomorphism*”. It was vital for our ancestors’ survival to be able to recognize an animal or human. It is genetically programmed into our brains. According to Sherry, we anthropomorphize in three ways: 1) in creating stories, movies, and television programs; 2) in granting human characteristics to animals, usually companion animals, like dogs, cats and even horses; and 3) in attributing human or animal characteristics to insensate objects (Sherry, 41).

Nevertheless, Sherry states that some animals have self-consciousness. They are “*apes, whales and dolphins, which are the only organisms whose brain/body ratio approaches (and in some cases exceeds) humans. These two dimensions require a well-developed cerebral cortex, significant cognitive ability, and self-consciousness*” (Sherry, 34). Though, Scruton argues that our belief that apes, dolphins and elephants are self-conscious occurs just because of our excess of sympathy towards these animals (Scruton, 22).

Coetzee compares animals with human infants. Infants are not self-conscious too, however we consider baby murder as more serious crime than a killing of an adult. Thus, “*...all this discussion of consciousness and whether animals have it is just a smokescreen. At bottom we protect our own kind. Thumbs up to human babies, thumbs down to veal calves...*” (Coetzee, 143).

Concepts of pain and suffering. Jeremy Bentham, an English philosopher is widely regarded as one of the earliest proponents of animal rights. He argued that the ability to suffer, not the ability to reason, should be the criteria to have right. If self-consciousness alone was the criterion by which we judge who

ought to have rights, human infants and adults with certain forms of disability might fall short, too. *“The question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?”* (Bentham, 144).

The person who firstly used the term *“painism”* was Richard Ryder. He is a British writer, psychologist, and animal rights advocate; moreover, he is a member of the Oxford Group. He believes that our concern for the pain and distress of others should be extended to any pain-feeling being regardless of his or her sex, class, race, religion, nationality or species. The same amount of pain in a mouse is as important as the same amount of pain in a human. Pain is the only one evil in the world (Ryder, 57). Animals feel pain, they scream and try to avoid the cause of pain; even their nervous system is similar to ours. Therefore, animals deserve rights. He argues that pain and other forms of suffering are much more powerful than pleasure, because if we were given a choice of choosing pleasure or avoiding pain we would choose to avoid pain. Thus, he does not agree with Singer’s utilitarian point of view: *“One of the problems with the utilitarian view is that, for example, the sufferings of a gang-rape victim can be justified if the rape gives a greater sum total of pleasure to the rapists”* (Ryder, 75).

Nevertheless, there are some scholars that argue it is impossible to know whether animals feel pain in the same way as humans. For example, Scruton believes that suffering of a human is different from animals’. People do not only feel pain, they can imagine it, rehearse it and anticipate it. For instance, a dog hit by a car suffers and feels pain, however it does not understand that this broken leg means death for him. A man with broken leg realizes that if he does not get help he will die in agony (Scruton, 39).

#### **4. Animal Rights Movement’s tactics and opponents.**

Usually, traditional animal welfare groups such as the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) and more aggressive animal rights groups such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) use similar tactics like any other social or political advocacy groups: fund-raising and member recruitment, education (including programs aimed at children), direct mail, letter writing campaigns, web sites and e-mail contact lists. They also use high-profile media campaigns, boycotts, lobbying of legislators, sponsorship of ballot initiatives, and lawsuits. Some groups sometimes even buy shares in companies that they oppose in order to gain the right to introduce

shareholder resolutions at company meetings; the resolutions almost never pass, but they gain publicity for the groups' point of view. However, there are some radical groups that use threats, vandalism and arson in order to be heard. Animal rights activist usually are very effective in gaining public attention, persuading people and changing public opinion, they can even persuade some companies to adopt animal-friendly policies. For instance, one of the most famous campaign of PETA is the banners with famous models, singers and actors such as Naomi Campbell, Adam Levine, Pink, Oprah Winfrey and others proclaiming that they would rather go naked than wear fur featuring pictures of dead animals. This campaign caused public outcry not only in the United States (US), but also in other countries (Yount, 14).

Targets of animal rights organizations are farmers, scientists, hunters, companies that in some way abuse animals. Targets often simply ignored them. However, when public pressure went up they began actively fighting back. Existing trade associations such as the Animal Agriculture Alliance created committees and campaigns to answer to animal rightists' attacks. Some new organizations, such as the National Association for Biomedical Research were established; their main purpose is to defend particular industries. Since the 1990s, these groups used many of the same tactics as their opponents. They argue that animal rightists misinterpret the information. Therefore, they started to spread information through publishing pamphlets and videotapes, presenting their position on the Internet, and giving fact packets to teachers and journalists. For example, the British Research Defence Society (animal research advocacy group) published reviews from seriously ill people who say that they would not be alive if research on animals had not taken place. This shows that testing on animals is not so bad as animal rightists claim (Yount, 20-21).

## **5. International protection of animal rights**

The people's close relationship with companion animals is the basis for the animal protection movement itself. Concern for companion animals was the reason for the formation of the first animal protection laws and organizations.

The first country that passed the first national animal protection law was England. It was called Martin Act, named after Richard Martin, the Irish minister of Parliament, who introduced it in 1822. It prohibited cruel beating or abusing any horse, mule, cow, sheep or other cattle. In 1835 cockfighting

became illegal. Two years after the original Martin Act was passed, Arthur Broome founded the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA), the West's first national animal protection organization. The group worked to make sure the Martin Act was enforced. Queen Victoria lent the society her patronage, allowing it to add Royal (RSPCA) to its name, in 1840. By the end of the century it had persuaded British legislators to pass laws that protected wild and domestic animals in a variety of situations, from use in scientific laboratories to drawing of carts, and had made kindness to animals a widely accepted concept. However, the idea was much less well received in rural England, where activities such as fox hunting remained popular and the slaughter of animals on farms was a daily routine. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that RSPCA exists nowadays and actively promotes animal welfare in the United Kingdom (Yount, 23-24).

In 2006 the Parliament of the United Kingdom signed The Animal Welfare Act. It introduced an important and new concept for people that have working or farm animals, pet owners and those who are responsible for domestic animals (like breeders). They must take positive steps to ensure they care for their animals properly and in particular must provide for the five welfare needs, which are: 1) need for a suitable environment; 2) need for a suitable diet; 3) need to be able to exhibit normal behavior patterns; 4) need to be housed with, or apart, from other animals; 5) need to be protected from pain, suffering, injury and disease. In other case a person commits an offence and will be punished.

The United States followed UK's example. American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) was founded by Henry Bergh, former diplomat in 1866. After one year he persuaded the New York legislature to pass an anticruelty law that became a model for later laws. Various similar groups and laws sprang up in the following decades in the United States, Britain, and other countries. By 1921, every state in the United States and most of European countries had some sort of law forbidding cruelty to animals (Yount, 24).

Additionally, numerous international agreements and conventions were created. Such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), which is an international agreement among governments to ensure that the international commercial trade in wild animals

and plants does not threaten their survival. CITES has 183 member countries, also known as Parties. In 1983 Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) entered into force. It is an environmental treaty on the conservation of migratory animals and their habitats, and it provides legal framework for internationally coordinated conservation measures, including protection of habitat and regulating trade. Convention includes 120 parties from Africa, Central and South America, Asia, Europe and Oceania.

However, there is no global, intergovernmental recognition of the importance of animal welfare legislation. The Universal Declaration on Animal Welfare (UDAW) is a proposed inter-governmental agreement to recognise that animals are sentient, to prevent cruelty and reduce suffering, and to promote standards on the welfare of animals. Confirmed by the United Nations it would be a non-binding set of principles, like Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The principles were designed to encourage and enable national governments to introduce and improve animal protection legislation and initiatives. It is supported by 46 countries and by ministries from 17 further countries.

## **6. Protection of animals in post-Soviet states**

It is worth mentioning that problem of cruelty to animals in post-Soviet countries is not paid so much attention and effort as it should be, especially compared with other countries where animal rights are protected quite efficiently. Moreover, Russia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and so on have highly limited animal welfare protections by international standards.

Animal rights and welfare in Russia are protected a little bit better than in other post-Soviet states. Russian Federation's Civil Code and Criminal Code address animal cruelty. They prohibit causing injury or death to an animal 1) with malicious or mercenary motives; 2) with sadistic methods; 3) in the presence of minors. However, there are no animal welfare laws addressing farm animals, companion animals, animals used in research, animals used for work, or animals used for recreation. For example, Russian chicken and pig production has increased recent years. Tail docking, tooth pulling, castration and other painful procedures without anesthetic are legal, unlike in developed states. Testing cosmetics on animals is also legal. Russian parliament considered a ban on this practice in 2015, however no ban passed.

Furthermore, Russia is the world's largest fur market; 80% of Russian populations wear fur during winter. Fur animals are raised on fur farms, which are not regulated. The most popular form of trapping in Russia is the leg hold trap, which has been banned in 90 countries for being inhumane.

Nevertheless, there are various organizations that implement campaigns for better conditions for farm animals, promote veganism (practice avoiding the use of animal products, particularly in diet), oppose fur production, push for the use of alternatives to animal testing, and address Russia's stray cat and dog programs through sterilization and provision of shelter. One of them is Alliance for Animal Rights. It is an organization founded by Russian animal rights advocates. Participants of the Alliance strive to achieve harmony between humans, animals and nature. They believe that animals should have the right to life, protection from suffering and care from the people. Alliance members oppose the most severe forms of violence against animals, such as meat and fur industries, animal experiments, circuses, etc., and support the development of vegetarian and vegan initiatives, the creation of an alternative for animal experiments, the production of clothing, food, medicine and household chemicals without using animals.

The Alliance for Animal Rights conducts campaigns in various areas and one of them is a speech against the fur industry in November 2005. This interregional campaign against the fur industry was held for the first time on the territory of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The Alliance is a member of the International Anti-Fur Coalition. Moreover, it maintains cooperation with PETA and Coalition to Abolish the Fur Trade (CAFT) organizations. Another campaign was against use of animals in experiments; protests took place at the Moscow State University (MSU), a demonstration in front of the nursery, which grows experimental animals. The Alliance also carried out actions near the offices of pharmaceutical corporations, which conduct experiments on animals. Furthermore, as an activist for veganism and vegetarianism the Alliance for Animal Rights has created an electronic catalog of vegetarian recreational facilities, including cafes, restaurants and tourist sites.

Another two main organizations in Russia are VITA and LAPA. VITA organized anti-fur protests spanning 46 Russian cities in 2013. In 2014 it published undercover videos of circus trainers abusing circus animals, which

caused public outcry. LAPA is an English animal charity organization founded in 2013 to help stray animals in Russia. Its goals are reduction of pet overpopulation and of animal cruelty. To achieve these goals organization promotes sterilization and runs sterilization programs and maintains school educational programs.

Situation in other post-Soviet counties are worse. For instance, Kazakhstan's Criminal Code addresses animal cruelty. However, according to data provided by Committee on Legal Statistics and Special Accounts it follows that from 2005 to 2013, out of 800 registered cases under Article 276 (cruel treatment of animals) of the Criminal Code of the Kazakhstan, only 11 have reached the court. It means that the article is formulated in such a way that it allows a person to avoid responsibility even in cases that are obvious to citizens as cruel treatment. Animals are used in circuses, cosmetics, experiments, etc. There is only one animal protection organization, which is called Kazakhstan Animal Rescue and Education (KARE). Its main goal is the education of a humane and responsible attitude toward animals in society. The Foundation is a member of the World Animal Protection organization and The International Society for Animal Professionals (ISAP). Additionally, KARE is the ambassador of the World Animal Day organization.

Usually it tries to build a dialogue with the government through requests, proposals and even criticism of certain norms and rules of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The organization insists that the main problems related to animals' welfare in Kazakhstan include: overpopulation of stray animals, animal abuse, dog fighting, the lack of clear rules and restrictions on the ownership of animals and the use of animals in sports, circuses, zoos and mobile dolphinariums. In 2013 thanks to efforts of the organization, KIMEP University in Almaty added a course called Animal Law. This was an unprecedented event for both Kazakhstan and Central Asia, and perhaps the entire post-Soviet space. Within the framework of the course, students study the basics of animal legislation in Kazakhstan and abroad, international normative acts, their ethnic, religious, philosophical and political basis.

In 2005 Ukraine adopted the law "On the Protection of Animals from Cruel Treatment", prohibiting the killing of dogs and cats in the streets. However, due to the adoption of ill-considered programs to regulate the number of homeless animals, their number on the streets of large cities

continues to increase. Therefore, after the adoption of the law, municipal services periodically kill dogs. Similar tendency is followed in Georgia, Estonia, Azerbaijan and other states. All of these countries have the law on the protection of animals, but the protection itself – no. *“Although state and federal laws insure humane treatment of animals, the existence of the law itself will not guarantee that animals will be cared for humanely”* (Guither, 163).

## **7. Problems on the animal rights issues**

Not counting problems concerning pets (dogs, cats, etc.), which were mentioned above there are other various problems on the animal rights issues. There are use of animals in spheres such as agriculture, science, education, animal fighting, hunting and entertainment.

Agriculture. Due to the fact that corporations' main goal is to earn and save money, cows, chickens, pigs and other animals used in agriculture are held in poor conditions. Dairies have increased in size and complexity. In order to be able to produce milk a cow has to have a calf. However calves are taken away from their mothers shortly after birth. After that, they are confined to a small box, called “veal crate”. In this tiny box a calf is not able to turn around or even lie down. Therefore, without motion its muscles atrophy. The calves are fed a milk substitute that lacks iron and other essential nutrients. They are slaughtered at about 14 weeks of age. The US, UK and other members of the European Union (EU) banned the use of crates in 2007 and started house these calves in small groups (Sherry, 40-41). However, such kinds of boxes are still used in post-Soviet states.

Science. The second largest and controversial use of animals by humans is for scientific research or product testing. On the first hand, the main motivation for basic research is to expand humanity's knowledge. For example, a scientist might test a new drug in order to determine whether it is not dangerous, dose that is needed, and the effects of the drug before it goes to the mass market (Sherry, 46). On the other hand, animal rights activists argue that animals in laboratories are socially isolated and psychologically traumatized, and in the end they die in agony. Therefore, testing on them is morally and ethically wrong. Furthermore, majority of animal experiments do not contribute to improving human health, and the value of the role that animal experimentation plays in most medical advances is questionable. Some researchers found that medical treatments developed in animals rarely

translated to humans. PETA claims that diseases that are artificially induced in animals in a laboratory are never identical to those that occur naturally in human beings.

Education. The use of animals in education is also controversial. College, university, and sometimes even elementary school students are frequently required to dissect the bodies of animals (such as euthanized dogs and cats, parts of cattle, sheep, and pigs from slaughterhouses) in their biology classes in developed states. Animals are also used in the training of clinical professionals, medical doctors, dentists and veterinarians. Many animal rights activists argue that killing animals for educational purposes is unnecessary, and some students have protested against dissection (Yount, 52).

Animal fighting. Most people in North America and Europe today, whether animal rightists or not, disapprove of animal fighting. Animal fighting is prohibited in European states and in the US (however, in some states such as Louisiana and New Mexico cockfighting is legal). Nevertheless, cockfighting remains popular enough in some cultures. Similarly, dog fighting is illegal, yet it is still a quite popular activity in Kazakhstan, Georgia, Russia, Ukraine, etc. On the one hand, dog fighting causes obvious pain and injury to the animals. The losers are killed by winners or often just die of their wounds. Furthermore, dog fighting presents potential danger to humans as well, since dogs bred to fight other dogs are also likely to attack people (Yount, 57). On the other hand, it is called “test run” (TR) carried out among some breeds, such as Central Asian Shepherd Dog (Alabai) and Caucasian Shepherd Dog, as the main task have the preservation of the working qualities necessary to protect the herd from wild predators. Thus, they are zootechnical measures, the rules of which are very strictly regulated.

Hunting. Animal rights activists see modern hunting as completely unfair and cruel murder of innocent animals. Though, hunters describe hunting as the way of expressing a bond with nature. As hunters point out, humans have hunted throughout their evolution. Therefore, hunting is a natural activity. The main purpose of hunting was to provide meat, clothing, and other materials necessary for survival (Yount, 71). However, nowadays people hunt primarily for enjoyment. Furthermore, various species became extinct. They are Steller’s sea cow, quagga, Chinese river dolphin (baiji), Tasmanian tiger (thylacine), North American cougar (puma), black rhinoceros and others.

Entertainment. Exploitation of animals in entertainment includes circuses, films and television, rodeo, zoos, marine mammal theme parks and fashion (feather, fur and leather). Almost every city in the world has a zoo. Zoos have changed over the past years. In the past animals used to be displayed in small cages made of concrete and iron, usually with one or two members of a species to a cage. Today many zoos have slowly replaced these cages with large enclosures. These areas are often viewed from trams or monorails (Sherry, 70). However, most of the zoos in post-Soviet countries still use small cages. For instance, in 2016 a zoo in Almaty was engaged in several scandals, when its animals died one after another. It caused a huge excitement among citizens. As a result, the director of the zoo has changed, nutrition of animals has changed, and some cages were replaced to enclosures. Moreover, the management of the zoo plans to remove all the cages and turn this place into an environment. It will take about seven years.

More than 30 million animals are raised in cages and killed for their fur. They are foxes, sables, chinchillas and ferrets. Some companies even use stray cats. The animals are typically raised in small wire mesh cages, which is stressful for them. Animals are typically fed agricultural byproducts, such as damaged eggs, expired cheeses and so on. Animals are euthanized by bottled gas that contains pure carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide. The same tendency is followed in feather and leather production (Sherry, 73). Due to the cold weather conditions fur is quite popular in Russia, Ukraine and in North Kazakhstan. Fur-lovers argue that fur coats provide warmth, while animal activists claim that there are synthetic materials that are as warm as fur. Furthermore, it is morally wrong to kill and wear an animal's skin.

Organizations like PETA state that most of circuses lack the funding, expertise, and sometimes the will to care for exotic animals properly. Additionally, even well cared animals cannot live in a natural environment and they live in stressful conditions. Conditions are even worse when circuses travel, requiring tight confinement. Animal rights activists compare circuses with slavery. In some circuses trainers of performing animals even use whips, electric prods, or other pain-inducing devices (Yount, 60)

## **8. Ways for the solution of the problems on the animal rights issues**

There are a lot of ways for the reduction of problems on animal rights issues. First of all, this is education. It is very important to increase people's

awareness and concern through education, through showing them the importance and relevance of animal rights issues. New subjects should be taught in schools and universities, where pupils/students may learn how to live in harmony with nature, how to protect and help animals and environment, how to be kind and not to do morally and ethically bad things. In addition, every country (especially in post-Soviet space) needs a unified, efficient and effective law on animals. According to this law every human maltreating an animal should be justly punished. The expression of “cruel treatment” should be defined. Cruel treatment means not only acts of violence like inflicting wounds. It also includes negligence, such as leaving an animal without water, food or veterinary assistance, and the organization of animal fighting. Another way to solve the problems on animal rights issues is the use of alternatives: 1) non-radical and 2) radical.

Non-radical alternatives. Keeping of animals regardless of the purpose must meet the minimum sanitary-hygienic requirements. Furthermore, animals in captivity (agriculture, zoos, circuses and so on) should have necessary space for resting and moving; the possibility to satisfy their needs in sleep, eating, drinking and so on; enough healthy food and drinking water; access to veterinary measures and timely vaccination as a mean of disease prevention. Animals in agriculture should be slaughtered without pain and suffering by a single blow or gunshot or an electrical, chemical or other means that is rapid and effective (Sherry, 107).

Animal fighting and hunting to endangered species should be prohibited, and any violations should be strictly persecuted. Hunters should use humane methods of trapping and killing of wild animals. In addition, the government should control the extraction of animals from nature.

In 1959 two British scientists Bill Russell and Rex Burch laid out three alternatives (called “three Rs”) in order to reduce use of animals in science. In *The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique* Russell and Burch wrote about: 1) replace—substitute tests and experiments using such things as cultured cells or computer simulations for tests and experiments on whole animals; 2) reduce — redesign tests and experiments so that they can be performed on smaller numbers of animals; 3) refine—redesign tests or experiments to cause less pain and distress to animals. In addition to replacing animal tests with ones that do not use animals and reducing the number of

animals needed in certain tests, scientists are trying to refine experiments on animals by developing better ways to define, measure, and relieve pain and stress, including stress caused by inadequate housing (Yount, 53-54).

In order to reduce use of animals in education colleges and universities should provide alternative methods, such as “virtual dissection” computer programs (Yount, 52).

Radical alternatives. Some animal rights activists resort to vegan or vegetarian lifestyle, which are accepted as radical alternatives. Vegetarians just do not consume meat. Meanwhile, vegans do not eat meat, fish, birds, eggs, dairy products or honey and do not use animal products, such as leather, wool, or silk (Sherry, 283). Moreover, one of principles of economics states that if there is no demand, and then there is no supply. Therefore, vegans do not visit zoos, circuses, rodeo, marine mammal theme parks and safari parks. They even ignore and do not watch films, where animals were somehow exploited in order not to promote such kind of activities.

## **9. Conclusion**

To sum up, lives of humans and animals are closely tied with each other. People have been considered animals as working partners and companions for thousand of years. Animals were also considered as “things” that can be used by people to satisfy their needs in food, clothing, entertainment, science and so on. However, nowadays people’s awareness of and concern for animal issues have increased. We should remember that animals are living creatures that deserve rights not on basis of existence or absence of self-consciousness or rationality, but on basis of ability to feel happiness, pain, suffering, pleasure and so on. Violence and cruelty toward animals do not mean only actions, which cause direct physical harm; it also goes beyond physical harm to acts, which cause psychological harm like fear or terror. Cruelty to animals deserves careful and serious attitude from the part of society in all aspects. The present legislations in post-Soviet countries reveal themselves as unsettled and unstable. However, as the world is rapidly changing and modernizing, there is hope that a specific law against animal cruelty and/or a law on animal welfare are about to be created.

## References

- Animal Welfare Act (2006). Chapter 45. Retrieved from [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/45/pdfs/ukpga\\_20060045\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/45/pdfs/ukpga_20060045_en.pdf)
- Baker, W. Lawrence (2015). *Animal Rights and Welfare: A Documentary and Reference Guide*. Santa Barbara CA: ABC-CLIO
- Bekoff, Marc and Pierce, Jessica (2017). *The Animals' Agenda: Freedom, Compassion, and Coexistence in the Human Age*. Boston MA: Beacon Press
- Bentham, Jeremy (1823). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Boyd, R. David (2017). *The Rights of Nature: A Legal Revolution That Could Save the World*. Toronto, Canada: ECW Press
- Cavaleri, Paola (2001). *The Animal Question. Why Nonhuman Animals Deserve Human Rights*. New York NY: Oxford University Press
- Coetzee, M. John (1997). *The Lives of Animals. The Tanner Lectures On Human Values*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press
- Cruton, Roger (2006). *Animal Rights and Wrongs*. London, UK: Elizabeth House
- DeGrazia, David (2002). *Animal Rights: A Very Short Introduction*. New York NY: Oxford University Press
- Franklin, H. Julian (2005). *Animal Rights and Moral Philosophy*. New York NY: Columbia University Press
- Guither, D. Harold (1998). *Animal Rights: History and Scope of a Radical Social Movement*. Carbondale IL: Southern Illinois University Press
- Kazakhstan Animal Rescue and Education (KARE). Retrieved from <http://kare.kz/>

Linzey, Andrew and Clarke, P. Barry (1893). *Animal Rights: A Historical Anthology*. Chichester NY: Columbia University Press

International Fund for Animal Welfare. Protecting Animals With International Law and Policy. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.ifaw.org/united-states>

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). Retrieved from <https://www.peta.org/>

Regan, Tom (1984). *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press

Russell Bill and Burch L. (1959). *Rex The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique*. Retrieved from [http://altweb.jhsph.edu/pubs/books/humane\\_exp/het-toc](http://altweb.jhsph.edu/pubs/books/humane_exp/het-toc)

Ryder, D. Richard (2011). *Speciesism, Painism and Happiness: A Morality for the Twenty-First Century*. Exeer, UK: Imprint Academic

Sherry, J. Clifford (2009). *Animal Rights: A Reference Handbook. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara CA: ABC-CLIO

Sinclair, Upton (1906). *The Jungle*. Chicago IL: Doubleday

Palmer, Clare (2016). *Animal Rights*. New York NY: Routledge

Scully, Matthew (2002). *Dominion: The Power of Man, the Suffering of Animals, and the Call to Mercy*. New York NY: St. Martin's Press

Singer, Peter (1985). *The Animal Liberation Movement*. Nottingham, England: Old Hammond Press

Paul Waldau (2011). *Animal Rights: What Everyone Needs to Know*. New York NY: Oxford University Press

Yount, Lisa (2008). *Animal Rights. Revised Edition*. New York NY: Facts on File, Inc.