

University of Iceland
School of Humanity
Literature, Culture and Media

Is faux fur fake?

*The success of the faux fur industry
through the animal rights movement and media*

M.A. Thesis

Akane Tsunoda
Kt.: 040690-3529

Supervisor: Gregory Alan Phipps
September 2019

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Introduction	3
Current problem among furs	8
The advantage and disadvantage of fur made of plastics	15
What if we end fur industry?	18
The changes in animal rights from the past and today	22
What's new in animal rights	24
Fur facts in the world	30
Media around the fur industry	34
How animal activists achieve their goals	37
Conclusion	48
Reference	51

Abstract

Discussions about the animal fur industry have developed through the animal rights' movement. However, while the fur industry has been criticized for killing animals, the faux fur industry has promoted itself as eco-friendly, even though scientists have found that plastics also harm the environment and eventually kill animals. Faux fur products are often advertised as the environmentally friendly choice, but that's not true. Plastics are difficult to recycle, and the waste is increasing day by day. With our current scientific progress, what we can do to stop the waste of plastics is simply to reduce the use. However, the faux fur industry blocks these efforts. Today, thanks to animal activists, faux fur is well known as a vegan option, but the vegan option is economically valued in the market, and even though we found that it's no longer the "educated choice", we cannot give up on plastic products. Besides, animal activists and faux fur supporters represent the cruelty of the fur industry through media. Those activists make use of visual materials to show the reality of the fur industry, but by doing so, they cause an argument between the fur industry and animal activists as supporters of faux fur products. Through their discussions and study of current issues around the industry such as feminism, environmental facts and economical and cultural development, animal activists and the faux fur industry try to win support and gain economic benefits and social status by using the Internet as a marketing tool.

Introduction

As we human beings have developed our own lifestyle, we may have destroyed our beautiful earth. The Earth has been around 4.54 billion years, but humans have appeared only recently. Then, we started hunting other species to eat, wear and live. Undeniably, there can be some other elements to cause animals' extinction as Nogués-Bravo discussed climate change leading to Mammoths' extinction (Nogués-Bravo et al., 2008). However, there are a lot of species that did go extinct because of human expansion, such as the Dodo did after humans arrived on the home of the Dodo: The islands of Mauritius, and American Crocodiles are made into bags, belts and shoes.

In this paper, first, the problems in the current fur industry are discussed. The fur industry has faced challenges from animal activists' movements against the industry for animal rights. Those who are against the fur industry believe that the way to harvest animal fur is painful and the environment in the fur farms is awful as well. They also claim that killing animals for

clothing is unethical. For this reason, the faux fur industry advertises their products as eco-friendly materials, since plastics don't kill any innocent creatures. However, later researchers found out that even though plastics don't kill any animals through the process of the production of clothing, they possibly poison the land where animals live and kill sea creatures in the ocean silently and without bloodshed. Today, researchers have noted the danger of the plastic waste and people and the governments have tried to save the waste. Then, we noticed that clothing made of plastics isn't eco-friendly, and rather even harms the environment.

Regarding the waste of plastics, it can harm both the environment and animals living in the area. Animals can eat plastics by accident and die. There have been many incidents where dead animals are found with plastics in their stomachs. Additionally, sometimes animals are found to be stuck to plastics. Those animals are sometimes lucky enough to be saved before the worst ending, but not always. However, it is always questionable if we are allowed to meddle in animals' lives for no reason. If we didn't waste plastics, those animals would never suffer from the accidents. Today's research found that even if clothing made by plastics doesn't harm the ocean directly, the characteristics of plastics have much potential to harm the environment after use. For this reason, artificial fur made of plastics is no longer the solution which can solve all the problems of killing animals for clothing.

The relationship between the faux fur industry and animal fur industry holds a huge contradiction. That is because they both advertise their products, faux fur and animal fur as eco-friendly material which saves the environment from the damage caused by the other. However, scientists unveiled the fact that both of them actually harm the environment. For example, the environment and animals living in the community receive ammonia from fur farms, or the wasted plastics by people through the manufacture of faux fur and lack of care of plastics after

use poisons the environment and kills animals by clinging onto and entering into animals' bodies. Which claim you believe depends on you, but as scientists have alerted us to the danger, if we would like to choose the "educated option", we cannot just ignore either side.

We might already have found a way to reduce the waste of plastics. Some countries have started taxing on plastic bags at the stores and that has successfully saved on 90% of the consumption of plastics. We have started focusing on saving plastics instead of finding a way to recycle it. This struggle is the most challenging fact of plastics, because we haven't found any effective way to recycle plastics. All we found about recycling plastics is the difficulty to dispose of them. As the wasted plastic harms animals and the environment, we should stop this trend that relies on plastics in our daily lives, however, as plastics are cheaper than other materials and it can be formed easily, this practicality accelerates the waste. Plastics are too useful to be given up. Besides, plastics as a package are not very recyclable. The issue discussed in this paper is how faux fur industry has developed its market in the fashion industry. Today's success of faux fur industry is not only because of its reasonable price or the quality, but also the moral question that if we can kill other animals for clothing. The discussion regarding animal rights has been active and animal activists are strongly against the use of animal fur for the sake of fashion's satisfaction. In the beginning, the plastic industry has made use of their passion toward animal rights, and advocated their faux fur made of plastics as the eco-friendly replacement which has never harmed innocent non-human animals.

The problem in today's fur industry is that people who engage in fur farming cannot justify their act of killing animals and convince people against their activity anymore. Our technology has been developed enough to protect ourselves from the cold and there is no need to kill animals to obtain their coats. Most of animal fur in the fur industry come from fur farming.

While trapping animals can be considered as an environmental activity, since people sometimes need to manage the wild population and prevent disease, the aim of fur farming is always only their fur. Animal activists have reported how farmers kill animals and the conditions of those farms. Even though decent farmers try to improve the environment and how to end the animals' lives, animal activists' goal isn't even close to the discussion. What they want is to terminate animal fur farming, not to improve the animals' condition in those farms.

Both the fur industry and animal rights activists understand what each of them wants, yet, what they can do for the other is another story. Since the fur industry has traditional cultural views because their business has been succeeded by family members for decades, as well as the fact that they make a lot of profits every year and have responsibility for people who work in the industry, they cannot just give up on fur. To live in the 21st century, thick and warm fur jackets may not be necessary, but money made from the industry is essential. Hence, even if we already knew faux fur is not sustainable in regard to the environmental aspect, we cannot just quit making faux fur while its supporters believe that faux fur is “educated option” not killing animals and contribute to its sales. In other words, faux fur will become the next “animal fur”. People know that we kill animals to make our fur jackets. Even if we don't kill animals, somebody else will kill them to make the jackets. Therefore, some fashion brands have started to announce that they will not use animal fur in their collections anymore, these brands get admired by media and make profits. However, they use faux fur made of plastics in the collection and the plastics harm the environment and kill the animals living in the communities. We need to discuss this contradiction and understand what really harms all creatures in the world.

The key to the success of faux fur industry is also related to increased population of Internet users. Before we had the Internet, we may have felt bad about animals killed for their

fur, but we didn't know how animals are raised in the farms and killed for us. However, after the internet has become common, we can easily share information and opinions with other people. We can access the pictures and video showing “how animals are beaten up to be skinned alive with full of blood”. This new technology has increased the number of animal rights advocates and developed the discussion about the fur industry. Nevertheless, at the same time, the exploitation leads to creation of faux fur and now we found that they both aren't perfect options for the environment and animals. To think of the merits of faux fur, it was only that we don't kill animals for the “fur”, but after scientists announced that plastics also kill animals, faux fur is no longer a better and “educated option” for animal activists. However, the biggest difference between animal fur and faux fur is that we don't see animals bloody struggle and it's true that for this reason many people still believe that faux fur is better option. While the Internet shows us some brutal farmers hit screaming animals, people in faux fur industry don't even touch animals.

In this paper, I would like to introduce the relationship among fur industry, faux fur industry and online media. Also, how the fur industry and faux fur industry advertise their products, and their reaction to current environmental circumstances are compared with each other. Also, as people share the news online anonymously, there isn't always responsibility for the information. I discuss about how faux fur developed along with animal rights movements, and how animal rights advocates present their ideas to achieve their goals. Specifically, the relationship between the fur industry and faux fur industry has huge contradictions in that they both claim that their own cause is environmentally friendly, and I believe that if we could understand the current situation of the industry, that understanding would help us decide which

side we would like to stand by, or try to find a third option, even if there are still incongruities in the discussion.

Current problem among furs

In 1943, Abraham H. Maslow outlined his hierarchy of needs in his book “A Theory of Human Motivation”. In his view, there are levels of satisfaction in human society. They are “physiological”, “safety”, “love/ belonging”, “esteem”, and “self-actualization”. Today we have discussed a lot of things that we have never done before. I believe that one of them is animal rights. Recently, the discussion about animal rights are getting more active, and animal rights activists are fighting for freedom of animals from any harm done by human beings. One of those harms is definitely animal fur farming. Animal fur farming has been criticized because of the condition of the farms and how farmers obtain fur from animals. For this reason, animal activists want to terminate fur farming that eventually kill innocent creatures only for their body parts: fur. I found it very interesting, because this argument over animal fur create more money in the world, as faux fur industry gains more support from animal activists as the “educated choice”. Although clothes made of plastics don’t need animal killing, is faux fur better than animal fur? The answer might depend on what you care about the most. If you think of animals’ lives as the most important thing, you would say yes, yet faux fur can take their living place away and kill them from the inside. As we discuss about the animal fur industry, while new discoveries are happening all the time, at the same time we found research results implying that not everything animal activists or faux fur industry advertise is true of the industry. To get educated and choose the educated option, we always have to stay up to date on new information.

The tactics to harvest fur and skin as leather can be cruel, as media reports. PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) accuses the cruel methods that those farmers use

to kill animals to make fur, such as gas, poison, breaking necks and electrocution, while the article welcomes Canadian medalist, Meagan Duhamel's policy toward Olympics uniform for Canadian teams (Englar, 2019). Is wearing fur or leather products worth such suffering? This is the origin of this discussion, but also the origin of the misunderstanding as well. Animal activists criticize the condition of the farms, but even if the condition gets improved like luxury nursing home for economically rich humans, animal activists will never get satisfied for sure. The condition of the fur farms is just one of the reasons that animal activists use to gain attention and convince people against fur farming. The same thing can be said in the process of obtention of fur. Even if fur farmers found a perfect way to kill animals and harvest the fur without any pain, as long as there are fur animals trapped in cages and getting killed for their fur, activists would fight.

In the view of the ethics of animal rights, animal lives are more valuable than animal products (Arney & Piirsalu, 2017). For that reason, the question of the relationship between the environment and animal rights regarding the use of plastics in the fashion industry has reached a dead-end. If we choose the environment, it harms animals for ripping their skin from their body, but if we choose faux fur to prevent use of natural fur, it may also damage the environment. This is because of the components of "faux fur": plastics' indisposable and harmful characteristics. OECD argues that plastics have gained much attention for "their ubiquity in the global economy," "the low material recovery rates that they currently achieve" and "the environmental impacts associated with current disposal methods" (OECD, 2018). Plastics are made from completely natural and organic materials such as cellulose, coal, natural gas, salt and crude oil, and in those materials, crude oil is the main element of plastics. Originally, crude oil is made of the remains of plants and animals that died millions of years ago. However, to produce

plastics, we artificially separate crude oil into “fractions” which are lighter elements. Then, we add heat, light, or a catalytic agent.

The history of plastics may be longer than you think. According to OECD, the earliest form of plastics was found in the 19th century, and the form has been changed to Bakelite, and today it has rapidly grown into a material that plays an important role in our daily lives (OECD, 2018). In 2015, the production of plastics finally reached 407 million tons per annum (Geyer, Jambeck & Law, 2017). The number is more than the production of paper (400 Mtpa) (WWF, 2018), fish (200 Mtpa) (World Bank, 2018). OECD predicts that if the rate of growth continues in this way, plastics production will reach 1600 Mtpa in 2050 (IMF, 2017).

Bakelite is known as an early form of plastics. It can basically be shaped into anything. The low cost attracts both producers and consumers alike. Their significant uniqueness, as well as being waterproof is very important to keep our food fresh. Also, plastics have “a high strength-to-weight ratio” and they are basically unaffected by physical and chemical deprivation (OECD, 2018). Plastics can be magical materials that can take the place of all other materials in existence like wood and metal, and the fact that plastic is this multifaceted results in the creation of artificial fur.

The British chemist, Alexander Parkes contributed to the founding of plastics. When he produced the element of plastics, could he imagine how much plastics would develop human life and ruin the environment? Later, Swiss textile engineer, Jacques Edwin Brandenberger developed plastics like Cellophane, beginning a new era of plastics as packaging. After that, people have tried to advance new technology called plastics. Tapes, zipper shortage bags, plastic wrap-- plastics are everywhere.

These days, most plastics are used to pack items (Geyer, Jambeck and Law, 2017). As we see at the store, almost everything is packed in bags made from plastic. After we finish the food, every package mostly goes to the trash can. Sometimes we open several packages to satisfy ourselves and those packages can just end up as waste. However, to prevent the waste, there is a store called “Original Unverpackt” (Originally Unpacked) in Berlin. If you would go to Original Unverpackt to shop items, do not forget your own bags. At the store, everything is not packed. The customers take the products as much as they want, and most importantly, they are required to bring their own bag and put the items in each. The concept of the store is to save the waste of plastics. There are stores with similar concepts in other nations.

As OECD reviews, plastics gather a lot of attention all over the world. Some individuals, states and countries are trying to save plastic waste. National Geographic reported that the oldest tax toward plastic bag was established in Denmark in 1993 and since then, Danish people use fewer single-use plastic bags: about 4 bags fewer for each person a year than American per day (Gunn, 2018). European countries tax plastic bags or ban free supply, and African countries have also announced tax on plastic bags. Announced in 2019, New York is to be a second state to ban plastic bags from March 2020 (BBC, 2019). As the result of this challenge, for example, 90% of the supply of plastic bags were saved in Ireland since 2002 (Convery, McDonnell & Ferreira, 2007). The sales tax matters a lot not only to governmental revenue but also environmental issues. However, as not all countries have acted to tax or control the supply of plastic bags yet, there is a gap among countries concerning plastic waste.

Human development has had a strong connection with consumption (Tukker et al., 2014). We develop and improve our social lives while we destroy the environment and sacrifice other creatures. The pattern of waste generation varies, but in general, the waste in many European

countries ends up in the ground (Tisserant et al, 2017). Obviously, there is too much waste to conduct the 3Rs: reduce, reuse and recycle as a principle of the circular economy (Ghisellini et al, 2016) which harms not only the environment, but also other species living under the ground.

The problem of the plastics is its character. Plastics are used for many purposes around the world as it is strong, light and cheap, although, once the litter gets in the ocean, the pollution caused by the plastics lasts for such a long time, because of the very slow degradation process (Steengaard et al, 2017). People have been trying to stop the waste of plastics by focusing on recycling, reducing and reusing while the number of the waste is increasing. Those techniques to save plastic waste can reprocess only 15 to 20% of the total waste (Nizami et al., 2015). We are still struggling with the management of plastics. A recent study found out that we can upgrade plastics to transport fuel through some processes, but usually some kinds of plastics are mixed and each of them needs different techniques to be developed, so that this investigation does not solve all problems (Miandad et al., 2017).

While plastics are recognized as a dangerous material for their toxicity, because of the popularity of plastics, studies on the recycling and the final disposal method has been delayed. One of the reasons for this current issue around plastics is the value of the plastics are very low and it costs more to recycle. Once different additives get together, it's hard to get them separated. So, to recycle plastic products easily, Environmental Labels and Declarations-Self-Declared Environmental Claims: ISO 14021 has been developed. Recyclable plastics have marks based on the plastic types. For example, PETE or PET in triangle with three arrows means polyethylene terephthalate: thermoplastic material.

Since those plastics in the ocean can be broken into micro-sized or even macro-sized particles as the part of its degradation process, we may not be able to see the pollution in the

water, but this aspect of plastic makes it almost impossible to clean up the ocean completely (Steengaard et al., 2017). Even what we see as clean water in the ocean is not always as it seems. In 2019, the BBC reported that a dead whale was found in the Philippines with 40kg of plastic in its stomach (BBC, 2019). Also, according to the Guardian, plastic bags were found in stomach of 9 from 14 dead deer in Nara park, Japan (The Guardian, 2019). The Nara park is well-known as a 'deer park', since there are many deer living in the park as angels of god, and the visitors used to be allowed to feed them with only crackers sold in the stores. However, even though people are supposed to feed deer only crackers, and there are signboards saying that "feed only crackers" in English and Chinese, if we think of animal rights, we should stop wasting plastics as well, as plastics harm or even kill animals. Ultimately the movements for reducing plastic use, for animal rights and environmental concerns are all on the same page.

However, it is true that some people are encouraged to use plastics instead of other materials for various reasons. Plastics Make It Possible is one of those companies claiming to expand the use of plastics. According to Plastics Make it Possible, plastic packing helps saving food waste (Plastics Make it Possible, December 7, 2017). Food waste is also a serious issue in the world. It's not economical, environmental or ethical. Nevertheless, if plastics are encouraged only to use only to save the food waste, this discussion is not reasonable enough to support the idea, because there are other ways to stop food waste, like using reusable packs, not cooking or buying too much. To save food waste, plastics can be useful and easiest, since we can just throw it away after use, but to save on plastics, we do not have an effective idea which we can conduct daily yet, instead of using the same bags again.

Here is another example that proves that plastics are not only the key to reduce food waste. According to UN news, developing countries and developed countries have different

types of food waste (UN news, 2013). Due to the lack of technology to harvest, package and market food at an early stage, people waste food in the developing countries, but in developed countries, people simply just buy too much, cook too much, use wrong storage and have overly high standards in judging whether food is still edible or not.

The second largest use of plastics is textiles (Geyer, Jambeck and Law, 2017). What is your clothing made from? Does the tag say Polyester or Polyurethane? They both are plastics called in different ways based on how the fabric is made. According to Cambridge Dictionary, Poly- is a prefix meaning many in English. Plastics are cheap material to make cloth. For that reason, the fashion industry cannot avoid the use of textile made from plastics. So, the fur made from plastics seems to solve all problems. We do not need to kill any innocent animals, and it costs less than natural fur as it's said in general. However, after we have faced the fact of the material that faux fur made of, we started to rethink the idea.

As fur made from animal fur is called (real, natural) fur, fur made from plastics needs to be called differently and so that it has some kind of names like faux fur, artificial fur, fake fur and eco-fur. The problem of those different labels for fur is not only the materials, but also how they are advertised can be misleading. For example, the naming of eco-fur comes from "ecology". Eco-fur sounds like something eco-friendly though, in fact, eco-fur is harming both animals and the environment. The idea of naming faux fur eco-fur comes from only the fact that production of faux fur doesn't kill animals and those who named it eco-fur recognize animals as a part of the environment.

The advantage and disadvantage of fur made of plastics

Due to the development of the studies in plastics, we have found out that eco-fur is no longer environmentally friendly. First of all, what people started calling eco-fur is only referring to the way that it is made. Eco-fur is made of plastics which means, of course, there is no animal killing in the process. To make eco-fur, we start from the synthetic fibers. Many types of polymers are used, and there are a lot of new technologies coming to improve the quality to get it close to animal fur. Why do we need to have eco-fur in this world? There can be two significant potential reasons.

First, the cost of faux fur is generally said to be cheaper than natural fur, and the faux fur industry could fit with the current needs. To compare the faux fur price with fur's price, I used the webstore of Nature Watch selling "real" animal products online. On the webstore, Rabbit fur is sold as rabbit skin and the price is \$13.25 for 13-18" in lengths and 11-13" across. Fox fur is more expensive. Red fox fur is for \$129.00 44-47" in length and 6-8" across. In contrast, according to fabric.com, the cheapest synthetic choice is from \$7.11 per yard and the most expensive faux fur is \$86.69 per yard.

Second, the animal rights movement matters a lot to increasing faux fur sales. Momoyo Yamamoto, salesperson of an international fashion brand selling items made from animal leather in Tokyo, Japan said that "we have received emails from animal activists every month both in English and Japanese. They demand us not to sell any animal products at the store". The population of animal rights activists has been increasing. The character of those activists is stereotyped as white, middle-class women (Groves, 2001). However, another study conducted in 2003 shows the population differ from previous study. According to Jerolmack, the general demographic of animal rights activists is young, non-black, less educated minority (Jerolmack, 2003). In common, females care more about animals than males did in each research.

What are animal rights? In his book, Regan discusses about animal rights as a wide range of subjects including “vegetarianism, wildlife and conservation management, domestic animals and pets, zoos and zoological parks, hunting, and animals in agriculture and factory farming” (Regan, 2006). We human beings have developed with animals culturally and economically. Animals have helped us; in other words, we have been making use of animals for scientific research, by farming or hunting for food and clothes, keeping them apart from their wildlife and training them to entertain us. The history of animal rights movement may be considered as something new, as most of animal rights advocates are females and often animal rights movement is grouped together with women's rights. The study in animal rights itself may be new, but when we think of the relationship between human and nonhuman animals, we have infringed animal rights for such a long period of time.

Of course, when we have been developing human rights and our daily life to survive the severe conditions without technology, we could justify the use of animals, because it's necessary to live, and if we don't make use of animals, we die. Fur protected human beings from cold in prehistory. People in the stone age hunted animals for food and warmth, in addition to making tools from the skins. Besides, people economically make profits through animal fur. Later in the Bronze age and Iron age, people started making textiles to make clothes and shoes from their skins. The origin of the fur used to be from the wild, but as people developed the economy through the fur industry, as the need of fur increased, and people started fur farming. Fur was not just a fashion item but essential material to survive the nature in the old days.

However, today our life has improved enough with high technology. When we have something else to choose to eat besides animals or products made of animals, and if those animals are killed for food, it's understandable that some of us who care about animals and

encourage the rest of us not to eat animals believe that they don't need to die for us. When it comes to fashion, it is more understandable that animal activists claim that "animals need their fur coats more than we do," as The Humane Society of the United States says. Today, fur is not mandatory for almost all of us, as long as we have access to other materials like cotton and plastics. It is true that fur lovers cannot excuse animal killing for their preference.

Animal rights movements has had great repercussion in our eating habit as well. A vegan diet entails not eating any animal products. Needless to say, vegan people don't eat any meat, seafood, or dairy products. When it comes to people don't eat meat but eat seafood, they are called Pescatarians. A Pescatarian eats fish in the sea but never eat whales because they are mammals. The purpose of these vegetarian habits is not only for animal rights but also health. Recently, vegan diet has gained attention and popularity, since vegan people tend to be thinner, and the diet has benefits including lower serum cholesterol, lower blood pressure, reducing their risk of heart disease, even though it risk their health by removing all animal products particularly vitamins B-12 and D, calcium, and long-chain $n-3$ fatty acids (Wilson, 2009). Although vegan habits have potential health concerns, this is why those vegan people still keep their eating habits away from consumption of any animal products. While vegan people believe that their eating habits are healthier than meat eaters, since eating meat, especially red and processed meat is said to cause colon cancer (Chao, 2005), those who eat meat may also think vegan habits can also cause malnutrition.

What if we end fur industry?

However, what if we suddenly banned animal fur? The market in the fur industry is already big and the loss of fur can influence not only the customers, but also something more.

According to Statista, the number of people who engaged in animal leather and fur industry has been decreasing from 30 thousands in 2006 to 22,56 thousand in 2016 (Statista, 2018), but the International Fur Trade Federation (IFTF) reports that there were over 75 million mink furs produced internationally in farms which is estimated worth 2.44bn USD, fox furs were 15.25 million worth approximately 1bn USD (Oaten, 2017). Fur industry doesn't mean only fur farming. Fur trade all over the globe includes farming, manufacturing, and retail. To compare with 2015, these numbers are slightly down, but IFTF estimates that the global fur trade would be 30bn USD (Oaten, 2017). The number of people involved in all stages is tremendous. Therefore, if we ban the fur items all of a sudden, it's easy to imagine that there would be a negative impact on the world economy and unemployment rate.

However, at the same time, faux fur industry has also gained support especially from animal activists. Some people don't buy animal fur, but only faux fur at the stores. Not to disappoint their customers, some stores have both kinds of fur to provide for the demand. How we dress reveals what kind of person we are. In the fashion industry, we often face this decision. Some of us would think that isn't true, but in regards to what kind of fur we wear, we can actually see whether a person agrees with the animal fur industry or not. The history of faux fur industry is shorter than the animal fur industry, and as I discussed in the history of plastics, the material used for faux fur is still new. According to Smithsonian.com, it was in the 1910s that artificial fur was introduced in the newspaper in the U.S (Hines, 2015). The American government's policy that taxed for 10% on animal fur products from 1919 to 1928 also helped marketing faux fur (Hines, 2015). Once a product is accepted in society, and the product gets popular and becomes depended on, it is difficult to terminate the manufacturer and eliminate the demand.

Whether we can give up on both animal fur and faux fur is questionable. People demand animal fur and faux fur, but this is not because we need to wear warm clothes to protect ourselves from cold, but people who are engaged in the industry need animal fur and faux fur to make money to live under capitalism. To make their business last, both fur industries market, advertise, and sell as much as they can. As a result, they criticize each other because there are advantages and disadvantages in both industries.

It is very frustrating that we know animal killing is against ethics which we value as a rule of conduct based on morals, but also plastics as a replacement of natural fur harms the environment as well. Since the history of the fur industry is very long, and we have made a lot of money in the industry, it should be hard to improve the situation as animal activists hope. It is easy to imagine that the value of the fur was very high for our ancestors, since they need the furs to live and they did not have anything else to cover their bodies instead, especially in the winter season. However, despite the value of the fur, the price has become very affordable nowadays. This is not because of the decreased demand, quite the opposite, but because the development of fur farming let us create more furs than before.

The tactics animal activists adopt to promote a fur-free society is that not buying any items made of fur and recommending faux fur instead. PETA develops their idea on how to wear vegan, and they emphasize that we no longer need animal product and suggest choosing faux leather instead. They even mention about animal-free brands on their website to address their supporters to those brands' webstores. Faux fur was developed as a replacement of natural fur for the low cost, improved through the development of science, and advertised as the ethical choice instead of natural fur as animal rights activity goes on. Animal rights movement has been moving on with women's rights as women began the conversation regarding animal welfare, and

the animal rights movement offered an opportunity for women to participate in social activist life (Gloves, 2001). In the 1980s, the fashion industry faced pressure and criticism from animal activists regarding the method to obtain fur, and high investment in media and advertisement raised our sense toward political justice and the attack on fur fashion brought new ethical standards to fashion industry (Emberley, 1998). It would be said that this was plastic industry's win. Faux fur industry succeeded in using the cruelty of the fur industry to sell more plastics with faux fur as an ecological replacement.

For that reason, even very well-known companies have given up on their tradition and shifted their companies' policies along the trend. In 2017, International Italian fashion brand Gucci announced its new policy that Gucci will remove fur from all of its collections from spring/summer in 2018 (Pithers, 2017). Before Gucci, there are many more fashion brands like Calvin Klein in 1994, Stella McCartney in 2001, Ralph Lauren in 2006, Tommy Hilfiger and Vivianne Westwood in 2007, Giorgio Armani in 2016 Burberry and John Galliano in 2018 that declared their fur-free policy. After Gucci, more fashion brands like Versace and DKNY in 2019 also adopted a fur-free policy based on the ideas of animal rights (Seth, 2018). These brands which gave up on animal fur for animal welfare doesn't mean that they gave up on the use of fur. They use, of course, faux fur in their collections.

Nevertheless, as the faux fur friendly attitude as a current trend is shared more widely, we have paid more attention to the fur industry, and we have found it questionable whether faux fur is environmentally good for us or not. The International Fur Federation (IFF) viewed that faux fur, which animal activists have faith in as a replacement of fur, destroys nature and that "It's time to call out the fake news about fake fur" (IFF, 2018). IFF is claiming that faux fur industry is telling us a lie about faux fur itself.

Today, the fur industry finds itself at an impasse. No matter what, both animal fur and faux fur aren't perfect. Which fur we support depends on our perspectives and what we think is more important. Animal activists are fighting for animals being killed for making fur and trying to convince us not to buy fur. We are manipulated through the information we receive. Those who disagree with fur know how fur is made, and those who disagree with faux fur also know faux fur is made of plastics which harm the environment. If what we believe and fight for depend on the information we receive, this argument between animal activists and environmental activists can be influenced by advertisement as media.

Our choice of the fur means which issue we feel is more important. Faux fur is ethical and economical but harm the environment. On the other hand, fur is immoral even though the materials are 100% natural. People have been struggling with the dilemma that we cannot just decide which one has more priority. However, both furs can damage the environment (Wakefield, 2011). Even though we found a way to make fur jackets from recycled plastic bottles, later we should find a way to transform those fake fur jackets into something else. As well, if it costs a lot for the transformation, previous studies regarding tax on plastic bags taught us that even if we know it is the best way for both animals and the environment, people still tend to choose a cheaper option first.

This is because we are under the control of the money. Plastics are everywhere, because it is cheaper than other materials. If we would like to support the idea which stops the use of plastics for the environment, we should be able to afford the more expensive materials.

Environmentalists may buy the more expensive replacement, but most people don't. This is simply because they cannot afford to, or they want to buy something else instead of expensive replacement of plastics. As long as plastics are cheap materials, people will buy it. We should

understand that not everybody is environmentally advocated. This doesn't mean that people who don't buy expensive eco-friendly products don't care about the environment at all, but when it comes to products which don't represent any uniqueness, it would be hard to get people to buy the products. Wurst and McGuire discussed how consumers choose products, and the motivation is based on price, style and symbolic meaning when they buy Nike sneakers (Wurst & McGuire, 2005). It's quite understandable that price comes first, because each product needs to be affordable. We can sell brand-name eco-friendly products or educate people, but this takes time and costs more than plastics. In this case, for the reason that some states have succeeded in reducing created by plastic bags by raising the tax on them, it's time to tax plastic itself. If the products made of plastics are more expensive than products made of natural products like wool and cotton, people think plastic isn't worth the purchase.

The changes in animal rights from the past and today

We could even see the ongoing trend equating animal rights with human rights. Even though the goal is still far, that tendency has already influenced several organizations. Animal rights starts from believing that animals can feel in the same way as we do. They see, hear, taste and communicate. There are businesses making use of animals, like bullfighting and horse race for fun, and the meat industry. Regan says that “the triumph of animal rights will put these industries out of business” (Regan, 1984). In his view, consumption of animals for the sake of research, fashion, eating habits or amusement are all against animal rights, since they all disgrace animals.

Besides, the use of fur clothing, animal activists believe in the needs of veganism. The motivation of veganism generally comes from three reasons; animal rights, the environment and their own health. The study conducted in Germany in 2014 shows that 89.7% of the participants

are motivated to commit to a vegan diet because of their attitude against animal agriculture (Jasen, et al, 2016). Less than that, but 69.3% of the participants also mentioned about health benefits (Jasen, et al, 2016). Besides, 46.8% of the participants motivation is related to environmental concern as well (Jasen, et al, 2016). Also, Jasen et al found that 81.8% of those vegan people have multiple motivation toward vegan habits (Jasen, et al, 2016). This research shows not only the motivation of vegan people but also their interests. 81.8% of the participants of this study at least show they do not think of only their health but also animals or the environment, or even both (Jasen, et al, 2016). The character of faux fur supporters as animal activists is similar to people with a vegan habit in the view of animal rights. As the study conducted by Jasen et al shows, people who care about animals tend to care about the environment as well. However, in regard to the relationship between the animal fur and faux fur industry, their ideas toward each other, especially the view on animal fur from anti-animal fur perspective is still struggling to find the goal which they both can agree with.

Animal rights movements has changed not only our eating habits or view on clothing through the development. In 2016, about animal rights, SeaWorld announced it would stop its orca breeding and shows programs (Howard, 2016). Also, the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus closed the curtains after 146 years, claiming high operation cost, the declining number of attendance and fights with animal activists (Lush, 2017). It was 1941 when Dumbo by Walt Disney debuted on screen. In the story, the poor baby elephant was struggling with his uniqueness of having big ears, but later, he could make use of those ears to gain fame as a circus star and live with his mother happily ever after in the circus. However, Dumbo in 2019 is totally different. He could get fame as he flew in the sky, but at the end of the story, the members of the circus set all the animals free from the circus and Dumbo and his mother went back to where

they should belong. This difference shows us how much our society has been changing and today's Dumbo has a different message from Dumbo in 1941.

What's new in animal rights

Today, there are cultural changes, environmental changes and economical changes caused by animal rights movements. There is an organization introducing faux fur as a "beautiful material" called Faux Fur Institute. It emphasizes that faux fur is superior to natural fur because it's easy to color, fashion brands can be separate from the bad image of fur use, and faux fur has a "positive impact" on air quality for less ammonia emission in the process of making faux fur. The research conducted by Finnish natural resources institute proved that the fur farming has a negative influence on the environment for ammonia from animal excrement, and the animal excrement also damages fishing industry through ocean (Silvenius et al, 2012). This is scientific proof that the fur industry damages not only local businesses but also the environment. As this research asks the question that under this situation local industries cause damage on each other, which business has priority over another one?

Moreover, as AP reported, after the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus got curtain call, around 500 employees were left without a job (Lush, 2017). The current tendency against the fur industry holds the same type of concern. What if all governments decide to ban any use of fur? We need to think of what those people who had worked in the fur industry would do as their second career after the fur industry. Since both fur/faux fur industries have been developing, we cannot ignore the potential economic damage to give up on either of them. In the debate on the fur industry, we can no longer just decide what is right, since the fur industry is not only about animal rights. The debate regarding fur products isn't about the fashion industry. This is politics or economics more than anything.

In most of the states in the United States of America, clothes are taxable and how much states tax clothes depends on each state. However, there are some exemptions like Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Vermont. They usually don't tax clothes, but they have rules to tax some clothing items like accessories, formal clothes and sport-related clothes. Similarly, in Minnesota, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania they don't tax normal clothes, but fur clothes. It was July 8th in 2006 that New Jersey passed the bill that tax on the retail sale of fur clothing (State of New Jersey Department of the Treasury, 2014). The state taxes on fur clothes are 6 %, and according to the Department of the Treasury in State of New Jersey, the revenue is used for general use in the state.

According to VOTE SMART, the bill: A 4714 - Fur Clothing Tax was passed by 21 to 19 disagree. Almost all Democrats agreed with the bill while all republicans disagreed with it (VOTE SMART, 2006). Only one democratic senator was against this bill whose name is Joseph Coniglio. As we see in this case, the political attitude toward fur products are different for Democrats to Republicans. Democrats are more likely to stand by animal rights which are even new to the world. LiveScience also reported that Democrats tend to support animal rights more than Republicans, but actually the number of people who care about animal rights from both Democrats and Republicans has increased since the last study (Pacelle, 2013).

The state of Pennsylvania also taxes on fur clothes. Clothing in the State is generally untaxable, but there are exceptions for formal apparel, sporting goods and clothes, and "articles made of fur". This fur is yet different from fur in New Jersey law. While New Jersey law clarifies that "fur clothing" is an item that is made of fur or pelt of an animal, or has fur as the chief component of its value' (State of New Jersey Department of the Treasury, 2014), Pennsylvanian law declares fur as "articles made of real, imitation, or synthetic fur where the fur

is more than three times the value of the next most valuable component material” (Pennsylvania Department of Revenue, 2004).

Both New Jersey and Pennsylvania tax on fur clothing, but the significant difference is how the State treats fur. New Jersey taxes on only fur made from animals, but on the other hand, Pennsylvania taxes both natural and artificial furs. Just as taxes on plastic bags worked to reduce the waste, New Jersey’s attitude toward fur clothing is telling us that they hope to reduce or stop the use of natural fur, though Pennsylvania’s purpose of tax on fur clothing can be simply increasing the revenue or decrease the use of both animal fur and plastic. In Pennsylvania, no matter what materials are used, fur is considered as a luxury which we don’t need in our daily life, while New Jersey treat it as a consideration of animal rights. This difference tells us the political opinions on the fur industry.

Since the bill has been issued, if we offend the rule, we will be punished under the law. Fur clothing is no longer just for fashion but also politics, as animal rights is. For example, animal rights organizations claim that they are non-profit and some of them make it clear that they never receive any donation from politicians, yet, those animal activists try to change the law to protect animal rights. As the part of their achievement, some nation tax on fur products and/or ban traditional fur activity.

The same thing can be seen and said in gun culture in the U.S. According to Bellesiles, in the beginning of the American history, guns were not common in the country (Bellesiles, 2001). When the price of the guns dropped, people first could afford it in 1840s because the mass production led to increased supply and reliability. By its second amendment, the right of Americans to bear arms is guaranteed. However, there are always risk to let your neighbor bear

weapons which can attack you. There are accidents, terrorist attacks, suicides and murders which never happen if there isn't a gun in their hands.

The Guardian reported that in 2017, almost 40,000 Americans were murdered in gun shootings in the US, which is the highest rate in the last twenty years (Pilkington, 2018). This number might sound small to compare with the population of the United States of America, but a study conducted by JAMA tells us how big this number is, to compare deaths by gun in other nations. In the study, homicide, suicide and unintentional injuries were compared. The suicides committed by a gun in the US was 6.4 deaths per 100,000 persons (23,800 deaths) in 2016, which is 35.3% of the suicides by a gun in the world and firearm homicide rate in the US was 4.2 deaths per 100,000 persons (The Global Burden of Disease 2016 Injury Collaborators, 2018). In 29 other countries, Singapore and Japan's rate was 0.0 death in firearm homicide and 0.1 death in firearm suicide rate per 100,000 persons (The Global Burden of Disease 2016 Injury Collaborators, 2018). The research also shows that the more the residents have access to a gun, the more firearm deaths occurred (The Global Burden of Disease 2016 Injury Collaborators, 2018).

Of course, guns aren't the reason, but a tool to commit certain actions. However, when we think of the reason that we need guns, it's often protection, but what for? Animals are not attacking us while we live in human communities. People bear arms to protect themselves from others. The society may hold this contradiction while they respect the traditional view on freedom in the US. According to Pew Research Center, although the public views on guns in the US has been up and down, the support of gun rights has gradually been increasing from the past 20 years, and especially white men tend to support the right (Pew Research Center, 2017).

The reason that America cannot give up on firearms is also economical. According to NSSF, firearms and ammunition have a strong impact on the American economy (2018). It's a fundamental right to bear arms in the US, but it is true that those legal arms hurt many people every year. Nevertheless, the firearms industry creates jobs and the tax on guns is massive. The National Shooting Sports Foundation says that their industry has created about 146,000 new jobs in the last decade (NSSF, 2018). In their research, they create 311,991 jobs in total including supplier and the supplementary industries (NSSF, 2018). The economic impact is about 52 thousand billion dollars, and the tax on those firearms is almost 4 billion dollars as business taxes and 654 million dollars as excise taxes in federal tax, state tax, almost 3 billion dollars business taxes in state taxes (NSSF, 2018). When we think of this huge amount, it's understandable that America cannot say yes to the ban of firearms easily. This tax on firearms goes to wildlife conservation funding which is a major source of the funding operation.

There are various types of tax on firearms. For example, taxes on manufacture of firearms, and exercise tax on ammunition are collected under the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. §4181) which dictates 10% of the sales price of pistols and revolvers and 11% of ammunition and other types of guns. It also accounts for the making and transfer of certain types of firearms and equipment such as machine guns, short-barreled firearms and silencers. As a general rule, every year on the 1st of July, importers, manufacturers, and dealers in firearms industry pay at the following rate that 1,000 USD a year or fraction thereof for importers and manufacturers as an imposition tax, and 500 USD a year or fraction thereof for dealers (§5801).

The tax on firearms in the US is used for different purposes, and some tax income is used for wildlife restoration, hunter education and safety. The hunter education provides hunters instruction in firearms operation and safety, wildlife management, nature conversation, ethics,

game laws, outdoor survival and wilderness first aid (Department of the Interior, 2018). The goal of this project is to teach the students to be safe, responsible conservation-minded hunters. The source of the fund is revenue from tax on firearms, bows and the equipment (Department of the Interior, 2018). These revenues are billed to the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund, the Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund, used for wildlife restoration, hunters' education and safety. The Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund is administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior. The tax on bows and arrows also goes to this organization (26 U.S.C. §4161(b)). Incongruously, hunters pay tax for wildlife restoration, to be able to buy arms to hunt animals, and to conduct wildlife restoration, the tax that comes from hunters is the main revenue.

Does this circumstance make sense? Even if not, since there are many people involved in this industry, as in the fur industry and faux fur industry, we cannot just change the context. Hunting animals as sport isn't necessary. Traditions and the continuation can mean a lot to someone who value it as important, and to change the view on the topic, it would cost much and take a lot of time. People can lose their jobs and income, then those unemployed people may not be able to feed their family. The more the economic impact on the society is, the more it would be hard to terminate the practice. While animal activists vilify any activity related to trophy hunting, those hunters ask for freedom to shoot animals as a sport. Ironically, the tax they pay goes to wildlife conservation, but that is obviously because they want to show their "contribution" to the animals' wildlife to prevent further criticism. The financial support toward wildlife conservation through the hunters' activity may be used as a cover for their animal killing under their freedom to shoot them.

Even though we adopt the sustainable consumer lifestyles, saving waste and living green and ethically, the global sales of the fur industry has been increasing by 70% in the past decade

(Ramchandani and Coste-Maniere, 2016). Many fashion brands have given up on natural fur to avoid any criticism based on animal rights, but the needs of natural fur certainly still exist and are even on the increase. There are still many people supporting the fur industry, because animal activists' logic is not based on scientific facts.

Fur facts in the world

There are basically two methods to obtain furs from animals. They are fur farming and trapping. Fur farming is banned in England, making them the first country who took this action in the world in 2000. The prohibition is called act 2000 and it bans people from keeping animals for their fur or breeding for the market (Ligisration.gov.us, 2000). However, in other nations besides the United Kingdom, Austria, Croatia, Slovenia and the Netherlands where the second largest producer of mink pelt decided to ban fur farming.

In those farms, farmers pack animals into cages where those animals are not even able to move freely because they are not big enough for them. The most common fur farming animal is minks. However, according to the European Commission, minks are not family-oriented animal in the wild (European Commission, 2001), so that when they are packed into small cages with many of other minks, as they are stressed and behave overanxiously. The unnatural condition drives minks in the farm crazy, and as a result, minks were observed eating each other alive in a Finnish farm (Tarhauskielto, 2018). In addition, the studies in fur damage of farmed minks indicates that when minks are put in a cage with other minks, bitemarks were found on their pelt (Damgaard & Hansen, 1996). The damage on the neck appeared when they were together with other minks which means it isn't self-inflicted, however, the damage on their tails increased when minks were separated or female minks lost their kits (Hansen, et al.,1998). Male wild

minks occupy 2.5 to 6 km as their territory while females do 0.5 to 3 km, but the size of standard cages in Dutch farms are approximately 30 x 85 x 45 cm and those minks are put together in the cage with groups of 3 to 5 other minks (European Commission, 2001).

Due to the idea of animal welfare, people start thinking of not only how those animals are killed, but also how we can improve the environment of the farms and get the animals comfortable until the end of their lives. Cooper and Mason studied farmed minks' interests. The study showed that minks seemed to value food and swimming water more than other resources (Cooper & Mason, 2001). Another study in farmed minks tells that taking baths reduces stress of minks that have previous experience swimming in the past, while some mink has no interest even in swimming bath (Vinke, et al., 2008). However, in 2019, Mette Lykke Nielsen, CEO of Fur Europe's stated that "These days it's only the professional animal lobby who promotes these old myths about wild animals and swimming water. Apart from reports written by the animal lobby itself, all serious studies states there is no scientific support for claiming swimming water to be an inherent need for mink" (EUROPE, 2019). That is true that there was mink which didn't show their interest in taking bath. However, we cannot say that they do not need the access to the water because we never know if they want to swim or not. The studies conducted in 2001 designates that farmed minks never forget their customs in the wild, in spite of being bred in custody for even 70 generations (Mason, Cooper & Clarebrough, 2001) and animal activists often use this result of the study to advocate for a ban on fur farming.

There are gaps in attitudes towards fur farming not only between farmers and animal activists, but also among scholars. Their discussion hasn't been developed because if what the fur industry says is all true, what the faux fur industry and animal activists say is all lies. In the discussion between animal activists and the fur industry, what each of them claims holds both

true and false information. Also, most importantly, their discussion doesn't make sense to each other. Each of their discussion seems to be talking about something different. First, animal activists' goals are often not improving the environment of the farm, but to completely terminate fur farming. Those studies about the relationship between farmed mink and swimming water helps to reinforce the animal welfare in fur farming, but animal activists would never be satisfied with the improvement. Of course, some studies imply that not every mink needs swimming water, but that cannot be the reason that farmers can take the water away from the minks. Even though Nielsen claims that the need of swimming water in the farms is an old myth, or "all serious studies state there is no scientific support", it doesn't mean that is what animals want. Unfortunately, while human rights lead us to have a sense of being born free, animal rights are late and there is an obstacle called economics.

According to the dodo, 85% of furs in the fashion industry comes from farms (Alberts, 2018). The rest of the fur is from trapping. Hunters use jaw traps to hunt wild animals. Trapping is also criticized because while the animals are trapped, they suffer from pain until death. In addition, sometimes non-targeted animals can be hunted by accident. Those animals include cats, dogs and endangered species. However, how many know that when we wear fur, we may be wearing the dogs and cats' fur? In the European Union, since 2008, cat and dog fur are banned by Regulation No 1523/2007 (European Union, 2007), which ban import or export cat and dog fur. Yet, animal activists claim that those furs are still imported from China by fake-labeling or mixed with other furs.

Hunting and trapping have been considered as the most cost-effective way to manage the wild population because the government doesn't need to employ people but those hunters and trappers would rather pay to enjoy hunting and trapping (Conover, 2001). Additionally, hunting

and trapping can contribute to the fur industry which means those animals' bodies aren't wasted. Also, there is already the solid market especially regarding hunting. There is a hunter safety course which is mandatory in many states so to have certification to hunt animals. This ensures that not only hunters hope to hunt animals but also there are schools and organizations making money from hunting animals which makes it difficult to ban hunting animals.

There is also a difference between trapping and farming. There are some states already banned fur farming while hunting is still somehow justified. From the UK (England, Wales) in 2000, and later in 2002, Scotland and Northern Ireland joined the alliance. Today there are many more countries and states that made the decision to give up on fur farming for animal welfare. That is because fur farming is considered only for fur even though the fur industry claims that the rest of the body is used for oil. On the other hand, hunting and trapping aren't always only for furs but also for the environment. Since hunting and trapping are believed to help to manage the wild population and prevent disease developing through the overcrowded population, hunting and trapping are necessary for the environment. In other words, people are convinced to agree with hunting wild animals by scientific research through media.

Media around the fur industry

The term environment is sometimes not clear enough to describe this issue over the fur industry, because both animal activists and environmental activists use the word against each other. Animal activists say that artificial fur is eco-friendly because they don't kill animals and environmental activists say that animal fur is eco-friendly because they don't need plastics. Environmentalists tend to support animal rights movement as well (Jerolmack, 2003), but about

the use of plastics, those eco-friendly people sometimes fight each other. Their ideas are contradicted between animal activists and environmentalists, and the discussion about the use of the animal fur is embroiled in the debate. Animal activists claim that the use of animal fur is cruel, because they believe that fur animals in farms are caged with many other animals in bad conditions and end up being skinned alive, even though fur farmers appeal how they try to reduce the fur animals' pain, stress in the farms and improve the farming environment.

For this reason, animal activists and people in the faux fur industry advertise faux fur as eco-friendly materials which is an ethical option for fur lovers instead of real fur killing innocent animals. However, as faux fur has grown in fame and popularity, people have started thinking about the damage to the environment caused by the waste of the plastics. Faux fur doesn't kill any animals through the production, but after the use, we found that those products made of plastics eventually kill animals by harming and poisoning the environment. In regards to the use of faux fur, there are people against the products for the sake of saving the environment, especially in the ocean. Those who are against faux fur are also against the use of plastics. They believe that faux fur is not environmentally friendly at all.

First, the use of plastic can harm the environment for sure. The plastics damage also animals and people living in the communities. However, whether the choice of faux fur is good for the environment or not is questionable. Animal activists believes that it's environmentally friendly not to buy animal products. However, as animal trapping is advocated as a way to prevent disease caused by wild animals and balance the wild population, what they claim does not always make sense.

How can we be sure the information we receive through the media is trustworthy?
Animal activists say that fur farming is cruel, while fur farmers appeal that they give animals

good care before death. In the interview by Truth About Fur, fur farmer Dan Mullen answered the question about how farmed mink are killed. He said that they use carbon monoxide gas so that those animals are unconscious within a few seconds, and after they die, their bodies are put in the box to cool them down until the next day to get processed (Truth About Fur, 2013). This is completely different from what animal activists say about fur farming. For example, The National Humane Education Society says that in those farms, not every animal is killed but some of them are unlucky enough to be skinned alive. In addition, PETA investigated a farm which contains about 100 foxes and 2500 minks, and in the video, minks are stressed by the noise of cleaning, biting the cages and bleeding from mouths in the old and dirty environment (PETA, 2016).

Truth About Fur claims that animal rights activists have presented an old video as a current one showing how animals are skinned alive in China to show inhumane treatment (Fur Commission USA, 2019, Truth About Fur, 2019). Moreover, those Chinese in the video uploaded online were paid for that. In the interview, the Chinese guy says that “a man and woman approached us, they had a camera and were filming. We asked what they were doing, and the woman said her grandfather had never seen a racoon skinned alive. She asked if I would do it and she’d like to film me doing so. I told her we can’t do that because the animal might bite us. She says she buys a good lunch or give us a few hundred yuan (1,000 yuan is about 145 USD today) to buy our own” (Truth About Fur, 2019). The Chinese interviewee who skinned the animal alive for the woman also says that he feels uncomfortable about what he did.

We can find the “original” video easily online. Although we never know if the Chinese interviewee is telling the truth in the interview. He might be just scared of being accused for what he did in the video. However, we can no longer judge if he is tricked or not. Sadly, as the

video shows, it's true that he skinned an animal alive for few hundred dollars no matter how he felt about the act. However, the question is what we can trust as a reliable source.

Fake news is everywhere. Today, as the internet gets more and more common, information from anonymous sources is spreading easily and quickly over the world. According to the Pew Research Center, in 2018, adults in the US receive more news online than through printed newspaper (Shearer, 2018). The result of the survey research shows that one in five adults in the U.S. says they often get news through social media. While the population of television and printed newspaper viewers decreased, the population of news website, radio and social media increased. This trend is not only in the U.S. The Pew Research Center conducted another research on how people receive news in Europe in 2017 and the result also shows that 69% of French, 75% of Denmark, 61% of UK, 50% of German, 68% of Swedish, 74% of Italian, 65% of Spanish and 55% of Dutch young adults aged 18 to 29 receive social media news (The Pew Research Center, 2018). The result tells us that young adults are more common social media consumers than older adults.

The research conducted by Hermida et al (2012) showed that today two fifth of Canadian social networking users answered the survey that they receive news from people who they follow on social network instead of news organizations or individual journalists. In that research, the participants said that they appreciated social media for the ability to keep in touch with more information and news (Hermida et al, 2012). However, Reich argues that citizen journalists tend to establish the stories about the news based on direct witness, technical sources like internet, personal connections and their own experiences (Reich, 2008). So as to report the news, we used to value newspaper, radio and TV and so on. However, as the Internet has been getting more common in our daily lives, we are able to report what we see through our own eyes directly on

the Internet. Today, the population of the internet consists of half of the world population (International Telecommunication Union, 2018). For that reason, the more the population of the internet users increases, the more both the population and the work of citizen journalists increase. In other words, we need citizen journalists when it comes to unexpected incidents like terrorist attacks and natural disasters. Today everybody can become journalists as we potentially have the potential to witness the accident to report it. Thanks to technology, the news that journalists miss can be reported by citizens.

Nevertheless, in addition to citizen reporters' different tactics used to collect the information, there is a significant difference from traditional news media. That is anonymity. When it comes to a privacy policy to protect citizen reporters, anonymity is essential. The protection makes reporters feel safe and makes the secrets that have never been reported easy to be shared in public. Yet, the anonymity can make the news reported with anonymity doubtful or even fake news can be shared widely as the truth because there is no individualistic responsibility.

How animal activists achieve their goals

Advertisement is an important aspect of sales, and thanks to online advertisements, advertisers can reach more customers than ever before. In addition, those online advertisements provide more communications among consumers' interests, peer reviews and the advertisements (Algharabat et al., 2018). Perception always influences the consumers' attitudes toward the advertisement (Eckler and Bolls, 2011). Additionally, marketers use new approaches to marketing. Instead of the traditional marketing which considered the consumers as "rational decision-makers who care about functional features and benefits", today's marketers think of

their consumers as “rational and emotional human beings who are concerned with achieving pleasurable experiences” (Schmitt, 1999).

The study to measure how advertisement sources impact consumers conducted by Steensgaard et al. (2017) shows that while entertainment and information have a positive effect on consumers’ attitude towards the advertisement, in contrast, frustration has a negative impact. In the political scene, candidates adapt to new techniques to win the race. Advertisement is not only to sell products, it is also used to make rival candidates less attractive to voters. The relationship between the animal fur industry and faux fur industry is not quite on the same level to be sure, but we can find something in common in the tactics used in both situations.

On the contrary, in general, both animal activists and environmental activists’ goals are similar or even the same. They both care about animals and the environment, but when the fur industry comes into the discussion, their argument turns out to be something different. For example, misleading advertisement leads this conflict between animal activists and environmental activists. Jacoby and Small warn of the dangers of misleading advertisements, that advertisements can misinform us as consumers by using unclear terms which give us a positive or negative impression as the advertisers want (Jacoby and Small, 1975). Their research applied to the FDA (The Food and Drug Administration), but the same thing may apply to the relationship between the fur industry and the advertisements. The fur industry appeals that fur is something superior to faux fur by using the term “environmentally friendly”, while animal activists blame the animal fur industry for killing animals. Fur farming also emits ammonia from the farms, which the fur industry never admits in its advertisements. The act of killing isn’t eco-friendly, at least for those who are against the animal killing, so that animal activists also present faux fur as an environmentally friendly option.

To study how today's ethical standards toward animal rights has been built, I looked into which words animal activists and environmental activists use to advocate their ideas. I listed several animal rights organizations that advertise their policy toward animal fur products and the industry. They are International Anti-Fur Coalition, Fur Free Alliance, Coalition to Abolish the Fur Trade, Anti-Fur Society, Respect for Animals, The Humane Society of the United States, and Fur Free Society.

To learn how each of them advertises its idea against fur products, online video posts were studied, and each video was analyzed to compare how to give an influence on our thoughts on animal rights. Emotional advertisement has been discussed by Alčaković et al. Their study examined the impact of emotional context on effectiveness on TV commercials. The effectiveness of TV commercials was measured by 4 gages: "Advertisement recall", "Attitude toward the advertisement", "Attitude towards the brand" and "Purchase intent". The result of the study shows that both positive and negative emotional contexts influence advertisement acknowledgment compared with neutral context (Alčaković, 2018). Another study conducted by Kensinger and Corkin also indicated that negative information lasts more than neutral information and negative words have more of an impact on our memories than neutral words (Kensinger and Corkin, 2003).

The study conducted by East et al. supports that idea in vocal expression too. They investigated how much positive and negative word influence consumers when it comes to product choice in advertisements. As the result of the study, positive (encourage the choice) and negative words (discourage the choice) have almost the same effect on the choice of the product, and their study proved that it depends on the products for whether the participants trust positive or negative information (East et al., 2016).

However, emotion has always had an impact on our choices and the emotion was provoked by advertisements as media. For example, animal activists often blame the fur industry in emotionally negative terms. Here is the example of animal activity organizations against fur products: International Anti-Fur Coalition (IAFC), Fur Free Alliance (FFA), Coalition to Abolish the Fur Trade (CAFT), Anti-fur Society, Respect for Animal, and PETA, all of them are against any use of fur including fur farming and fur trade.

The common character of the advertisements made by those animal rights organizations is using negatively emotional words to describe the fur industry. For example, IAFC uses “death/dead” and “victim” often. This trend of advertisement reminds us of a political negative campaign. Of course, as they are all against the practice which kill animals to obtain fur, it makes sense to appeal with the problematic methods used to obtain fur. However, when it comes to comparison of words spoken and written by people who agree with fur from the environmental aspect, there is a significant difference between what the fur industry presents and what the faux fur industry presents in their advertisements.

To compare with animal activists’ words, I chose International Fur Federation as a comparison. International Fur Federation pursues the development of the fur industry under pressure from animal activists. It has its own YouTube channel, so I studied words used in each video to describe faux fur, anti-fur activists, and fur products. International Fur Federation uses both positive words and negative words in its advertisement videos, because it talks about both natural fur and faux fur. It uses negative term to describe how plastic waste causes problems in our daily lives and the environment which also harms animals in the community. At the same time, positive terms are used when it talks about the use of natural fur. International Fur

Federation talks about how natural fur can be a sustainability choice. It lasts longer than faux fur, and it is biodegradable.

The tactic used in each side by using negative terms to claim how fur/ faux fur damages the environment or animals is an ordinary and reasonable way to convince a third person to agree with its view on the use of fur/ faux fur or disagree with it, but I found that those who disagree with the fur industry focus only on animal rights and this is why animal rights movement can be said to be based on “emotion”. Groves discussed the relationship between feminism and animal rights activists. In his view, animal protectionism offered women an opportunity to join a political conversation and they sometimes even take violent actions to fight for animals (Groves, 2001), which can be considered an emotional act. Yet, Groves said when it comes to scientific argument, those female animal activists are very careful to criticize the animal research because those scientific researches tend to be conducted by well- known men in the organization (Groves, 2001). This might be also one of the reasons that animal rights is studied with feminism. In the society, higher position is still authorized by men than women, and females are trying to challenge those existing authority. Groves also found that the negotiation between women, animal activists are less “emotional” (Groves, 2001). However, it’s doubtful whether the animal activists’ emotional acts are their intention. Female activists get emotional in their activity, especially when it comes to negotiations with male opponents, but this is not only because they are fighting for animals and animal rights movement, but also gender inequality can cause this emotional act.

Animal activists may be emotional, or champion animal rights by influencing the emotions of others, but that is because their opponents treat animal activists as something illegitimate. The idea of animal rights is new to the world, and there isn’t legislation of the law

regarding animal rights yet. To those who may lose income, social status, or political power through the development of animal rights movement and legitimacy, the current circumstance would be serious trouble, and they want to hinder the development as a result. Hence, there should be discussions and struggles to create rules to ban people from things that were allowed previously. Those who don't listen to animal rights activists and delay the development of the law get animal activists emotional and put the negative image of activists into our minds.

As International Fur Federation says, use of natural fur may not give a negative impact on the environment. Otherwise, both pollutions caused by fur and faux fur are characterized differently, but do we need to discuss which harm matters more to the environment? They both harm the environment for sure. In this case both "fur" industries are the same in regards to environmental pollution. On the contrary, faux fur can cause further trouble instead of protection of animal rights. The companies producing faux fur advertise their products as the "environmentally friendly choice" instead of natural fur killing animals, and the idea of use of faux fur developed by animal activists basically relies on sympathy to innocent creatures. The increased share of faux fur in the world is not a victory of animal rights, but a victory of the companies' marketing.

To understand who an animal activist is and how the animal activist became what it is, I view that how they get information about animal rights is important. The survey conducted by Jerolmack shows a resemblance between the media and animal activists. Young participants of the survey tend to show more interest in animal rights than middle-aged participants (Jerolmack, 2003). Also, as the character of animal activists, adults aged 26 to 35 is the biggest population and second biggest population is 36 to 45 and 18 to 25 (Lowe & Ginsberg, 2002). The population of animal activists resembles the population of the internet media. This similarity may

come from where they receive the news from. As the Pew Research Center's research shows, even though there are differences among countries, after young adults aged 18 to 29, the second biggest population of social media news receivers is people aged 30 to 49. The results of both studies in the population of animal activists and social media news/ Internet news imply that social networks play an important role for animal activists.

In addition, as the number of animal activists grow, their voice in politics gets bigger, as politicians need to listen to voters to win the race. According to United States Census Bureau, the vote rate varies based on age. The results of the census show that the older they get, the more people go to vote in the U.S. Age group 65 plus is the most active group, and group 45 to 64 is the second most active voters (US Census Bureau, 2018). Since 2012, the voting rate of youth (18 to 29) is increasing, even though it is still less than 50% which is the worst of all groups, while the other three groups (30 to 44, 45 to 64, 65 plus) are decreasing (US Census Bureau, 2018). When we think of the animal activists' character, if we could improve the vote rate, animal rights would be treated as more important issue that politicians need to take care of.

The ways that animal activists work on their goals vary. These are the reasons that animal activists use the Internet to be more active online. First, online news is cheaper than printed news or news on TV. Online news doesn't need paper or printing. In addition, the population of social media has risen dramatically. According to We Are Social and Hootsuite, alongside the internet usage, the number of social media users has increased rapidly, as much as 13% in the last 12 months (Hootsuite Media Inc, 2017). This study analyzing access to Facebook implies that the internet population isn't well balanced in gender yet, because the number of the access by female users from Central Africa, the Middle East, and Southern Asia is significantly less than the males (Hootsuite Media Inc, 2017). This inequality may come from gender inequality. Those regions

where the access to the internet is not balanced in gender also tend to be categorized as unequal countries in the annual gender gap report issued by the World Economic Forum (WEF, 2018).

By this comparison, the relationship between questions such as gender equality and the internet population to the development of animal welfare can be examined, since animal activists often use online tools to share their ideas. Besides, animal activists are characterized as mostly females, therefore I assumed that as female rights become more stable, animal welfare develops as well. If women tend to take part in animal rights movements, we first need to develop gender equality until all women can have an equal voice to their own political views. There is not a significant study examining the reason why women care more about animals than men, but since all traditional political standard has been built up by men in the past, women try to build something new because animal rights were not previously viewed as an important issue by men. Actually, the study conducted by Sanbonmatsu showed that voters perceive male candidates as better at economy, foreign affairs, military and crimes (Sanbonmatsu, 2002).

There are Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea Gabon, Republic of the Congo and Sao Tome Amd Principe in Central Africa, Iran, Israel, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, United Arab Emirates, Syria, Iraq, Palestine, Bahrain, Jordan, Kuwait, Qatar, Yemen, Lebanon, Oman and Cyprus in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka in Southern Asia. In those countries, in regards to animal welfare, gender equality and access to the Internet, only Iran and Turkey from the Middle East, and India and Pakistan from Southern Asia were selected. Unfortunately, in central African countries, World Animal Protection does not have any data on any of them, therefore I could compare only gender equality and access to the

Internet in Cameroon and Congo, which do record data on gender equality and the Internet access.

World Animal Protection (WAP) selects 50 countries to categorize A to G, based on Formal recognition of animal sentience, Support for the Universal Declaration on Animal Welfare, Laws against causing animal suffering, Protecting animals used in farming, Protecting animals in captivity, Protecting companion animals, Protecting animals used for draught and recreation, Protecting animals used in scientific research, Protecting the welfare of wild animals, Government accountability for animal welfare, Engagement with the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), OIE animal welfare standards, Reporting on progress, Education on animal care and protection, and Consultation with stakeholders (World Animal Protection, 2014). World Economic Forum issues the Global Gender Gap Report every year. There were 149 countries in its list in 2018 and those countries are ranked based on Economic Participation and Opportunity Sub index, Educational Attainment, Health and Survival, and Political Empowerment. Finally, Julia Murphy and Max Roser in Our World in Data shows the World Internet population from 1990. Their latest data in 2017 suggests that there are still some regions without the Internet access. There is also a possibility which connects Internet supply, gender equality and development of animal welfare.

From the Middle Eastern countries, I could find the data on animal welfare, gender equality and the Internet population in Iran and Turkey, and from Southern Asian countries such as India and Pakistan in all three studies. According to World Animal Protection, Iran was categorized G, and Turkey was E (World Animal Protection, 2014). In regard to the gender equality, Iran was 142nd in 149 countries and Turkey was 130th (World Economic Forum, 2018). The internet access in Iran was 60.2% and Turkey was 64.68% (World Bank, 2017),

while India was categorized C in animal welfare (World Animal Protection, 2014), ranked 108th in gender equality (World Economic Forum, 2018) and 14.1% of the Internet population (World Bank, 2017). Whereas Pakistan was F in animal welfare (World Animal Protection, 2014), 148th in gender equality (World Economic Forum, 2018) and 15.51% of the Internet population (World Bank, 2017). To think of the relationship between the internet population and gender equality, those last two don't seem to be related to each other in this comparison, because even though the internet population in Iran and Turkey are higher than in Pakistan and India, India was ranked 108th in gender equality and the animal welfare is more developed than the other three countries. This comparison suggests that the internet population doesn't matter as much to the development of animal welfare in these four countries.

The next potential reason that relates to the development of animal welfare is religion. In Pakistan, Iran and Turkey, most people are Islamic, while Indian people are Hindu (WGBH Educational Foundation, 2015). The cultural effect on the locals' views regarding animals can be traditionally shared, especially in those developing areas. Actually, in developed countries, all three sectors in animal welfare, gender equality and the Internet population tend to score high as we see the results from the United Kingdom and Austria categorized as A in animal welfare (World Animal Protection, 2014), 15th in gender equality (the UK) and 53rd (Austria) (World Economic Forum, 2018). Around 95% of the population in the UK has access to the Internet, and so does about 87% in Austria (World Bank, 2017). Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands and Denmark are B in animal welfare (World Animal Protection, 2014), and 14th (Germany), 3rd (Sweden), 13rd (Denmark) and 27th (Netherlands) in gender equality (World Economic Forum, 2018). The internet population is about 84% in Germany, 96% in Sweden and Denmark, and 93% in the Netherlands (World Bank, 2017). Thus, countries well developed in animal welfare

also can be recognized as developed countries in other sections which may be related to the development of the discussion in regard to the animal rights movement.

The cost of online media is well-known to be cheaper to run than traditional media like TV, radio and newspaper. The study to compare media channels indicates that generally traditional media is more expensive than social media. For example, to reach 1000 reactions, direct mail cost the most, TV costs 28 USD, both magazines and newspapers cost USD and radio costs 10 USD. On the other hand, social media costs only 2.5 USD (Standberry, 2015). As a result, the online population has been increasing, and we can say how much online advertisement is economical. For this reason, there is no way to avoid online media, especially when it comes to animal rights organizations as non-profit NGOs.

However, there are more risks that people might obtain incorrect information from online news. Vosoughi, Roy and Aral studied 126,000 rumors on twitter from 2006 to 2017, trying to determine if those rumors were true, false, or mixed true and false. Their research indicates that about 126,000 rumors were shared by about 3 million people, false news spread to more people than the truth, and it's faster than the truth (Vosoughi et al, 2018). However, another research conducted in 2017 suggested that 24% of 70,000 people in 36 countries think social media report fact separately from the fictions, compared to the news media (Newman et al, 2017). From 2016 to 2017, articles posted on Twitter, API, and Hoaxy were collected and studied. As a result, Shao et al found that fake news websites published 100 fake articles per week (Shao et al, 2017).

The character of the media environment around the fur industry can be that people have different opinions with various stories based on what they believe. We can say the same of other topics such as global warming. Scientists sometimes believe different facts from other researchers' research results and that makes the development of the understanding more difficult.

This is because people in general don't have any educational background to obtain the information on the subject without professionals' research results and comments, but those professionals can sometimes have different views on the subjects. However, this fur industry's story is different from the rest of the others, because animals feel pain as we do and we believe that they have emotions as well. This is also why some people don't take animal welfare seriously as an opinion based on scientific research or fact. There isn't always scientific suggestion or numbers for the reason that every individual has a different character. Sadly, the animal rights movement is said to be based on activists' emotion, because science isn't developed enough to measure those aspects yet. Therefore, we are trying to observe animal rights movement and develop the understanding by comparison with other subjects. From one perspective, the most common view on the character of animal activists is the gender balance. In general, the number of female activists is beyond the number of male activists (Jerolmack, 2003; Lowe & Ginsberg, 2002). Therefore, animal rights movement has been studied with feminism (Gaarder, 2011) which the development of the study will help us to lead the world to a better place for many more species.

Conclusion

After the society has developed enough to focus on animal rights, the Internet can be an efficient tool to share the information on animal rights and discuss about that. However, as the online source always holds the danger of spreading fake news, to develop the idea of not only animal rights but also all other subjects, we should first learn how to handle the information and the risk. As the Internet suddenly showed up in front of us, started to lead the market and increase online population, there is always a need to be able to use it before the education.

The relationship between the fur industry and faux fur industry is contradictory, but if we think of their huge responsibility to society, new findings by scientists and social researchers should be pressure to each industry. The discussion about the fur industry is an economical subject more than anything. Plastics are cheap materials, and that's why companies can offer faux fur with reasonable price. If faux fur is more expensive than natural fur, would people buy it, or even value faux fur better than natural fur? Faux fur is an imitation. To develop the value of faux fur products and gain demands, animal rights movement contributes to the industry a lot. Manufacturers and suppliers in faux fur industry had to find a reason to be chosen over natural and real fur. The interest and benefit of faux fur industry and animal activists are matched, so faux fur could get this much support from all over the world.

To give up on animal fur, we should spend a lot of money on people losing job by the act and tax revenue in each country, but to give up on plastics, we have to find the replacement having the same characters, and idealistically cheaper material than plastics. It will cost a lot to invest and develop, and take a lot of time for sure. If plastics are more expensive, we wouldn't adopt them this much in our daily life. Besides, we still must think of animals killed for their fur in farms. Killing animals for clothing cannot be justified in any condition in the 21st century. The reason that we still persist in animal fur is to impress somebody by how we dress, even though those animal fur lovers can no longer make use of fur to impress animal activists whose number is increasing day by day. If only trapping animals can be justified by science, we can make clothes only with trapped animals' fur.

Today, both the animal fur and faux fur industries create job opportunities and profits that makes people feel afraid of giving up on either of them. However, we cannot listen to only what the fur industry and faux fur industry say. Today, we already know that animals are killed not

only in fur farms but also in nature by faux fur. Words are so powerful that we can easily get influenced. Advertisers and marketers know how to gain attention from us in the most effective way. In this case of animal fur and faux fur, I believe that we should not take it as only an animal rights issue. To increase their benefits, companies try to bring animal rights into the discussion and sell more products of faux fur. Faux fur industry makes use of animal rights movement to make more money.

If both animal activists and environmentalists purely fight for animals or the environment, they should be able to find that we cannot justify either animal fur or faux fur, since they both have purpose and cause harm. Some brands never use animal fur in order to get more chances to obtain more customers. When it comes to the use of faux fur, if people living in developed countries with access to the Internet know how faux fur made of, and that the material can harm the environment, are they really animal activists? They may be neither animal activists or environmentalists but capitalists. Otherwise, the choice of faux fur is more likely for us. We don't want to see animals being killed for their fur because it makes us feel guilty.

It's a great thing to discuss animal rights. That means that we develop our society well enough to think of other species. While we have difficulties endangering us to poverty, disease or death, we cannot even imagine how animals suffer. Although, as the animal rights movement gets more active, the relationship between the animal fur industry and faux fur industry becomes complicated. All the animal fur, faux fur, meat eating or vegetarian isn't perfect option, but we sometimes compromise the negativity and try to take the better one. This is nothing negative. We develop the discussion and understanding of both sides. For this reason, the development of this discussion implies our societies' achievement. Although it's true that there is a gap between

developed countries and developing countries, animal rights movement will be more discussed more frequently as the Internet continues to grow.

So, here is an idea about how we can live with current argument regarding animal fur and faux fur as plastics. First, we definitely need to raise the tax both on fur clothing and plastics up to getting them more expensive than other natural materials like cotton and wool. The purpose of tax on fur is of course to make it difficult to purchase it. Also, if plastics are more expensive than other materials, at least we lose one of the biggest merits to choose plastics over the other products. The tax revenue from plastics can be used to study the recycling of plastics or finding other new materials rather than plastics. Finally, fur is politics. If we want to change it now, we should go to vote for the candidate who would work on saving our planet.

Reference

A prior section 5849, Pub. L. 85–859, title II, §203(g)(1), Sept. 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1427, consisted of provisions similar to those comprising this section, prior to the general revision of this chapter by Pub. L. 90–618.

Abnett, K. (2015, June 07). Inside the Growing Global Fur Industry. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/intelligence/inside-the-growing-global-fur-industry>

Alberts, E. C. (2018, December 19). This Is Where Canada Goose Coats Come From. Retrieved August 14, 2019, from <https://www.thedodo.com/in-the-wild/coyotes-geese-suffering-canada-goose-jackets>

Alčaković, S., Orlić, A., & Đurić, V. (2018). Emotional Context And Effectiveness Of Tv Advertising. *Primenjena Psihologija*, 11(2), 155-170. doi:10.19090/pp.2018.2.155-170

Algharabat, R., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., Alalwan, A. A., & Qasem, Z. (2018). The effect of telepresence, social presence and involvement on consumer brand engagement: An empirical study of non-profit organizations. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 40, 139-149. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.09.011

Arney, D., & Piirsalu, P. (2017). The Ethics of Keeping fur Animals, the Estonian Context. *Proceedings of the Latvian Academy of Sciences. Section B. Natural, Exact, and Applied Sciences.*, 71(1-2), 78-80. doi:10.1515/prolas-2017-0013

- BBC NEWS. (2019, April 2). New York to ban plastic bags - CBBC Newsround. Retrieved April 10, 2019, from https://www.bbc.co.uk/newsround/47777112?intlink_from_url=https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/c6lpgw300llt/plastic-pollution&link_location=live-reporting-story
- BBC NEWS. (2019, March 22). Dead whale 'had 40kg of plastic in its stomach'. Retrieved April 10, 2019, from https://www.bbc.com/news/av/science-environment-47666059/dead-whale-had-40kg-of-plastic-in-its-stomach?intlink_from_url=https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/c6lpgw300llt/plastic-pollution&link_location=live-reporting-map
- Bellesiles, M. A. (2001). Arming America: The Origins of a National Gun Culture. *The Journal of Military History*, 65(4), 47. doi:10.2307/2677658
- Conover, M. R. (2001). *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. Effect of Hunting and Trapping on Wildlife Damage, 29, 521-532. doi:10.1002/(issn)1938-5463a
- Convery, F., McDonnell, S., & Ferreira, S. (2007). The most popular tax in Europe? Lessons from the Irish plastic bags levy. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 38(1), 1-11. doi:10.1007/s10640-006-9059-2
- Cooper, J. J., & Mason, G. J. (2001). The use of operant technology to measure behavioral priorities in captive animals. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 33(3), 427-434. doi:10.3758/bf03195397
- Damgaard, B. M., & Hansen, S. W. (1996). Stress Physiological Status and Fur Properties in Farm Mink Placed in Pairs or Singly. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section A - Animal Science*, 46(4), 253-259. doi:10.1080/09064709609415878
- Department of Interior. (2018, February 2). USFWS-WSFR Hunter Education Program. Retrieved from <https://wsfrprograms.fws.gov/Subpages/GrantPrograms/HunterEd/HE.htm>
- East, R., Uncles, M. D., Romaniuk, J., & Lomax, W. (2016). Measuring the impact of positive and negative word of mouth: A reappraisal. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 24(1), 54-58. doi:10.1016/j.ausmj.2015.12.003
- Eckler, P., & Bolls, P. (2011). Spreading the Virus. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 11(2), 1-11. doi:10.1080/15252019.2011.10722180
- Else, R., Woodward, A. & Balaguera-Reina, S.A. 2019. Alligator mississippiensis. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2019: e.T46583A3009637. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2019-2.RLTS.T46583A3009637.en>. Downloaded on 30 August 2019.
- Emberley, J. V. (1998). *Venus and furs: The cultural politics of fur*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Englar, C. (2019, April 04). Olympian Meagan Duhamel: Keep Team Canada Fur-Free. Retrieved April 4, 2019, from <https://www.peta.org/blog/meagan-duhamel-keep-canadian-olympic-uniforms-fur-free/>

EUROPE. (2019, January 16). Swimming Water Myth Debunked Again - Fur Europe %. Retrieved May 23, 2019, from <https://www.fureurope.eu/news/swimming-water-myth-debunked-again/>

European Commission (2001) The Welfare of Animals Kept for Fur Production. Report of the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare. Adopted on 12-13 December 2001

European Union. (2007). Regulation (EC) No 864/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on the law applicable to non-contractual obligations (Rome II). Official Journal of the European Union, 1-24. doi:10.1515/9783866539020.1

Fur Commission USA. (2019, April 6). Anti Fur Activists Use Faked Video – the IFF Investigates. Retrieved May 20, 2019, from <https://furcommission.com/anti-fur-activists-use-faked-video-the-iff-investigates/>

Gardner, E. (2011). Where the Boys Arent: The Predominance of Women in Animal Rights Activism. *Feminist Formations*, 23(2), 54-76. doi:10.1353/ff.2011.0019

Geyer, R., J. Jambeck and K. Law (2017), “Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made”, *Science Advances*, Vol. 3/7, p. e1700782

Chao, A. (2005). Meat Consumption and Risk of Colorectal Cancer. *Jama*, 293(2). doi: 10.1001/jama.293.2.172

Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., and Ulgiati, S.. 2016. A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 114: 11– 32.

Groves, J. M. (2001). Animal Rights and the Politics of Emotion. *Passionate Politics*, 212-230. doi:10.7208/chicago/9780226304007.003.0013

Gunn, K. (2018, May 21). Danes Use Far Fewer Plastic Bags Than Americans-Here's How. Retrieved from <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2018/05/denmark-uses-less-plastic-bags-usa-culture/>

Hansen, S. W., Houbak, B., & Malmkvist, J. (1998). Development and possible causes of fur damage in farm mink—significance of social environment. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section A - Animal Science*, 48(1), 58-64. doi:10.1080/09064709809362403

Hermida, A., Fletcher, F., Korell, D., & Logan, D. (2012). Share, Like, Recommend. *Journalism Studies*, 13(5-6), 815-824. doi:10.1080/1461670x.2012.664430

Hines, A. (2015, January 22). The History of Faux Fur. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/history-faux-fur-180953984/>

Hootsuite Media Inc. (2017, January 24). New Research Reveals Global Social Media Use Increased by 21 Percent in 2016 - Social Media Marketing & Management Dashboard. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://hootsuite.com/newsroom/press-releases/digital-in-2017-report>

Howard, B. (2016, March 18). SeaWorld to End Controversial Orca Shows and Breeding. Retrieved April 10, 2019, from <https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160317-seaworld-orcas-killer-whales-captivity-breeding-shamu-tilikum/>

Improving Plastics Management. (2018). OECD Environment Policy Papers. doi:10.1787/c5f7c448-en

International Fur Federation. (2018, February 01). Fur industry says "it's time to call out the fake news about fake fur" • We Are Fur. Retrieved April 8, 2019, from <https://www.wearefur.com/fur-industry-says-time-call-fake-news-fake-fur/>

International Telecommunication Union. (2018, May 30). Half the world's population is still offline. Here's why that matters. Retrieved July 18, 2019, from <https://news.itu.int/half-the-worlds-population-is-still-offline-heres-why-that-matters/>

Jacoby, J., & Small, C. (1975). The FDA Approach to Defining Misleading Advertising. *Journal of Marketing*, 39(4), 65. doi:10.2307/1250601

Janssen, M., Busch, C., Rödiger, M., & Hamm, U. (2016). Motives of consumers following a vegan diet and their attitudes towards animal agriculture. *Appetite*, 105, 643-651. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2016.06.039

Jerolmack, C. (2003). Tracing the Profile of Animal Rights Supporters: A Preliminary Investigation. *Society & Animals*, 11(3), 245-263. doi:10.1163/156853003322773041

Kensinger, E. A., & Corkin, S. (2003). Memory enhancement for emotional words: Are emotional words more vividly remembered than neutral words?

Memory & Cognition, 31(8), 1169-1180. doi:10.3758/bf03195800

Ligisration.gov.uk. (2000, November 23). Fur Farming (Prohibition) Act 2000. Retrieved May 17, 2019, from <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/33/section/1>

Lowe, B., & Ginsberg, C. (2002). Animal Rights as a Post-Citizenship Movement. *Society & Animals*, 10(2), 203-215. doi:10.1163/156853002320292345

Lush, T. (2017, January 15). APNewsBreak: Ringling Bros. circus to close after 146 years. Retrieved April 10, 2019, from <https://apnews.com/020bc7b2f16f4446ade338bcf4a500ed>

McCurry, J. (2019, July 10). Japan's famous Nara deer dying from eating plastic bags. Retrieved July 18, 2019, from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jul/10/japans-famous-nara-deer-dying-from-eating-plastic-bags>

Mason, G. J., Cooper, J., & Clarebrough, C. (2001). Frustrations of fur-farmed mink. *Nature*, 410(6824), 35-36. doi:10.1038/35065157

Miandad, R., Barakat, M., Aburiazaiza, A. S., Rehan, M., Ismail, I., & Nizami, A. (2017). Effect of plastic waste types on pyrolysis liquid oil. *International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation*, 119, 239-252. doi:10.1016/j.ibiod.2016.09.017

Nazer, D. W., Al-Sa`ed, R. M., & Siebel, M. A. (2006). Reducing the environmental impact of the unhairing-liming process in the leather tanning industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 14(1), 65-74.

Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Kalogeropoulos, A., Levy, D., & Nielsen, R. K. (2017). Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2017. SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3026082>

- Nizami, Dr. Abdul-Sattar & Rehan, Mohammad & Ouda, Omar & Shahzad, Khurram & Sadeq, Yumna & Iqbal, Tariq & Ismail, Iqbal. (2015). An Argument for Developing Waste-to-Energy Technologies in Saudi Arabia. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*. 45. 337-342. 10.3303/CET1545057.
- Nogués-Bravo D, Rodríguez J, Hortal J, Batra P, Araújo MB (2008) Climate Change, Humans, and the Extinction of the Woolly Mammoth. *PLoS Biol* 6(4): e79. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060079>
- NSSF. (2018). Firearms and Ammunition Industry Economic Impact Report 2019 [PDF]. The National Shooting Sports Foundation. Retrieved August 15, 2019, from <https://d3aya7xwz8momx.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/2019-Economic-Impact.pdf>
- Oaten, M. (2017, August 01). World Fur Trade is booming despite China slowdown • We Are Fur. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.wearefur.com/world-fur-trade-is-booming-despite-china-slowdown/>
- Pacelle, W. (2013, December 04). U.S. Research Chimps Heading to New Homes (Op-Ed). Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.livescience.com/41674-research-chimps-head-to-sanctuaries.html>
- Regan, T. (2006). *Defending animal rights*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Pennsylvania Department of Revenue. (2004). *Retailer's Information (REV-717)* [Pamphlet]. Pennsylvania.
- Pennsylvania Department of Revenue. (2004, August 10). Are clothes subject to Sales Tax? Retrieved May 15, 2019, from https://revenue-pa.custhelp.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/1846/~/~are-clothes-subject-to-sales-tax?
- PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). (2016, January 11). Retrieved May 20, 2019, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jx-b2o8MCpY>
- Pilkington, E. (2018, December 13). Gun deaths in US rise to highest level in 20 years, data shows. Retrieved August 14, 2019, from <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/dec/13/us-gun-deaths-levels-cdc-2017>
- Pithers, E. (2017, October 12). Gucci Announces It Will Be Going Fur-Free. Retrieved April 05, 2019, from <https://www.vogue.co.uk/gallery/gucci-announces-it-is-going-fur-free>
- Published on December 7, 2. U. (2018, October 24). Reducing Food Waste Begins at the Grocery Store. Retrieved April 1, 2019, from <https://www.plasticmakeitpossible.com/press-room/reducing-food-waste-starts-grocery-store/>
- Ramchandani, M., & Coste-Maniere, I. (2016). To Fur or not to Fur: Sustainable Production and Consumption Within Animal-Based Luxury and Fashion Products. *Textile Science and Clothing Technology Textiles and Clothing Sustainability*, 41-60. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-2131-2_2
- Reed, C. A. (1980). *The Beginnings of Animal Domestication: primary and Secondary Energy Traps in the History of Life*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Co, 1-6.

- Regan, T. (1984). *The case for animal rights* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Reich, Z. (2008). How Citizens Create News Stories. *Journalism Studies*, 9(5), 739-758. doi:10.1080/14616700802207748
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (2002). Gender Stereotypes and Vote Choice. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(1), 20. doi:10.2307/3088412
- Schmitt, B. (1999). Experiential Marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(1-3), 53-67. doi:10.1362/026725799784870496
- Seth, R. (2018, April 04). The Designers Who Have Gone Fur-Free. Retrieved April 5, 2019, from <https://www.vogue.co.uk/gallery/designers-not-using-fur>
- Shao, C., Ciampaglia, G. L., Varol, O., Flammini, A., & Menczer, F. (2017). The spread of fake news by social bots.
- Shearer, E. (2018, December 10). Social media outpaces print newspapers in the U.S. as a news source. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/12/10/social-media-outpaces-print-newspapers-in-the-u-s-as-a-news-source/>
- Silvenius, F., Koskinen, N., Kurppa, S., Rekilä, T., Sepponen, J., & Hyvärinen, H. (2012). Life cycle assessment of mink and fox pelts produced in Finland. *Proceedings of the Xth International Scientific Congress in Fur Animal Production*, 106-111. doi:10.3920/978-90-8686-760-8_15
- State of New Jersey Department of the Treasury. (2014, August 20). Fur Clothing Retail Gross Receipts Tax & Use Tax Overview. Retrieved May 15, 2019, from https://www.state.nj.us/treasury/taxation/fur_over.shtml
- Standberry, S. (2015, July 7). Traditional Media vs. Social Media Advertising - Cost Comparison. Retrieved from <https://www.lyfemarketing.com/traditional-media-versus-social-media/>
- Statista. (2018, October 26). Japan: Leather manufacturing industry employee number 2016. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/638661/japan-fur-skin-manufacturing-industry-employed-people/>
- Steensgaard, I. M., Syberg, K., Rist, S., Hartmann, N. B., Boldrin, A., & Hansen, S. F. (2017). From macro- to microplastics - Analysis of EU regulation along the life cycle of plastic bags. *Environmental Pollution*, 224, 289-299. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2017.02.007
- Sul, J. A., & Costa, M. F. (2014). The present and future of microplastic pollution in the marine environment. *Environmental Pollution*, 185, 352-364. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.10.036
- Tarhauskielto. (2018). Cannibal mink. Retrieved May 21, 2019, from <https://tarhauskielto.fi/en>
- The Global Burden of Disease 2016 Injury Collaborators. (2018, August 28). Global Mortality From Firearms, 1990-2016. Retrieved August 14, 2019, from <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/article-abstract/2698492>
- The Pew Research Center. (2017, June 22). Public Views About Guns. Retrieved August 15, 2019, from <https://www.people-press.org/2017/06/22/public-views-about-guns/#total>

Tisserant, A., Pauliuk, S., Merciai, S., Schmidt, J., Fry, J., Wood, R., & Tukker, A. (2017). Solid Waste and the Circular Economy: A Global Analysis of Waste Treatment and Waste Footprints. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 21(3), 628-640. doi:10.1111/jiec.12562

Truth About Fur. (2013, December 17). Retrieved May 20, 2019, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=45&v=mdHWjKrZSpM

Truth About Fur. (2019, March 18). Retrieved May 20, 2019, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z6joIOEk6JU>

The Pew Research Center. (2018, May 08). Young people tend to be more avid social media news consumers than their elders. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from https://www.journalism.org/2018/05/14/many-western-europeans-get-news-via-social-media-but-in-some-countries-substantial-minorities-do-not-pay-attention-to-the-source/pj_2018-05-14_western-europe_5-03/

Tukker, A., Bulavskaya, T., Giljum, S., Koning, A., Lutter, S., Simas, M., Stadler, K., and Vinke, C. M., Hansen, S. W., Mononen, J., Korhonen, H., Cooper, J. J., Mohaibes, M., . . . Spruijt, B. M. (2008). To swim or not to swim: An interpretation of farmed minks motivation for a water bath. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 111(1-2), 1-27. doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2008.02.006

US Census Bureau. (2018, January 15). Voting Rates by Age. Retrieved August 14, 2019, from <https://census.gov/library/visualizations/2017/comm/voting-rates-age.html>

UN. (2013, January 22). UN and partners launch global campaign to reduce food waste | UN News. Retrieved July 31, 2019, from <https://news.un.org/en/story/2013/01/430352>

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146-1151. doi:10.1126/science.aap9559

VOTE SMART. (2006, July 08). A 4714 - Fur Clothing Tax - Voting Record. Retrieved May 15, 2019, from <https://votesmart.org/bill/votes/4756#.XNwPw2j7SUI>

Wakefield, I.P. (2011). Drop dead stylish: Mitigating environmental impact of fur production through consumer protection in the truth in fur labeling act of 2010. 19. 267-286.

WGBH Educational Foundation. (2015). World Religions Map. Retrieved August 4, 2019, from <http://d3tt741pwxqwm0.cloudfront.net/WGBH/sj14/sj14-int-religmap/index.html>

Winston J Craig, Health effects of vegan diets, *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Volume 89, Issue 5, May 2009, Pages 1627S–1633S, <https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.2009.26736N>

World Animal Protection. (2014, November 2). World Animal Protection. Retrieved August 5, 2019, from <https://api.worldanimalprotection.org/indicators>

World Bank. (2017). Individuals using the Internet (% of population). Retrieved August 5, 2019, from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IT.NET.USER.ZS>

World Economic Forum. (2018). The Global Gender Gap Report 2018. *Insight Report*, 4-11. Retrieved August 4, 2019, from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf

Wood, R. 2014. The Global Resource Footprint of Nations. Carbon, water, land and material embodied in trade and final consumption calculated with EXIOBASE 2.1. Leiden/Delft/Vienna/Trondheim. <http://www.exiobase.eu/index.php/publications/creea-booklet/72-creea-booklet-high-resolution/file>. Accessed 3 April 2019.

Wurst, L., & McGuire, R. (2004). Immaculate Consumption: A Critique of the “Shop till you drop” School of Human Behavior. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 3(3), 191-199.

WWF (2018), Pulp and paper. Retrieved March 25, 2018, http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/deforestation/forest_sector_transformation/pulp_and_paper/