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THE EFFECTS OF AN INCREASE IN BENEFITS ON CRIMINAL INCIDENTS PERPETRATED BY MEMBERS OF RADICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND ANIMAL RIGHTS GROUPS

By

Hillary D. McNeel

A Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment

Of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

In the Department of Criminal Justice

University of Central Missouri

August 2012
THE EFFECTS OF AN INCREASE IN BENEFITS ON CRIMINAL INCIDENTS PERPETRATED BY MEMBERS OF RADICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND ANIMAL RIGHTS GROUPS

By

Hillary D. McNeel

August, 2012

APPROVED:

__________________________________
Dr. Jennifer Carson, Chair

__________________________________
Dr. Gene Bonham, Member

__________________________________
Dr. Gregg Etter, Member

ACCEPTED:

__________________________________
Dr. Betsy Kreisel, Chair
Criminal Justice Department

__________________________________
Dean, School of Graduate and Extended Studies

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI

WARRENSBURG, MISSOURI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family for their continued support and for reminding me to take time to enjoy the little things. To James, thank you for the motivation and a quick laugh when I really needed it; to my Thesis Chair, Dr. Jennifer Carson for her helpful guidance and my Thesis Committee, Drs. Bonham and Etter for their never ending support. Last but definitely not least, I would like to express my sincere gratitude toward Cole and Tristen, for being a constant reminder as for the reason I have chosen my path in Criminal Justice.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical Environmental and Animal Rights Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Air Act 1970</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act 1972</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered Species Act 1973</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1976</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security Act of 1985</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act 1988</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Pets</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act 2007</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Choice Theory</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical Environmental and Animal Rights Groups</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Paired Samples T-Test for Non-Terrorist and Terrorist Action</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Paired Samples T-Test on Terrorist Incidents</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Paired Samples T-Test on All Incidents (12 months before/after)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Paired Samples T-Test on Terrorist Incidents (12 months before/after)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE PAGE

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Rational choice theory is based on the consideration of cost and benefits of a given action. This investigation focuses on the latter and its applicability to the criminal incidents perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups. By utilizing the Eco-Incidents Database, this study seeks to answer whether pro-animal and environmental legislation decreased the frequency of criminal acts perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups.

This chapter introduces radical environmental and animal rights groups in addition to establishing the definition of terrorism pertinent to this study and the pre-requisites that determine what conduct falls under this construct. Pro-environmental and animal legislation, specific to this research, is provided along with the basic element of rational choice theory and more specifically, the benefits of the rational choice equation.

Radical Environmental and Animal Rights Groups

Since the early 1970’s the United States has witnessed criminal actions perpetrated by environmental and animal rights groups. These groups have been labeled radical because their actions have crossed the line into criminal and even terrorist conduct. Actions such as releasing mink from a mink farm and the protesting at nuclear power plants are just some of the incidents perpetrated by the members of these groups; detonating pipe bombs to blow up offices and harm persons lie at the other end of the spectrum. Environmental and animal rights groups, although quite similar, have their own agendas to get their message across and are made up of several different groups working toward the same end.
Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) constitute the majority of criminal and even terrorist incidents perpetrated by radical eco-groups (Carson et al., 2011). The Animal Liberation Front is an organization where the short-term goal is to save as many animals as possible from abuse, whereas the long-term objective is to end animal suffering (animalliberationfront.com). These groups are against the companies and businesses that, in their view, abuse and neglect animals. According to their website, any group of people who are vegetarians and who follow ALF guidelines when carrying out direct actions can consider themselves a part of ALF. The guidelines that ALF follows are to liberate animals from places of abuse (e.g. laboratories, factory farms), to inflict economic damage to those involved with the abuse and suffering of animals, to reveal what they perceive as the horror committed against animals, to take all precautions against harming any person or animal, and to name specific businesses and/or individuals when proposing any action.

Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) originated in the United Kingdom and started campaigning in the United States in 2002 against Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS). Huntingdon Life Sciences and their alleged cruelties against animals have gained national attention both in the United States and around the world after videos of animal testing and treatment at HLS showcased on YouTube and the SHAC website (animalrightstube.com). Huntingdon Life Sciences are not the only targets that SHAC has focused on; they go after anyone that they view is abusive or cruel to animals, along with third party targets. Most recently, 30 members of SHAC were arrested and charged under the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act because they went beyond what the Senate termed “constitutionally protected advocacy” (U.S. Senate Committee on Environment & Public Works, 2007).

Earth First! and its splinter, the Earth Liberation Front, are of the most active of the environmental rights groups in the United States. In an analysis of the Eco-Incidence Database
Carson, LaFree and Dugan (2012) found that 25% of the incidents from 1970 to 2007 were claimed by these two groups and 24% of those incidents were considered acts of terrorism by the aforementioned START definition.

Formed in 1979 in response to perceived issues with the corporate environmental community, Earth First! was created. Per the Earth First! website, Earth First! members do not consider themselves an organization but a movement; believing in using direct action to protect “Mother Earth.” Such a movement encompasses everything from civil disobedience to monkey-wrenching. Monkey-wrenching is the unlawful sabotage and/or destruction of industrial equipment that, in the minds of animal and environmental extremists, destroys the earth (Earthfirstjournal.org). On their website, Earth First! encourages people to educate themselves of the law and to be aware of the risks involved with their actions. They also help gather others toward further action, enhancing the chances of getting noticed and being heard (Earthfirst.org).

The Earth Liberation Front (ELF) came into being in 1992. Founder Dave Foreman and the originator of Earth Liberation Front, John Hanna, had been communicating since 1985. Hanna’s original ELF stood for “Environmental Life Force” but has since been renamed the Earth Liberation Front. Earth Liberation Front’s philosophy is based on no central leadership; anyone can be a member, while no one can be a leader. Although some ELF members have resorted to destructive behavior and intimidation, the ELF code is based on the premise of winning the hearts and minds of the public, which will bring more people to view the earth as a priority instead of something to be “used and abused” (Earthliberationfront.com). Per their mission statement, the Earth Liberation Front follows the logic that the best and most effective way to do this to inform and draw attention to the damages of the environment.

Many of the actions by pro-animal and environmental groups are considered criminal incidents and other events have gone to be labeled terrorist actions. Since the definition of
terrorism itself has been debated, and for the purpose of this inquiry, a criteria of terrorism has been selected.

Terrorism

Terrorism, based on the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START) criteria, has to have the following three elements: the incident is perpetrated by a non-state actor, the incident is intentional, and the incident involves violence or the threat of violence. The event must also have two of the following three elements. First, the event has a social, political, economic or religious goal. This criterion is not satisfied in those cases where the perpetrator(s) acted out of a pure profit motive or from an idiosyncratic personal motive. Second, the act exhibits the intention to coerce or intimidate to a larger audience than the immediate victim(s) (www.start.umd.edu/start/retrieved July 16th, 2011). To satisfy this criterion there must be evidence of intentions to coerce, intimidate, or convey some other message to a larger audience(s) above that of the immediate victims. Such evidence can include (but is not limited to) the following: pre- or post-attack by the perpetrator(s), or the particular nature of the target, weapon, or attack type (www.start.umd.edu/start/retrieved July 16th, 2011). Finally, the act violates international humanitarian law, and thus, is outside the context of legitimate warfare activities, such as the targeting of civilians and non-combatants.

Prior research, like that of Braithwaite (2005), has examined the applicability of rational choice theory to this context. Acts of terrorism follow the same rationale as any other courses of action, which the individual actor chooses a course of action based on the costs and benefits. Here individuals are acting in accordance with their beliefs or sacred values. If the costs of upholding an individual’s beliefs or sacred values are the costs of one’s life, then that individual sees the cost of their life is far outweighed by the benefit of following those beliefs or sacred values. Where one group holds their deity in high regard and will do anything for that cause,
there are individuals who hold all life regardless if it is human, animal or plant just as sacred and will also do whatever is in their power to protect them (Atran, 2006).

Terrorist acts result from an individual or group of people that have weighed the cost and benefits of actions and have come to the conclusion that the perceived benefit outweigh the costs. Although not all acts included in this inquiry are terrorism, the remaining incidents contained in the Eco-Incidents Database is in fact criminal. Prior research has determined that activists are often rational actors that weigh the costs and benefits (Carson et al., 2012).

Many actions by pro-animal and environmental groups have gained the attention of the public and therefore have garnered awareness to animal and environmental practices and regulations. Legislation has been passed concerning the humane and ethical treatment of both animals and the environment. Specific legislation were chosen for this study to provide the information needed to understand the importance of such laws and their possible effect on actions perpetrated by radical environmental and animal rights groups.

**Legislation**

The following legislation has focused on protecting animals and/or the environment and are relevant to this investigation. During this studies time frame (January 1970 to December 2007) there have been many pro-environment and animal legislation passed but only eight were selected. Each was chosen for its protection for animals and/or the environment to include those that increased punishments for violating regulations, which at least in this study, is considered a possible benefit. This summary of the legislation provides insight on what exactly is protected and the repercussions to businesses, companies and individuals if they are not followed: Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Animal Welfare Act, Food Security Act, Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, Protection of Pets, and the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement act.
Clean Air Act 1970

Enacted December 31, 1970, the Clean Air Act (CAA) was put into place to regulate air emissions that are hazardous or pollutant from both stationary and mobile sources. The CAA also established the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the protection of public health and welfare against harmful air pollutants. A goal of the CAA was to have every state in the United States following air quality standard by 1977. The penalties for noncompliance by a company or dealer is a fine of up to $27,500 per violation (per day or per motor vehicle) and violations by a person that is not a company or a dealer is a fine up to $2,750 per vehicle or engine (Epa.gov).

Clean Water Act 1972

Originally called the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; the Clean Water Act (CWA) enacted October 18, 1972, regulated any and all discharge of pollutants into the waters to include quality standards for surface water in the United States. Under this legislation, pollution control programs were implemented by the Environmental Protection Agency to control the setting of wastewater standards for industries and water quality standards in all surface waters. The Clean Water Act made it illegal to discharge any type of pollutants into navigable waters without a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) PERMIT. The penalties for not having a permit to discharge in the waters of the United States are up to $27,500 per violation per day. For a Class I penalty, the fine is $10,000 per violation per day not to exceed $25,000, and for Class II penalty, the fine is $10,000 per violation per day not to exceed $125,000. Civil penalties are $1,100 per barrel of oil or unit of hazardous materials dumped unlawfully (Epa.gov).

Endangered Species Act 1973

On December 28, 1973, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) was designed for the
conservation, protection, and recovery of threatened or endangered plants and animals. (www.nrdc.org/reference/laws.asp retrieved September 10th, 2011). The ESA created the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (T.I.A.S. 8249). This Act, authorized the acquirement of land for conservation of species listed as endangered or threatened. Furthermore, the legislation sanctioned the assessment of penalties for those caught violating the act and specified regulation to include the reward(s) to anyone providing information on such violators. Federal agencies are also required to ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the existences or modification of the habitat that is critical to a species on the endangered species list (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). Civil penalties (exportation of endangered species while engaged in a business importing wild life) for violation of any provision of this act is no more than $25,000 per violation; whereas criminal violations (authorizing an individual with past convictions of violating the ESA to import wildlife), or any part of this act will be fined at most $50,000 and/or imprisonment for up to one year (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).

*Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1976*

Enacted April 22, 1976, the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) amendments continue in its support against the inhumane treatment of animals used in research and/or exhibition to include the transportations of such animals in commerce. The transportation of animals is expanded to include not only a “state” in the United States but the District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and any other territory of the United States. Also included is an expansion of dogs to those used for security, breeding and hunting. The Animal Welfare Acts Amendments of 1976 also introduce the criminal act of animal fighting ventures; this is defined as any fight that contains at least two animals and is used for gambling, sport, or entertainment. Any person violating the animal fighting ventures component
will be fined no more than $5,000 or imprisoned for less than one year making illegal any actions that place animals against each other for profit at the inevitable demise or serious injury of one or both parties (animals) in addition to providing extra protection for animals of all kinds against not only neglect but harmful and deadly acts.

_Food Security Act of 1985 Subtitle F-Animal Welfare_

The Food Security Act (FSA) demands the improved standards and humane treatment of laboratory animals. Put into action December 23, 1986, the legislation governs the handling and reinforces the standards of animals by dealers, exhibitors, and research facilities to include housing, feedings, handling, ventilation and sanitation, and veterinary care. The FSA requires not only an adequate physical and psychological environment for primates, but also the minimization of pain and distress. The legislation also requires that each research facility has a committee composed of no less than three members, to include at least one member who is not in any way affiliated with the facility and represents the general community. Furthermore the committee should be comprised of persons who are able to sufficiently assess care, treatment, and practices of experiments on animals. For penalties of the FSA, fines of $2,500 will be imposed on each violation (USDA.gov).

_Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act 1988_

More commonly known as the Ocean Dumping Ban Act, the Marine Protections, Research and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) enacted November 1988, made the disposing of material that could degrade or endanger the environment illegal. Civil violations are not to exceed $50,000 per violation of a permit or permit requirement and criminal violations are open to seizure and forfeiture of vessels. Civil penalties for the dumping of medical waste is not to exceed $125,000 for each violation and for criminal penalties, a fine of up to $250,000 and/or five years in prison (epa.gov).
**Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990, Section 2503 – Protection of Pets**

The protection of pets (POP) was set into motion November 28th, 1990 and required an entity to hold and care for any and all dog or cats for a minimum of five days before either selling to a dealer. An entity is defined as any state, county or city owned and operated pound or shelter to include humane societies and other organizations like it. Further, the entities are required to make available valid certification of any and all dog and cats before being sold, with address, name, registration number and signature of recipient of dog or cat. If for any reason a dealer, carrier or handler is thought to have dealt with stolen animals or has put any animals in harm’s way within violation of this act, a temporary restraining order or order of injunction will be applied (USDA.gov).

**Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007**

The Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007 (AFPEA), enacted May 3rd, 2007, amends the federal criminal fine and/or imprisonment to up to three years for violations of the Animal Welfare Act. This act encompasses the sponsorship or exhibition of animal fighting ventures, to include the purchase, transportation, sale of a dog or any other animal for the purpose of participation. Further, the AFPEA specifies the criminal act of buying, transporting, and/or attaching a knife, or any sharp object to the leg of a bird used in animal fighting ventures (Thomas.loc.gov).

Legislation, like the aforementioned acts, is often born out of a need to set forth guidelines for socially acceptable behavior and usually on the coattail of illegal or morally corrupt events. Radical environmental and animal rights groups are acting out in a way to signify that harm done to the environment or animals (perceived or fact) should be socially unacceptable, acknowledged by greater society and corrected. The legislation contained herein have covered everything from providing standards for sanitation to dumping chemicals in water,
Effects of Benefits

protecting endangered species and applying charges to animal fighting adventures. The main goal of the selected legislation was to incorporate land mark animal and environmental legislation to provide a holistic view of what has been set forth as law and possibly perceived as a benefit for events perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups bringing to light the alleged injustices toward animals and of the environment. Moreover, each legislation incorporated an increase in quality of life for animals and/or the environment (benefit) which is what the different radical group’s state they are lobbying; for this point alone, was a major reason for their inclusion in this examination. Because of this perceived benefit, it is possible that the members of these environmental and animal extremists groups rationalize the cost of their actions as minimal compared to the benefit of the passing of pro-environmental and animal legislation.

*Rational Choice Theory*

Rational choice is a theoretical perspective focused on choices and preferences; where an individual actor is able to consider all available options and able to choose which option or course of actions is most preferable (Burgess, et al., 2003). Such individual actors seek to maximize their utility (resources, goals, etc.) by exploring the best course of action to produce what is most preferable to them. Through acting with the expressed purpose of attaining the ends consistent with their hierarchy of preferences, it is assumed that all the actors are sufficiently informed about any alternative courses of action to attain what they desire (Friedman & Hechter, 1988). Thus, any purposeful actor will act in the way to optimize utility in contrast to the constraints that they happen to face (Lovett, 2006). This “hierarchy of preference” is focused on the idea that certain ends are more important than others (Friedman & Hechter, 1988), for example, the ability to feed your child is more significant than being labeled a criminal for stealing. Not all individuals would be able to rationalize this course of action since
all individuals are different and have their own preferences. In addition, groups of people (e.g. family, organizations and social networks) with similar thinking and preferences seem to receive more benefits than someone acting alone. Some individual actors would be deterred by informal sanctions like shaming or embarrassment, whereas the individuals with a social or family setting which encourages such action would not be so deterred (Friedman & Hechter, 1988).

Rational choice theory is based on the calculation of weighing the costs against the benefits of a potential act. Prior research, like that of Grasmick and Bursik, Jr. (1990), has focused more on the cost side of the rational choice equation, where increasing the costs will deter certain actions. This study is focused on the other side of the spectrum; the benefits of potential actions and their applicability to the decision-making process. This process is based on the idea that individuals rationalize their actions in such a way that despite the chance of getting caught and punished, they focus on the benefits of their actions. For example, benefits for members of radical environmental and animal rights groups can include tougher laws (increase of penalties, stricter rules) and the ability to increase livelihood, things that benefit many and perhaps in their minds supporting a “revolutionary cause” (Shughart, 2011, p. 1) and can be viewed as participating in a greater good for something bigger than their self and where the benefits weigh heavier than any punishment they may receive (Atran, 2006).

Summary

By focusing on the benefits side of the rational choice equation, it can be brought to light how criminal acts perpetrated by the members of the extremists groups are affected by the benefits that come from their actions. Although prior research has focused primarily on the costs of acts, this study centers on the benefits (goal, preferences, etc.) as operationalized through pro-environmental and animal legislation.

In the next chapter, this researcher reviews the literature regarding radical environmental
and animal rights groups, terrorism, and the benefits-side of the rational choice theory. In the Chapter 3, the methodology is laid out including operational definitions and research design. The results are presented in Chapter 4, followed by discussion and conclusions in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, this researcher includes a more in-depth look into how radical environmental and animal rights groups work. This chapter will also provide information on terrorism in general to incorporate a more in depth look into rational choice theory.

Radical Environmental and Animal Rights Groups

Radical environmental and animal rights groups are composed of men and women who are willing to commit certain acts that garner attention. In many situations, the incident is criminal in nature and in more extreme cases, considered to be an act of terrorism. There are many extremists groups that fall under this umbrella but four have been chosen based on their motivation to act, their recognition in the mainstream public and frequency of incidents. Earth First!, Earth Liberation Front (ELF), Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) will be discussed and examples of criminal and terrorist actions are supplied.

Earth First! started in 1979 and was self-declared by their organization to be one of the best organized environmental extremists group in the United States; they knew how to get results and set the standard to emulate for people dedicated to the earth (Earth First.org). Earth First! is responsible for several acts of terrorism by radical environmental and animal rights groups. In 1984, Earth First! member, George Dessaux, stabbed two people multiple times with a ski pole during a protest against buffalo hunting in West Yellowstone, Montana. In another case, the members of Earth First! torched logging equipment that belonged to Little John Logging Company causing $300,000 in damages (Fur Commission USA). In Welde, Maine, members trenched and barricaded a road with stones and dead trees to prevent logging (Sullivan, 1992). Although Earth First! has been a major force in terms of eco-terrorism, other groups have sprung
into action and have joined the fight against harmful acts to the environment.

Since 1992, the Earth Liberation Front has made a name for themselves as one of the most active radical organizations within the extremist movement. Their website claims that they frown upon anyone who acts in the name of ELF in an unlawful manner and that such action only takes away from their overall message (Earthfirst.org). However, members of ELF have been known to dabble in terrorist acts; acts such as the damage of several luxury homes under construction in a new development in New York, where crude explosives caused $40,000. In another incident in Indiana the GOP headquarters was set on fire as a way of warning politicians to stop the expansion of Interstate 69 (Eco-Incidents Database). Both of these incidents are considered acts of terrorism based on the aforementioned criteria. However, not all acts by members of ELF are terrorism; for example, in April of 2005, four hummers were vandalized at a dealership in Washington (Eco-Incidents Database).

The radical environmental groups have caused economic damage and their radical animal counterparts are no different. Although on several occasions both radical environmental and animal rights groups have claimed responsibility for the same event, such as the torching of a McDonalds restaurant in Arizona with $500,000 in damages (Fur Commission USA), their goal is to reach the same end which is the attention and lobbying for environmental and animal rights. While the radical animal and environmental groups may conspire for some incidents, the groups usually act alone.

The Animal Liberation Front could easily be argued as the front runner for criminal actions by radical environmental and animal rights groups. This is not to say that they are the most violent, but they are surely one of the most active with 316 incidents tied to their organization (Carson et al., 2011). The members of ALF are self-proclaimed soldiers in the fight to liberate all animals and for the prevention of perceived animal cruelty such as laboratories and
experiments (Anti-Defamation League). Their extensive lists of crimes vary from vandalisms of restaurants to acts of terrorism. In Torrance, California, April 20th 1985, ALF activists sent razor blades to the home of the CEO of Phenomenex, a company that supplies Huntingdon Life Sciences with chemicals that are said to be used in the torture of animals. A couple of years later ALF used military strength smoke bombs to attack the home of an Animal Services General Manager in Los Angeles, California. In 2004, ALF members left two un-ignited incendiary devices outside of a McDonald’s restaurant in Chico, California along with graffiti claiming it to be an act by the Animal Liberation Front (Anti-Defamation League). Although the actual cases mentioned above were labeled terrorism, cases like this do not make up the majority of criminal acts by ALF. In fact, out of 316 events, only 16% of incidents perpetrated by ALF were labeled as terrorism (Carson et al., 2011).

Aside from actions against the plethora of persons and organizations that are viewed as harmful to animals, one particular group has based their operation against a single entity, Huntingdon Life Sciences, and has made headline news covering their actions and the cost of those actions which have expanded to third party targets.

Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty has made it their mission to expose Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS) for its alleged inhumane treatment of animals. SHAC has also gone so far as to confront any persons and/or organizations that are involved with Huntingdon which has lead to many companies cutting ties with HLS. In July of 1997, Joshua Harper, a member of SHAC, attacked Makah Native Americans who were on a whale hunt by throwing smoke bombs and flares at them and spraying them in the face with chemical fire extinguishers (Eco-Incidents Database). In 2001, three activists were arrested for protesting outside of the home of an HLS client (LA Times). In Piedmont, California, November 2004, activists descended on the home of the vice president of corporate resources at Chiron Corporation and stenciled “Puppy Killer” and
“Drop HLS” on her car (Earthliberationfront.com). Most recently SHAC has been in the news for the arrests of seven members for using their internet site to encourage criminal actions and to terrorize anyone associated with Huntingdon Life Sciences; the “SHAC-7” have been indicted for conspiracy to violate the Animal Enterprise Protection Act \(^1\) (Smith, 2005).

Radical environmental and animal rights groups take their cause to an extreme form thus crossing the line into criminal and even terrorist action (Carson et al., 2011). Their main goal is the humane treatment of animals and the environment (Earthliberationfront.com & Animalliberationfront.com); it could be assumed that if certain acts brought public attention that eventually, at least in their mind, garnered enough action that legislation was passed that focused on pro-environment and animal legislation, it would be greatly rewarding and viewed as a significant gain. Such benefits would supply a means of accomplishment (Shughart, 2009) and could possibly decrease the frequency of criminal activity perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups and possibly affect the amount of terrorist attacks.

**Terrorism**

Terrorism is a multifaceted crime and many have strived to understand the inner workings of the terrorist mind and how to be pro-active in terms of counter terrorism. Since 17% of incidents committed by extreme animal and environmental groups are considered terrorism (Carson et al., 2012), the literature on terrorism also supplies an important context which will provide explanations, empirical research, and ideas on how rational choice theory informs the actions by terrorist groups and individuals.

Braithwaite (2005) considers the effect of deterrence on terrorist actions and how he believes that using more “sophisticated” models than that of criminology or economics

---

\(^1\) The Animal Enterprise Act, in the case against SHAC-7, is when a person or groups of persons intentionally “physically disrupt” an animal enterprise entity by conspiring and/or causing economic damage in excess of $10,000 (Public Law 102-346, 1992).
would make more of an impact. Braithwaite introduces research on the deterrence curve and the
defiance curve, which suggests that when there are constraints on freedoms that are not very
important, the reaction of defiance is incredibly low whereas when freedoms are constrained that
are highly important, defiance is high. In other words, if what is being limited or taken away is
of little importance, the need to react is minimal if at all, whereas, if something highly regarded
and in demand is taken away, then the need to react is high.

Caplan (2006) contends that the rational choice model is relevant to terrorism on the bare
notion that “if you use means to achieve ends, you are rational” (Caplan, 2006, p. 93).
Furthermore his explanation of a stronger sense of rationality is how individuals respond to
incentives of a given action. In terms of terrorist sympathizers or supporters, if the costs of
participation were lower they would be more likely to engage in terrorist action, whereas, some
active terrorists stay fully faithful to the cause despite the costs (even if the price is their life).
Caplan goes on to explain that those that have chosen to be active terrorists are less selfish and
more concerned with the devotion to beliefs regardless of the risks involved. Benefits like
beliefs, moral duties, and devotion to group, outweighs any costs. He claims that such beliefs are
held on to extremely tight especially if the individual in question is older. People cling to their
beliefs because that is what they were brought up with and/or that was the information that was
available to them. Although Caplan bases these assumptions on terrorists groups such as Al
Qaeda and other Middle Eastern terrorist groups, his explanation for the applicability of rational
choice to acts of terrorism can be applied to other contexts.

Shughart (2009) frames his ideas of terrorists being rational actors around two important
“means-end” (Shughart, 2009, p. 1) senses. First, whether in a group or alone, terrorists face
budget constraints; they spread out their funds to actions that show promise of maximizing the
returns. Second, terrorists respond to measures taken against them or to counter their attack(s).
When one target hardens or increases security, terrorists change their targets toward something softer, or less secure. His explanation of the lack of identifying markers of terrorists or future terrorist apply to those used against members of radical environmental and animal rights groups; race, ethnicity, social status and gender have no specific application.

The rationality of terrorism as a means to achieve an end (Caplan, 2006) may sound absurd to some but in terms of some group’s morals and values, it is the highest compliment. Moreover, how the individual terrorist actor(s) use logic to set budgets, memberships and placements (Shughart, 2009) add to the support for rational terrorism. The fact that a criminal or terrorist act can be rationalized in such a way as to provide the ultimate benefit regardless of the costs allows for an understanding of why different groups commit illegal acts. Aside from the seemingly religious fanatics (Al Qaeda) proposed by Caplan (2006), many other groups see their values worth more than any expense whether it is for a deity, morals, the environment or life of an animal.

Legislation

Barr & Pease (1990), discuss the affects of legislation on criminal patterns, activity and victimization. The authors explain in detail the circumstances that provide crime patterns: motivation, vulnerable targets, preparation and investment which offers insight into why a person or object is targeted by perpetrators. In this meta-analysis, Barr & Pease supply several investigations into the possible deterrent effects of legislation. In a car security study, it was found that car theft decreased in new cars but increased in older model vehicles. The authors concluded that although legislation seemed to have an effect, crime was displaced or re-directed to another target that was not protected or as strongly protected as the original object by legislation.

Cohen & Jeglic (2007) studied the effectiveness of sex offender legislation in the United
States. The authors stated that although the public felt more secure about sex offender registrations due to the legislation, the legislation itself did not seem to deter criminal sexual behavior. Furthermore, they concluded that the legislation only affects the individuals that actually obey the rules and regulations of their parole/probation for their crime, whereas other offenders do not check in and register their new address and thus are not affected nor deterred.

Legislation is used to help regulate laws and regulations and, ideally, to deter criminal behavior. From the literature listed above, criminal behavior is first calculated on the availability of vulnerable targets, investment and possible costs of the crime. Additionally, it can be concluded that legislation only has a positive affect if it is enforced and/or followed by the masses to make a difference in crime rates. This of course is based on the assumption that the individuals involved are rational thinkers that are able to make educated decisions about their course of action.

*Rational Choice Theory*

Rational choice theory was born out of the Classical School, a philosophy based on the idea that all individuals possessed free will, a rational manner, and manipulability or collectively shared self-interest (Beccaria, 2008). Based on the belief that individuals look out for their own satisfaction, the Classical School directed its philosophy toward increasing punishments or in this case, the costs, as to diminish the luster of the benefits that an action could provide. Rational choice is based on the calculation of weighing the costs against the benefits of any given action. The authors listed herein, provide the different perceptions of rational choice and their individual focus on either the costs or the benefits side of the rational choice equation. Each belief is either proved or disproved by the findings of their research and more importantly provide a holistic view of rational choice theory.

Friedman and Hechter (1988) provide an in-depth perspective on rational choice theory...
and how it applies to individuals and groups. The authors base their presumptions on the postulation that all actors are rational thinkers and that all action is, in fact, intentional. The authors conducted multiple studies on the relationship between preferences and outcomes when it comes to individual actions and highlight how the social construct, an idea or perception that is constructed through social and/or cultural practice, is a major player in regards to decision-making. Friedman and Hechter (1988) found that social structural commonality alone is not sufficient to produce a collective action. In other words, when a group of people collaborate to produce a result, that successful combined achievement depends on who actually profits.

The benefit of any action depends on the person(s) committing the act. Each individual has predefined preferences and understandings of the costs to achieve those preferences (Friedman & Hechter, 1988). On the flip-side are the costs to achieve those benefits which are also weighed by the individual player(s). Each person identifies benefits and costs differently as investigated by Bouffard (2002) who tested the viewpoint (benefits, costs) of college level males.

Bouffard (2002) conducted a study concerning what male subjects perceived as consequences and benefits to sexually coercive behavior. His sample of 129 undergraduate males were asked to read a date rape scenario after which they had to answer several hypothetical behavior questions. Once the participants were done answering the questions they were then asked to develop a list of consequences and benefits to sexually coercive behavior and then rate them on severity, certainty, and salience. The male students had to repeat the process with a drunken driving scenario. Bouffard found that the participants under the hypothetical scenario given on date rape, would be less likely to become involved in more sexually coercive behavior and found similar responses with the drunken driving. He concluded that in support of rational choice theory and prior research, the intention to offend is influenced by costs and
benefits. In this scenario the cost of either losing one’s license or being charged with rape outweighs the benefits of “letting loose” or a questionable sexual experience is based on their own individual preferences.

Lovett (2006) explains the role that rational choice and self-interest play in the realm of social phenomena and how it can answer questions pertaining to the usefulness of solving problems in given situations. Lovett believed that past research on rational choice failed because it did not take into consideration what individuals cared about. He put stock into the perceived “benefits” of any action in relation to how and why social phenomena occur. Lovett concluded that to be able to understand the underpinnings of social events, one needs to understand the importance and level of importance of an idea, event, or goal, and how one would intentionally behave to realize that idea. Intangible things such as respect, shaming and embarrassment can play a significant role in the decision-making process depending on how important it is to the individual actor.

Grasmick and Bursik, Jr. (1990) conducted a study using a random sampling of adults on the effects of perceived threats on people’s intentions to violate the law and how shame and embarrassment plays a major role in decision-making. The authors propose that shame and loss of respect are just as important in the decision-making process as the threat of legal sanctions in regards to rational choice and deterrence. All of the factors that Grasmick and Bursik apply to rational choice theory is still based on a cost side, but still gives a good insight on the benefits of respect and making the “group” they support proud of their accomplishments. For example, if the “group” holds the act of standing up for one’s rights incredibly high, then the person committing the act has retained their respect or even gained some despite the fact they got arrested. Within this ideal, the benefit of respect is worth more than any repercussions by outside entities. Again, this study suggests that the weight of the benefits of actions play a
Botti & Iyengar (2006) argue for the benefits of choice and its relation to utility maximization. The more options one has to choose from increases the likelihood that the individual will be able to find the choice that best fits their predefined preferences. One such study the authors reviewed was in the field of education. Students participating in the research were either asked to choose one of six puzzles or were assigned a specific puzzle; they found that the participants who got to choose their puzzle were more highly motivated than those who were assigned a puzzle. In their article, Botti & Iyengar (2006) provide a meta-analysis which found that the majority of the studies concluded that the happiness of the decision-maker depended on the ability to have more control over their decisions and match their choice with their preferences, or simply, with their personal goals.

Quackenbush (2004) dives into the different aspects and views of rational choice theory and how it applies to certain individuals, or more specifically, international interactions. Quackenbush also implies that preferences get an insufficient amount of attention and the applicability of rational choice theory in all situations is misplaced. The author also argues that the role of assumptions plays a part in every aspect of rational choice and in this particular study, the assumption that international leaders prefer negotiations to acts of war can be a major dilemma. The author’s main points focus completely on the cost side of the rational choice equation and his work suggests that he sees the costs of actions as the most important indicator of what an individual will choose to do but also gives an alternative view point of how rational choice can be applied in a myriad of situations.

Atran (2006) stresses the applicability of sacred values as benefits concerning rational choice. Moreover, the author wanted to draw the connection between religious behavior and sacred values and how the former motivates the latter. An example given by Atran is of the
Jihad conception of martyrdom and although it is considered a high cost, the benefit, at least in the minds of the offenders, will be rewarded in the afterlife. Atran concludes that all sacred values should be recognized and not disregarded; that values make up a society and even a cultural identity, which is an incredible influence on the individuals within the society. Furthermore, he believes that the knowledge of the amount of influence that sacred or protected values hold is limited and if we can identify a group’s sacred values then we can reduce the amount of violent action in response to possible threats of those values. Although he based this assumption on seemingly radical religious idealists and extremists groups such as Jihadist conceptions of martyrdom, he believes that all truly sacred values of any given culture would react in similar fashion given a threat to what they hold supreme.

Spickard (1998) applies rational choice to religious acts that are both basic and extreme. Further, he explains how the devotion to religion is a “benefit” to the individual in terms of weighing costs against the benefits, and the benefit of holding true to their beliefs are paramount in regards to their assessment of an act. Spickard further explains the rationality associated with religious fervor by comparing dedication to one’s religion with marketing. In marketing, people are looking to achieve the goods that they seek and this is no different than an individual looking to attain goals in the religious sector. With the understanding of values in terms of benefits, it encourages people to understand how an individual, whether they are a Christian, Muslim or one who believes in the equality of animals and of the environment, can hold their beliefs paramount over any repercussions. Similar to the devotion of one’s beliefs is the devotion to family or group and the possibility of losing that support system due to an action that is either deemed acceptable or shameful. Such examination of the outcomes of an action, especially criminal, is how one gauges the amount of benefit that will come from the incident.

Burgess, Hutchinson, McCallion and Scarpa (2003) investigated the rationality in
preference for enhanced farm animal welfare in the United Kingdom. They sought to figure out by appealing to one’s preferences, if people would agree to increase the welfare of farm animals despite a rise in production costs for said welfare through legislation. The researchers began with educating the participants on the current treatment and results of the treatment per animal (e.g. the percentage of laying hens that have broken legs due to the batter cages they are transported in). They then did a survey regarding welfare improvement for laying hens, dairy cows, pigs and broiler chickens and which, if any, they would choose to push for legislation to improve their living standards. What Burgess and colleagues (2003) found was that people were supportive of additional farm animal welfare legislation despite the monetary increase in production. The authors concluded that the information regarding the treatment of the specified farm animals tapped into individual’s emotions (visualization of broken legs, etc.) and perceptions of animal products. Furthermore, the study provided the benefits associated with pro-farm animal welfare legislation regarding this issue.

Carson, Lafree and Dugan (2011) provide the costs and benefits side of the rational choice equation and how it applies to members of radical environmental and animal rights groups. They conducted interviews with persons that were either affiliated with a environmental or animal rights group or were participants in activities but not tied to any specific group. The participants were asked about the motivation to act regarding legal sanctions and they found that many of them were deterred from criminal acts by the chance of being arrested. Furthermore, the participants expressed how the cost of going to jail held future complications which were not worth, in their eyes, criminal acts for their cause; the cost outweighed the benefit.

Sometimes, like mentioned above with farm animal welfare, individuals need to be provided with all the pertinent information regarding a situation before making a good informed rational decision. One must remember that all of this is based on the presumption that all
persons are rational thinkers (Friedman & Hechter, 1988); that all individual actors will act in a way that provides the benefit from a specific course of action that not only outweighs the costs of the act but adheres to their hierarchy of preferences (Botti & Iyengar, 2006). Rational choice theory can be applied to any decision making process as shown by the literature listed herein. What differentiates the authors is their position on the rational choice equation, costs versus benefits. The birth of rational choice theory from the Classical School set the foundation needed to understand rational choice and its relevance to daily decision-making, crime and terrorism (Atran, 2006 and Spickard, 1998).

Although certainly less studied than the cost side of the equation, the benefits part is equally, if not more responsible for the reason why persons choose certain courses of action Botti and Iyengar (2006), also examined the benefits side of the rational choice equation and the positive effects of choice on motivation. The authors found that when presented with the availability of multiple choices, in this case the ability to choose what puzzle to complete, individuals are motivated and able to choose the best option that will maximize their own utility connected to their preferences. Further, they found that the psychological well-being of the decision makers had increased due to the availability of choices (Botti & Iyengar, 2006).

The benefits of the rational choice theory are further elucidated in the explanation of sacred values by Atran (2006). Atran states that the benefits of strictly following such values are paramount in comparison to any possible cost that an action might provoke. In regards to seemingly radical religious individuals, Atran presents how these individuals are following their hierarchy of preferences and any type of proactive effort to thwart terrorism would be insufficient. Sacred values can be non-instrumental, moral, or protected values that are held by all individuals’ and not just extremists (Atran, 2006). Therefore, what one individual or country sees as an act of terrorism another sees as the ultimate fight for their deity and way of
life; both of which are justified beliefs based on each group’s morals and values. Because of these differences, the definition of terrorism itself has been debated and for the purpose of this inquiry a criteria of terrorism has been selected.

Summary

Radical environmental and animal rights groups consider themselves the protectors albeit enforcers of animals and the environment. Their actions are to gain attention from the government and public to demonstrate those they perceive as harming animals or the environment, accountable for any presumed inhumane actions. These groups rationalize their criminal actions based on the benefit of, in their mind, protecting animals and the environment from harm.

While these groups are labeled radical, it does not mean that they are not rational thinkers. As mentioned earlier, some authors focused on the rational choice theory and have made arguments for their side, cost or benefit, and others made a great contribution to the existing theories of rational choice. Specific studies on rational choice provided authentic examples such as the rationality of seemingly radical religious ideals (Spickard, 1998) and the “means end” rational that if people take into consideration the costs of the goal they are rational thinkers (Shughart, 2009).

The information on terrorism provided not only the necessary knowledge needed to understand what is considered terrorism but also an explanation as to why individuals use terrorist action to achieve their goals or benefits. The legislation was explained in-depth to include the date they were enacted, the regulations of each, and penalties for violations of these acts.

In the next chapter, relevant definitions important to this study will be discussed. Also, a re-introduction to the research question and what this researcher hypothesizes in terms of the
frequency of incidents perpetrated by radical environmental and animal rights groups in comparison to the pro-animal and environmental legislation. Also specified are the primary variables, population sample, research design, and descriptive statistics provided in the data.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

In the first chapter, this researcher introduced a detailed description and outline of the proposed research. In the second chapter, past literature was reviewed delving further into the ideas pertaining to rational choice theory, terrorism, radical environmental and animal rights groups, and pertinent pro-environmental legislation. In this chapter, the current study is described through listing the research question and hypothesis, outline the variables being studied with the operational definitions of these variables, and present the research design.

Research Question/Hypothesis

This investigation seeks to answer the question: has pro-animal and environmental legislation decreased the frequency of criminal acts perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups? Based on the tenets of rational choice theory, this researcher hypothesizes that pro-animal and environmental legislation does in fact decrease the amount of criminal incidents by these groups. Once an individual or group of persons sees their benefit or goal achieved through legitimate avenues such as lobbying it is possible that the benefits of criminal activity will be outweighed by legal alternatives. This hypothesis is consistent with Carson and colleagues (2012) finding that activists saw lobbying as an important alternative to illegal activity.

Data/Sample

Secondary data were collected from the Eco-Incidents Database, which consists of all illegal activity committed by members of the extremist’s end of the animal and environmental rights movement in protest of the “destruction or degradation of the environment, the mistreatment of animals, or both” (Carson et al., 2012, p. 297). The EID also includes the date, place, perpetrator, incident and whether or not the act(s) were considered terrorism by following START’s requirements; the incident is perpetrated by a non-state actor, the incident is
intentional, and the incident involves violence or the threat of violence. The event must also have two of the following three elements. First, the event has a social, political, economic or religious goal. This criterion is not satisfied in those cases where the perpetrator(s) acted out of a pure profit motive or from an idiosyncratic personal motive. Second, the act exhibits the intention to coerce or intimidate to a larger audience than the immediate victim(s), and third, the act violates international humanitarian law, and thus, is outside the context of legitimate warfare activities, such as the targeting of civilians and non-combatants. (www.start.umd.edu/start/retrieved 16 July 20110).

When conducting research, the sample you select should be as comparable to the target population as possible. By using the Eco-Incidents Database (Carson et al., 2012), this researcher was able to examine 1,068 criminal incidents committed by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups within the United States from January 1st, 1970 to December 31st, 2007.

The sample consisted of a total of 1,068 incidents that included criminal and terrorist events. Seventeen percent of events were labeled as acts of terrorism compared to 83% that were non-terrorist criminal action. Among the data used for this inquiry, incidents perpetrated by members of radical animal rights groups represented 47% of the sample while radical environmental groups made up 26%. When further broken down, radical animal rights groups perpetrated 49% of criminal incidents and 34% of terrorist coded actions, whereas the radical environmental groups were responsible for 25% of criminal events and 40% terrorist events. There were 2% non-terrorist criminal incidents and 8% of terrorist action committed by both radical environmental and animal rights groups. In cases where the perpetrators committed an act based on environmental or animal issues but were not claimed by any particular group made up 24% non-terrorist and 18% terrorist cases.
Variables

The study’s independent variable is operationalized as a dummy variable, where 0 = before the legislation and 1 = after the legislation. This investigation includes two dependent variables: all criminal incidents and terrorist incidents, both of which are measured as an aggregation of incidents before and after the enactment of pro-environmental and animal legislation. The dates for each legislation used in this study are as follows: Clean Air Act – December 1970, Clean Water Act – October 1972, Endangered Species Act – December 1973, Animal Welfare Act – April 1976, Food Security Act – December 1986, Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act – November 1988, Protection of Pets – November 1990, and Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act – May 2007.

Research Design

This examination is considered a quasi-experimental design. The sample was selected without any random process to test the variable(s) in addition, the variables are compared between different groups (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009). The averaged amount of non-terrorist criminal action and terrorist events are the variables being compared between the “before” legislation and the “after” legislation periods; the process will go through each legislation individually.

Analysis

Simple descriptive calculations were used, in addition to a series of paired samples t-test, in order to determine whether the amount of non-terrorist criminal incidents and events labeled as terrorism were different before and after the legislation of interest.

This researcher also chose to use the paired samples t-test as a part of this preliminary investigation since two population means where the samples are correlated are compared, moreover, the two groups are “paired” as to allow the study of the “before” and “after” results.
This correlation makes an independent t-test inappropriate. A series of paired samples t-tests were also ran on the twelve-month period prior to and after the legislation was enacted to see if there were any immediate or short-term differences between the two averages in regards to criminal and terrorist incidents. One major limitation to using a paired samples t-test is that one of the assumptions is the samples being paired have to be of equal size to ensure the most accurate outcome (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009). It is acknowledge that this assumption is violated given this researcher is aggregating incident data that in turn creates different sample sizes. However, other investigations have utilized paired sample t-tests on incident-level data to garner preliminary conclusions (Ratcliffe et al., 2007 and Jansma et al., 2011). In addition, the results of this study are presented as preliminary introductory in nature, as a basis to build a more statistically sophisticated study upon.

**Analysis One. Paired samples T-test on all incidents.**

The first analysis ran was on all incidents, both those considered to be non-terrorist criminal and those that were solely terrorism. This researcher then paired an aggregation of the incidents before each legislation and after. For example, there was an average of .14 incidents a month before the Food Security Act was enacted on December 23rd, 1986 and 2.2 a month after.

**Analysis Two. Paired samples T-test on terrorist incidents.**

The second analysis ran was a test on solely the incidents that fit the definition of terrorism. As above, this researcher aggregated the amount of terrorist events perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups “before” and “after” each individual piece of legislation. The terrorist actions are an important concern to deter because it “is the deliberate killing or maiming of innocent people with the aim of spreading fear in the civilian population and thereby forcing governments to change their policies” (Norman, 2001, p.1). For example, there was an average of .13 terrorist events a month before the enactment of the
Protection of Pets Act on November 28th, 1990 and .28 a month after.

*Analysis Three. Paired samples T-test on all incidents (12 months before/after).*

The third test was ran was on all incidents, but solely in the 12-month period before and after the legislation of interest. Again, this researcher aggregated the number of all incidents before and after each legislation. Such as, there was an average of .10 incidents per month in the twelve months before the enactment of the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act that was put into action on May 3rd, 2007 and .06 per month in the twelve months after. This test was to see whether there was an immediate result to compare to the legislation that the aggregation of so many months in the previous test may mask.

*Analysis Four. Paired samples T-test on terrorist incidents (12 months before/after).*

Finally, this examination ran the same 12-month before and after test, but this time on only terrorism incidents. As mentioned before, terrorist acts are targeting people and/or companies to try and force changes, because of this; this researcher wanted to be able to see data specifically on terrorist events. For example, the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act had an average of .01 terrorist incidents a month in the twelve months before its enactment in November of 1988 and .02 a month in the twelve months after.

*Summary*

The purpose of this study is to find out whether or not pro-environmental and animal legislation had any effect on the frequency of criminal incidents perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups. The current study was described in detail in reference to my variables, sample, and proposed analyses. Additionally, separate analyses for terrorist events were provided to offer more specific results in terms of acts of terrorism.

In the next chapter, this researcher will offer, in detail, the results of the descriptive trends and the paired samples t-tests. These preliminary results will give some indication as to
whether the average of incidents before the legislation of interest was any different than after.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This study provides a preliminary analysis of the frequency of criminal incidents perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups from January 1, 1970 to December 31, 2007 compared to selected pro-environmental and animal legislation enacted within the same time frame. Thus far, rational choice theory, terrorism, radical environmental and animal rights groups and pertinent legislation have been defined and explained. Moreover, information regarding the data, sample, variables, and analyses were supplied. This chapter will introduce and explain the findings of this inquiry.

It was hypothesized that the enactment of pro-environmental and animal legislation would decrease the frequency of criminal incidents by radical environmental and animal rights groups based on the premise that once benefits are achieved through noncriminal activity, such activity will decrease. The null hypothesis (Ho) is that pro-environmental and animal legislation has no effect on the frequency of criminal incidents committed by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups. To either prove that the null hypothesis stands or that my hypothesis is accurate, descriptive statistics and analyses of the four paired samples t-test are supplied.

Descriptive Statistics

Figure 1 shows the frequency of criminal incidents perpetrated by radical environment and animal rights groups with the interventions of interests. At first glance, there is a sharp increase in criminal incidents around the year 2001 which yielded 161 events. Additionally, the results of this graph show that the frequencies of criminal incidents, during four of the acts
(CAA, CWA, POP and AFPEA), actually show a decrease in the months immediately (12-months) following compared to those months prior to their enactment. More specifically, the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act had one incident before and zero after, Protection of Pets had 24 events before and 16 after, and finally the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act had 30 criminal actions before compared to 23 after. The other pieces of legislations such as the Endangered Species Act and Animal Welfare Acts did not provide comparable numbers since neither one had a criminal incident within the 12-months prior nor any incidents the 12-months following their enactment.

Figure 1. *Frequency of non-terrorist and terrorist action (1970-2007).*

**Paired Samples Examination**

The paired sample t-test was used to give a preliminary indicator of whether the mean of incidents before the legislation was enacted is statistically different than the means after the legislation. As previously stated, these tests are a good beginning step, but are in no way a
conclusion regarding the effect of the intervention. Four analyses were run with two conducted on total incidents and two on solely those that constituted terrorism. Each of these tests were also run on a 12-month before and after period to test for short-term effects.

*Results for Analysis One. Paired samples T-test on all incidents.*

The paired samples t-test on all incidents (Table 1), shows the difference between the before and after means of each legislation and indicates whether these means were statistically different. The Clean Air Act had an average of 0.00 incidents before and 2.34 after \((M = -2.338, p < .001)\). Similarly, the Clean Water Act averaged 0.00 events before and 2.34 after \((M = -2.333, p < .001)\). The Endangered Species Act has an average 0.00 before and 2.34 after \((M = -2.333, p < .001)\), Additionally, the Animal Welfare Act averaged 0.00 incidents before and 2.34 after. The Food Security Act had an average of .14 criminal events before its enactment and an average of 2.20 after \((M = -2.057, p < .001)\). The average amount of criminal events before the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act was .23 and 2.09 after \((M = -1.853, p < .001)\). The Protection of Pets Act had an average of .39 of criminal incidents before and 1.93 after \((M = -1.535, p < .001)\). Lastly, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement act had an average of 2.27 events before and .05 after \((M = 2.219, p < .001)\).

As implied by the data, the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Animal Welfare Act, Food Security Act, Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, and the Protection of Pets all showed more incidents after their enactment than the amount of incidents committed prior to their activations. The \(p\) values for all the paired legislations were .000. This value is less than .05. Because of this, it can be inferred that the difference between the means of non-terrorist and terrorist action before and after each of the legislations are statistically different.
Table 1. Paired samples T-test for non-terrorist and terrorist action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Before Legislation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of The Difference</th>
<th>Sig. (2 Tailed)</th>
<th>p Value</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Before FSA</td>
<td>-2.057</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>3.880</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-2.414</td>
<td>-1.700</td>
<td>-11.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Before MPRSA</td>
<td>-1.853</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>3.969</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-2.218</td>
<td>-1.488</td>
<td>-9.970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Before POP</td>
<td>-1.535</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.912</td>
<td>-1.158</td>
<td>-7.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Before AFPEA</td>
<td>2.219</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>2.567</td>
<td>12.560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results for Analysis Two. Paired samples T-test on terrorist incidents.**

Acts of terrorism are a way for individuals and/or groups to use violence as a way of forcing or aggressively encouraging political changes; because of this, a test was based solely on the average number of terrorist incidents before and after each legislation to be able to view results of terrorist action (See Table 2). The Clean Air Act had an average of 0.00 terrorist events before and .41 after ($M = -.406, p < .001$). Similarly, the Clean Water Act had 0.00 averaged terrorist events before its enactment and .41 after ($M = -.406, p < .001$). The Endangered Species Act had 0.00 averaged terrorist incidents before and .41 after ($M = -.406, p < .001$). The average amount of terrorist events was 0.00 before the enactment of the Animal Welfare Act and .41 after ($M = -.406, p < .001$). The Food Security Act had an average of .05 incidents before it was put into action and .36 after ($M = -.305, p < .001$). The Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act had an average of .09 terrorist incidents before its
enactment and .32 after ($M = -.203, p < .001$). The Protection of Pets Act averaged .13 events before it was put into motion and .28 after which did show statistical significance. Lastly, the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act had an average of .41 terrorist events before it was enacted compared to 0.00 after ($M = .401, p < .001$).

Table 2. *Paired samples T-test on terrorist incidents.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Before Legislation</th>
<th>After Legislation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Before CAA</td>
<td>After CAA</td>
<td>-.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Before CWA</td>
<td>After CWA</td>
<td>-.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Before ESA</td>
<td>After ESA</td>
<td>-.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>Before AWA</td>
<td>After AWA</td>
<td>-.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Before FSA</td>
<td>After FSA</td>
<td>-.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Before MPRSA</td>
<td>After MPRSA</td>
<td>-.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Before POP</td>
<td>After POP</td>
<td>-.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Before AFPEA</td>
<td>After AFPEA</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the legislation showed a significant difference in the amount of terrorist events after their enactments than was committed before their activations.

*Results for Analysis Three. Paired Samples T- Test on All Incidents (12 months before/after)*

The next test ran was a series of paired sample t-tests on all incidents, both non-terrorist and terrorism alike, in the 12-months before the legislation were enacted compared to the 12-months after their activation. This limited before and after time frame allows for the possibility of a more immediate effect compared to the long term results in the earlier paired samples t-tests. There was no statistical significant difference among any of the legislation for this test. Due to
the lack of a standard error of difference, the Endangered Species and Animal Welfare Act’s correlation and t could be not computed. For the Food Security Act, Marine Protection, and the Research and Santuaries Act, they each had a higher average of criminal incidents in the 12 months after their enactment compared to the 12 months prior. The Protection of Pets and the Animal Fighting Prohibition Acts were the only legislation that showed a higher average of events prior to their activation than what conspired the 12 months following.

Table Three. Paired samples T-test on all incidents (12 months before/after).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Before Legislation</th>
<th>After Legislation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Paired Differences Sig. (2 Tailed) p value</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Before CAA</td>
<td>After CAA</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Before CWA</td>
<td>After CWA</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Before FSA</td>
<td>After FSA</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Before MPRSA</td>
<td>After MPRSA</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Before POP</td>
<td>After POP</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Before AFPEA</td>
<td>After AFPEA</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can tell by looking at Table 3, the limited “before” and “after” time frame made for small averages of events and several of the legislation lacked an average amount altogether (CAA, CWA, ESA, AWA). Aside from the Endangered Species Act and the Animal Welfare Act, the Sig. (2-Tailed) values were all above .05 which indicates that the means of non-terrorist and terrorist events were not statistically significant.

In every paired samples t-test done so far, the higher averages of events appear later in the time frame and therefore certain legislation (MPRSA, POP, and AFPEA) show more averaged incidents compared to their earlier legislation counterparts. It can also be implied by
the data that even though the 12 month time frame before and after can provide a possible immediate before and after result, it cannot explain or supply information about long term effects. On the other hand, the limited time frame could have imposed a restricted “reaction time” for the radical groups; limiting time to orchestrate another criminal event or even process the information of what the legislation(s) are about. We already know that these extremists groups follow closely with pro-environmental and animal legislation by looking at their websites (animalprotectionparty.com, Earthfirst! journal.org & animalliberationfront.com) where they encourage their members to educate themselves on the latest and greatest laws and regulations in terms of environmental and animal protection. Assuming that their members follow the guidelines, it can possibly account for the lack of events so close (12-months before/after) to an enactment of legislation due to them taking their time with understanding the legislation and in turn increasing the turnaround time to execute a successful mission (criminal event).

Results for Analysis Four. Paired samples T-test on terrorist incidents (12 months before/after).

The fourth test ran was a paired samples t-test on terrorist incidents and the results provided shows significant $p$ value of over .05; thus, the means do not show statistical significant difference between the terrorist incidents 12- months before and 12- months after the legislations. The Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, and Animal Welfare Act had a zero for the standard error of the difference and therefore the t and correlation could not be computed.

As mentioned above, several pieces legislation did not have a correlation or t computed due to the lack of a standard error of difference (CAA, CWA, ESA, and AWA). However, the Food Security Act showed a slightly lower average of incidents prior to it being enacted than compared to the terrorist events after which was also similar for the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act and the Protection of Pets Act. The Animal Fighting Prohibition
Table Four. Paired samples T-test on terrorist incidents (12 months before/after).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Paired Differences Sig. (2 Tailed) p value</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of The Difference Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5 Before FSA-After FSA</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 Before MPRSA-After MPRSA</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 Before POP-After POP</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 Before AFPEA-After AFPEA</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act actually had the same average of incidents prior to and after it was put into motion in 2007. The numbers, like the paired samples t-test of the non-terrorist and terrorist events (12 months before/after), were small and the time frame was limited. Again we see that more incidents are occurring post legislation versus before the legislation was enacted. Additionally, aside from the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act, more terrorist events happened after the legislation was enacted.

Summary

The descriptive statistics provided a basic overview of the amount of incidents both non-terrorist and terrorist. The breakdown of incidents by extremist groups were also explained in terms of whether the perpetrator of events were radical environmental, animal, both environmental and animal, or the perpetrator was unknown. Additionally, Figure 1 showed the trend of incidents (non-terrorist/terrorist action) over the same 37 year time frame.

The paired samples t-test results supplied an average of events before and after each legislation was enacted and the tests were broken down in: all incidents (non-terrorist/terrorist), terrorist action, all incidents 12- months before/after, and terrorist incidents 12- months before
and after. Although the trend seemed to be that there was a higher average of events after the legislation was put into motion than the months prior, it cannot be concluded that the results were only due to pro-environmental and animal legislation being passed but possibly due to some other variables. In the next chapter, some of these competing explanations along with policy implications, and recommendations for future research are discussed.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

Summary of findings

Overall, the findings did not fall in line with the hypothesis that pro-environmental and animal legislation would decrease the frequency of criminal incidents perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups. Instead, the majority of legislation witnessed an increase of criminal (both non-terrorist and terrorist) events following their enactment. It is possible that the legislation was viewed as a benefit (goal) of criminal, rather than legitimate actions by animal and environmental extremists groups and thus motivated the more radical contingent to become more active. Next, this researcher will comment on policy implications consistent with these results.

Policy Implications

All in all, the majority of the paired samples t-tests showed that the actions of animal and environmental extremists increased in the months following the enactment of pro-environmental and animal legislation. Consistent with these results is the assumption that the members of radical environmental and animal groups are motivated by the passing of legislation and in response, amplified their criminal activity. This could be because the legislation did not seem appropriate in its punishments for violations or in its protection, thus calling for more action, or that the passing of legislation was believed to be an accomplishment of criminal activity. By visiting some of the radical environmental and extremists group websites (animalprotectionparty.com, Earthfirst!Journal.org & animalliberationfront.com), you are able to see how they comment on the different laws and regulations and how they are going to respond in terms of criminal activity for legislation that does not, at least in their mind, provide enough protection and/or harsher penalties for violations; the websites even go so far as to point out where and when the attack should happen or did happen and how they did it.
 Nonetheless, it should not be ignored that the increase in criminal incidents by members of animal and environmental extremists groups are due to other competing factors. These include the rise in member attendance and opportunity.

 On the other hand, as seen in Figure 1, the frequency of criminal dealings by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups decreased within the twelve months immediately following several of the legislations. It could be inferred that the acknowledgement of what these groups, at least for a short period of time, feel like they have accomplished something.

 Such information is useful when considering the accountability of law breaking and backlash of extremist incidents during major events (September 11th, 2001). What this means to the criminal justice system, from law enforcement personnel to the courts, is the equality of punishment and conviction of those against persons, animals and the environment. In addition, increasing the number of local law enforcement personnel hitting the streets would be more productive in not only getting a grip on the effects of major events but the secondary criminal activity that seem to spawn from such incidents. Also notable, is the awareness that the increase in incidents can be due to member population and opportunity rather than the legislation alone having made a difference.

 Limitations of Study

 The span of this research is limited to the specified range of 37 years from January 1970 to December 2007; this time frame excluded many incidents after 2007 which could have provided more information to this study. Although the sample is highly representative for the time frame of this study by using publicly available resources, it is possible that lesser known radical groups could have committed acts that were not accounted for and/or the area at which the incident was committed did not report the act. In response to comparing the amount of criminal actions before and after each individual legislation, the number of months before and
after the enactment of each legislation was not consistent; this would impact the number of
criminal incidents within either the ‘before or after’ timeframe. The lack of ‘before and after’
months could have possibly impacted the results and was an issue of equality among the
legislation periods and for the frequency of criminal incidents that did or did not occur within the
time structure.

Call for Future Research

Subsequent research would be complimented by expanding the time frame of incidents
and possibly focusing on specific areas that have numerous documented incidents from animal
and environmental extremist groups. Moreover, the definition of terrorism and what is
considered terrorist action could be re-evaluated with potential re-coding of events.
Even further, an inquiry into specific animal or environmental groups compared to their more
extreme counterparts might provide another dimension as to the inner workings and motivation
of criminal incidents. In addition, addressing the disparity in number of months before and after
the enactment of each legislation, choosing legislation that allowed for similar months before and
after could provide a more accurate account on the frequency of criminal incidents perpetrated
by radical environmental and animal rights groups. Lastly and perhaps most importantly, is
measuring the possible effects of pro-environmental and animal legislation by using a better
research method. A method such as time series analysis would be quite effective using the
different legislations as interventions for the 37 year time frame of this study which could offer
more concrete results in terms of non-terrorist and terrorist criminal activity perpetrated by
members of radical environmental and animal rights groups.

Conclusion

Rational choice theory states that individuals choose the course of action that best fits
their goals; that they use a cost versus benefit rationale (Friedman & Hechter, 1988). From this
point, the rational choice theory was explained and several different interpretations were provided to include a multitude of studies like that of the investigation completed by Grasmick and Bursik, Jr. (1990) that provided insight into how shaming and embarrassment (cost) affected the adult decision making process and in addition showed how respect and accomplishment were benefits of the same course of action. Spickard (1998) introduced the relationship between rational choice and religious acts, both basic and extreme; this supplied information regarding the rationality of individuals regardless of their views moreover, how even terrorist action is done by evaluating the costs versus the benefits of actions.

Caplan (2006) and Carson et al. (2011) provided the connection between rational choice and terrorism. Whereas, Caplan explained how terrorists (Jihad, International terrorists) use means to achieve an end as being rational thinkers, in addition to viewing moral duties and devotion to group as a major benefit, Carson et al. supplied the same rationale to domestic radical environmental and animal rights groups. In many cases, Carson et al. found that the cost did in fact outweigh the benefits to many members which are why they chose to support the group but not act in a way that could possibly put them in jail or lead to other legal repercussions (Carson et al., 2011).

In this study, the benefits side to the rational choice equation was the main focus; that the perceived benefits, possibly pro-environmental and animal legislation, might be viewed as a benefit thus affecting the frequency of criminal incidents perpetrated by members of radical environmental and animal rights groups. Furthermore, it is quite possible that when members of radical environmental and animal rights groups saw the passing of legislation, they were motivated and decided to increase their protesting and other actions to gain more laws protecting animals and the environment.

Eight pieces of legislation were chosen for this inquiry, each being pro environmental
and/or animal in nature in that they increased the protection for animals and the environment in addition to attaching a penalty for any violations. All the legislation, like the criminal incidents, fell within the 37 year time frame from January 1st, 1970 to December 31st, 2007. By using paired samples t-tests, it was determined that the mean number of incident prior to and after each individual legislation, which was further broken down by all criminal incidents, terrorists events, all criminal incidents (12-months before/after), and terrorist events (12-months before/after). Tables 1 and 2 showed statistically significant difference in the amount of criminal incidents; that there were actually more incidents following the enactment of legislations than there were before. Moreover, results were also supplied (Figure 1 and Tables 3 and 4), which explained the possible immediate results in the twelve months before and after the enactment of each legislation and showed that out of eight, four had more criminal incidents prior (CAA, CWA, POP, AFPEA) and two had more after (FSA, MPRSA); two of the Acts (ESA, AWA) lacked any criminal activity in their before and after time frames.

It can be inferred from this investigation that the legislation may not have been passed or enacted out of response to criminal events by radical groups but did show a significant difference in the amount of criminal activity after the legislations were enacted compared to the frequency of criminal actions before the legislation were passed. Nonetheless, it is quite possible that when members of radical environmental and animal rights groups seen the passing of legislation they were motivated to increase their actions to gain more laws protecting animals and the environment; thus, explaining the rational choice of an act to produce a benefit (legislation). Again, it should be taken into consideration that other outside factors could be the cause for the increase in incidents that occurred in the aftermath of each legislation. In response to the drastic spike seen in Figure 1, we cannot assume that the rise in incidents is due to the intervention of the legislation alone but possible outside influences and opportunities. Around this same time
(1990’s) the United States was still in flux in terms of terrorism (Desert Storm). Because of Desert Storm, there was a considerable amount of focus on what was happening in the Middle East and this could have provided opportunities for domestic extremists groups to take action either due to the lack of focus on them or to feed off the fear of a terrorist attack and gain even more media coverage for their actions.

Nonetheless, members of radical environmental and animal rights groups have acted in such a way as to garner national attention to their actions and their cause; the fact that they view the protection of animals and the environment as outweighing the costs of being arrested shows the possibility that they are rational thinkers. One must not assume that because an individual or group are seemingly radical that they are irrational, and to remember that every rational person has a price that they will incur to see their preferences realized.
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APPENDIX B

Frequency of Criminal Incidents Codebook

Case Id

Perpetrator of Events

Number of Incidents in Month

Legislation

Criminal Incidents

\[0 = \text{Before/After Legislation Period}\]
\[1 = \text{Legislation Period}\]

Terrorism

\[0 = \text{Non-Terrorism}\]
\[1 = \text{Terrorism}\]