

Tribhuvan University

Call for Human-Animal Coexistence in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, T.U.,
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Philosophy in English**

By

Narendra Man Mukhiya

Symbol No.: 618/067/068-03

T.U. Regd. No.: 6-1-305-78-98

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

April 2025

April 2025

Narendra Man Mukhiya

Call for Human-Animal Coexistence in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Call for Human-Animal Coexistence in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*” submitted to the Central Department of English, TU by Narendra Man Mukhiya has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

.....

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Toya Nath Upadhyay

Supervisor

.....

Asst. Prof. Dr. Bal Bahadur Thapa

External Supervisor

.....

Prof. Dr. Dhruva Bahadur Karki

Head

Central Department of English

Date:

Declaration

I hereby declare that the thesis entitled “Call for Human-Animal Coexistence in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*” is entirely my work prepared to submit to the Central Department of English, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Degree of Master of Philosophy in English. The sources used and referred to in the preparation of this thesis have been duly acknowledged. I confirm that this work has not been previously submitted for any academic award and has not been published elsewhere in any form. Wherever extended sources, ideas, or words have been used, proper citations and references have been provided. I have also been committed to ethical academic practices throughout the research analysis and writing process. By submitting this thesis, I affirm my commitment to upholding the principles of honesty and research integrity in academic research.

.....

Narendra Man Mukhiya

April 2025

Acknowledgments

It is my immense privilege to undertake an academic journey while carrying out the research in M. Phil. My sincere thanks go to my thesis supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Toya Nath Upadhyay for his scholarly guidance. Similarly, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Prof. Dr. Dhruva Bahadur Karki, Head of the Central Department of English, for his guidance and suggestions. I am very thankful to Prof. Dr. Jib Lal Sapkota for his support.

I also extend my deep respect to the members of research committee. I want to express my deep thanks to all the faculty members of the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University who taught me in MA and MPhil and encouraged me to carry out the research work.

I am grateful to the people beyond the university for providing me support which I can never ignore. I am thankful to my spouse Mrs. Maiya Devi Kumal for her unconditional support in completion of this research. Equally, I express my love and affection to my daughter Preetisha Kumal, who always motivates me. I am also indebted to my parents, brothers, sister, relatives, friends, and supporters.

April 2025

Narendra Man Mukhiya

Abstract

The research examines the relation between humans and animals in Jack London's novels *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild* from the perspective of animal studies.

Generally, animals are supposed to lack rationality and are considered inferior to human beings. However, in the novels of Jack London selected for this study, the dogs, Buck and White Fang, are presented as sentient beings with rationality.

Regarding this issue, the study argues that London— by representing the dogs as sentient as well as rational beings—critiques the hierarchical relation between animals and humans and thus advocates for egalitarian relation between them. This is how London advocates for agency, rights and justice for animals. In order to develop a theoretical framework to analyze the selected primary texts, the study derives the insights from the animal studies, especially from Peter Singer's idea of animal rights.

To some extent, in both the novels, animals are domesticated to fulfill the human needs and purposes. In the process of domesticating, White Fang and Buck are treated badly that their natural animals' rights are violated in the different human camps.

Because of the exceptionalism, human beings mistreat Buck and White Fang ignoring their sentiments, emotions, feelings, desires, dreams and duties. However, human beings and animals, as observed in these novels, are both the ecological selves of the same ecosphere. If both respect each other's rights, emotions, feelings and experiences, the bond between human beings and animals grows stronger.

Keywords: Animal agency, animal rights, domestication, earth jurisprudence, animal welfare, coexistence

Table of Contents

Declaration	i
Letter of Approval	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Chapter I. Introduction: Animal Studies in <i>White Fang</i> and <i>The Call of the Wild</i>	1
Chapter II. Critique of Human-Animal Relation in <i>White Fang</i> and <i>The Call of the Wild</i>	20
Chapter III. Human-Animal Coexistence in <i>White Fang</i> and <i>The Call of the Wild</i>	64
Works Cited	67

Chapter One

Introduction: Animal Studies in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*

The research explores the human-animal relation in Jack London's novels, *The Call of the Wild* (1903) and *White Fang* (1906) in the light of concepts of 'Animal Welfare', 'Animal Agency', 'Earth Jurisprudence' and 'Bio-centrism'. Currently, human-animal relations are, mostly, based on human domination and exploitation of animals. But if it is based on egalitarianism, it becomes healthy and positive one which ensures the continuity of all lives. As presented in the novels, the dogs, Buck and White Fang, are sentient beings with feelings, and sentience in contrast to general belief that dogs lack sentience.

Positive relation between human world and animal world creates balanced and happy environment between human and animal. As shown in *White Fang*, the narrator thinks of good message about positive side of human-animal bond: "Like has been replaced by love . . . in whose light White Fang's nature expanded as a flower expands under Sun" (London 243). Here, the dog, White Fang, is a loving and caring animal to humans. He is treated well and he treats humans harmoniously in return.

The relation between human and animals is disastrous if one of them turns out to be violent. In the fighting between White Fang and the bull dog 'Cherokee', the possible death is signaled: "He struggled vainly to shake off the clinging death" (216). He almost died in the fighting. So far as negative relations are concerned, they create imbalance, enmity, fighting and hence results the ecological disparities. If animal represents the nature, the conflict between human and animal is the conflict between human and nature, and hence heading towards the apocalypse. Therefore, there should be good relationship between human and animal i.e. between each and every creature

of the world and the nature because in the earth everything is connected to everything else as the inseparable parts of the same ecosphere.

In the *White Fang*, there are various examples, incidents and dialogues between humans and animals concerning positive and negative relations, sometimes resulting in separation and sometimes leading to good, harmonious and peaceful environment. In the hands of Grey Beaver, White Fang is dominated and exploited in the camps. When White Fang is dominated, the relations between human and animal is not good. When Grey Beaver loves and becomes careful to the White Fang, in turn White Fang also loves and respects Grey Beaver. Here develops the good relationship between human and animal. When White Fang is sold to Beauty Smith, he is treated badly. He is made to fight different dogs, wolves, and Lynx and became victorious until the bull dog Cherokee is brought to fight with him. He is defeated with the bull dog and mal-treated by Beauty Smith. Then the good-hearted gold hunter Weedon Scott frees him from the ties and buys him and hospitalizes and nurses him. White Fang respects Weedon Scott, who brought him to California and he is adjusted to the human family. Here, the relation between human and animal is very good.

In *The Call of the Wild* by Jack London, the Buck is a pet dog of Judge Miller family, who is very happy and has prosperous life there. When he is stolen and sold to different people, he is badly treated, dominated and exploited in the hands of different people. At the end, he assimilates the wild nature where he finds his identity. The story almost ends with this remark: "And now the call came to Buck . . . sat down and he howled" (149). He is sold many times by and too many places. He is dominated, exploited and whipped in the hands of Charles, Mercedes and Hal. He is liberated by John Thornton in his very much pathetic condition. There is conflict between Buck and Hal. So, the relation is not good. When Thornton rescues Buck and nurses and

teaches him the rules, regulations norms and values, Buck is happy with Thornton. There develops the good and harmonious relation between human and animal. In the camp of John Thornton, Buck has free and liberated life. Buck starts loving the human being for the first time in his life so much more than judge Miller's family. The Buck frequently goes to the wilderness and again returns to the campsite because of the love of John Thornton i.e. good relation between human and animal. Even Buck takes revenge to the Native Indians for murdering his lovely human, John Thornton.

The textual details show that animals are sentient beings like humans beings and the animals should be behaved respecting their dignity and their natural rights. This claim is reinforced by the ideas from Human-Animal Bond theorists like, Peter Singer, Laura Wright and Val Plumwood. The proposed study intends to study human-animal relation critically from the perspective of Animal Studies.

Literature Review

The novels, *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*, are critically examined by the critics from various perspectives. These reviews on the primary texts under study have helped me to figure out the research gap. These reviews are drawn from scholarly articles and books. These two novels received critical reviews since their publication. For example, John Bruni, in "Fury Logic: Biological Kinship ad Empire in Jack London's *The Call of the Wild*", studies the novel from the perspective of biological kinship. He asserts, "My study connects London's response to Dabin's argument that animals and humans share biological kinship, an idea supported by his findings on dog and wolf behaviour" (16). According to the quote, the animals like humans, survive if they fit the given circumstances. Along with this line, this study further seeks sentience quality in dogs in relation to rights or justice. In the same way, he further mentions about the emotional ties between humans and animals.

Furthermore, in the deeper level, there is the interconnectedness between humans and animals having shared the same ecosphere, though, there seems to be quite varieties of differences between humans and animals.

Similarly, Richard Fiusco argues that creatures are influenced by the primordial instincts. He states:

Jack London's *The Call of the Wild* traces animals gradual reversion to its primordial instincts. During the course of the novel, the dog, Buck experiences a gamut of life styles from civilization to apparent primitiveness. If a reader analyzes the story only superficially, he could erroneously conclude that London's protagonist does indeed surrender totally to ancient urges. (76)

In this passage, Fusco states the animals are deeply influenced by primitive instincts, however, they are in reality, living the social life in the human world. Moreover, Buck is having the desire of being the leader of wolf pack on the one hand, and on the other hand, he has the deep memories of the wilderness where he could live free and liberated life as his ancestors lived in the lap of nature without having any human disciplines and the law of clubs ad fangs and so on. Furthermore, he talks about primitivisms. He states:

After Buck attempts to dominate his new world and does succeed in establishing his authority over the team. On the other hand, the order and purpose of his new family bear the artificial imprint of civilization, represented by the men who drive the sled. The team exists not for its own benefits but to transport men and mail. Consequently, the team must suffer the shims of its human masters. When a backlog of Yukon mail must be delivered, Buck's tired family must transport it. (78)

In the passage, Fusco clearly explains that animals are deeply guided and influenced by their primitivism. Buck is guided and influenced by the same. Similarly, humans are also deeply guided and influenced by their primitivism from where they were developed. In this way, both humans and animals are inwardly guided and influenced by their past and primitivism. If both are influenced by primitivism, there is clearly the deep relationship between humans and animals. It supports the thesis statement that animals and humans share similar things so the dogs have sentient qualities. Buck's emotional qualities justify that human exceptionalism is not acceptable.

Similarly, Wael Moustafa has read the novel *The Call of the Wild* from the perspective of the politics of postcolonial eco-poetics. The nature and animal suffer at the hand of humans the way native people once suffered due to the Master-model where the master was at the top and the natives were put at the bottom. He asserts, "Consequently, postcolonial eco-poetical discourse emerges as a reaction against the anthropocentric essentialist discourse with its exclusionary and hegemonic politics" (79). However, the post-colonial eco-poetics stands sharp contrast to anthropocentrism. Moustafa claims:

The domination of the coloniser over the colonised has the same affinities to that of man over the natural and physical world. Both types of domination are derived from the same essentialist logic with their exclusionary politics. Essentialism, Eurocentrism, and anthropocentrism distinguish non-European people and the natural world with its non-human inhabitants as the inferior other. (82)

When humans move with an essentialist logic and exclusionary politics, the non-human world is ravaged. He rereads the story of the Buck, the dog in this way:

One day, a gardener kidnapped Buck, selling him to an anonymous dog trader who took him to the north as a sled dog. The bad weather, the terrible Husky dogs, the fights, his dead friend, and many things made Buck sense and witness the imbalance of unequal and uneven power structures. By so doing, Buck manages to subvert the hierarchical power structure of anthropocentric discourse and to master his surroundings. (86)

The dog's activity of gaming, fighting and following his instincts are the instances to subvert the hierarchical power structure of anthropocentric discourse and to master his surroundings. The kidnapped Buck is not limited to the boundary set by humanity. He sheds light on the issue of power hierarchies faced by the Buck: "Moreover, throughout the novel, Buck faced a series of difficult challenges in his attempt to undermine power hierarchies in nature and culture" (87). The hierarchy between animal and human is not good and it is to be challenged which the writer – Jack London mentions in the novel as "had been suddenly jerked from the heart of civilisation and flung into the heart of things primordial" (7). The instance of challenging the hierarchy is a return to primordial.

Jonathan Auerbach talks about the animal pride and respect when they are successful in accomplishing their assigned task as: "Like Buck and his soulmates, seton's, "wild animals I have known" are heavily invested with character traits such as sullenness, courage, fidelity and pride" (54). Like humans, animals feel pride and comfort in their success: "Buck's toil as a letter carrier grants him respect and recognition, but his intense killing ultimately grants him the iconographic status of ghost dog, an awe-inspiring totem far more powerful and lasting than civilized man's paler version, fame" (72). In the quotation, like humans, animals also enjoy the success and become happy with their name and fame. Humans have the desire of

being always superior and successful in their life with name and fame. Similarly, animals have the same desire and intention of having name and fame. Therefore, there is the close links, connections and relations between humans and animals in the deeper level of the psychological sphere.

Daniel Dyer, in the article "Answering *The Call of the Wild*," discusses the novel from the socialist perspective. He asserts, "His social idealism seems naïve and simple-minded. Moreover, throughout his career he wrote about the same sorts of people, his characters are interchangeable" (62). In this quotation, Dyer talks about the social idealism that Jack London has. These ideas share that even people have different traits, but they are not considered as different species. This can be applied to animals so they are similar. This novel is explained from the point of view of ideal socialism where there are always two hostile classes always in never ending clash. In the class struggle, haves always dominate and dismantle the haves not or the poor class. In the novel, women and animals like Buck and other dogs are the representatives of working class.

Similarly, Earle Labor, in his article "Jack London's symbolic wilderness: Four Versions on *White Fang*," talks about the adaptability of the White Fang in the following lines:

White Fang proves his right to Edenic privileges by saving the judge's life, and is consequently christened "Blessed Wolf." Having proved himself worthy of his new environment, the dog-hew settles into the southlands softly modulated rhythms; and the novel concludes with White Fang drowsing comfortably in the life-giving California sun, while his new-born puppies romp around him.
(156)

In the above extract, Labor talks about the adjustment of the White Fang in the new social environment of the new place by showing his bravery to save the life of Judge Scott and he earned the name and fame of 'Blessed Wolf'. This shows the adaptable quality of the animal in the human world like White Fang.

Jeanee Campbell Reesman, in his article, "Never Travel Alone: Naturalism, Jack London, and White Silence," explains: "Every word London wrote was an attempt to combat the white logic and to reply the white silence; the belief in spirit (meaning) is in London's mind a belief first in himself and his efforts and second in humanity as a vast community spanning time and space, artist and audience in white man's 'form union plan'" (38-39). In this quotation, Reesman talks about London's amalgamation of different forms with clear and concise plan deeply rooted to the white man. Here, London's intention seems anthropocentric and racial only focusing on the white man, one of the communities of the human world. Thus, writer shows the lacks, gaps and biases deeply rooted in the psychology of Jack London. The idea of anthropocentrism is quite opposite to earth jurisprudence.

Karen Jones, in "Writing the Wolf: Canine Tales and North American Environmental Literary Tradition," talks about the canine perspective in Jack London's *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild* in the following lines:

Published in 1903 and 1906 respectively, *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang* communicated Jack London's attempts to explore canine consciousness. The companion novels, one dealing with a dog's attempts to adjust to life in the Alaskan wilds, the other considering the experiences of an Arctic Wolf forced into a domestic sphere, offered a canine perspective on issues of evolution, species behaviour and environmental conditioning. (208)

In this extract, Jones, clearly states that both the novels by Jack London are deeply influenced by canine consciousness. He views these novels from the perspective of canine consciousness that dogs/wolves have the different sense, emotions, smell and perspectives towards the human world. He clearly states that there are vast differences between human world and the animal world, especially of the world of canine animals like wolves and dogs.

In the same way, the next novel *White Fang* has also been studied from various perspectives. Harshita U Urs studies the novel from anthropocentric point of view while dealing with the human- animal relation. Both the novels are rich for the study of human animal relations. There are plenty of examples, incidents, dialogues and so on in both the novels to show human animal relationships sometimes positive and sometimes negatives resulting into conflicts, torture, dominations and exploitation as well. Somewhere in the story, wolves dog eat human being named Bill in the time of famine. Wolves not only kill and eat other species like humans, but also their own kin and kind, dogs and wolves as well. This shows that, if there is the ecological imbalance in the nature or in the ecosphere, there happens the apocalypse like killing each other in the time of famine and at the time of scarcity of food. If humans become cruel to the animal and nature, they are sure to face the dooms day as in *The Call of the Wild*, Native Indians are killed by Buck and in the *White Fang*, all the sled dogs and Bill was killed and eaten by the wolves. Therefore, there should be harmonious relationship between and among the creatures, human beings and the nature living and sharing the same ecosphere.

Harshita U Urs talks about the influence of anthropocentrism. He mentions, “Human beings have become as busy as a bee, in mastering the laws of nature. This attitude is philosophically termed “anthropocentrism” where ‘anthropos’ in Greek

means human beings and ‘center’ means core” (53). He highlights on how anthropocentrism deprives animals of their basic rights. He further argues, “The anthropocentric view of the world enables humans to view animals as inferior to them in the cosmic order”(54). The animals are taken as inferior in the world order.

Yang Guang, in the same way, mentions about psychological impact on dogs. His reading of the novel *White Fang* shows the similarity between animals and humans in terms of psychology. He mentions, “The novel, *White Fang*, describes the legendary experience of a wolf living in a barbaric area, who undergoes trials and tribulations in his constant interactions with people” (105). The world of barbarism is viewed as the world of dogs on the contrary to human world. He further asserts, “As a result, the wolf-dog has been bought and taken back to cabin by a mining engineer, Scott. It is here that White Fang first learns about love and becomes civilized. In the end of the story, the gray wolf received an honorary title ‘the Blessed Wolf’ from his host family” (106). The blessed wolf indicates he is no less than humans: “The description of White Fang in the novel shows the pain and awakening of a man deeply engraved in Jack London’s heart. In this regard, the growth of White Fang also implied a theme of the pursuit of the dream and exploration of life” (107). The White Fang searches the idea of dream and exploration in his life like humans.

In this way, the critics have studied these novels from various perspectives. John Bruni while studying the novel *The Call of the Wild* argues that humans and animals share the same biological kinship. Therefore, he applies the perspective of biological kinship in the study of the novel from the perspective primitivism. In the same novel, Richard Fiusco, finds the primordial instincts and analyses the text from the perspective of primordial instincts. In this way, Wael Moustafa finds politics of postcolonial eco-poetics in the same novel. He has read from postcolonial

perspectives. Thus, he is of the opinion of the politics of postcolonial eco-poetics while going through the novel *The Call of the Wild*. Similarly, Jonathan Auerbach analyses the novel from the perspective of primitivism. Daniel Dyer analyses the novel from the perspective of socialism. In the same way, another critic Earle Labor reads the novel from the perspective of adjustment or the adaptability. Another critic, Jeanee Campbell finds speciesism in the novel. He has studied the novel from naturalistic point of view. Therefore, he analyses the text from the perspective of speciesism. Another critic, Karen Jones, while reading both the novels with ecological overtones, finds the canine consciousness. So, he explains both the novels from the canine perspective. Harshita U. Urs finds anthropocentrism while reading the novel *White Fang* while reading the novel from ecological lens that devalue anthropocentrism. So, he studies the novel from the perspective of anthropocentrism. Next critics Yang Gaun, in the same way, analyses the novel *White Fang* from the psychological perspective.

However, these critics have not addressed thoroughly the issues of co-existence between humans and animals. The present study investigates the human-animal relations in the novels under scrutiny focusing on co-existence between humans and animals where humans are understood as companion species to animals. This gap is fulfilled by analyzing the novels from the perspective of co-existence which is a basic concept of animal studies.

Statement of Problem

The issue of human-animal relation sounds odd to anthropocentric world. On the contrary to anthropocentrism which keeps humanity at the center, Jack London presents the dogs, Buck and White Fang, as sentient beings with rationality blurring the notion of anthropocentrism. The primary concern of the investigation in this study

is to explore the co-existence between humans and animals. Based in this context, the research has answered the following research questions:

- What does the domestication of animals, as seen in the case of White Fang and Buck, mean in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*?
- Why is the concept of 'Human Exceptionalism' problematic to White Fang and Buck?
- How can Human-animal bonding be strengthened as indicated in the two novels so that balance among ecological lives is maintained?

Research Objectives

The study has following objectives:

- To examine the sense of domestication in relation to animals' life in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*
- To analyze why Human Exceptionalism' is problematic to White Fang and Buck.
- To explore the way of boosting human-animal bond to maintain a balance among ecological lives.

Hypothesis

The study hypothesizes that the co-existence between animals and humans based on mutual respect, adaptation, and a true understanding of each other's nature is possible. This can lead to an egalitarian world where the dominant traits from each side are sidelined.

The implication behind presenting the dogs, Buck and White Fang, as sentient beings with rationality and feelings, is to advocate for egalitarian relation between humans and animals based on justice, equality and freedom.

Methodology

The research is qualitative in nature based on paradigms like interpretivism and constructivism. It has employed textual analysis as method for the study. The research employs theoretical concepts from critical Animal Studies. I have selected *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild* because these two novels show a complex journey of domestication to wild and vice-versa.

Scholars like Peter Singer and Laura Wright working on the literary representation on human-animal bond (HAB), animal welfare, animal agency, and earth Jurisprudence have argued about animals as sentient creatures which are ‘actually equal’ to humans. They are also ‘equal on average’ as suggested by them. The concept of ‘equal on average’ is based on the philosophy of human responsibility towards animals similar to the way where one group of humans (dominant groups) has to rethink the discriminatory behaviors towards the people at margin. The responsibility to humans owes much to Immanuel Kant who says that humans, as they claim to be rational beings, have moral and ethical responsibility to save animals.

In the same way, Peter Singer in *A Utilitarian Defense of Animal Liberation*, talks about the animal rights like that of women's right, black rights and so on and women and men are equal and they have equal rights and animals are different and they have the different rights. He asserts, “There are many other obvious ways in which men and women resemble each other closely, while human and other animals differ greatly. So, it might be said, men and women are similar beings, and should have equal rights, while humans and non-humans are different and should not have equal rights” (97). Indeed men and women are human beings and they need to have equal right because they are similar in each other. So far as animals are concerned, they are different from human beings and they need different rights that is to say, they

should be endowed the animal rights which are not equal to human rights. Moreover, he clarifies, “the basic principle of equality, I shall argue, is equality of consideration; an equal consideration for different beings may lead the different treatment and different rights” (97). Singer states that any animals should be in consideration in terms of treatment and different rights. The relation between human and animals is foregrounded in the novels as the author Jack London shares the ideas that Buck and White Fang are equal to humans.

Similarly, Singer further views that, equality is related to moral ideal and it is not the acceptance of fact simply as, “Equality is a moral ideal, not a simple assertion of fact” (99). It means everybody is guided by morality to support other. Furthermore, he argues that in the treatment of animals, humans should avoid the racism and speciesism. In the name of this and that humans should not exploit the non-human animals. He states: “It is on this basis that the case against racism and the case against sexism must both ultimately rest; and it is in accordance with this principle that speciesism is also to be condemned. If possessing higher degree of intelligence does not entitle one human to use another for his own ends, how can it entitle humans to exploit non-humans?” (99). In this extract, Singer explicitly explains that humans should be far from racist and sexist behaviour. Similarly, we should not be speciesist in terms of treating animals because they need kind and helpful consideration from human beings. According to Singer, we should always condemn the racism, sexism and speciesism because if we follow them, the harmony, peace, order and tranquillity and so on are broken in the society as well as in the ecosphere. Thus, we should be against these evils. Buck is treated badly by Hal and White Fang is badly treated by Beauty Smith, it shows human speciesism or exceptionalism which is bad.

Singer, again, explains that animals are killed for meat. They are treated as machines. Singer states:

The suffering we inflict on the animals while they are alive is perhaps as even clearer indication of our speciesism than the fact that we are prepared to kill them. In order to have meat on the table at the price that people can afford, our society tolerates methods of meat production that confines sentient animals in cramped, unsuitable conditions for the entire duration of their lives. Animals are treated like machines that convert fodder into flesh, and any innovation that results in higher “conversion ratio” is liable to be adopted. (100)

In this extract, animals are killed for meat. Before killing, they are treated like machines. They are kept in very pathetic condition which is against animal rights. They are not considered that they are sentient beings like human beings. Thus, they are dominated, exploited and treated like machines throughout their entire life. This kind of activities of human beings is speciesism which creates the imbalance in the ecosphere. This has proven disastrous to humans as well. Yeehats are killed by Buck. This does not lead to co-existence. Thus, one should accept other either human or animals.

In our society people are mostly speciesists. They love and respect their own species. They are intolerant towards the differences. They hate, exploit and dominate others. They think that they are self and rest of the species are other. They always create dichotomy between subject and object. They are subject and others are objects. They perform scientific experiment on animal for the human ends/ purpose as, “Experimenting on animals, and eating their flesh, are perhaps the two major forms of speciesism in our society” (101). Human beings use the animals in scientific experiment and eating flesh. While doing this, they do not even think that animals are

also sentient beings like humans. So, they are cruel to the animals' life and deeply rooted in the speciesist mindset because they are by nature biased towards the others i.e. animals.

According to Singer, animals, being the sentient beings like human beings, they can enjoy the good and happy and peaceful as well as danger free life. They have the capacity of having enjoyment as Singer states, "But what is this capacity is to enjoy the good life which all humans have, but no other animals? Other animals have emotions and desires, and appear to be capable of enjoying a good life" (102). Like human beings, animals, being the sentient beings, they have the emotions and desires of enjoying the good and happy life. They can feel, like human beings, pain and pleasure, and hence they have some capacities to deal with the situation in front of them. Therefore, they can enjoy the good and happy life. He states:

Surely every sentient being is capable of leading a life that is happier or less miserable than some alternative life, and hence has a claim to be taken into account. In this respect the distinction between humans and non-humans is not a sharp division, but continuum along which we move gradually, and with overlaps between the species, from simple capacities for enjoyment and satisfaction, or pain and suffering, to know more complex one. (102)

In this extract, Singer, clearly states that like human being, animals can feel pain and pleasure. They have the capacity of leading the good and happy life. They can feel satisfaction, pain, sufferings and so on like human beings. In this respect, animals and humans have no vast distinction and hence they are close in terms of feelings and leading the happy and good life. Animals can feel danger and try to avoid the dangerous situation like human beings. Animals have some common qualities like that of human qualities. Thus, they share some commonalities between them. Buck in

the Call of the Wild shows anger and love humans depending on their nature. Similarly, White Fang also exposes similar traits. He shows anger in the cage.

Similarly, Peter Singer marks why animals' liberation matters. Critical animals studies objects to human exceptionalism. He outlines history of animal pain as, "Alas, domesticated species paid for their unparalleled collective success with unprecedented individual suffering. The animal kingdom has known many types of pain and misery for millions of years" (X). The problem lies in human's attempt to quench his or her thirst at animals' pain and suffering. Singer highlights, "Humans can cause tremendous suffering to farm animals without endangering their survival and reproduction. The root of the problem is that domesticated animals have inherited from their wild ancestors many physical, emotional, and social needs" (xi). These feelings and emotions are snatched by human world. When dogs are sold in the novels, they don't accept easily first. They need time for adjustment similar to humans who finds odd in new places.

In the introductory part of *Animals and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger discuss about animal agency which they entitled as "Approaching The Agency of Other Animals: An Introduction." McFarland and Hediger argue that animals have the agency as they exhibit their capacity to think and decide in rational way. The problem is in anthropomorphism that humans interpret animals based on their consciousness. They argue:

As human animals, we often advocate for essential rights of activity that include the expression of agency: the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in one key formulation. Many have contended that other animals

deserve no such opportunities because they lack the abilities, particularly the cognitive abilities, to make use of them. (1)

Humans think that animals lack cognitive abilities; however, it is not a fair judgment. The recent studies on animals show that the animals share many traits similar to humans: “However, recent scientific studies argue that some other species do have higher level of cognitive functions similar to those of humans” (1). It is the natural human tendency to view an animal’s actions in terms of our own consciousness (popularly known as anthropomorphism). In the same way, the conscious motives may not be as conscious as humans like to think. This is also shared by Paul Taylor. They bring Taylor’s reference, “In his 1986 book, *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics*, Paul W. Taylor offers an inclusive view when he says, “All organisms are teleological centers of life in the sense that each is a unique individual pursuing its own good in its own way” (2). Taylor highlights bio-centrism and indicates the animal agency. Bio-centrism is similar to co-existence as they share that both humans and animals have inherent worth. This inherent worth needs to be protected so good relation is possible among different species.

The issue of agency is crucial thing in Human-Animal relation. It is a theory that gives a voice to animal through literary representation of animals as agent. Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger opine, “. . . a theory of agency, moves among a number of closely related terms—free will, ability, rationality, mind, morality, subjectivity—and we could add to this list in an indefinitely long fashion” (3). The agency of animals is realized through a movement among a number of closely related terms—free will, ability, rationality, mind, morality, and subjectivity. The idea of foregrounding free will, ability, rationality, mind, and morality in animals and humanity stands in favour of animal rights and agency along with welfare. Morally,

humans are responsible for this. In the novels, Weedon Scott cares more about White Fang and John Thornton cares much about Buck. They are responsible humans.

Singer's humanization of animals, establishment of animal agency and rights are useful in the thesis. Singer's ideas help one analyze the politics behind London's representation of dogs as sentient beings. Indeed, Buck and White Fang along with most of the people' dehumanization of Buck and White Fang represents a dilemma in contemporary world representing two sides: positive relation with dogs and the negative one. In such a case, with these theoretical insights, one can observe how London is advocating for the reciprocal relation between humans and animals based on equality, freedom and justice.

Chapter Two

Critique of Human-Animal Relation in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*

This chapter analyzes human-animal Bonding in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild* by Jack London. It establishes a ground to acknowledge animal agency and rights through the analysis of these novels. By humanizing animals, as this study shows, London critiques the human-centric relation between animals and humans and thus proposes for human-animal bond based on equality, justice, freedom and rights. London critiques the conventional human-animal relation by representing human and animals as equal beings of same ecosphere.

In the novel *The Call of the Wild*, there is a good environment for Buck, the dog, in Judge Miller's house. Because of the good and positive relation between Buck and Judge Miller's family, Buck is satisfied, "Buck lived at a big house in the sun-kissed Santa Clara valley. Judge Miller's palace, it was called . . . and over this great demense Buck lived" (10). Buck, a dog is living like a ruler in the Judge Miller's estate. Having good and positive relation between human and animal, they are satisfied. This satisfaction creates harmony, peace, tranquility and friendly atmosphere in the relation between human beings and animals. This is where one can perceive jurisprudence.

The first principle of jurisprudence is, according to Jules Cashford, is that "rights originate where existence originates which determines existence determines rights" (8). Respecting all life forms including animals is jurisprudence. Moreover, there is better and more positive relation. The narrator mentions: "But Buck was neither house-dog nor kennel dog . . . on wintry nights he lay at the Judge's feet before the roaring library fire; he carried the Judge's grandsons on his backs, or rolled them in the grass, and guarded their footsteps through wild adventures down to the

fountain in the stable yard” (London 11). This quotation shows that there is mutual cooperation between Buck and each and every members of the Judge Miller's family. This indicates the sound and mutual relation between human beings and animals. This incident clearly presents the similar nature of animals like that of human beings. The Buck is provided the animal rights in the Judge Miller's family where his agency is also established. Talking about agency, S. Marek Muller mentions that the animal agency and welfare are overlapping but they are different: “Animal welfare is thus anthropocentric at its core in that it advocates for compassion for animals on the part of humans, but does not question if it is ultimately natural, normal, right, or wrong to consider animals as chattel with predominantly instrumental value” (xxv). Welfare is liberal concept defined from human perspective, along with it opting for agency and right is based on recognition of essence of animals.

The process of recognizing the animal agency establishes a common ground of similarity between animals and human. In this regards, Immanuel Kant asserts, “Animal nature has analogies to human nature, and by doing our duties to animals is respect of manifestations which correspond to manifestations of human nature, we indirectly do our duty towards humanity” (86). To maintain good and positive relation between human and animal, human beings have certain duties towards animals. Animals’ rights and their self-respect should be maintained in order to have the peaceful and harmonious relations between human beings and animals. This kind of mutual relationship creates the ecological balance in the ecosphere. This maintains the mutuality and coexistence between human beings and animals, beneficial to all the ecological lives. This brings the satisfaction in ecological lives leading to the fine pride among them. Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger talk about how animals are misbehaved. They state, “Many have contended that other animals deserve no such

opportunities because they lack the abilities, particularly the cognitive abilities, to make use of them” (1). It is misconception to think that animals do not deserve the opportunities.

Buck, in the Judge Miller's house, is living an aristocratic life preserving his natural animal instincts. Every creature has natural right and instinct. The Buck is having both pampered life on the one hand and still having the primordial instinct of animal nature as in the lines, “But he had saved himself by not becoming a mere pampered house dog. Hunting and kinder outdoor delights had kept down the fat and hardened his muscles; the love of water had been a tonic and a health preserver” (12). Buck, on the one hand, is living the life of aristocrat like human beings and on the other hand, is preserving his natural instincts of canine animals. He is balancing the dual life. This clearly indicates that he is not completely domesticated though he maintains the domestication while living with the human beings. He maintains the good relation with each and every member of the Judge's family. The good relation is based on what Wilson calls inherent worth of every creatures. Holy L. Wilson asserts, “There in a qualified sense in which one can say that animals have inherent worth, according to Kant, because they are intrinsically and extrinsically purposive” (89). As Buck maintains the dual life, being animal, he is assertive in doing this. He maintains his behavior as per the demand of environment and situations.

Buck, at the time of living happy and prosperous life, he is not deeply guided by his natural animal instincts though he has not completely forgotten. When he is stolen and sold to other people, he is started to be beaten and at that time he has the sudden revelation of his natural instincts that he has to fight for it which is the primitive law of animals:

He was beaten (he knew that); but he was not broken. He saw, once for all, that he stood no chance against a man with a club. He had learnt the lesson, and in all his afterlife he never forgot it. That club was a revelation. It was his introduction to the reign of primitive law, and he met the introduction halfway. The facts of life took on fierce aspect; and while he faced that aspect uncowed, he faced it with all the latent cunning of his nature aroused. (London 21)

Buck was not fully domesticated while in the prosperous house of Judge Miller in the Santa Clara valley. He had some kind of freedom to enjoy the natural life. Now, he is stolen and sold by one of the gardeners to the hands of cruel people, a man with the red sweater. He is heavily beaten to teach him the human laws with the club. Now, he suddenly remembers his about-to-be forgotten animal instinct which leads to his revelation of his primitive laws and decides to fight for it. This kind of behaviour creates the imbalance between human beings and animals. Because of this incident, Buck realizes that his natural animal rights are violated. This denotes that the difference between human beings and animals. Human beings try to teach the law to the animals. However, they are not guided by any laws; they are guided by their natural instincts. It is impossible to teach them the concepts of laws by hook or by crook because they cannot learn the law but they know the natural instincts and hence there is difference between human beings and animals. These animals have inherent worth.

The inherent relation between animals and relation is not accepted in general perspectives. In this regards, Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin, in *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environments*, argue, “Indeed, our emphasis in differentiating ourselves from animals has rarely stressed the anatomical or physiological; rather, we prefer to designate animals as 'lesser' through mentality,

signating out those traits we regard as peculiar to ourselves—a practice which is not trust anthropocentric but often ethnocentric as well” (154). In this quotation Graham and Helen clearly explains that humans are not only anthropocentric but also ethnocentric as well. Therefore, humans always see the animals as others and tried to dominate them being inferior to them regarding thinking and understanding the signals like human beings, however, there is the inseparable relations between human and animals.

Human beings as well as animals need to be adjustable in the changing environment. They should adjust themselves according to the situation to adjust the new environment. If they do not adjust themselves, they should face the existential problems. Like human beings, Buck himself adjust in the changing environment as in the lines:

The first theft marked Buck has fit to survive in the hostile Northland environment. It marked is adaptability is capacity to adjust himself to the changing conditions, the lack of which would have meant swift and terrible death. It marked, further, the decay or going to pieces of his moral nature, vain thing and a handicap in the ruthless struggle for existence. (38)

Both Buck (the dog) and his master (human being) adjust themselves in the new environment. They develop their adaptability in the changing environment. Moreover, Buck easily changes himself in the new environment. He has the capacity of adjusting himself in the changing conditions. If he had not adjusted himself in the changing environment, he would be extinct or would be handicapped. Thus, he is fit to survive in the changing condition. He maintained the adaptability in the uneven environment. Because of this adaptability, he survived in the difficult situations.

Buck, during the different course of life, went through the various ups and downs. He experienced in different hardships and difficulties. During this course of life, while being domesticated, he has to give up the natural impulses. As he is free, he shows them. He remembers his old ancestors and their lives. He is now crystal clear that he belongs to the wilderness of his own ancestors as in the lines:

And not only did he learn by experience, but instincts long dead begin alive again. The domestication generations fell from him. In vague ways he remembered back to youth after breed. To the time the wild dogs ranged in packs through the primeval forest and killed their meat as they ran it down. It was no task for him to learn to fight with cut and slash and the quick wolf snap. In this manner he had fought forgotten ancestors. They quickened the old life within him, and the old tricks which they had stamped into the hereditary of the breed were his tricks. (40)

Buck becomes atavistic when he is badly beaten. He remembers his real life and his ancestors that they were not domesticated. They had free and liberated life in the wilderness. In the domestication, he is badly beaten to the death in order to teach him the human norms, values, rules and regulations. The rule of club in the domestication reminded him of his own natural instincts and his liberated life ahead. He became nostalgic about his ancestor's life in the natural habitat. He further refuses to be ruled by the human laws in the domestication. He feels that domesticated life for his species is the trapped life where he could not enjoy the natural rights of his life.

Sense of pride and competition are the characters attributed to the human beings only, to some extent which is not the complete understanding in the light of ecological study. In this way, not only, the human beings have the sense of pride and competition, but also the animals have the sense of pride and competition as in the

lines, “This was the pride of Dave as wheel dog. This was the pride that bore up Spitz and made him test the sled dogs who blundered and shrank in the traces or hid away at harness-up time in the morning. Likewise it was this pride that made him fear, Buck as a possible lead dog. And this was Buck’s pride too” (54). Like human beings, animals also have the desire of pride and competition between and among them. Spitz is the lead dog in the team and Buck is that it would be lead dog. There is the sharp competition between Buck and Spitz. Most of the dogs in the team are in the support of Buck. So, when they find the lacks and gap in Spitz, Buck and others are happy and proud. To be the lead-dog, Buck should kill the Spitz at any cost and he kills the Spitz to become the lead dog in the lines, “Only Spitz quivered and bristled as he staggered back and forth, snarling with horrible menace, as though to frighten off impending death. Then Buck sprang in and out; but while he was in, shoulder had at last squarely met shoulder” (64). Buck killed Spitz to become the lead dog. He applied his primordial beast instinct because after killing his competitor Spitz, he is feeling very good and happy in his success. Though he is the pampered dog, he is champion in his natural instincts. He proved this by killing and becoming the lead dog. He is feeling proud of killing the rival i.e. Spitz. Having the analogous feeling of pride and competition, animals are like human beings. Therefore, there is the relation between human beings and animals.

Animals are nostalgic like human beings. They feel not only pride and competition, but they also memorize the past as well, "There is an ecstasy that marks the summit of life, and beyond which life cannot rise" (60). Like human beings, animals also feel the extreme pleasure of life when they are victorious in their task as Buck feels when he wins the position of lead dog by killing his rival dog, Spitz. In this winning feeling he remembers, "He was sounding the deep of his nature, and of

the parts of his nature that were deeper than he, going back into the womb of Time" (60). Buck feels extreme pleasure in his achievement of leadership. In his ecstasy, he remembers the past from where he was here. This is the extreme successful point of his life for him. He feels like human beings, though he is animal.

Buck and Francois have good relation which makes both happy and joyful. This indicates the harmonious and mutual cooperation between human and animal: "Francois called Buck to him, threw his arms around him, went over him. And that was the last of Francois and Perrault. Like other men, they passed out of Buck's life for good" (70). Francois and Perrault are good people. So, they hugged the Buck closely and showed their respect to Buck for he had done to them. This situation creates the mutual and sentimental relation between human beings and the animal. Both human being and animal respect and understand each other. This leads to the happy and pleasant relation between them. This shows the sound and peaceful relation results the heart-touching environment which is possible through mutual understanding between human beings and animals.

Human beings are biased towards animals. They create gap between human beings and animals. This kind of biasness is the result because of anthropocentrism. They think that animals' life is nothing in comparison to human life because of which they neglect other animals. This kind of thinking and behavior leads nowhere except problem and hardships and so on. Anthropocentric concept is the problematic in the ecologically balanced ecosphere. This does not solve the problem rather leads to the doomsday of all the ecological lives and the planet itself. One of the sled dogs, Dave is tired to pull the sled. He tries to pull but could not and sat on the trail. The sled master pulled him out of the team and brought to the side and shot him to death as in the lines, "His strength left him, and the last his mates saw of him he lay gasping in

the snow and yearning toward them. But they could hear him mournfully howling till they passed out of sight behind a belt of river timber. The men ceased talking. A revolver-shot rang out” (78). Dave, one of the sled dogs in his very much pathetic condition, he is killed very cruelly. His life is nothing for human beings. He is used to pull the sled when he is young and strong. When he is old and weak, instead of caring and nursing him, he is killed mercilessly which is the result of anthropocentrism. This kind of task leads to the apocalypse in the planet.

Moreover, Hal, one of the masters of sled dogs, kills Dub, a poor dog in his bad and pathetic situation thinking that he's no more useful to pull the sled and to serve the human interest, “The first to go was Dub. Poor blundering thief that he was, always getting caught and punished, he had none the less been of faithful worker. His wrenched shoulder blade, untreated and unrested, went from bad to worse, till finally, Hal shot him with the big Colt’s revolver” (91). Human beings are very much selfish and self-centered. They do not value the animal's life. They use them for their welfare and betterment, when they are no more useful, they kill them mercilessly. This kind of behaviour towards the fellow beings of the same ecosphere leads to nowhere except towards the extinction of biodiversity of the planet and heading towards the nearness of the doomsday.

Buck is badly beaten by Hal in his pathetic situations. Buck is about to die because of the beating of Hal. John Thornton rescues Buck from the hands of cruel Hal, “Thornton stood between him and Buck, and evinced no intention of getting out of the way. Hal draws his long hunting-knife. Mercedes screamed, cried, laughed and manifested the chaotic abandonment of hysteria. Thornton rapped Hal's knuckles with an axe-handle, knocking the knife to the ground. He rapped his knockles again as he tried to pick up it up” (101). John Thornton, a kind man rescues the Buck from the

cruel hands of Hal challenging him that he would kill him. Hal is very cruel to his own dog, Buck, because he is no more capable of pulling the sled that he had seen the dangerous situations ahead. He disobeyed his master in the cost of his life. However, John Thornton, being kind and animal lover, rescues and nurses Buck back to the health. Thornton saved the life of Buck. Buck is evaluating all this like human beings. Buck is very much happy to be rescued from the cruel hands of Hal. Like human beings, animals have the evaluating capacity that they can find out who is good and who is bad. Being the sentient beings, animals like dogs undergo pain, pleasure, sorrow and so on. Buck has the same traits as he is the sentient beings like human beings.

John Thornton, after rescuing Buck, from the pathetic situation, there develops the good relation between Thornton and Buck. Buck started to love the human beings for the first time in his life. Buck started to love and respect his ideal master John Thornton. This part shows the good, positive, and sound relation between human beings and animals. This is shown in the following lines, “Love, genuine passionate love, was his for the first time. This he had never experienced at Judge Miller's down in the sun-kissed Santa Clara valley” (104). These qualities are found in dog. It does mean the non-sentient beings should be killed.

The narrator further highlights affections in dog, “a stately and dignified friendship. But love that was feverish and burning, that was aboration, that was madness, it had taken John Thornton to arouse . . . This man had saved his life, which was something, but, further, he was a ideal master” (105). Buck is happy in the hands of John Thornton. London’s attempt to sympathize dogs is his support to animal justice.

The Buck feels that Thornton not only saved his life, for the first time, in his life he feels the genuine passionate love. He compares the life in Judge's home and Thornton's home. In Judge's house, his life was in the partnership with Judge's sons and grandsons, and with Judge he had royal and dignified life. There was no sign of genuine love. This recognition of dog problematizes the human exceptionalism. So far as Thornton's home is concerned, he fully feels the respect, love, affection, brotherhood and fellow feeling. He feels equal with John Thornton. This means there is no discrimination between human being and animal. Buck, is not only saved but also nursed, cared and provided the equal status as family member. Buck feels no restrictions and bondages in the home of John Thornton. He feels free and liberated for the first time in his entire life. Buck realizes that Thornton is not only the ideal master, but also his ideal and unique master in comparison to all other masters.

Human beings and animals struggle for living the life in the course of time. For this they should fit them according to the situational environment. Buck is also struggling to survive in the new environment. Charles Darwin theory applies to all the beings, same is applied to Buck. Buck is clear that in the cost of life, there is no middle way to live. In the following lines, this is clearly indicated visibly:

And Buck was merciless. He had learned well the law of club and fang, and he never forwent an advantage or drew back from a foe he had started on the way to death. He had learned from Spitz, and from the chief fighting dogs of the police and mail, and knew there was no middle course. He must master or be mastered; while to show mercy was a weakness. Mercy did not exist in the primordial life. It was misunderstood for fear, and such misunderstandings made for death. Kill or be killed, eat or be eaten, was the law, and this mundane, down out of the depths of time, he obeyed. (108)

Buck, being canine animal, is clear that he should struggle too much to live in the cut throat competitive world of wilderness. There is no place for mercy which is inevitable in the wilderness. In the law of primordial life, there is only fight to finish among and between animals. They are clear that either they would kill or they would be killed. Furthermore, either they would eat other or they would be eaten by others because there is no middle course life in the wilderness. There is not any understanding and cooperation in the fighting and killings. No human laws will be working. Only the law of club and fang will work. Everyone should be merciless in the wilderness according to primordial law which is natural for them. Accordingly, Buck is merciless on his working because he knows that he is deeply rooted and loaded with primordial laws of life. Their agency is denied on the humanity-based relation.

Animal's agency is denied in the present. Animals are used, misused and overused for human purpose. Animals are the resources for human beings since the time immemorial. They are, as resources, used in various purposes for the welfare and betterment of human beings. Tom Regan in *The Radical Egalitarian Case for Animal Right*, argues, "The fundamental wrong is the system that allows us to view animals are *our resources*, here for *us* - to be eaten, or surgically manipulated, or exploited for sports or money" (106). Here, animals are manipulated and exploited. Sometimes, they are used as meat, sometimes they are used surgically and sometimes, they are used in sports for earning money. This kind of manipulated use of animals is totally wrong. Tom Regan asserts, "To right the wrong of our treatment of farm animals requires more than making rearing methods 'more humane'; it requires the total dissolution of commercial animal agriculture" (107). Regan is against the manipulation and exploitation of animals in the name of different benefits of human

beings. He is of opinion that human being should be totally changed as "people must change their belief before they change their habits" (107). The use of animals as their resources, people have strong belief that they are deeply habituated. First, they should totally change their belief that the animals are their resources that they can use either way they like. After that the habit will automatically be changed. It is the wrong belief and practices of the human system that made them to use the animals as their resources.

Buck was living in duality of human love and the call of the natural instinct. He has deep love with John Thornton and he has the urge of wilderness at the same time. It means he has developed a sense of positivity to humans due to the care and affection, at the same time, he has natural instincts. Time and again he is regularly confused what do to and not to do. Neither totally he could leave John Thornton nor he is with the wilderness. Moreover, he is dominantly called by the natural instinct that is to say, he is mostly ruled and guided by primordial instinct. This is clearly shown in the following lines:

So primordially did these shades becom him that each day mankind and the claim mankind slipped farther from him. Deep in the forest a call was surrounding, and as often as he heard this call, mysteriously thrilling and luring, he felt compelled to turn his back upon the fire and the beaten earth around it, and to plunge into the forest, and on and on, he knew not where and why; nor did he wonder where or why, the call sounding imperiously, deep in the forest. But as often as he gained the soft unbroken earth and the green shade, the love for John Thornton drew him back to the fire again. (109)

Slowly and gradually, Buck is deeply pulled. He loves Thornton, so he frequently returns back to the camp from the wilderness. Moreover, he is deeply called by his

natural instinct towards the wilderness. He feels freer and more liberated on the wilderness than in the human camps, though he could not break the deep tie with Thornton. He is very much happy in the wilderness: "To Buck it was boundless delight, this hunting, fishing, and indefinite wandering through strange places" (126-127). He feels unlimited pleasure in the wilderness having done the hunting, fishing and freely wandering as his ancestors in their wilderness. For him, the call becomes dominant and strong from the core of his heart. He is heading towards the final call of the primordial life in the wilderness in the lines: "Buck was wildly glad. He knew he was at last answering the call, running by the side of his wood brother toward the place from where the calls surely came" (133). Here, the Buck is about to break the relation with human beings to return to his originality and his real root that is the wilderness. To do this, he is extremely happy and delightful. This shows that animals become happy and delightful in their own habitat where there is not any boundaries and restrictions. Despite the human love, he is compelled to return to his own wilderness because he feels more comfortable and delightful in his original life in the wilderness.

Though Buck is dominantly pulled towards the wilderness, time and again he returns back to the camp because of the deep affection of John Thornton. It is very difficult for him to forget his human master who saved his life in his very much pathetic condition. The affectionate love between Buck and Thornton is clearly seen in the following lines, "John Thornton was eating dinner when Buck dashed into the camp and sprang upon him in a frenzy of affection, overturning him, scrambling upon him, licking his face, biting his hand – "playing the general tom-fool", as John Thornton characterized it, the while he shook Buck back and forth and cursed him lovingly" (134). Both, Buck and Thornton love each other deeply. They play happily

when they meet after sometime, after the returning of Buck from the wilderness, wandering there for many days. This clearly indicates that there is the deep affection, respect and mutual understanding between Buck and Thornton. Because of this kind of deep and affectionate relation between Buck and Thornton, it is very difficult for Buck to totally forget Thornton to go in his wilderness because of which he frequently returns back to the camp.

Buck was in the wilderness when his master Thornton and all others were killed by the native Indians Yeehats. In the camp, all were killed and left scattered in the ground hither and thither. There should be good relation between Yeehats and gods, but the situation goes in violent ways. It is the anger feeling that results into violence. They were mercilessly killed for no reason, at least, Buck could not understand. When Buck returned to the camp saw the scene. He states:

All day Buck brooded by the pool or roamed restlessly about the camp. Death, as a cessation of movement, as a passing out and away from the lives of the living, he knew, and he knew John Thornton was dead. It left a great void in him, somewhat akin to hunger, but a void which ached and ached, and which food could not fill. (146)

The buck killed man, the noblest game of all, and he had killed in the face of the law of club and fang. Buck becomes mad in the death of his lovely master John Thornton and others. He is very much panic in the death and in his rage he kills many Yeehats in revenge of the death of his master. At first he becomes sad in the death of Thornton and others. Later on when he sees the scattered dead bodies of Yeehats that he had killed, he forgets the pain of the death of Thornton and others and feels pride in himself that he had killed the human beings in revenge which is the new experience in his whole life that provided him the deep satisfaction that he did all this new task

applying the law of club and fang which is naturally related to him. Now he is completely satisfied that what he had done to fulfill his duty towards John Thornton and others.

Now Buck is totally free and liberated to live in his own way. His lovely man Thornton is no more in the world. Moreover, he recognizes his reality that he is no more a domesticated dog. He is totally free and can do according to his natural urges. Then he returns to the wilderness proving that the call was natural to him. This is seen in the lines: "He walked to the centre of the open space and listened. It was the call, the many-noted call, sounding more luringly and compellingly than ever before. And as never before, he was ready to obey. John Thornton was dead. The last tie was broken. Man and the claims no longer bound him" (149). Buck has no more reason to stay with the human beings that John Thornton died. Now he is free to return to the wilderness. His last tie was broken in the death of his master. He is totally free to do anything he desires. Before departing the wilderness he does not forget to fulfill his duties to Thornton as: "Here a yellow stream flows from rotted moose-hide sacks and sinks into the ground with long grasses growing through it and hiding its yellow from the sun; and here he muses for a time, howling once, long and mournfully, as he departs" (157). He ultimately mourns deeply in the loss of his lovely master Thornton and departs from there to the wilderness for always. Again, he no longer will be with human world obeying human laws, norms, and values and so on. He is free and liberated forever and now he leads his life according to the rule of his primordial instincts. He is no more compelled to return to the human world.

Human-animal relation is very ancient since the time immemorial. There is close relation between human beings and animals, sometimes sound, peaceful, harmonious and mutual but sometimes, hostile, enmity, fighting and killing each

other, according to the demand of the situation. In the relation between human and animal, there are the factors of animal welfare and the animal agency which play the crucial role to be considered. Humans are mostly anthropocentric while treating the animals which leads towards the more problematic situation in the relation to the animals. They ignore the rights of animals foregrounding their own right and backgrounding the rights of the animals.

In the relation to the animals, people should be very much careful but the biological health of the animals that is to say, the physical health of an animals including its normal physical functioning including its ability to experience emotions, feelings, desires, dreams, demands and so on. Moreover, their subjective experience also must be respected that is to say, the emotional state of an animals and the ability to express their normal behaviors, and social behavior and so on. Animal welfare considers the physical, emotional, social and behavioral well-being of the animals. Talking about the human-animal relation, the factor of animal agency plays the prominent role to shape the human-animal relation. Respecting the factor of animal agency for the better and improved and harmonious relations between humans and animals is supported by London. Animal agency is the ability of animals to influence their environment and shape their relationship with humans. Because of the animal agency, the animals have the capacity to shape their relationship with human beings influencing the environment. Therefore, anthropocentrism, animal welfare and animal agency play the pivotal role in shaping the relationship between human beings and animals, the ecological lives of the some ecosphere.

Human being treat animal according to their whim which is very much problematic in creating the balanced relationship between humans and animals. Similarly, in the next novel *The White Fang*, the dog 'White Fang' is treated badly in

the hands of Grey Beaver, the first owner of White Fang who is sometimes very cruel towards his animals like White Fang. White Fang is beaten badly as in the lines:

White Fang was too helpless to defend himself, and it would have gone hard with him had not Grey Beaver's foot shot out, lifting Lip-Lip into the air with its violence, so that he smashed down to earth a dozen feet away. This was the man animal's justice; and even then, in his own pitiable plight, White Fang experienced a little grateful thrill. At Grey Beaver's heels he limped obediently through the village to the tepee. (130)

As seen in the passage, when they are beaten their rights are violated and their right is beyond imagination. Grey Beaver treats the White Fang badly because of which he is in the pathetic plight. He is armless and harmless animal because of the cruelty of Grey Beaver. He is badly beaten to domesticate and to be obedient towards the human beings. While treating him, Grey Beaver does not consider about the physical, health, subjective experience, animal rights, emotions and feelings of White Fang. Grey Beaver, being anthropocentric, denied the self-respect, rights, desires, demands and dreams of White Fang. People forget that every creature has equal right to flourish. Jules Cashford further mentions, “Every component to the Earth community has three rights: the right to be, the right to habitat, and the right to fulfill its role in the ever-renewing processes of the Earth community” (9). It is bad to treat animals as object. The component to the Earth community has three rights: the right to be, the right to habitat, and right to be responsible.

The Buck and White Fang are to be treated as animals just like humans having inherent worth as suggested by the principle of Earth jurisprudence which is necessary. Marek observes: “Earth jurisprudence, with its focus on legal justice for all of Earth’s beings, necessarily includes legal rights for animals—subsumed, of course, under a

broader notion of a ‘biotic-community’” (99). Animals are the members of the same biotic community. The way Beaver treats animals is anti-human. Grey Beaver thought that other creatures should be under his will and whims because he was superior than all the creatures in the planet. Because of such anthropocentric behavior of Grey Beaver, the White Fang is in the pitiable plight. He can do nothing except to be obedient to his cruel master, Grey Beaver. Because of such harsh behavior, it is the man-animal's justice where, animals like him are dominated and exploited extremely because of no reason.

Animals, also being the sentient beings, like human beings, they have pain and pleasures, emotions and feelings, desires and dreams and duties. These are the characteristics common to both human beings and animals that is to say, remembering and memories are the traits of all the ecological selves. Animals, feel these things because of animal agency. White Fang feels the same because he is the sentient being. When he is badly beaten by his god, Grey Beaver, he expresses sorrows and remembers his mother in the following lines:

That Night, when all was still, White Fang remembered his mother and sorrowed for her. He sorrowed too loudly, and woke up Grey Beaver, who beat him. After that he mourned gently when the gods were around. But sometimes, straying off to the edge of the woods by himself, he gave vent to his grief, and cried it out with loud whimpering and wailings . . . so he remained in his bondage waiting for her. (130-131)

White Fang, in his very much pitiable plight, remembers his mother's love and affections that he used to have when he was a cub. Now he is no longer a cub and not with his mother rather he is young and in the hands of Grey Beaver who beats him cruelly. Here, his rights are snatched. Again, S. Marek Muller claims, “Again, animal

welfare stands in stark contrast to animal rights: the latter is considerably more radical in its philosophical undergirding, as it is focused not only on how to lessen animal suffering at human hands but also how to incorporate best practices that might end systemic, normalized suffering in its entirety”(xxvi). The animals have difficulty to face the suffering made upon them via humans.

The White Fang has the emotions and feelings and intelligences like that in human beings. When he could not tolerate the pains and sufferings of the beatings of Grey Beaver, he expresses sorrows too loudly because of which his god wakes up and again beats him, then he goes near to the woods and expresses sorrows loudly however he mourns gently when there are gods around. Here, his animal rights and agencies are violated because he could not express his pains and sufferings loudly. Gods were disturbed because of his mournful sounds. He is compelled to mourn gently or go to the woods to mourn loudly. That's how animal's rights and agencies are violated cruelly. The right of dog is snatched dismantling the concept of earth jurisprudence. For Jules Cashford: "The planet Earth is a single community bound together with interdependent relationships” (9). The earth is a biotic community. Cashford furthermore claims, “Each component of the Earth community is immediately or mediately dependent on every other member of the community for the nourishment and assistance it needs for its own survival” (9). This mutual nourishment, which includes the predator-prey relationship, is integral with the role that each component of the Earth has within the comprehensive community of existence.

In the course of harsh life, White Fang, learns how to deal with human intelligence. He is learning slowly and gradually, that how to survive in the difficult situations. Similarly, he learns protective strengths and how to deal individually and how to deal with the mass. In this way, he developed the necessary skills to protect

himself as per the demand of the situations. This kind of abilities are associated not only to human beings but also to the animals like White Fang, because they are the same ecological selves of the same ecosphere. This is clearly seen in the lines:

Out of this pack-persecution he learned two important things: how to take care of himself in a mass-fight against him; and how, on a single dog, to inflict the greatest amount of damage in the briefest space of time. To keep one's feet in the midst of the hostile mass meant life, and this he learned well. He became catlike in his ability to stay on his feet. Even grown dogs might hurtle him backward or sideways he would go, in the air or sliding on the ground, but always with his legs under him and his feet downward to the mother earth.

(134)

White Fang, in the course of different difficult and painful situations of life, he learns the survival skills which are the demand of the situations. Here applies the Charles Darwin's theory of "survival of the fittest". Along with the flow of time and space, each and every thing and being of the world should be updated, upgraded and changed and modified as per the desire and demand of the situation and time in order to be suited to survive in the changing environment.

White Fang, always changes, updates, upgrades and modifies himself in order to be suited to the particular environment of the surrounding world. Because of this capability, White Fang always fits in the environment there, though, sometimes it takes long time to be suited. E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger argue that animals have emotions like humans, "Emotions evolved via natural selection and are not unique to human animals. Behaviors, expressions, gestures, and vocalizations reflect similar emotional responses across species lines" (5). Animals do have emotions similar to humans.

In nature, there is the law of dichotomy between strong and weak. Strong always dominates and dismantles the weak. Among and between human beings stronger always suppresses the weaker in the society. Strong is always obeyed and the weaker is always destroyed, is the natural law. White Fang learns the same law and applies in this life as per the demand of the situations. It is a kind of irony/satire to the human beings by the animals. This is clearly presented in the lines:

The code he learned was to obey the strong and to oppress the weak. Grey Beaver was a god, and strong. Therefore, White Fang obeyed him. But the dog younger or smaller than himself was weak-a thing to be destroyed. His development was in the direction of power. In order to face the constant danger of hunt and even of destruction, his predatory and protective faculties were unduly developed. (138-139)

White Fang learned to avoid the dangerous situations. He is quite intelligent to do these because his long experiences of difficult course of life with Grey Beaver teaches him these lessons. He behaves as per the demand of the situations. He obeys the strong and he destroys and suppresses the weak. He became quicker of movement than the other dogs swifter of foot, craftier, deadlier, more lithe, more lean with iron-like muscle and sinew, more enduring, more cruel, more ferocious, and more intelligent.

He had become all these things, else he would not have held his own nor survived the hostile environment in which he found himself. This is in a way, a satire to the god, Grey Beaver because, he does the same. White Fang learned many lessons from the human beings and satirized the human beings themselves. He has the reasoning like human beings. Mostly, he learned all the intelligences of the human beings. Peter Singer marks why animals' liberation matters. It is because animals like

humans are creatures that can fulfil duty and seeks for rights. Critical animals studies objects to human exceptionalism. He outlines history of animal pain as: “Alas, domesticated species paid for their unparalleled collective success with unprecedented individual suffering” (Singer x). The problem lies in human’s attempt to quench his or her thirst at animals’ pain and suffering.

In the course of life, there is the good and sound relations between human beings and the animals. Sometimes, there seems to be quite mutual understanding between human beings and animals. Same happens in the case of Grey Beaver and White Fang. There appears to be good and harmonious relations between Grey Beaver and the White Fang. This proves that if human beings love animals in return, animals also love humans which creates the mutuality between and among them. This is clearly indicated in the lines:

Of his own choice, he came into sit by man's fire and to be ruled by him . . .

There was a movement of the hand above him . . . Grey Beaver ordered meat to be brought to him, and guarded him from the other dogs while he ate. After that, grateful and content, White Fang lay at Grey Beaver's feet, gazing at the fire that warmed him, blinking and dozing, secure in the knowledge that the morrow would find him, not wandering forlorn through bleak forest-stretches, but in the camp of the man-animals, with the gods to whom he had given himself and upon whom he was now dependent. (London 146-147)

There is reciprocal relations between Grey Beaver and White Fang. When Grey Beaver loves and provides meat to White Fang, he loves and respects and devotes wholeheartedly towards his god, Grey Beaver. White Fang has emotions and feelings and reasonings as well. He behaves like 'tit for tat'. If someone loves him, he also loves him in return. This kind of exchange of love and affection as mutual

understanding between Grey Beaver and White Fang creates the sound and peaceful environment in the life of ecological selves and hence avoiding the apocalypse in the planet. Because of the friendly and respectful behaviour from Grey Beaver, White Fang is quite satisfied and enjoying the beautiful environment in the human camps. Now, because of the good and positive response from Grey Beaver, he is doing the same in return.

The relation between human beings and animals is as old as the birth of the creatures in this planet. From the ancient time, the animals and human beings are always connected in the name of different purposes. They are strongly dependent in each other. Though animals and human beings are different, they need each other in the course of their life. They love each other sometimes and they hate each other sometimes. Either this way or that, there is close relationship between human beings and animals, however, they belong to the different species of the same ecosphere. This is visibly indicated in the lines:

The possession of a god implies service. White Fang's was a service of duty and awe, but not of love. He did not know what love was. He had no experience of love. Kiche was a remote memory. Besides, not only had he abandoned the wild, and his kind when he gave himself up to man, but the terms of covenant were such that if he ever met Kiche again he would not desert his god to go with her. His allegiance to man seemed somehow a law of his being greater than the love of liberty, of kind and kin. (159)

The relation between man and wolf is very ancient. There was the agreement between man, the god and the wolf, the animal that animals have the duty to serve the human beings. White Fang does not feel any sign of love in the hands of Grey Beaver. He has sacrificed all his rights, kin and kind to serve Grey Beaver. He did all the doings to

Grey Beaver, however, he did not get any love from him. His memory of love by Kiche, his mother, was remote. For this, if he met her, he could not go with her because he was bound by the agreement to stay with Grey Beaver abandoning all his wild, liberty, kind and kin. He could not violet the agreement made with man by his ancestors since the time immemorial. Therefore, there is the close relation between human beings and animals which depends on the ancient agreement between them that their ancestors did which is strictly to be implemented in the modern time as always.

Similarly, Peter Singer views that, equality is related to moral ideal and it is not the acceptance of fact simply as, “Equality is a moral ideal, not a simple assertion of fact” (99). Furthermore, he argues that in the treatment of animals, humans should avoid the racism and speciesism. In the name of this and that, humans should not exploit the non-human animals. He states, “It is on this basis that the case against racism and the case against sexism must both ultimately rest; and it is in accordance with this principle that speciesism is also to be condemned” (1). In this quote, Singer, clearly states that the like human being, animal can feel pain and pleasure. They have the capacity of leading the good and happy life. They can feel satisfaction, pain, sufferings and so on like human beings.

Human beings are selfish and cruel to animals. They keep animals to fulfill their purpose. When they think their purpose was met, they sell the animal to the others violating their natural rights and respect. Grey Beaver sold the White Fang to Beauty Smith whom White Fang does not like and hates him clearly. Beauty Smith is crook and crueler to White Fang. The narrator reflects, “This man was called 'Beauty' by the other man of the fort. No one knew his first name, and in general he was known in the country as Beauty Smith. But he was anything save a beauty”

(190). Beauty Smith was his name which was quite ironic. His physical appearance and his behaviors are quite similar. He was very crook and cruel not only in physicality but also in his internal behavior. White Fang is treated badly in his hands. He dominated White Fang extremely. He let the White Fang to fight with different kinds of dogs to earn the money. In the very much pitiable plight, Beauty Smith beat the White Fang so cruelly. Though he is human beings, he is like demon in his behavior: "In short, Beauty Smith was a monstrosity, and the balance of it lay elsewhere. He was not responsible. The clay of him had been so moulded in the making" (191). This proves that he is rotten to the core that he is like monster though his appearance is of human beings.

Moreover, White Fang, from the very beginning, did not like Beauty Smith. Because of the appearance and behavior of Beauty Smith, he started to hate him. He sensed the devil in him. He was not feeling comfortable with the presence of Beauty Smith. He explains more clearly and vividly about Beauty Smith in the following lines:

This was the man that looked at White Fang, delighted in his ferocious prowess, and desired to possess him . . . White Fang began by ignoring him . . . The feel of him was bad. He sensed the devil in him, and feared the extended hand and the attempts at self-spoken speech. Because of all this, he hated man . . . therefore, the good is liked. The bad stands for all things that are fraught with discomfort, menace, and hurt, and he hated accordingly. White Fang's feel of Beauty Smith was bad. (192)

White Fang hated Beauty Smith so extremely that he started hating and disliking all the human beings. He has bad impression of Beauty Smith. He sensed evil attributes in Beauty Smith. Beauty Smith has the desire of possessing him from the very

beginning. He is anthropocentric that by owning White Fang, he has the greed of earning more property by letting him fight all the other dogs. White Fang likes the comfortable and pleasurable behavior and appearances. When he sees Beauty Smith, he feels awkward and uncomfortable. This kind of feelings could not lead to the good and sound relationship between White Fang and Beauty Smith. Beauty Smith thinks that the White Fang would be his property. However, White Fang thinks that he could no longer stay with Beauty Smith. This kind of binary feelings and thinkings do not lead towards the sound and mutual relation between them. This leads towards conflicting and hostile relation between them and hence Beauty Smith becomes more and more cruel towards White Fang and vice versa. There could not be sound relation between them.

White Fang was dominated in the hands of Beauty Smith, the mad god, because of which the sense of hatred developed in him. Previously, he used to hate his own kind, now he started hating each and everything in the world mostly the human beings. He is chained in the pen and is not allowed to celebrate his liberty and freedom and the natural rights of animals. He was tormented and made irritated extremely by Beauty Smith and others. His agency and animal welfare are seized by the gods which is against the natural law. This is clearly indicated in the following lines in the text:

Under the tutelage of mad god, White Fang became a fiend. He was kept chained in a pen at the near of the fort, and here Beauty Smith teased and irritated and drove him wild with petty torment. The man early discovered White Fang's susceptibility to laughter, and made it a point, after painfully tricking him, to laugh at him . . . Formerly, White Fang had been merely the

enemy of his kind – withal and ferocious enemy. He now became the enemy of all things, and more ferocious than ever. (201)

Beauty Smith is actually a mad god because he does not respect the minimum rights of White Fang. He always irritates White Fang for his pleasure and enjoyment.

Because of his insitating behavior, White Fang started to hate not only him but also all the things existing in the world. He became enemy of everything in the world. He was totally fed up of the humiliating activities of Beauty Smith. He was teased time and again in the pen without any reason. This kind of tormenting and painful activities lead to the bad relation between human beings and animals and hence resulting towards the binary opposition between human beings and animals which is not the good and positive sign for the welfare and betterment of ecological selves sharing the same ecosphere. Therefore, White Fang hates each and everythings.

Moreover, hatred is deeply rooted in the mind and heart of White Fang. Sense of hatred creates problem in the relation between human beings and animals. Because of the cruel behavior of Beauty Smith, White Fang finds the gloomy and sad environment all around the world. He does not see any ray of hope and pleasure and liberation there because of which he hates and rejects each and everything in his life. He is confined in the pen that bound him to enjoy his natural rights that he is in the verge of revolting against human boundaries, restrictions and so on. He is deeply saddened due to the confinement of Beauty Smith. Hatred is clearly indicated in the following lines of the text as, “He hated the chain that bound him, the men who peered in at him through the slats of that pen, the dogs that accompanied the men and that snarled malignantly at him in his helplessness. He hated the very wood of the pen that confined him. At first, last, and most of all, he hated Beauty Smith” (201-202).

White Fang is chained in the pen and he is teased not only by men but also by different dogs that are with men. He is helpless that he could do nothing except to be angry and irritated. All this is done because of the cruel god, Beauty Smith who confined him in the wooden pen and let other men and dogs to tease him. His animal agencies and animal welfare and animal rights were seized by Beauty Smith. There is not mutual understanding and cooperation between Beauty Smith and White Fang.

White Fang is not accepted as one of the ecological being of the same ecosphere. He is othered, dominated, maltreated and oppressed so cruelly that he started to hate each and everything in the world. He hates the very wooden pen, that confined him, other men that they teased him, the dogs that were his own kind that they accompanied the man who treated him and mostly, he hated whole heartedly, the Beauty Smith who confined him. He hated all of them because they were anthropocentric and speciesist in their behavior.

White Fang in the very much pathetic situation that he had to fight with different kinds of dogs. He is treated not as living beings but as a machine. He is compelled to fight regularly with varieties of dogs in the confinement of Beauty Smith who is very much cruel to the White Fang. Because of regular fighting, life for White Fang became hell which raised more and more hatred towards Beauty Smith and others. Beauty Smith and others could not understand the emotions, feelings and experience of White Fang because of which he is sad with his life. He is only famous as fighting wolf around the land, however, his real situation of life is not taken into the consideration by the human beings. This is presented in the text in this way:

White Fang had now achieved a reputation in the land. As 'the Fighting Wolf', he was known far and wide, and the cage in which he was kept on the Steambot's deck was usually surrounded by curious men. He raged and snarled

at them, or lay quietly and studied them with cold hatred. Why should he not hate them? He never asked himself the question. He knows only hate, and lost himself in the passion of it. Life had become a hell to him . . . If Beauty Smith had in him a devil, White Fang had another; and the two of them raged against each other unceasingly. (204-205)

Beauty Smith makes the White Fang fight regularly with different dogs and he won all the dogs and become famous in the land as 'Fighting Wolf'. This kind of fighting which is very much regular made the White Fang more irritated and sad towards Beauty Smith. Beauty Smith earned plenty of wealth by this fight, however, he did not care and respect the White Fang. His life became like a hell that strong sense of devil developed in White Fang. Both Beauty Smith and White Fang hated each other unceasingly throughout their life. White Fang left respecting Beauty Smith and others because of the cruel behaviour of human beings.

Animals have emotions like humans. McFarland and Ryan Hediger argue, “Emotions evolved via natural selection and are not unique to human animals. Behaviors, expressions, gestures, and vocalizations reflect similar emotional responses across species lines” (5). Animals share behaviors, expressions, gestures, and vocalizations. They further argue, “. . . comparable studies of animal cognition reveal that humans are not as different from other animals as we have historically thought—even animals with whom we share very few physical similarities” (2). The quote explains that animals share many similar things to humans. They mention: In other words, the mind is a phenomenon created out of an organization of things in the physical brain. And if the mind is another physical aspect, as cognitive scientists claim, then the continuum between human and nonhuman animals also suggests that other animals might have similar physical facilities” (6). In the passage, it is clear that

animal subjects manipulate their environments and express agency. The animals might have similar physical facilities and faculty to exercise their mental process.

Laura Wright in *Vegan Studies Project* shares her idea that veganism can be extended as identity marker. She asserts, “Veganism constitutes both an identity category . . . and a practice dependent upon the eschewing of all animal products from numerous aspects of one’s life” (6). It is also a ‘rejection of the normative ideology of speciesism’. By this, the concept of eater and to be eaten justifies oppression by hiding responsibility for death and the causal connection between the production of meat and the animal’s death. In the case of White Fang and Buck, the concept of 'Human Exceptionalism' is problematic because both of them are treated not as living beings but as machines. They are not let to enjoy their minimum animals rights in their life. They are always othered as machine. They are not respected and treated as beings but, as things. Human beings always focus on their own interest and desires. To fulfill their needs and desires, they use the animals like White Fang and Buck as tools to be used whatever way they like. Because of the speciesism, human beings treat Buck and White Fang badly ignoring their sentiments, emotions, feelings, desires, dreams and duties. They are not considered to be the ecological selves of the same ecosphere like human beings and others. They are always rejected and othered and dejected by the human beings, however, both animals and human beings, are the same ecological selves of the single ecosphere. Thus, human exceptionalism always creates the problem in the relation between human beings and animals.

This is shared by Plumwood. In *Environmental Culture*, Plumwood talks about the problematic relation between nature, women and culture. Similarly in the chapter, “The ethics of commodification” by Val Plumwood justifies why humans fail to acknowledge the possible recognition between or within species. It is due to

instrumentalism. The commodification of animals is problematic for Plumwood. She argues, “There is injustice in all these modes of conception. There is injustice for a communicative and ethical being in being conceived systematically in ways that refuse recognition of their capacity for mindfulness and communication, both within and between species” (157). There is injustice in human animal relation because of instrumental conception that defines the other in terms that assume the right of a ‘higher’ group to treat them as a resource to meet their goals. Plumwood further argues:

Animals so conceived are subject to both radical exclusion (as having a radically different nature discontinuous from that of the human meat consumer) and homogenisation – they ‘drown in the anonymous collectivity’ of meat. The radical exclusion of the meat concept generates a conceptual distance or boundary between humanity and its ‘meat’ which blocks sympathy and reduces the risk of identification. The reductiveness of the meat concept involves a conceptual strategy designed to block recognition of these injustices. (157)

Plumwood finds problems in treating animals radically other and the subsequent exclusion. This marks a conceptual strategy designed to block recognition of these injustices. On the contrary to this, interspecies (biospheric lives) egalitarianism is liberating principles where human or nonhuman should have equal moral weight. Human beings and animals are both the ecological selves of the same ecosphere but animals are commodified and homogenized when they are sold. If both respect each other's rights, emotions, feelings and experiences, the bond between human beings and animals can be strengthened. For this, human beings should respect the animal agency, animal welfare, and so on. They should be bio-centric rather than

anthropocentric. They should apply the earth jurisprudence while treating the animals. In order to maintain the sound and mutual relation between human beings and animals, human beings should stop thinking they are master and superior and animals are inferior and others. Both animals and human are sentient beings that they have love, morality, pains, pleasures, emotions, feelings and so on because both are the ecological lives of the same planet. To maintain the balance in the ecological life, all creatures should enjoy their natural rights. Both human space and wild space are equal for the well-being and betterment of the ecosphere. By doing this, human-animal bonding can be strengthened throughout the life. Thus, there should be sound and prosperous relation between human beings and animals that is to say, between and among different ecological selves of the same ecosphere.

Jacques Derrida, in his speech "The Animal that Therefore I Am", states that humans and animals are historically connected to each other. There is the inter-dependence between humans and animals. Animals in the beings are interpreted from the perspective human-ground. He argues: "I shall therefore not be speaking of a historical turning point in order to name a transformation in progress, an alteration that is at the same time more serious and less recognizable than a historical turning point in the relation to the animals in the being-with shared by the human and by what the human calls the animal" (24). Derrida asserts that humans and animal have the sharing experiences of pains, pleasures, sufferings, conflicts, killings and dominations as well. Thus, human and animals have historical relations among and between them. Unlike Derrida's ideas, White Fang and Buck in the hand of cruel masters are not treated equal. Their existence is denied. When White Fang is beaten, he remembers his mother similar to human world.

Similarly, Immanuel Kant in *Rational Beings Above Have Moral Worth*, argues that, "So far as animals are concerned, we have no direct duties. Animals are not self-conscious and are there merely as a means to an end. That end is man" (86). In this quote, Kant is of the opinion that humans have the indirect responsibilities to the animals because animals are not self-conscious and they are the means to fulfill the goal of human beings. Furthermore, he is quite liberal to animals in the following lines:

Animal nature has analogies to human nature, by doing our duties to animals in respect of manifestations which correspond to animals in respect of manifestations of human nature, we indirectly do our duty towards humanity. Thus, if a dog has served his master long and faithfully, his service, on the analogy of human service, deserves reward and when the dog has grown too old to serve, his master ought to keep him until he dies. (86)

In the extract, Kant clearly opines that animals are in the welfare and betterment of human beings. If the animals are faithful and dutiful towards their masters, they should be rewarded and nursed and cared until they die. Both the human beings and animals have the similar nature in respect to their assigned duties. Therefore, there is reciprocal relationship between and among human beings and animals.

Holly L. Wilson, in *The Green Kant: Kant's Treatment of Animals*, views, "In this limited sense, we are no better than animals" (89). Here, Wilson clearly states that we are equal to animals. Furthermore, he provides the slightly different views that, "Because animals are not capable of "being under moral laws", they do not have this same status. In this, human beings distinguish themselves from animals" (89). Wilson clearly shows difference between human and animal because human beings follow the moral laws whereas animals cannot follow the moral laws as human beings. To

support his views, he, moreover, says, “Humans are held to higher standards morally because there are ontological differences between human beings and animals” (93).

Here, Wilson views the differences between human beings and animals from the perspective of ontological morality. Similarly, he supports his claim in the following lines:

If animals have a right not to be treated cruelly, then human beings can be punished if they do treat them cruelly. Kant wants us to be motivated out of respect for our own humanity to keep us from treating animals cruelly, because he knows that our dignity as human beings is always at stake in our treatment of animals. Kant holds that we preserve our moral and inherent dignity by treating animals kindly because in so doing we take our humanity as an end-in-itself since animals are like us. (94)

In this extract, Wilson, bringing the reference of Kant precisely explains that though, the animals are not equal to human beings, we have duty to treat them kindly or if we treat them cruelly, we are punished. We human beings have the moral dignity to preserve the animal rights because they are like us in some sense. Thus, there is the relation between humans and animals. Domestication of animals means to make them follow and obey the rules and regulations of human society, foregrounding the humanity but backgrounding and ignoring their natural instinctual animal traits which means humanizing the animals. In this sense, domestication of animals means humanization of animals. They have to learn, follow and obey the human norms, values, laws, practices and traditions as well. In the human society, animals are not let to enjoy their natural rights, desires, emotions, feelings and so on. Thus, domestication is a kind of humanization of animals in the light of anthropocentrism.

Animals are used in science to serve the human purposes. According to Tom Regan animals should not be used in science. He asserts, "It is complete replacement. The best we can do when it comes to using animals in science is – not to use them. That is where our duty lies according to the right view" (113). In the scientific experiment, animals should not be used. It is our right duty not to use the animals in such case. Animals are armless and harmless and to dominate, to kill and to exploit such animals is the great crime.

Animals should not be treated badly in the hands of human beings. In this regard, Tom Regan further states, "As for the passion: there are times, and these are not infrequent, when tears come to my eyes when I see, or read, or hear of the wretched plight of animals in the hands of humans. Their pain, their suffering, their loneliness, their innocence, their death. Anger. Rage. Pity. Sorrow. Disgust" (113). In this quote, Tom Regan, directly feels that animals are cruelly treated in the hands of human beings. He feels the pain, sufferings, sorrows, pity, rage and their loneliness in the hands of human beings. This kind of activities towards helpless animals is unjust and the humans will be condemned by the whole creations for such evil doings towards armless, harmless and pathetic innocent animals. This kind of bad and evil system of animal exploitation should totally be eradicated. If we continue this system, it leads towards the dooms day in the days to come. Thus, it should be stopped as soon as possible.

The hunting of animals in the name of any purposes, is not justifiable. Animals, like human beings have the moral rights to live in the world. Any endangered animals should be stopped to prey them as, "We cannot negotiate a treaty with the feral cats and foxes, requiring them to stop preying on endangered native species in return for suitable concession on our part" (118). Humanbeings always run

after the benefits rather than preserving the life of endangered animal which is not good for the welfare and betterment of the ecosphere. Because of the human exceptionalism, animals are compelled to bear the intolerable pain and cruelty in the hands of human beings.

Mary Anne Warren states, "Cruelty is inflicting pain or suffering and either taking pleasures in the pain or suffering or being more or less indifferent to it" (119). Thus, expressing the demand for the decent treatment of animals in terms of the rejection of cruelty is to invite the too easy response that those who subject animals to suffering are not being cruel because they regret the suffering they cause but sincerely believe that what they do is justified, "The injunction to avoid cruelty is also inadequate in that it does not preclude the killing of animals – for any reason, however trivial – so long as it is done relatively painlessly" (120). Here, it is argued that the human beings should be very careful about the rights of the animals. We should not be indifferent towards the pain and suffering of the animals in the hands of human beings.

Cruelty and sufferings of the animals could not be justified from the perspective of animal rights. Even the less and trivial pain and sufferings of animals could not be justified. Therefore, any activities of pain and sufferings and cruelty done to animals are against the animals' rights perspective. Warren asserts that, "Thus, sentient animals, unlike mountains, rivers or species, are at least logically possible candidates for moral rights" (120). Animals as the sentient beings deserve the moral rights like human beings unlike non-living things like mountains and so on.

Human beings use animals for different purposes. They keep them in the zoos. They are used for amusement, education and scientific research. Human beings use animals to learn different activities and behaviour that they perform. They get

pleasure and amusement confining them in the capacity which is against the animals rights. They are not only kept in the zoos for education and amusement purposes but also to preserve the endangered species. For the better relation between human beings and animals, zoos should be totally abolished and animals should be liberated. Dale Jamieson states, “The means of confinement marks a different between humans and animals. They are there at our pleasures to be used for our purposes. Morality and perhaps our very survival require that we learn to live as one species among many rather than one species over many” (127). In the quote, Jamieson clearly explains that keeping animals in the zoos, is not beneficial neither for human beings nor for animals.

By confining animals in the zoos, human beings are learning false education. Jamieson further argues, “To do this, we must forget what we learn at zoos. Because what zoos teach us is false and dangerous, both humans and animals will be better off when they are abolished” (127). For the welfare and betterment for both human beings and animals, zoos should totally be abolished. If we continue confining different animals in the zoos, in the name of amusement, education and scientific research, it will harm the ecosphere leading towards the ecological apocalypse. Therefore, we people should be prudent to abolish the zoos as soon as possible for the welfare and betterment of not only the humans beings and animal but also for all the ecological lives and ecosphere. The domination of animals by humans and the subsequent subjugation by the dominant ideology of human-centered ethics are problematic as human centric philosophies based on Western capitalist model of hierarchy, commodify animals as represented in the selected primary texts. These practices deprive animals of their rights, agency and love.

To some extent, in both the novels, animals are domesticated to fulfil the human needs and purposes. In the process of domesticating White Fang and Buck, they are treated badly that their natural animals' rights are violated and dismantled in the different human camps. They are beaten, whipped and dominated in order to teach them the human laws, norms, values and traditions ignoring their natural animals' rights.

Human beings always consider the wild animal as savage and they call themselves the civilized ones. In fact, human beings as well as animals both are savage in some respect. Human beings could show their savagery at any time in their life. Beauty Smith made the White Fang fight regularly in his life without considering his health condition and emotional feelings. In this sense, Beauty Smith is savage as in the lines: "It was a savage land, the men are savage, and the fights were usually to the death" (206). Beauty Smith and White Fang, both were living in the savage land where fighting to death is common. Not only they were living in the savage land, but also both of them were equally savage that they involve in the fighting that could easily lead to the death. It is a kind of irony to the human being that they call themselves civilized. The narrator thinks that human beings are intact, savage and rotten to the core.

White Fang is critical in his reading of his gods that Indian gods like Grey Beaver is quite different from the white gods who were there to hunt the gold. He thinks that white gods are superior in comparison to the Indian gods like Grey Beaver. White gods were more powerful and superior in their skills and knowledge because of which they are capable of ruling not only the Indian and other animals but also the whole world. They have the weapon of power because of which they rule the world.

The White Fang's readings of both Indians and white gods is clearly presented in the text:

It was at Fort Yukon that White Fang saw his first white men. As compared with Indians he had known, they were to him another race of beings, a race of superior gods. They impressed him as possessing superior power, and it is on power that godhead rests. White Fang did not reason it out, did not in his mind make the sharp generalization that the white gods were more powerful. It was a feeling, nothing more, and yet none the less potent. As in his puppyhood the looming bulks of the teepes, man-reared, had affected him as manifestations of power, so was he affected now by the houses and the huge fort, all of massive logs. (182-183)

White Fang has the critical mind like that of human beings. He distinguishes between Indian gods and the white gods that white gods are superior in each and every aspects of life than the Indian god, Grey Beaver and others. Indian god, Grey Beaver is like a child-god in front of white gods. He is like Liliputians in front of white gods. This kind of comparison indicates that animals like White Fang, have the quality of judging the situations and circumstances around them. This is the human trait to judge the things and situations. Here, the animal, White Fang has feelings of judgement because he has the experience of living with the human beings since the long time bearing different difficulties, hardships, pains and pangs.

He analyses that power is everything in the world. Because of power, Grey Beaver dominated, ruled, suppressed and mal-treated him even in his pitiable plight. Power is always blind that it could not value emotions, feelings, pains, sufferings, and hardships of oppressed and suppressed. Having power with them, white gods also rule each and every things in the world. They are wealthy that they possess really all

the matter of the world because of which they are capable of dominating, ruling and twisting not only the other human beings and animals, but also all the world around them which is possible because of power.

White Fang is always dominated and dismantled in the hands of Grey Beaver and Beauty Smith. He hates both of them mostly. When he is rescued and taken to the hospital by Weedon Scott, he is slowly cured and started to love the god that is Weedon Scott. He is feeling the tremendous changes in his life. Now, he is feeling quite different and comfortable in his life in comparison to the past days of life that he faced and experienced in the hands of Grey Beaver and Beauty Smith. His different feelings are visibly presented in the text as:

As the days went by, the evolution of *like* into *love* was accelerated. White Fang himself began to grow aware of it, though in his consciousness he knew not what love was. It manifested itself to him as a void in his being—a hungry, arching, yearning void that clamoured to be filled. It was a pain and an unrest, and it received easement only by the touch of the new god's presence. (242)

In the past, White Fang has the bitter experiences of domination, oppression, pains, and pangs and beatings in the hands of Grey Beaver and beauty Smith. Now, he has the different feelings that he has deep love to Weedon Scott, his kind and loveable god. When Weedon Scott is in front of White Fang, he feels full satisfaction and when he is no more there he feels sad and incomplete. A kind of strong bondage is developed between White Fang and Weedon Scott. It indicates that if we love and respect the animal they also love and respect in return. Positive and respectful behaviour always leads towards the good and sound relations between White Fang and Weedon Scott. There should always be good and harmonious relations between and among the different ecological lives in the ecosphere to maintain the sustainable

life of the planet. This is clearly maintained in the relations between White Fang and Weedon Scott. Moreover, the relation developed as presented in the text:

Like had been replaced by love. And love was the plummet dropped down into the deeps of him where like had never gone. And responsive out of his deeps had come the new thing-love. That which was given into him did he return.

This was a good indeed, a love-god, a warm and radiant god, in whose light-

White Fang's nature expanded as a flower expands under the sun. (243)

White Fang gets plenty of love, affection, fellow feelings, fraternity and brotherhood in the hands of Weedon Scott. He is no more in chains, restrictions and bondage. He is not dominated as in the hands of Grey Beaver and Beauty Smith. Now he feels fully liberated and free. He is quite happy and prosperous that he is kissing the apex of happiness and pleasure for the first time in his entire life. His feelings, experiences, emotions, desires and dreams are fully respected and taken into consideration. He calls the god, Weedon Scott the 'love-god'. White fang's relation to Scott is major focus in this study suggesting a positive relation.

White Fang feels void and unrest in the absence of Weedon Scott. Weedon Scott provides the total liberation and freedom to the White Fang that he enjoys a lot. This kind of good and positive behavior from the side of human beings leads to the harmonious and sound relation between human beings and animals. In turn, from the side of animals as well, human beings get the same behavior and respect. This kind of reciprocal positive behavior from the both sides helps to maintain the ecological environment sound and prosperous. London- as per the analysis of the novels above- seems to favour the reciprocal relation between humans and animals based on equality, justice and freedom.

These two novels offer different perspectives. *White Fang* turns towards domesticated life being a blessed dog whereas *Buck* is called for the wild by his heart or inner intuition. Humanity should respect the natural traits that come and follow in their life. While respecting this, positive bond between animals and humans is boosted. While criticizing the conventional human animal relation, London advocates for the co-existence that transcends the dichotomy between humans and animals as superior and inferior beings respectively. By presenting *Buck* and *White Fang* as sentient and rational beings, London critiques the traditional notion of animals as mere dogs or objects. However, the ways these animals are humanized and domesticated differ.

The dehumanization of the *Buck* and *White Fang* is consistently present in the novels. This follows domination from the side of humans. For example, *White Fang* is sold a number of times to different cruel masters. Out of many masters, Beauty Smith beats him as non-sentient being. He is also behaved in negative ways by Grey Beaver. Similarly, *Buck* is sold a number of times where he is beaten, whipped, and tortured. Hal, the cruel master, beats him in extreme form. Had not he been rescued by John Thornton, he would have been killed at this time. The dehumanization and humanization of dogs are two contrasting sides of human's treatment to them where the first one is problematic for coexistence and the second one supports the coexistence between humans and animals.

While *White Fang* transforms to blessed dog from fighting wolf, he is in harmonious relation with human world representing the theme of co-existence. He follows human norms and values. This is a result of positive relation he receives while being with Weedon Scott. Scott's humanizing vibes triggers him to be in close connection with humanity. In this way, he is a blessed dog. He was once the fighting

wolf and he is continuously beaten by Beauty Smith. He also fought bravely. This is a result of dominating relation he receives with Beauty Smith.

The coexistence in *The Call of the Wild* is problematic due to the murder of John Thornton by Yeehats whom the Buck intends to kill by fighting. He fights to them till he defeats them. He has two purposes: one is to kill the murderer of his kind master – John Thornton as a part of revenge; another is to acknowledge his natural instincts. Had the human world accepted the natural instincts of the Buck, he would not have become a fighting dog or a ghost dog. The coexistence in the novel is problematic one because of misunderstanding or misjudgment of the Buck.

Chapter Three

Human-Animal Coexistence in *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*

The present research has examined the relation between humans and animals in Jack London's novels *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild* from the perspective of animal studies. The animals and humans as shown in the selected novels have sentient feelings, common sensibilities of love and hate, and they co-exist with a harmonious bonding. London's humanization of Buck and White Fang is a challenge to the anthropocentric belief that humans are superior to dogs. It hypothesizes that there is possibility of the co-existence between animals and humans based on mutual respect, adaptation, and a true understanding of each other's nature, not in exposing dominant traits from each side. In order to develop a theoretical framework to analyze the selected primary texts, the study derives the insights from the critical animals studies theorists, especially from the works of Peter Singer.

In *White Fang*, the dog as presented in the story is humanized through its possession of human features. The writer London shows White Fang with similar qualities and experiences to humans. The qualities like fear, curiosity, loyalty, and with intense feeling of love and hatred serves background for human-animal relations. White Fang experiences a massive change in his development. He adapts new methods depending on situation, learns from the past actions, and behaves like a human. The transformation from wild dog to blessed one is his new perspective in life similar to character development in human. The co-existence comes from emotional relation between them rather than from domination.

White Fang's emotional tie with Weedon Scott is based on loving relation. His bond goes beyond human expectation. He goes from wild pup to a violent fighter, and finally to a loving companion often called the blessed dog. His action of trusting

human again after being abused by Beauty Smith is a feature of forgiveness. Through humanization, London cares dogs and represents them with human qualities. By showing human qualities of the dog, often called humanization, London creates a connection between the nature of the wild and the nature of the civilized, both share emotional bond. Jack London humanizes the dog to explore themes of psychological maturity, emotional bond and human-animal relation. True co-existence between animal and human is possible from understanding and connection.

Jack London exposes the Buck with human-like qualities by discussing his memories, stimulus and reactions. His sad feelings, grieves, loyalty to human companion, experience of happiness, and contact to humans is humanization. One example of this is Buck's mourning of the death of John Thornton, the kind-hearted master of the Buck. This is similar to human attribute as it goes in a way that shows it has feeling of revenge which is beyond a simple reaction. It is the grief that makes return to the wild, hinting the natural instincts. The Buck is a character seeking new experiences. His transformation from a pampered house dog to a wild, dominant leader showcases the personal journey of growth. This journey is a journey to freedom. The true bond or co-existence comes from mutual relation.

White Fang and Buck are not just "dogs"—they have a name, memories, a unique character, and a fate similar to humans. So, they are humanized and this shows the possibility of co-existence. Their stories are similar to an individual's story not being limited to a general tale about animals. True co-existence comes not from dominance, but from understanding and connection. Buck and White Fang show how human and animal co-exist in loving relation with care and share. This humanization expands the possible outlet of co-existence between human and dog. While animals

and humans share co-existence, both can share bonds of love and loyalty in the real home with love and feelings.

Buck's journey from domesticated pet animal to wild dog or leader shows the innate traits similar to humans. The innate instincts and traits of Buck to survive in difficult time, and resilience show the shared relation between humans and dogs. His relationship with John Thornton is backed up with love and loyalty rather than controlling mechanism and it shows a harmonious bonding that is beyond human definition. In the same way, in *White Fang*, the dog believes human and coexists with humans to live a happy life. After Weedon Scott's love, forgiveness, and care, *White Fang* turns out to be a loyal companion. This implies that co-existence is most successful when humans accept the animals and recognize them as sentient beings with feelings and instincts. If the animals are given a proper environment, they show kindness. Thus, mutual connection is a key to peaceful and meaningful human-animal relationships.

The concept of 'Human Exceptionalism' is problematic to *White Fang* and Buck because it valorizes humans irrespective of dogs. The Human-animal bonding is strengthened as indicated in the two novels through positive relation so that balance among ecological lives is maintained. The present dissertation is expected to open new avenues for future researchers especially focusing on 'Animals Consciousness', 'Human and Plants Relation', and 'Critical Animal Studies'.

Works Cited

- Bruni, John. "Furry Logic: Biological Kinship and Empire in Jack London's 'The Call of the Wild.'" *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2007, pp. 25–49. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44086556>. Accessed 1 Jan. 2025.
- Campbell, Jeanne. "Never Travel Alone": Naturalism, Jack London, and the White Silence." *American Literary Realism*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1997, pp. 33-49. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27746687>
- Cashford, Jules. "What is Earth Jurisprudence?" *Exploring Wild Law The Philosophy of Earth Jurisprudence*, edited by Peter Burdon. Wakefield Press, 2011, pp. 1-11.
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. Fordham University Press, 2008.
- Dyer, Daniel. "Answering the Call of the Wild", *The English Journal*, vol. 77, no. 4, 1988, pp. 57-62. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/819308>.
- Fusco, Richard. "On Primitivism in 'The Call of the Wild.'" *American Literary Realism, 1870-1910*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1987, pp. 76–80. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27746265>. Accessed 1 Jan. 2025.
- Guang, Yang. "Life Lessons: The Philosophy of Growth Contained in Jack London's *White Fang* — An Exploration of Survival and Love." *Pacific International Journal*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2022. DOI: 10.55014/pij.v5i2.175
- Huggan, Graham and Helen Tiffin. "Zoocriticism and the Postcolonial", *Postcolonial Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2010, pp. 149-59.
- Jamieson, Dale. "Against Zoos." *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Cengage Learning, 2017, pp. 121-28.

- Jones, Karen. "Writing the Wolf: Canine Tales and North American Environmental-Literary Tradition", *Environment and History*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2011, pp. 201-28. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41303507>
- Kant, Immanuel. "Rational Beings Alone Have Moral Worth." *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Cengage Learning, 2017, pp. 85-87.
- Labor, Earle. "Jack London's Symbolic Wilderness: Four Versions", *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1962, pp. 149-161. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2932517>.
- London, Jack. *White Fang*. Penguin Books, 2008.
- . *The Call of the Wild*. Prakash Books, 2023.
- McFarland, Sarah E., and Ryan Hediger. "Approaching the Agency of Other Animals: An Introduction." *Animals and Agency An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by Sarah E. McFarland Ryan Hediger. Brill, 2009, pp. 1.20.
- Moustafa, Wael. "A Postcolonial Tale of Nature: The Postcolonial Eco-Poetics." *Journal of Qena Faculty of Arts*, vol. 55, 2022.
Doi.10.21608/qarts.2022.114461.1334.
- Muller, S. Marek. *Impersonating Animals: Rhetoric, Ecofeminism, and Animals Rights Law*. Michigan UP, 2020.
- Plumwood, Val. *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason*. Routledge, 2002.
- Regan, Tom. "The Radical Egalitarian Case of Animal Rights," *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Cengage Learning, 2017, pp. 106-14.
- Singer, Peter. "A Utilitarian Defense of Animal Liberation." *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*. Cengage Learning, 2017, pp. 96-105.

---. *Animal Liberation Now and Animal Liberation*. Penguins, 2024.

Taylor, Paul. "Biocentric Egalitarianism." *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, edited by Louis P. Pojman, Paul Pojman and Katie Mcshane, Cengage Learning, 2017, pp. 177-92.

Urs, Harshita U. "Theorization of Animal Studies and Re-reading *White Fang*." *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2021, pp. 52-58. DOI: 10.22161/ijels

Warren, Mary Anne. "A Critique of Regan's Animal Rights Theory." *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Cengage Learning, 2017, pp. 114-21.

Wilson, Holly, L. "The Green Kant: Kant's Treatment of Animals." *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Cengage Learning, 2017, pp. 87-95.

Wright, Laura. *The Vegan Studies Project: Food, Animals, and Gender in the Age of Terror*. University of GP, 2015.