
Invisible Geographies: Violence and Oppression in the Prison Industrial Complex and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations

Richard Merritt and Scott Hurley

ABSTRACT

Nowhere is the act of violence more complete, sustained, and systematically codified than in the Prison Industrial Complex (PIC). Through overt physical domination, the psychological and bodily control of inmates is maintained. Lobbying by the private prison industry and the war on drugs and terror have fuelled the increase in the United States prison population and have contributed to the commodification and objectification of inmate bodies. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) perpetuate violence in organized and efficient ways. The commodified animal body- controlled through confinement, restriction, and pain- systemically parallels the treatment of inmate bodies. Just as the PIC maintains itself through lobbying efforts, law and manipulation of public opinion, CAFOs have relied on lobbying efforts, deregulation, and profiteering to fuel growth. Central to these industries is the invisibility of their operations. Both of them rely on a “post regulatory” systematized objectification of bodies, the visceral nature of which would be publicly inflammatory, and thus detrimental to economic profit. Therefore, these industries have created hidden geographies that conceal their physical locations and processes while at the same time normalizing the notion that Americans need prisons to stay safe and meat to stay healthy. This article discusses the historical development of these industries and examines the meta-structures that sustain them in order to highlight the violent and oppressive social, political, and economic structures and forces behind the treatment of inmate and animal bodies.

Key words: Prison Industrial Complex, Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, oppression, exploitation, intersectionality.

In *Animal Rights Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation*, American sociologist David Nibert clearly articulates the ways that oppression becomes rooted in capitalist societies. Simply put, Nibert argues that profit-making and the concomitant competition for resources characteristic of capitalist praxis leads to the elimination or exploitation of the “other”. That is, human beings will strive either to eliminate groups that they perceive to be unlike themselves when those groups can adversely affect their economic interests or exploit them when they can enhance their interests. Social arrangements evolve

on the basis of this oppressive and exploitative treatment leading to “the construction and propagation of ideas that devalue the oppressed” (Nibert 14). Ideologies like racism, classism, and speciesism are produced to underscore the differences between the oppressor and the oppressed as well as to assure the continued devaluation of the latter. It is in these ideological contexts that prejudice arises, discrimination is commonly practiced, and oppression becomes part of the status quo. From here the process cycles back to reinforce the “economically and elite-driven dispersal, elimination, or exploitation of the ‘other’” (14). Capitalism then is a system that results in the objectification and marginalization of human and nonhuman animals as they are used as tools or commodities in the pursuit of wealth and profit.

Nowhere is the act of violence more complete, sustained, and systematically codified than in the prison-industrial complex (PIC). Through overt physical domination, the psychological and bodily control of inmates is maintained. Lobbying by the private prison industry and the war on drugs and terror have fuelled the increase in the United States prison population and have contributed to the commodification and objectification of inmate bodies. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) also perpetrate violence in organized and efficient ways. The commodified animal body- controlled through confinement, restriction, and pain-systemically parallels the treatment of inmate bodies. Just as the PIC maintains itself through lobbying efforts, law, and manipulation of public opinion, CAFOs have relied on lobbying efforts, deregulation, and profiteering to fuel growth.

It is in this context that we find the exploitation and oppression of prison inmates and nonhuman animals to be inextricably linked. This is not to equate the suffering of human and nonhuman animals as is sometimes done carelessly when some animal rights advocates refer to animals in captivity as “animal slaves” or to the slaughter of untold billions of animals as a Holocaust. As Carol Adams remarked in her book *The Sexual Politics of Meat*, some terms

such as Holocaust or slavery are so deeply connected to a particular group of people that their use in other contexts is potentially exploitative (68). However, linking the experiences of inmates and nonhumans suggests that their exploitation and oppression are interconnected, intersecting at significant socio-economic and political junctures. Here we argue that the Prison Industrial Complex and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations maintain control in part due to the invisibility of their operations. Both rely on a “post-regulatory” systematized objectification of bodies, the visceral nature of which would be publicly inflammatory, and thus detrimental to economic profit. Therefore, these industries have created hidden geographies that conceal their physical locations and processes while at the same time normalizing the notion that Americans need prisons to stay safe and meat to stay healthy. In what follows, we will examine the meta-structures that sustain each of these industries, indicating how they intersect with one another. In doing so, it is our hope that we will call attention to the violent and oppressive social, political and economic structures and forces behind the treatment of inmate and animal bodies.

The history of CAFOs dates back to the 1950’s and that of the PIC dates to the nineteenth century. For our purposes we are focusing on the historical and structural intersections of the development of these two industries. The 1980’s marks the crucial historical vector of the rise of both the factory farm and the Prison Industrial Complex. At the core of the rise of these two industries rests the Reagan administration. Deregulation motivated by a tacit acceptance of a Friedmanian “market” approach- an approach which advocates that corporate “social responsibility” is intrinsically subversive to the capitalist system and any form of social concern by government or corporations above the concerns of providing value for shareholders ultimately leads to totalitarianism-resulted in many individual sectors no longer having regulatory oversight from governmental agencies (Friedman 119).

The Farm Crisis, Big Agribusiness, and the Development of the CAFO

For our treatment of the rise of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, we focus on the results of the deregulation of the agricultural sector and the subsequent removal of protections (e.g. farm subsidies) that had formally safeguarded the small and medium family farm. The 1980s saw mass foreclosures of the American family farm, the advent of mass land speculation, and the development of Big Agribusiness.

By 1985 mid-level family farms (farms earning between 40,000- and 249,999 dollars per year) had grown to account for a fourth of all farms in the United States (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture 3). The farm indebtedness crisis of the 1980's would see these mid-level farms suffering the most even though they produced 60 percent of all the commodities of the United States. By 1984 farm debt had reached 215 billion dollars; double what it had been in 1978. For the first time in US history farm indebtedness interest payments had exceeded farm income (Ball, Beatty 442). This resulted in exponential increases in farm foreclosures and the decimation of many rural communities as rural banks fell into receivership and rural industries and services went bankrupt. In fact, the Minnesota State Department of Agriculture had determined that every farm foreclosure in Minnesota resulted in the loss of three non-farm related jobs (Kabat, Paul 50). Large companies like Monsanto, JBS Five Rivers, Sanderson Farms and Smithfield's subsidiary Murphy-Brown and investors would use these conditions to rapidly expand their growth. Sanderson Farms, the third largest poultry producer, saw its profits nearly double during the 1980's, posting earnings of 125 million dollars in 1982 and then 371 million dollars by 1994 (Funding Universe). Today Sanderson Farms posts annual profits of 1.79 billion dollars (Sanderson Farms).

In 1987 investor-owned farm management companies farmed over 62.6 million acres giving birth to Big Agribusiness. At the time, corn, biotech, and Concentrated Animal

Feeding Operations were intertwined into a complex network of inter-structurally supported industries. Big Agribusiness in general and CAFOs in particular developed as a result of Reagan administration policies that led to deregulation, cost reduction, and elimination of trade barriers in the agricultural sector. Furthermore, government agricultural policies during the 1980's incentivized the lowering of farm production costs via assembly line manufacturing processes and smaller workforces. The intended consequence of such practices was lower consumer food costs. This strategy unfortunately failed as food prices in fact rose 36% and farm profits diminished by corresponding 36% during this time (DeMarco 26).

Though automated factory systems for raising animals for human consumption predate the Reagan era, it can be clearly demonstrated that deregulation and the growth of Big Agribusiness gave rise to the rapid expansion of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations during Reagan's administration. Today large corporations dominate animal production accounting for 83.5% of beef production, 66% of pork production, and 58.5% of chicken production (Hendrickson, 1-2). At the heart of this lies the 257,000 animal feed operations of which only around 15,000 meet the narrow criteria to fall under government regulation. As per economies of scale CAFO's have become the standard means of production as smaller farms have adopted its practices.

Private Prison Companies

For our purposes the Prison Industrial Complex is a term that refers to the complex network of laws, industries, political influences, and states of mind that maintain and monetize both the public and private prison industry. Throughout different times in American history, the privatization of incarceration had occurred. However, as a result of the collusion of several factors, it is the 1980's that sees the exponential increase in the private prison industry.

Enacted by New York governor Nelson Rockefeller, the 1973 Rockefeller drug laws became the strictest laws to mandate sentences for the possession as well as distribution of various classes of drugs. The criminalization of drug possession would profoundly alter the American penal landscape. Prisons for decades, at least by decree if not by practice were charged with reform, rehabilitation, and crime prevention in order to inhibit recidivism. Though criticised at the time for making non-violent crimes such as drug-distribution equivalent to murder, “Tough on Crime” laws began to spread across the nation as public opinion would come to see these laws as a socially beneficial response to a high crime rate. With the advent of these laws, which criminalized drug addiction, the carceral system, of which the Prison Industrial Complex plays a significant role, lowered “the level from which it becomes natural and acceptable to be punished” (Foucault 303), resulting in an increase in the numbers of people sent to prison. This in turn set the stage for social, political, legal, and economic institutions to accept and justify the use of prisoner bodies as economic units.

Prison overcrowding and the rising cost of incarceration, then, would become a boon to the private prison industry. Suffering from financial pressure, state and local authorities beginning in 1984 began to contract out prison operations to the private sector. As a result, the three largest private prison corporations, Corrections Corporation of American (CCA) the GEO Group, and Community Education Center were formed in the 1980’s.

Private prisons account for only 3.5 % of the United States massive population of 2,266,800 incarcerated adults (Glaze). Though relatively small in number, these institutions form the vanguard in monetizing labor practices- practices that would prove to be vital to a surprising cross section of American industry. From 1984-1994 penitentiary profits would rise from 392 million dollars to 1.31 billion dollars. Currently at least 37 states allow private industries to contract through Federal Prison Industries (UNICOR and FPI) whose labor is supplied through the Federal Bureau of Prisons (Palaez). The list of corporations using prison

labor is staggering: IBM, Boeing, Motorola, Microsoft, AT&T Wireless, Texas Instrument, Dell, Compaq, Honeywell, Hewlett-Packard, Nortel, Lucent Technologies, 3Com, Intel, Northern Telecom, Nordstrom's, Revlon, Macy's Pierre Cardin, Target Stores, and many, many more (Corrections Corporation of America). Federal inmates received \$1.25 an hour for their work allowing some inmates to send as much as \$200 to \$300 home if the penitentiary does not use the money to offset the cost of their incarceration. Prisoners in private prisons fair far worse earning 17 cents an hour which amount to about \$20.00 a month (The Prison Policy Initiative).

The accelerated profits of the prison industrial complex have spawned a new sub-industry seeking out prisoners with the longest sentences. Prison overcrowding in Texas would result in a profit sharing contract with Corrections Corporation of America to house prisoners, particularly those with the longest sentences, in order to guarantee a longer period of surplus value production. Lobbying is a central component to the institution by managing public opinion and leveraging new contracts. A cornerstone of CCA lobbying efforts has included contracting the penitentiary needs for entire states. In 2011 the private prison industry spent 45 million dollars in lobbying efforts. The same year Corrections Corporation of America posted 161 million dollars in profits (Munuz 1).

Not unlike Big Agribusiness, deregulation, privatization and the free market approach gave rise to the modern prison industrial complex. In both cases private industry provided the vanguard of best practices for the industrial sector. In Big Agribusiness the implementation and propagation of CAFOs became a best practice throughout the farm industry regardless of scale of facility, resulting in a new way of talking about food animals and their use. In new discourses and practices that support Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, animals are objectified and commodified. Carol Adams refers to these discourses and practices as the cycle of objectification, fragmentation, and consumption. She writes:

This process allows fragmentation, or brutal dismemberment, and finally consumption... Consumption is the fulfilment of oppression, the annihilation of will, of separate identity. So too with language: a subject first is viewed, or objectified, through metaphor. Through fragmentation the object is severed from its ontological meaning. Finally, consumed, it exists through what it represents. The consumption of the referent reiterated its annihilation as a subject of importance in itself (73).

Thus nonhuman animal bodies are disassembled and reduced to their parts without reference to the living being and his/her body: it is beef, not cow flesh and pork not pig flesh; it is a tenderloin, pork chop or breast meat. All of this is done to prevent both producer and consumer from identifying with a living being- from looking into her eyes, smelling her breath, hearing her voice. Further concealing the sentient nature of the animal is the language of economics. The industry does not speak of the inherent worth of the animal, but of her monetary value- the animal (or her body parts) is a product- an object or commodity that is brought and sold. Guided by profit-making, market forces shape how the industry thinks about and treats the animal. Animals are not given names, but instead numbers. They have no opportunity to interact with their own species or the human species in any relational way. That is, they are unable to establish intra- or interspecies social groups. All aspects of their lives are controlled and their living conditions are completely human-made. In the physical structures of these facilities, animals have “no access to outside air, no dirt, no sunlight, and no capacity for natural movement or activities such as grooming, play, exercise, unaided reproduction, or the like” (DeMello 133). Antibiotics, hormones, genetic modification, manipulation of lighting and food are used to protect the “product” from disease and to increase yield (155) which of course multiplies the profit for the corporations that operate these facilities.

The private prison industry, though managing only a small portion of the overall prison population, created management practices that monetized and commodified every aspect of prison life- particularly inmates' bodies and their labor. Private prison industries and public prisons share strategies in this complex network of administration, low cost labor, production, and consumerism. At the core of this network is the inmate's body whose primary value to the industry is low input and a sustainable workforce. The prison industry as such requires a highly networked systemic and procedural mechanism to acquire said labor. Beginning with social ostracization via criminalization of an entire class of persons, the prison industry is fuelled by America's ethno-racial history. Though conceptions of race in United States history is no the explicit subject of this chapter, it is essential to the functions of the systems we are delineating. Recall here David Nibert's theory of oppression: hierarchical ideologies like racism highlight the differences between the exploiter and the exploited (in this case the private prison industry/corporate America and prison inmates who are predominately people of color), resulting in the sustained diminution of the latter. The mass incarceration of United States citizens requires that a dominant status group must simultaneously ostracize and exploit a subordinate group that is imbued with a historically negative social capital (Waquant 383). The prison industry relies on this subjugation and requires a complex array of social systems to maintain its existence such as lobbying, asymmetrical judicial punishment and mass media. Sociologist Loic Waquant argues that in order to maintain a stable workforce the prison industry must maintain four key elements (282): stigma, constraint, territorial confinement, and institutional encasement.

For Waquant the prison serves as a surrogate ghetto wherein the stigma of poverty is replaced by the psychosocial and legal forces of incarceration (e.g. restrictions in voting). Criminal disenfranchisement laws, however, are not limited to voting: collateral legal measures such as denial of access to employment, housing, and other facilities prevent former

inmates from freely engaging in community outside of prison. This negative cultural capital of stigma increases the likelihood of recidivism. In inmates are commodities, then recidivism is a value to the prison industrial complex.

Constraint of inmate bodies while incarcerated and subsequent to incarceration is both a concrete physical entity fortified by walls and architecture, and a systemic social form. With the advent of the Rockefeller laws of the 1970's, prison "walls" encompassed an increasingly broad section of the social body. As prisons became the go-to solution for a host of social problems, complex systems of constraint would evolve. As the adaptive behaviour to incarceration such as language, systems of exchange, and ethics persist beyond the prison walls, individuals suffer a form of "constraint alienation" which serves to normalize prison within the human cycle of life. Constraint is deeply connected to territorial confinement which includes prison and redlined communities whose borders are surveilled by police. This results in severe limitation in access to housing, food, education, and employment. Institutionalized psychosocial stigmatization, constraint of body, alienation, and confinement to set territories encases swaths of the U.S. population in a highly networked school to prison pipeline.

The result of this collusion of elements is a composite structure that controls a population that is physically marginalized by geography, constraint, repetition and spatial control. In prison industries the body is reduced to a function that provides profit and can be understood most effectively as an incorporate thing whose primary value can be best understood as an asset or liability.

Architecture and Geography

Our research began with the observation that prisons and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations share fundamentally similar formal qualities. As we observed this fact we also noted that as institutions they were not visible to much of the United States population,

hidden, in some cases, in plain view. The invisible geographies in question share geographic, architectural, and operational characteristics. Geographically large federal and corporate prisons tend to be located in states with lower populations; correspondingly they are often located in remote locations. Large prisons, both federal and private, are often found in the south and west. The states have lower population densities, high poverty rates, and spend a greater percentage of general fund expenditures to maintain prisons. They also have the highest number of CAFO's for cattle, broiler chickens and dairy cows (the notable exception is for hogs with the greatest number of hog operations centered in the Midwest).

Architecturally, both CAFO's and modern prisons share similar formal structures and attributes as can be most readily identified by their respective aerial views. Both building types are constructed on large planes with single rectilinear structures at the center. Functionally these kinds of structures tend to maximize the number of occupants and minimize the staff required to maintain the daily operations and surveillance needs of the buildings.

Camouflage is also an inherent element of both CAFO's and Prisons. The planar construction of prisons and CAFO's increases the visual relationship with the horizon which minimizes the visibility and one's ability from a distance to determine the scale of the building or groups of buildings. Some prisons such as Florence ADX have adopted two-tone color schemas to heighten the visual effect of blending with the environment. Two-tone color schemas with a tertiary color at the base and lighter tone on top tend to confuse the ability to distinguish ground from sky. For prisons, perhaps the most chilling "in plain sight" placement and architectural approach can be seen in the Corrections Corporation of America's CAI Boston Avenue Prison in San Diego California. House in a residential and light industry zoned neighbourhood, it rests adjacent to a Burger King and is unmarked and matches its surroundings. In so far as the aesthetics of prison architecture is concerned, we

should note here that though one can identify these characteristics formally we can prove no intention to these designs. In interesting contrast, however, there is Halden Prison in Halden, Norway whose structure is open and un-hidden yet secure, and whose material design mirrors its principles of rehabilitation. Norway, with a much larger per-capita budget, less violent crime and absence of Rockefeller Laws is confronting an entirely different penal landscape. Despite our inability to prove intention behind the observable structure of prisons in the United States, the American penal system whose principles of commodification of prison labor and minimizing cost reinforces the prison as a place of punishment, violence, and squalor- we would argue- which by necessity manifests itself in the design attributes discussed here.

Rarely seen, CAFO's also make use of a "hidden in plain view" approach. The Iowa rural landscape is replete with unmarked white and off-white colored and unmarked planar oriented buildings whose purpose is difficult to determine cursorily. Buildings that house industries, farm equipment, storage, small businesses, or Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations are virtually indiscernible.

Conclusion

A legitimate critique of capitalist economic systems is that the accumulation of capital becomes the primary goal- the *raison d'être* that drives not only economic, but also social and political life. In such societies labor is abstracted from those who perform it and capital is used to produce more capital- a process of further abstraction that excises human beings from the act of generating wealth and resources. Philosopher and sociologist, Michael Lowy points out that the capitalist economic system is "a universe where 'individuals are directed by abstractions,' (Marx), where impersonal relations and objects [Versachlicht] replace personal relations of dependence, and where the accumulation of capital becomes an end in itself and, by and large, irrational" (77). This desire to generate capital creates a "generalized pressure

for more growth and expansion,” resulting in an indifference to social and environmental problems (Loy 28). The pursuit of continuous growth and evermore capital tends to relegate the environment, human beings, and nonhuman animals to means for making profit (90) thereby causing great harm and suffering to the exploited and allowing those in positions of power to amass great wealth.

Elucidating how this process works, the anthropologist Michael Taussig in his book, *The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America*, writes that the market organization of human affairs in capitalist economies converts essential human qualities into commodities (4). These qualities such as labor are abstracted from their social context and connection to the natural world and turned into things or object that can be bought and sold on the market. In the spirit of Lowy and Tasussig, we would suggest that in capitalist cultures human relations become depersonalized and living beings (both human and nonhuman) as unique individuals, and not just their essential qualities, are abstracted from their social and relational realities and turned into things that can be purchased, sold, and/or discarded at will. They become capital generating commodities, resources rather than living beings with intrinsic value.

Patricia Collins refers to the overall organization of power in a society as a “matrix of domination”- a concept she uses to explain how social, political, and economic systems support and propagate oppression and exploitation (Collins 221-238). “Matrix of domination” is particularly helpful for understanding not only how the PIC and CAFOs perpetuate the suffering of inmates in prisons and nonhumans in factory farms, but also how these intersecting systems of oppression are organized. Collins identifies four interrelated

domains of power. These include the structural, disciplinary, hegemonic, and interpersonal domains. In this chapter our discussion focuses primarily on the first two.¹

The structural domain includes social constructions such as law, politics, religion and the economy (Allen 8-9). “Tough on crime” policies, for example, support the prison industrial complex assuring that there will be inmates available for cheap labor in private, state, and federal prisons: “Three strikes and you’re out” laws (laws which impose life sentences for a crime- no matter how minor- if the defendant has had two prior convictions for serious or violent offenses²) and the criminalization of drug possession (in addition to drug distribution) have both contributed to an increase in the prison population. Similarly, government agricultural and economic policies such as deregulation of the industry, elimination of trade barriers, and incentives for automation of agricultural practices have influenced the growth and size of factory farms. The point here of course is that law and public policy at both the state and federal levels support a socio-political infrastructure that encourages economic gain through the exploitation of living beings- here, inmates and nonhuman animals.

The disciplinary domain “manages oppression” and includes bureaucratic organizations that manipulate and direct the behaviour and activities of living beings “through routinization, rationalization, and surveillance” (Allen, 8-9). The architecture of prison buildings and animal confinement operations, for example, facilitates the regulation and observation of both inmates and animals. Both facilities structurally separate their

¹ The hegemonic domain legitimates oppression. This domain is made up of the “language we use, images we respond to, values we hold, and ideas we entertain, and it is produced through school curricula and textbooks, religious teachings, mass media images and contexts, community cultures, family histories, etc” (Allen 8-9). The interpersonal domain influences “everyday life and is made up of the personal relationships we maintain as well as the different interactions that constitute our daily life” (Allen, 8-9). Though we do not address these two components of the matrix of domination, they certainly apply to discussions of the Prison Industrial Complex and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations.

² There is some indication that support for “tough on crime” laws might be waning. In the recent 2014 elections, California voters passed proposition 47 that reclassifies nonviolent crimes including drug possession as misdemeanours instead of felonies. See Zachary Norris’ article (2014) in the Huffington Post entitled “The Vote Is In: It’s Time to Replace “Tough on Crime” with Jobs Not Jails.”

charges by keeping them in cages or behind bars; they confine them out in the open so they can be under constant supervision, recording their every activity in writing; they control movement by regulating the amount of living space for each individual and access to the outdoors (e.g. some prisons allow outdoor exercise at certain times of the day and some hog confinement facilities and milking operations open tot doors to the outside to let fresh air in); they limit contact with members of the opposite sex; and they both are hidden from the larger social contexts.³ This last point is particularly important. Prisons and CAFOs are concealed from the public view by the remoteness of their location or by hiding them “in plain view”; moreover, they are often surrounded by walls, high fences, and/or barbed wire- constructed this way as much for keeping the external world out as for keeping charges in. The vey structure of these facilities, then, serves to “inculcate docility and produce delinquency by the same mechanism” (Foucault, 302); they support efforts to direct, manipulate, and regulate the living beings within their walls.

The Prison Industrial complex and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations operated as components of a carceral network (Foucault 301), sharing similar social, political, economic, and legislative structures. Our concept of invisible geographies emphasizes those indistinct and networked systems that normalize and justify punishment and/or confinement to those “outside” the penal system and factory farm. The economic viability of such geographies incentivizes recidivism for those “within” the penal system and encourages the constant supply of nonhuman animal bodies for the factory farm. Throughout this study we have addressed the interdependence of social systems that concretize in the form of the PIC and the CAFO. Thus, we argue that the Prison Industrial Complex and the Concentrated

³ These mechanisms of power and control found in twenty-first century prison complexes and CAFOs are nearly identical to those Foucault describes in his *Discipline and Punish*. He writes, “ This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded... all this constitutes a compact model of disciplinary mechanism” (197). For a detailed Foucauldian analysis of hog confinement operations see Dawn Coppin’s article entitles “Foucauldian Hog Futures: The Birth of Mega- Hog Farms”

Animal Feeding Operation as political and socio-economic institutions comprise a “matrix of domination” supported by intersecting structural and disciplinary practices, bureaucracies, and ideologies. Any attempt to correct the injustices experienced by people in prisons and nonhuman animals in CAFOs must interrogate and deconstruct the underlying social, political, and economic systems that perpetuate exploitation and oppression in both.

Works Cited

- Allan, Kenneth D. "Chapter 16 Web Byte-Patricia Hill Collins." *Contemporary Social and Sociological Theory: Visualizing Social Worlds*. Web. 13 Nov. 2014.
- Adams, Carol. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (Twentieth Anniversary Edition). New York: Continuum Press, 2010. Print.
- Ball, Heather, Beatty Lelland "Blowing Away the Family Farmer: The Debt Tornado." *The Nation*, v239. Nov. 1984:1442-444. Print
- Collins, Patricia. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990. Print.
- Coppin, Dawn. "Foucauldian Hog Futures: The Birth of the Mega-Hog Farms." *The Sociological Quarterly* 44.4 (Autumn, 2003): 597-616. Print.
- Correction Corporation of America. *Annual Report: Partnership in Action, Building Value for Stakeholders*. United States Securities and Exchange Commission Washington, D.C. 20549 Form 10-L : Corrections Corporation of America, 2011
- DeMarco, Susan "A Fresh Crop of Ideas: State Sows the Seeds of a New Agriculture," *The Progressive*, v53 (January 1989), 26-31. Print
- DeMello, Margo. *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012. Print.
- Friedman, Milton. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1962. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977. Print.
- Glaze, Lauren E. Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Correctional Populations in the United States*, 2010. Dec 2011: 6-9. Print.
- Hendrickson, Mary and Heffernan, William. "Concentration of Agricultural Markets April 2007." *Food Circles*. U of Missouri, April 2007. Web 9 Nov. 2014.
- Kabat, Paul, "The Farmer in the Cell," *The Progressive*, v49 (November 1985), 50.
- Lowy, Michael. "Marx, Weber and the Critique of Capitalism." *Logos: a journal of Modern Society & Culture* 1.3 (2002): 77-88. Web. 12 Nov. 2014.
- Loy, David. *Money, Sex, War, Karma: Notes for a Buddhist Revolution*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2008. Print.
- Munuz, Laura and Burke, Garance. "Clarification: Private Prisons-Immigrants Story." *The Big Story*. Associated Press, Sept-Oct. 2012. Web. 11 Nov. 2014.

- Norris, Zachary. "The Vote Is In: It's Time to Replace 'Tough on Crime' With 'Jobs Not Jails.'" The Blog. Huffington Post. 10 Nov. 2014. Web. 13 Nov. 2014.
- Pelaez, Vicky. "Global Research." Global Research. N.p., n.d. Web. 26 Mar. 2014
- Reimund, Donn Alvin, 1930 , Brooks, Nora L. , Velde, Paul D. , United States. Dept. of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. The U.S. Farm Sector in the 1980's. May 1986. Print.
- "Sanderson Farms, Inc. History." History of Sanderson Farms, Inc. – FundingUniverse. N.p., n.d. Web. 19 Mar. 2014.
- "Sanderson Farms (SAFM)." Stock:. N.p., n.d. Web. 27 Mar. 2014.
- Taussig, Michael. The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983. Print.
- The Prison Policy Initiative. "Section III: The Prison Economy." Section 3 The Prison Economy. The Prison Policy Initiative, n.d. Web. 19 Mar. 2014.
- Waquant, Louis. "The New Peculiar Institution." Theoretical Criminology 4.3 (2000): 377–389. Print