



PROJECT MUSE®

“Becoming in Kind”: Race, Class, Gender, and Nation in Cultures of Dog
Rescue and Dogfighting

Harlan Weaver

American Quarterly, Volume 65, Number 3, September 2013, pp. 689-709
(Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: 10.1353/aq.2013.0034



➔ For additional information about this article
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/521604>

“Becoming in Kind”: Race, Class, Gender, and Nation in Cultures of Dog Rescue and Dogfighting

Harlan Weaver

In September 2002 I adopted a “pit bull” I named Haley. Rescued from euthanasia at the hands of animal control, Haley made the rounds of several foster homes before our meeting on a sunny San Francisco street. She proceeded to accompany me through the many life changes of a twenty-something graduate student: marching with me in protests and Pride parades, moving with me to Santa Cruz and then back to the Bay Area, and staying by my side as we walked through numerous public spaces. This last element of our relationship merits some discussion, because during our time together, I transitioned from female to male. While the social is always part of the personal in trans, transgender, and transsexual experiences, in my case Haley’s presence deeply shapes my world. In moments when my appearance has been at its most liminal, when I have felt vulnerable as a visibly transgender person, she has ensured my safety. Concurrently, my whiteness, queer identity, and middle-class status encourage other humans to read Haley as less threatening; in my presence, she is perceived as less dangerous. Each of us shapes who the other is. This enmeshment of our identities exemplifies what I term “becoming in kind.”

Becoming in kind signals the deep imbrications of identity and being that many relationships between humans and nonhuman animals entail. Consider gender—as the above story reveals, Haley helps make my gender expression possible, for my gender is shaped by the space between us, just as her experiences of species and breed are shaped by my race, class, and sexuality. The “kind” of becoming in kind indexes the role of these identity categories in relationships between humans and nonhuman animals. “Becoming” indicates the nonstatic, processual nature of these relationships, a sense of negotiating togetherness as an ongoing process, a becoming like that described by Rosi Braidotti as “an affect that flows, . . . a composition, a location that needs to be constructed together with, that is to say in the encounter with, others.”¹ Becoming in kind speaks to the joint building of a sense of togetherness, a we, and the kind of beings we become.

In attending to the ways togetherness shapes who we become, becoming in kind has stakes in ontology. In this sense, becoming in kind is inflected by Donna Haraway's "becoming with": a "dance of relating" in which "all the dancers are redone through the patterns they enact," processes of human/nonhuman animal encountering in which each becomes "jointly available" and through which each emerges changed.² Becomings have a rich philosophical inheritance, and Haraway's becoming with is deliberately set against another becoming: Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's "becoming animal." For Deleuze and Guattari, becoming animal elucidates connections that challenge patrilinear genealogies, connections with others produced not by resemblance or filiation but by alliance.³ These becomings are ways of being that bring into doubt individual subjectivities through relatedness without descent, kinship despite kind. However, Haraway is critical of the way Deleuze and Guattari write against "individuated animals, family pets" as participants in modes of oedipalized subjectivity they abhor, which she sees as a commitment to the sublime altogether disconnected from the ordinary fleshly relationships between humans and nonhuman animals.⁴ And while my own sense of becoming is also invested in unexpected kinships, I find that Deleuze and Guattari's becoming animal misses the ways that ontologies and identities are often mixed, for it fails to address how a statement about one's being, such as "I am transgender," can be a statement about one's categorical kind that is caught up in and shaped by one's encounters with nonhuman animals. In this sense, my becoming in kind is indebted to Haraway, Deleuze, and Guattari, but by pairing becoming with kind I aim to connect the ontological stakes of jointly crafted ways of being and unexpected kinships with the identity categories of larger social worlds.

Becoming in kind provides an important way to think through the relationship among categories such as species, breed, race, class, and gender. My use of *kind* indexes it as category and divider, as a taxonomy that shapes and is shaped by these connections. Deleuze, Guattari, and Haraway linger in this sense of kind, for it is a kind rooted in difference rather than analogy. In this sense, my pairing of becoming and kind deliberately contrasts with the parallels introduced by animal advocates between, for example, species and race.⁵ My sense of kind also contrasts with the notion of difference inherent in the introduction of the term *speciesism* by Richard Ryder and its subsequent use by Peter Singer, which relies on analogies with racism and sexism as explanatory mechanisms.⁶ What I would like to suggest by thinking through and reading for becoming in kind is an alternate way to understand the connections among species distinctions and human-specific categories. Instead of parallels or analogies, becoming in kind describes intersections. These intersections reveal how

relationships between humans and nonhuman animals provide the conditions of possibility for specific experiences of race, gender, class, sexuality, species, and breed. Because of this focus, becoming in kind has the potential to change how we understand the relationships among the categories that define humans and nonhuman animals in a way that has important implications not only for animal studies but also for scholarship invested in critical race, feminist, and queer theories.

The specific relationships among humans and nonhuman animals that shape this writing are those among “pit bulls,” dog rescuers, and dog fighters. Debates about so-called dangerous dogs and dogs perceived to be in danger provide apt case studies for thinking through the intersections of race, species, gender, breed, and nation because they reflect social conflicts about identities. What constitutes danger and in which bodies should it be localized? What kinds of measures should be taken and at whom should they be aimed? These and related questions come up all too frequently in debates about pit bulls and the people connected to them, and it is in this fertile ground that the enmeshments of human and nonhuman animal identities I name “becomings in kind” are the easiest to see.

The “Pit Bull”

Any casual Internet search about dangerous dogs today would lead one to believe that the top contender, what one might term America’s most wanted dog, is the “pit bull.” I use quotation marks because, despite the fact that it is a widely used term, there is technically no such thing as a pit bull. Keeping in mind that contemporary dog breeds are regulated and determined by kennel clubs, not biologists, one can see that this confusion is partly due to the shifting history of breed politics: the American Kennel Club (AKC), in an effort to distance its registries from dogs with reputations as fighters, began to recognize the American Staffordshire Terrier (AmStaf) in the 1930s, while the United Kennel Club (UKC) continued to register the American Pit Bull Terrier (APBT) throughout the twentieth century. Add to this the fact that the American Dog Breeder’s Association (ADBA) also has a registry for APBTs, and the confusion as to what exactly pit bull stands for is easy to see. As Malcolm Gladwell notes, pit bulls are dogs with a “category problem.”⁷

While many take the term *pit bull* as a loose indicator of all the breeds noted above, the question of phenotype, or physical characteristics, complicates matters. An Internet-based test developed by the pit bull advocate Marcy Setter illustrates the difficulties of identification: “Find-A-Bull” features a grid of

sixteen dogs ranging from thirty to eighty pounds, all registered members of bully breeds, all fairly squat, muscular, short-haired.⁸ Only one of the dogs is an APBT. Setter's point, that very few people can accurately identify any of the pit bull-type breeds just by looking, is compounded by the fact that many dogs identified as pit bulls or pit bull-type dogs are not registered with the AKC, UKC, or ADBA at all. For example, dogs identified as pit bulls by members of communities experiencing conflicts related to dog bites very rarely have a human around who can or will attest to their parentage, papers, or bodily correlation to a breed's ideal phenotype. In this sense, dogs labeled as pit bulls experience breed as a formulation that lies in the eye of the beholder, a variation of "I know it when I see it." Indeed, a recent study contrasting perceptions of breed by workers at dog adoption agencies and animal shelters with DNA samples showed only 36 percent agreement between the label of pit bull or pit bull-type and APBT- or AmStaf-specific genomic markers.⁹ Thus, while dog breeds are regulated by kennel clubs, popular perceptions of the ways breed is understood to inhere in physical characteristics, unclear understandings of the specifics of those characteristics, and the fuzziness of the term *pit bull* itself make for a tricky situation. Then there is the term *pit bull-type*, used throughout much of this piece, which attempts to address the category problems of the term *pit bull* through the looser "-type" while indicating an understanding of a kind of being, however loosely identified, shared by both advocates and foes.¹⁰ Of course, a more precise taxonomy would not address the problem of the dangerous dog as a moral category.

The practice of labeling particular breeds of dogs as dangerous requires some context. Harold Herzog points out that problems with dogs such as pit bulls and Rottweilers often reflect an increase in numbers rooted in boom and bust breed popularity cycles.¹¹ Shifting understandings of breed also affect matters, as Karen Delise reminds us when she notes that the most dangerous dog of the nineteenth century was the bloodhound, a dog designated by its purpose (often the pursuit of escaped slaves), not its appearance.¹² Indeed, breed-as-phenotype began in the twentieth century, in contrast with breed-as-purpose.¹³ Unfortunately, legal solutions to dog-related problems often perpetuate these category problems, evident in the passage of breed-specific legislation, or BSL.

BSL ranges from banning particular dog breeds and mandating their euthanasia to requiring muzzles and mandatory fence heights.¹⁴ Bans have resulted in the forcible removal of dogs from homes who are then killed by animal shelters, as was the case with a 1989 breed ban in Denver, Colorado, where even elderly dogs who had not experienced any conflicts were subject to seizure and euthanasia. Mandatory fence heights and related restrictions can also be

prohibitively expensive, making it next-to-impossible for people with lower incomes to be able to afford to keep their dogs.¹⁵ Notably, BSL has also been documented to be ineffective; the National Canine Research Council points out that “citizens of Denver continued to suffer a higher rate of hospitalization from dog-bite related injuries after the breed ban than the citizens of breed-neutral Colorado counties.”¹⁶ Further, while breed bans have been enacted in a wide range of locales, their logic is universally problematic.

The language of BSL reflects the complexities outlined above to varying degrees. “Pit bulls,” “pit bull terrier dogs,” “American Pit Bull Terriers,” “Bull Terriers,” and “pit bull–type dogs” are all targeted in different municipalities. The addition of “-type” is telling, as are common provisions that name breeds such as the APBT and AmStaf, followed by the addendum: “or any dog displaying the majority of physical traits of any one or more of the above breeds.”¹⁷ However, these laws are fairly uniform in attributing danger to dogs because of breed. For example, Des Moines, Iowa, defines “vicious dog” to include “the American Staffordshire Bull Terrier and the Pit Bull Terrier.”¹⁸ This is to say, BSL names and labels as innate (and often, unpredictable) the qualities of danger and viciousness in the bodies of specific kinds of dogs, kinds of dogs characterized by fairly fuzzy categories.¹⁹ In practice, these laws are focused on dogs with a loose conglomeration of physical characteristics such as “exaggerated jaw muscles, heavy necks and shoulders, and large physical mass,” pointing to what one might term pit bull profiling.²⁰ BSL produces pit bulls and pit bull–type dogs as criminalized beings. As Colin Dayan notes, legal rituals make and unmake particular humans and nonhuman animals, and the legal rituals clustered around dangerous dogs participate in producing the very kinds of being they regulate as criminalized by naming them criminal by nature.²¹

Dangerous Dogs and Race

As my opening vignette makes clear, pit bull identities are not only crafted through the frequently contested processes outlined above but also shaped by connections with human-specific categories.²² The most prominent among these is race. For example, pit bull advocates routinely seize on race-related language to garner sympathy for their cause. Intent on transporting dogs out of Denver, Colorado, after the passage of the breed ban, owners and allies developed what they termed a “pit bull underground railroad,” calling to mind emancipation from a race-based system of slavery.²³ Pit bull proponents deliberately appropriate terms from race-related struggles, reframing BSL as “Breed-Discriminatory Legislation” and referring to the practice of differen-

tiating between pit bulls and other dogs as “canine racism.”²⁴ Op-ed pieces critiquing anti-pit bull activists often introduce parallels between breed stigma and race: “I’m white, but if an African American or Hispanic person were to murder my entire family I wouldn’t go to my local paper and call for the demonization of all African American and Hispanic people.”²⁵ And the recent case of Lennox, a dog in Ireland who was seized and euthanized for being a pit bull-type dog, resulted in a flood of pictures on the Internet from advocates of pit bulls captioned with the phrase “I am Lennox,” a deliberate echo of an earlier meme of photos of people in hoodies protesting the 2011 killing of African American youth Trayvon Martin as racist.²⁶

The media also frequently make both implicit and explicit connections among pit bulls, race, and criminalization. Writers decrying the presence of pit bulls in urban areas characterize the dogs’ owners as “thugs,” “gangstas,” and “white trash.”²⁷ Recent stories about dogfighting center on and vilify prominent African American public figures, such as NFL quarterback Michael Vick and the rapper DMX. These stories frequently make claims that rap and hip-hop cultures are central to contemporary social problems related to pit bulls.²⁸ The language used to describe the dogs also resonates with nineteenth-century sciences of race. The criminologist Cesare Lombroso’s characterizations of criminals as being excessively large of face, overly muscled, and possessing enormous jaws, and Samuel George Morton’s depiction of so-called lower races as encumbered by protruding jaws both echo the contemporary emphasis on pit bulls’ strong jaws, heavy muscles, and large physical mass.²⁹

These examples demonstrate how the contemporary production of the pit bull in the United States as a kind of being frequently relies on, overlaps with, and connects to human racial categories. Breed histories reflect these connections, for while APBTs and AmStafs were primarily owned and bred by white men in the rural southern United States for much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in the 1980s there was an influx of urban men of color into breeding circles.³⁰ In pointing out these connections I am not positing that pit bulls are themselves racialized, a move that ignores disparities in histories of violence and species. However, the role of race in pit bull category construction speaks to this article’s central formulation: “becoming in kind.” Pit bull figurations actively and continuously connect to and draw from processes and practices of human racialization. This is especially evident in a recent and prominent legal case involving pit bulls, dogfighting, and a famous African American man.

Bad Newz Kennels

The 2007 conviction of Michael Vick on dogfighting charges drew national attention. A talented African American athlete in a position reserved for white men for most of the NFL's history—quarterback—Vick was an important public figure because of his race long before his conviction. When the federal government indicted him, stories began to surface of his cruelty to the dogs he owned, alleging his and his cohort's involvement in strangling, shooting, hanging, and electrocuting dogs who would not fight. A media storm followed, with protests staged against Vick across the country, some of which harked back to practices of lynching by hanging and burning him in effigy.³¹ Images surfaced of Vick spray-painted onto concrete walls in his football uniform, choking a dog, and in more Internet-based media, shackled to a snarling dog as if he were enslaved.³² The case was hotly debated along racial lines among dogfighters as well, many of whom saw in it the denigration of the sport by street-level style fights known to be staged in urban areas by men of color.³³ These images and stories point to how the case shaped public perceptions of who Vick is and was.

The cultural geographers Glen Elder, Jennifer Wolch, and Jody Emel have argued that when practices involving animals deemed problematic, such as dogfighting, “occur in racialized and marginalized places, such as ghetto areas, the prospects of racialization on the basis of animal practices rise higher.”³⁴ They point out that “animal bodies have become one site of political struggle over the construction of cultural difference and help to maintain white American supremacy.”³⁵ Vick's conviction by both the judiciary and the court of public opinion transformed him into a convicted criminal in serious debt with a major image problem. This transformation, concomitant with his temporary exile from the elite fraternity of the NFL, changed how people read Vick's African American masculinity. In this sense, it was not just his conviction that transformed public perceptions of Vick but also the relationships with animals on which his conviction was based.

Jim Gorant's 2010 *New York Times* best seller, *The Lost Dogs: Michael Vick's Dogs and Their Tale of Rescue and Redemption*, underscores changing perceptions of Vick in light of race. In his description of Vick, Gorant, a *Sports Illustrated* writer, highlights features such as “a strong jaw that made him look as if he had an underbite,” and culminates in an assertion that Vick's appearance, “while handsome, could be fairly described as almost canine.”³⁶ This description codes Vick as animal-like, othering him in a manner deeply reminiscent of earlier projects of human racialization through animal likeness.³⁷

Media connected to the dogs taken from Vick's Bad Newz Kennels also affected public perceptions of Vick. Gorant's book, which contains italicized passages narrated from the viewpoint of one of the dead dogs, is part of a larger advocacy movement on behalf of the dogs formerly owned by Vick. Initially understood as "some of the most viciously trained dogs in the country" by Wayne Pacelle, head of the Humane Society of the United States, the dogs from Vick's kennel came to be seen as "Vick-tims."³⁸ This transformation changed perceptions of Vick, for the danger initially seen as inhering in breed came to be localized instead in the person of Vick, an African American man. The dogs' transformation from fighters to victims played a central role in altering public understandings of who Vick was and is by changing the meanings others attached to his race and masculinity. These shifting perceptions reveal that Vick's relationship with his dogs is a becoming in kind.

Whiteness to the Rescue

Typically, federal, state, and local governments euthanize any and all dogs involved in a dogfighting bust, including those that work as government informants.³⁹ Indeed, workers at animal shelters commonly call pit bulls seized from dogfighting operations "kennel trash," for as they wait for their inevitable death, they take up shelter space that other adoptable dogs might well use.⁴⁰ However, the federal government's decision to permit the dogs involved in the Vick case to be evaluated, rehabilitated, and, if possible, placed with families denotes a shift in federal policy that changed the connections the dogs experienced between the category pit bull and race. This is especially apparent in the rescue narratives about the dogs, for they uniformly emphasize tropes common to both neoconservative and neoliberal projects of citizenship, recuperating them into a tacit whiteness.

An Internet video titled "See Them Now" posted by BAD RAP, a pit bull advocacy group involved in the Vick case, features photos of several of the postrescue dogs accompanied by a voice-over from Donna Reynolds, the group's cofounder.⁴¹ Emphasizing that the dogs' job is to "show America that pit bulls aren't monsters," Reynolds tells us that they "remind us that everyone wants and needs to be treated as an individual." Hector, a dog covered with bite scars, has "wonderful play manners." Ernie is a big dork who "wants to be friends with everybody" and happily lives in a home with a child. And Uba, who now lives with a dog and a cat, knows that "the cat is his boss, and he's happy to take on a cat as part of his family." Gorant uses similar language, pointing to the dogs' "dorkiness" and "pure unfiltered love."⁴² Much of the literature and

media coverage of the Vick dogs traffics in these tropes: the dogs are almost uniformly described as happy, unique individuals who are excellent and loving family members and have good manners. Importantly, this language is also central to contemporary practices of US citizenship.

Writing at the beginning of the Clinton administration, Lauren Berlant notes how “the intimate public sphere of the U.S. present tense renders citizenship as a condition of social membership produced by personal acts and values, especially acts originating in or directed towards the family sphere.”⁴³ This agenda continues in contemporary US politics, not just in the neoconservative “focus on the family” campaign, but also in the push for gay marriage, a central tactic of which is the deployment of rhetoric and images tying queer identities into the norms of American kinship practices. The stories of the Vick dogs reveal how nonhuman animals also participate in these practices of citizenship. In addition to their goal of finding what rescuers term “forever” homes and families, the Vick dogs became more literal aspiring citizens, for one of the main goals for all the dogs is that they pass the Canine Good Citizen Test.⁴⁴ Where and how this canine citizenship intersects with the citizen-acts of family-oriented dog rescuers, and how both parties relate to “tacit whiteness,” merit further attention.

For Berlant, two figures are central to the discourses of reactionary conservative politics: the American fetus and the American child. She calls them “supericons,” reading them as “the last living American[s] not yet bruised by history . . . not yet caught up in the confusing identity exchanges made possible by mass consumption and ethnic, racial, and sexual mixing.” Further, she notes how both the fetus and the child’s lack of knowledge, agency, and accountability give them ethical claims on the adult political agents who write laws and administer resources.⁴⁵ Not-yet citizens, Berlant’s innocent supericons require that others advocate on their behalf; unmarked by the categories of difference so divisive to contemporary US society, they participate in an invisible racialization, a tacit whiteness.

The rescued and rehabilitated Vick dogs, cleansed of the taint of dogfighting by their rehabilitation, represented as innocent victims, and transformed into iconic family members, participate in the national public sphere in ways remarkably similar to Berlant’s supericons. Indeed, the very shift in federal policy that enabled their initial salvation—and I use the term *salvation* deliberately, as the language of “second chance” runs rampant in their stories—is a case of adult political agents’ acknowledging their ethical claim on both the law and the resources at its disposal. Of course, unlike the fetus and the child, these dogs will never become real US citizens. Rather, in aspiring to pass the

Canine Good Citizen Test, they aim to become good cultural citizens even as they are unable to act as political citizens. Notably, publicity on behalf of other rescued pit bull–type dogs deploys similar tropes.

Rescue groups that work with pit bulls routinely describe them as fun-loving, exuberantly happy, sweet, affectionate dogs who crave human attention.⁴⁶ Pictures of dogs engaged in cross-species love with humans and other animals and depictions of dogs as productive members of society abound in this type of media. For example, stories about dogs who have become certified therapy dogs are prolific, as in the case of Ruby, a pit bull–type dog who now works with elderly folks in a nursing home.⁴⁷ Leo, another Vick dog, earned the nickname “Dr. Leo” from hospital staff because of “the healing joy he brought to cancer patients” in his work as a therapy dog.⁴⁸ Affective labor in the strong sense, these dogs’ work affirms their place in US American families and homes.

The work of former rescue dogs underscores my central point about the dogs taken from Vick’s kennels, for the changes they undergo in terms of the category pit bull rely on changes in their relationship to the categories of race and nation. No longer partnered with “thugs,” these hardworking canine citizens have been very publicly removed from their position as victims of abuse. Recoded as “unique individuals” with stories to tell and love to give, these dogs participate in families in ways that connect them to a tacit, normative whiteness. They become pit bulls who are committed to the greater social good, pit bulls with stakes in home-life, pit bulls whose loving families need to advocate for them to further distance them from the taint of their bad reputation, or “bad rap.” In living, training, and becoming with the humans who are committed to their rescue, these dogs undergo alterations in their experience of kind.

On Rescue

The experiences of dog rescuers involved in the Vick case and others like it are also forms of becoming in kind. Detailing the labor and emotional toll of care and love in dog rescue, Gorant describes a volunteer who worked with the Vick dogs during their shelter confinement, Nicole Rattay. Noting that “Rattay was quickly growing attached to the dogs and this caused her distress, . . . they made her cry . . . every night,” Gorant sympathizes with Rattay’s admiration for “how resilient and loving” the dogs were.⁴⁹ One can join this narrative with that of the pit bull advocate Ken Foster, who finds that each time he rescues a dog, he has a puzzling epiphany, “wondering if I’m doing it for them or whether in rescuing them, I’m actually doing something for myself.”⁵⁰ Another dog rescuer, Terry Bain, underscores the power of this connection, noting that dog rescue can transform your heart, giving it “an even greater capacity to love.”⁵¹

The sense of a self made more whole by the act of rescue reflects the ways that dog rescuers are changed by encounters with their canine charges. The prominence of the term *rescue* in their accounts reveals an identity rooted in salvation. While inflected by religion—one Vick dog adopter, upon meeting her charge, is moved to help “this beautiful soul”—this salvation also relies on geography, for it hinges on moving these dogs out of the woods and/or the streets, out of animal shelters, and into homes.⁵² David Delaney notes that the space of home is one among many spaces that race makes, and while the spaces into which these dogs are moved are inflected by whiteness, as Berlant makes clear, they are also shaped by class.⁵³ It can be difficult to rent a home and own any dog in many urban US municipalities, much less a pit bull–type dog, the looseness of whose category is no impediment to insurers’ denial of coverage or charging higher rates. These factors reveal that the homes made more whole by a rescued dog are homes that are themselves made possible by the financial resources of the middle class. The identities of the animal rescuers whose hearts and homes are made whole reveal becomings in kind shaped by class as well as race, changes all the more notable when contrasted with the writings of white southern dog men.⁵⁴

Becoming Dog Men

Dogfighters, or dog men, are seen as the diabolical enemy by dog rescuers, humane organizations, law enforcement, and most animal lovers. While contemporary dogfighting involves dog men from both urban and rural contexts, often divided along racial lines, throughout much of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries most American dog men were white men located in the southern United States. Importantly, these men were in conversation with each other through underground breed magazines and semisecret publications in obscure presses. Because it is difficult to gain access to the more web-based contemporary discussions, I focus here on writings from underground publications dating from the 1970s through the 1990s.⁵⁵ These writings reveal an alternate formation of becoming in kind, one with stakes in a different kind of whiteness, but one, like that of the rescuers, cemented by kinship and love.

The unique individual pit bull so prominent in stories about the Vick dogs and pro–pit bull media is central to the narratives of dog men and game dog fanciers. Ed Faron and Chris Faron, the authors of *The Complete Gamedog*, describe their mistake in matching Pinky in terms of ignoring her individuality: “Instead of looking at each dog as an individual, a lot of the time we would tend to assume that if a dog acted hot and was at least 18 months old it was ‘ready.’”⁵⁶ They go on to exhort their readers to tailor their conditioning and

testing to the individual dog. Elaborate accounts of individual dogs' matches and detailed descriptions of particularly prized dogs' personalities further this emphasis, especially as such tales figure prominently in the readings of individual dogs critical to dog men's genealogies, both human and nonhuman.

Like rescued dogs, fighting dogs participate in human families. Writing of the loss of Mean Jolene in a match against Sadie, the Farons describe not only how much they loved her and how they believe that Jolene died doing what she loved doing but also how they value her as a family member, stating: "We bid farewell to you, Jolene, and feel privileged to have been able to call you one of our family."⁵⁷ Another white southern dog man, Thomas Garner, proudly displays an 11" by 14" picture of his stud dog "Ch Pedro" beside his children's pictures on his office wall.⁵⁸ And while game dogs' names are often prefaced by the kennel in which they were bred—Wildside's Mean Jolene, for example—it is also common for them to retain the patronymic of their breeder, as in the Boudreaux line of dogs. The language of these naming practices often crosses human and nonhuman animals in additional ways, as in the following description of Roadblock's Grand Champion: "Joey beat three top dogmen with good dogs for his championship, and then went on to beat two champions and a grand champion for his next three matches."⁵⁹ Because dog men retain these patronymics to track dogs' genealogies, and because dogs are often gifted to or fostered by other dog men, the dogs cement a kinship network among dogfighters and dog men. Dog men's relationships with their dogs also explicitly incorporate an affect often tied to family: love.

Bobby Hall, an old-timer dog man, describes a moment when a woman asks Earl Tudor, one of his idols in the world of dog men, "Just what kind of S.O.B. does it take to fight dogs?" And Earl replied, "Lady, it takes a man who loves dogs very much."⁶⁰ The touch of this love comes through in Hall's writing about handling, the job of the person in the fighting pit with the dog. Describing a conversation with Tudor during which Hall holds a dog, Hall relates Tudor's words to him: "I have watched you and you have picked up and handled each dog as if you were in the pit with them." Hall replies, "It makes me feel closer to them." Hall's description of Tudor's response is telling: "Peering gently over the top of his glasses, he cleared his throat so the emotion feeling would permit him to reply in a low church tone and with tenderness he said 'Bobby, it makes them feel closer to you, too.'" Tudor then congratulates Hall on a recent win, and Hall notes, "Well, after he told me this it was all I needed, a little pat on the back from the master."⁶¹

Hall and Tudor's exchange reveals how dog men navigate a form of masculinity through the bodies of their dogs. Tales traded among dog men tend to be

filled with paeans to the older dog men who introduced the younger ones to the game. While some are brief—"I owe everything I know to Ron"—others are more intimate, as Hall's story reveals.⁶² The process of introduction involves established dog men's not only bringing a newcomer to an underground fight but also letting him buy into their bloodlines, a practice of kinship cemented through dog breeding. Introductions are also something of an apprenticeship: "If you're lucky, someone who is already established in the game will take you under his wing and teach you everything he knows."⁶³ These ties between older and younger dog men reveal how the practices that bring these white southern dog men together, fighting and breeding pit bulls, also bring them into a shared masculinity in which the kind of man one becomes is fundamentally shaped by connections with other men made possible through the bodies of pit bulls. Not only is this masculinity very homosocial, as Hall and Tudor's exchange reveals, but it is also white.

Ed Faron's description of being arrested on suspicion of dogfighting while living in North Carolina highlights his understanding of race. Writing "I found myself in a cell block where I was the only white person, which I guess was just another way they were trying to mess with my head," Faron distinguishes himself from other prisoners.⁶⁴ Notable in naming whiteness, the implicit norm of most of these dog men's accounts, Faron's description of his placement as a deliberately offensive measure speaks to his understanding of himself as someone whose whiteness would normally keep him out of such spaces. He narrates an increased sense of not-belonging in this jail space the following morning, when he is overwhelmed and irritated by the "Motown music" played by his fellow prisoners, almost all of whom are men of color, and many of whom he met previously when he repossessed their belongings while working as a repo man.⁶⁵ For Faron, his placement in this space signifies a change in his experience of white masculinity, one tainted not only by its association with dogfighting but also by race and class. As a white man and suspected dogfighter, Faron has been categorized with the men of color who were previously unhappy participants in his labor as a repossession agent. Like Hall's and others' ties to fellow dog men, Faron's arrest reveals how he and they become in kind with their fighting dogs, for their experiences of the intersections of whiteness, class, and masculinity are fundamentally shaped by their relationships with pit bulls.

Some Kind of Love

It is notable that all the relationships I examine in this article involve love. Even Vick has gone on record to publicly affirm that he loves dogs.⁶⁶ But what kind

of love is this, especially given the many ways in which it is neither innocent nor liberatory? And how is this love part of the becomings in kind that I read in these relationships? At the beginning of this article, I laid out the ways that “becoming in kind” speaks to the overlaps in identity and ontology experienced by humans and nonhuman animals. As the dogfighters I write with reveal, while the becomings I read are like Haraway’s “becoming with” in that humans and nonhuman animals emerge changed from an encounter, they are not the kinds of becomings that necessarily build better shared worlds. To get at the ethics and politics I hope to draw from becoming in kind, I take up how it is caught up in specific affects like love by outlining how I am in conversation with not only Haraway but also Vinciane Despret, a feminist philosopher of science.

Despret thinks through “attunement” as a way to articulate the changes to both humans and nonhuman animals enabled by practices of relating. Describing an experiment in which students were given ostensibly smart and dumb groups of rats to raise in order to see whether the students’ expectations of the rats would shape the rats’ performances (which they did), Despret finds that the rats and the students became attuned.⁶⁷ She argues that the students conveyed their trust to the rats through caressing, manipulating, handling, and encouraging them, gestures that attuned the rats to the students’ beliefs. For Despret, “These beliefs brought into existence new identities for the students and for the rats.”⁶⁸ The students and rats emerged differently, into new identities, because of the touches exchanged between them.

Love and touch are key to the interspecies ontologies Haraway and Despret describe. Despret argues that the trust that makes the students and rats become available to each other is tied to love. Quoting Isabelle Stengers, who notes that “trust is one of the many names for love, and you can never be indifferent to the trust you inspire,” Despret reads trust as a practice of love that facilitates the ontological shifts prompted by attunement.⁶⁹ Haraway’s sense of love is less wholesome—she describes her relationship with her dog as follows: “Significantly other to each other, in specific difference, we signify in the flesh a nasty developmental infection called love.”⁷⁰ These kinds of love make clear how touching and loving encounters shape experiences from which humans and nonhuman animals emerge changed. Love is part of becomings.

The loves that shape the becomings in kind I read among pit bulls, pit bull rescuers, and dog men are similar to those outlined by Haraway and Despret. The bodily intimacy of handling, apparent in Hall’s use of massage as part of his “duty and obligation to give 100% total dedication to this gladiator going into battle,” is a form of love conveyed through touch.⁷¹ And love features in dog men’s stories not only in the ways the men are driven by “the love of this

great dog”⁷² but also in accounts like that of Mean Jolene, who they claim died “doing what she loved best.”⁷³ Love is omnipresent in rescuers’ stories that tell of the ways rescue acts as a way to expand one’s heart and highlight how rescued dogs do love-oriented labor as canine good citizens. However, love is also central to rescuers’ advocating a better kind of death. Arguing against the outsourcing of the work of rescue to often poorly funded animal sanctuaries, the pit bull activist Jessica Dolce advocates another form of love through contact: “Putting them to sleep, in your arms, can be the greatest act of love you can give to your pet.”⁷⁴ These are undoubtedly funny kinds of love.

Parallels between Despret’s rats and Hall’s dogs also reveal important differences among these loves, for dogfighters’ loves are laced with power dynamics. Like the rats, the dogs are eager to move into the identities their handlers desire. Unlike the rats, these dogs are directed into violence. While many dogs bred for fighting do not like to fight, some do. Indeed, many dogs love to fight—called “dead game” by proud handlers—even as many other dogs, also bred by dog men, would be happy never to fight. Dog men like Hall express a love that is a way to gain money, a love that makes me uneasy, not only because a dogfight is terrible to witness, but also because this love, even when the dogs also love to participate in fighting, is a love that extracts profit from the bodies of the dogs it breeds, maims, and kills. The love of Hall and others is a love shaped by power, money, and blood, but not necessarily a love that makes for better, healthier dogs.

The loves under discussion here are inextricably tied to contemporary political discussions about not only animals but also race, gender, and nation. Perceptions of love are often the basis for public discussions about whether a relationship with an animal is good or ethical. Indeed, the love that animal rescuers speak about is a love drawn from the language of political discourse that asks us to “make love, not war,” a love connected to justice. However, as Hall and others reveal, love is never easy, nor is it innocent. Indeed, uneasy and noninnocent loves are central to the becomings that emerge from human and nonhuman animal encounters. As Haraway reminds us, love is “often disturbing, given to betrayal, occasionally aggressive, and regularly not reciprocated in the ways the lovers desire.”⁷⁵ Many of the loves I outline here are connected to oppression and aggression, racism and nationalism. The presence or absence of love, or its perceived presence or absence, as articulated by the woman who asks Tudor “just what kind of S.O.B. does it take to fight dogs?” does not directly address the ethics or politics of becoming in kind, for love is everywhere in these stories, yet each love differs in terms of the kinds of power dynamics involved. Becoming in kind offers a way to better understand and even challenge these uneasy and different loves.

Conclusion: Loving Differences

Let me revisit the story with which I began this piece, in which a dog, a middle-class white transperson, safety, and love become together: the story of Haley and me. Like pit bulls, transgender identities bring with them a number of category problems. Legibility is an issue, but there is also the question of whether one even wants to be read as, say, a white male. I admit that when I first began transitioning, thoughts of running into the likes of Newt Gingrich in the bathroom made me very nervous. I did not want to share a category with such a man. Becoming in kind was a way for me to think through the ways that who I was, no longer a woman, but not quite a man, and not really interested in being a man, was facilitated by my relationship with a pit bull. As a feminist and white transperson, becoming in kind was a way for me to understand how the categories that shape many humans' existences and against which many folks chafe—race, class, gender, nation, transgender, and more—are caught up in relationships with nonhuman animals. Importantly, becoming in kind also made me uneasy about my love with Haley, for it pushed me to situate the ways narratives of animal rescue and salvation are caught up in these category problems. In this sense, becoming in kind not only helped me better understand the many ways human and nonhuman animal loves are noninnocent but also pushed me to think critically about how to disrupt the connections among these enmeshed human and nonhuman identities and, for example, racism and nationalism.

However, becoming in kind does not necessarily help Haley in the way that it helps me, for the problems of categories and kinds central to this essay are problems that dogs in Haley's position cannot themselves contest. She cannot express ambivalences about her legibility as a pit bull, nor can she "look back" in a way that challenges the connections among categories and kinds I outline here.⁷⁶ In this sense, this essay falls into a long line of animal representations in which advocacy is mixed with seeming anthropocentrism, for the categories of race, class, sexuality, and nation I address are categories that Haley herself will never recognize, even as they shape her body.⁷⁷ This problem of animal representation leads me to the formulation of more hopeful and hopefully less anthropocentric politics that stem from becoming in kind, formations inflected by what one might term "becoming in kindness."

The political stakes of becoming in kind are twofold: recognition and disruption. Kimberle Crenshaw's influential formulation of intersectionality has inspired myriad conversations about how the experiences of categories such as race and gender are ineradicably intertwined.⁷⁸ In proposing "becoming in

kind,” I hope to introduce a way to understand how the overlapping categories of difference that divide human worlds are part and parcel of necessarily intermingled human and nonhuman worldings.⁷⁹ In this sense, the recognition becoming in kind prompts participates in ongoing conversations among many scholars in animal studies, in feminist, critical race, labor, environmental, and indigenous studies, who are concerned with how we might inherit the intertwined violences that have shaped our more-than-human worlds. This recognition can, in turn, help us interrupt and disrupt the ties among these identity categories for the better.

When I advocate disruption as following from thinking with becoming in kind, I am invested in taking up the uneasy loves I read with and finding ways to interrupt their attachments to the norms of rescue, race, gender, and nation.⁸⁰ A disruption following from becoming in kind might mean understanding how some forms of uneasy loves, like that of the person whose pit bull–type dog is skinny and has heartworms, shape and are shaped by classism and racism, such that help, if offered, should address how these factors shape the twinned lives of human and dog rather than propose salvation by separation. A disruption might also mean exploring the potential for restorative justice rather than lengthy prison sentences when dealing with people who have been involved in dogfighting, challenging ties between notions of justice and a growing and highly racialized prison-industrial complex. And disruption might mean facilitating loves outside homes and apart from narratives of normative kinship, as illustrated in the following story.

Downtown Dog Rescue, a Los Angeles–based organization founded by Lori Weise and Richard Tuttlemondo in 1996, began its work trying to spay and neuter dogs. Weise and Tuttlemondo had become concerned with the ballooning stray dog population in LA’s “skid row” and wanted to help. They quickly learned that many of the seeming strays—most of them pit bull–type dogs—had owners.⁸¹ Rather than attempt to part people from their dogs, they tried to connect them with not just spay/neuter resources but also more general veterinary care. Tuttlemondo notes that a key lesson from this process was to “accept the dog owner as he or she is now, no judging their lifestyle choices.”⁸² This sense of a person who lives outside—Tuttlemondo is careful to note that folks prefer “living outside” to “homeless”—as a dog owner who should not be judged reveals a form of understanding well versed in funny kinds of love. Tuttlemondo points out that “people love animals regardless if they live inside or outside.”⁸³ The practices of Downtown Dog Rescue—paying for impound fees and medical treatment, giving an address for dog licenses, and providing transportation to a vet, leashes and collars, dog food and training, and letters

of recommendation—respond to how the lives of these dogs and owners are mutually shaped by intersections of racism, classism, sexism, speciesism, and, given the predominance of pit bull–types, what I will call “breedism.”⁸⁴ And these practices do not attempt to recuperate owners or dogs into normative or wholesome patterns of, say home building and kinship, but rather encourage their continual disruption.

The work of the folks at Downtown Dog Rescue is attuned to becoming in kind; it is a work whose politics is about understanding uneasy loves and facilitating these loves’ interruption of the incorporation of dogs into contemporary American conceptions of home and family. This work is savvy to the use of dogs-as-victims as a way to racialize and denigrate humans, and this work is invested in helping pit bull–type dogs thrive without having to bring them into families and affirm their connections to an implicit and normative whiteness. This work is also committed to understanding that dogs love and are happy with folks who live outside, which is to say that Downtown Dog Rescues recognizes that what is good for dogs, according to dogs themselves, is not necessarily home ownership and pit bull–inclusive insurance. This is a work that pits kindness against kind. No community outreach efforts are ever innocent, but the work of Downtown Dog Rescue strikes me as uneasy and uncomfortable in a good way. It is this kind of work that I hope thinking with becoming in kind can encourage. And it is this kind of work that I think makes for a better and jointly shared world, for it takes up the troubles of a more than human intersectionality and finds ways to encourage different kinds of becoming in kind.

Notes

- This writing of this article was facilitated by the generosity of Drucilla Pettibone, whose unique archives provided much of the material I think with. Revisions were made with the intellectual and financial support of the Animals and Society Institute and Wesleyan Animal Studies summer fellowship program.
1. Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming* (Cambridge, MA: Polity, 2002), 118.
 2. Donna Haraway, *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 34, 25.
 3. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 238.
 4. *Ibid.*, 240; Haraway, *When Species Meet*, 30.
 5. Marjorie Spiegel draws such parallels in *The Dreaded Comparison* (London: Heretic, 1988). Claire Jean Kim discusses these types of analogies in “Moral Extensionism or Racist Exploitation? The Use of Holocaust and Slavery Analogies in the Animal Liberation Movement,” *New Political Science* 33.3 (2011): 311–33.
 6. Richard Ryder, “Experiments on Animals,” in *Animals, Men, and Morals*, ed. Stanley Godlovitch, Roslind Godlovitch, and John Harris (New York: Taplinger, 1972); and Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation*, 2nd ed. (New York: New York Review of Books, 1990).

7. Malcolm Gladwell, "Troublemakers: What Pit Bulls Can Teach Us about Profiling," *New Yorker*, February 6, 2006, www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/02/06/060206fa_fact.
8. For Marcy Setter's Find-a-Bull test, see www.pitbullsontheweb.com/petbull/findpit.html (accessed June 30, 2012).
9. Victoria Voith, Elizabeth Ingram, Katherine Mitsouras, and Kristopher Irizarry, "Comparison of Adoption Agency Breed Identification and DNA Breed Identification of Dogs," *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 12 (2009): 253–62.
10. "Pit bull–type" illustrates the category problems associated with denigrated identities: how does one speak on behalf of and acknowledge a need for shared recognition of the very grouping one is simultaneously committed to challenging?
11. Harold Herzog, "Forty-Two Thousand and One Dalmations: Fads, Social Contagion, and Breed Popularity," *Society and Animals* 14.4 (2006): 383–97.
12. Karen Delise, *The Pit Bull Placebo: The Media, Myths, and Politics of Canine Aggression* (Ramsey, NJ: Anubis, 2007), 20–35.
13. *Ibid.*, 48.
14. For locations, see map of BSL, www.understand-a-bull.com/BSL/Locations/USLocations.htm (accessed July 2, 2012).
15. Vicki Hearne, *Bandit: The Heart-Warming True Story of One Dog's Rescue from Death Row* (New York: Sky Horse, 2007), 25.
16. These data are from the National Canine Research Council website, "Media Center," nationalcanineresearchcouncil.com/media-center/bsl/ (accessed July 2, 2012).
17. Linda Weiss, "Breed-Specific Legislation in the United States," *Animal Legal and Historical Web Center*, 2001, www.animallaw.info/articles/aruslweiss2001.htm.
18. *Ibid.*
19. The attorney Kenneth M. Phillips points to several cases where the "owners of a pit bull were deemed to be aware of its dangerous propensity to attack without warning, even though it never had done so in the past, thereby supporting a jury's finding of civil liability for a dog bite" ("Breed Specific Laws," dogbitelaw.com/breed-specific-laws/breed-specific-laws.html [accessed July 3, 2012]).
20. *Ibid.*
21. Colin Dayan, *The Law Is a White Dog: How Legal Rituals Make and Unmake Persons* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011).
22. Here and in the remainder of this article, I use pit bull without quotations, but with the understanding that the term itself is contested.
23. Nicolas Riccardi, "Denver's Dogged Outlaws," *Los Angeles Times*, August 2, 2005.
24. The authors of stubbydog.org are among those who use the phrase "breed-discriminatory legislation" (stubbydog.org/2012/07/12-reasons-to-oppose-breed-discriminatory-legislation/ [accessed July 23, 2012]). The term *canine racism* is widespread; see Karyn Grey, "Breed-Specific Legislation Revisited: Canine Racism or the Answer to Florida's Dog Control Problems?," *Nova Law Review* 27 (Spring 2003): 415–32.
25. Josh Liddy, "Response to Pam Ashley," under "discrimination," and "opinion," www.swaylove.org/response-to-pam-ashley (accessed July 23, 2012).
26. There are prolific examples of this on Facebook pages related to the Lennox case (www.facebook.com/WeRLennox [accessed July 27, 2012]), and there are also more formal blog-type entries: see, for example, Karyn Zoldan, "Tucson: I Am Lennox Pitbull. BSL Sucks," "Tucson Tales," tucsoncitizen.com/tucson-tails/2012/07/17/tucson-i-am-lennox-pitbull-bsl-sucks/ (accessed July 27, 2012).
27. Brian C. Anderson, "Scared of Pit Bulls? You'd Better Be!" *City Journal* (Spring 1999), www.city-journal.org/html/9_2_scared_of_pit.html; Bixby Jones, "Pit Bulls, White Trash, and Ghetto Fabulous A-holes," thesandytongue.wordpress.com/2012/04/27/794/ (accessed July 3, 2012).
28. For example, a July 24, 2007, Associated Press article, "Vick Case Illustrates Pit Bull's Changing Status," includes a subsection titled "Tied into the Hip Hop Culture" outlining links between pit bull problems and hip-hop and rap music cultures (www.msnbc.msn.com/id/19937995/ns/us_news/t/vick-case-illustrates-pit-bulls-changing-status/ [accessed July 7, 2012]).
29. Gina Lombroso-Ferrero, *Criminal Man: According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso*, commentary Cesare Lombroso (New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1911), 11–24; Samuel George Morton, *Crania Americana* (Philadelphia: J. Dobson, 1839).

30. Changes in racial patterns of ownership and breeding in the 1980s are discussed in Hearne's *Bandit* and further highlighted with regard to dog men in *Off the Chain: A Shocking Exposé on America's Forsaken Breed* (dir. Bobby Brown; Allumination Filmworks, 2004).
31. Steve Hummer, "Vick Burns in Tailgate Effigy at Dome," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, September 18, 2011, www.ajc.com/sports/atlanta-falcons/vick-burns-in-tailgate-1183830.html.
32. MJD of *Yahoo News* documents the graffiti in "NFL" (sports.yahoo.com/nfl/blog/shutdown_corner/post/Philly-graffiti-artist-wants-Vick-to-treat-Cowbo?urn=nfl,185585 [accessed July 7, 2012]), while Lisa Richards deploys the Vick in chains image in "Excusing Michael Vick's Animal Abuse as Reaction to Slavery and Segregation," *Lisa Richards: Rock N' Roll Politics*, January 4, 2011, sports.yahoo.com/nfl/blog/shutdown_corner/post/Philly-graffiti-artist-wants-Vick-to-treat-Cowbo?urn=nfl,185585.
33. Typical of these arguments are assertions that those who engage in street-level fights are less responsible than earlier dog men, failing in such tasks as the weeding out of "man eaters," resulting in higher levels of dogs biting humans than previously, when such dogs were (supposedly) assiduously put down. See, for one example, answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20080318180257AAVT6Pq (accessed January 30, 2013).
34. Glen Elder, Jennifer Wolch, and Jody Emel, "Race, Place, and the Bounds of Humanity," *Society and Animals* 6.2 (1998): 198.
35. *Ibid.*, 194.
36. Jim Gorant, *The Lost Dogs: Michael Vick's Dogs and Their Tales of Rescue and Redemption* (New York: Gotham Books, 2010), 10.
37. Achille Mbembe remarks on this in *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 26–28.
38. Quoted in Gorant, *Lost Dogs*, 109.
39. I learned of this practice through a seminar on illegal animal fighting in which a USDA agent gave details of a bust where three successive contests were staged inside a building operated by the USDA and its informants. The dogs involved in the contest, government agents or no, were all put down (HSUS and Oakland Animal Shelter, July 2010).
40. Susan McCarthy, "A Better Life for Michael Vick's Pit Bulls: BAD RAP Lends a Helping Hand," *Bark*, July–August 2008, www.thebark.com/content/better-life-michael-vick%E2%80%99s-pit-bulls.
41. Bay Area Dog Lovers Responsible about Pit Bulls was one of two rescue groups involved in evaluating the Vick dogs. The video, "See Them Now," was posted at www.badrap.org/rescue/vick/now.html but is no longer up (accessed February 1, 2011).
42. Gorant, *Lost Dogs*, 148, 212, 227.
43. Lauren Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), 5.
44. The Canine Good Citizen is a program run by the AKC. The test involves ten elements, including accepting a friendly stranger and supervised separation. More information is available at www.akc.org/events/cgc/program.cfm (accessed July 27, 2012).
45. Berlant, *Queen of America*, 6.
46. These descriptions are easy to find, but one of the more prominent is that of the Villalobos Rescue Center, also featured in the television show on Animal Planet, *Pit Bulls and Parolees*, www.vrcpitbull.net/dog/ (accessed July 3, 2012).
47. Julie Kink, "Gentle Pit Bull Ruby Working to Erase Breed Stereotype," *St. Croix Valley Press*, November 27, 2009, www.presspubs.com/st_croix/news/article_7d40b429-aa49-5740-add4-1035a36f51df.html.
48. Joanne Brokaw, "Leo, One of the Michael Vick Dogs, Passes Away," *Patheos* (blog), December 18, 2011, www.patheos.com/blogs/heavenlycreatures/2011/12/leo-one-of-the-michael-vick-dogs-passes-away/.
49. Gorant, *Lost Dogs*, 148.
50. Ken Foster, *The Dogs Who Found Me* (Guilford, CT: Lyons, 2006), 11.
51. Quoted in Foster, *Dogs Who Found Me*, book jacket.
52. Catalina Stirling, "Jasmine's Story," www.jasmineshouse.org/who-we-are/jasmines-story/ (accessed January 27, 2013).
53. David Delany, "The Space That Race Makes," *Professional Geographer* 54.1 (2002): 6–14.
54. To note, many rescuers also highlight how owning a "breed ambassador" gives them the feeling that "you've got to work harder . . . you are being scrutinized and watched every minute of the day," revealing how some pit bull rescuers experience a sense of stigma as pit bull owners (quoted in Hilary

- Twining, Arnold Arluke, and Gary Patronek, "Managing the Stigma of Outlaw Breeds: A Case Study of Pit Bull Owners," *Society and Animals* 8.1 [2000]: 26).
55. My access to this archive was made possible by the generosity of my friend and colleague Drucilla Pettibone of Emory University.
 56. Ed Faron and Chris Faron, *The Complete Gamedog: A Guide to Breeding and Raising the American Pit Bull Terrier* (Charlotte, NC: Walsworth, 1995), 86.
 57. *Ibid.*, 55.
 58. Quoted in Faron and Faron, *Complete Gamedog*, 75. To note, the term *Ch* is short for *Champion*, indicating a dog who has won three fights.
 59. Faron and Faron, *Complete Gamedog*, 63. The term *Grand Champion* indicates a dog who has won five fights.
 60. Bobby Hall, *Bullyson and His Sons* (Charlotte, NC: Walsworth, 1986), 85.
 61. *Ibid.*, 73.
 62. Quoted in Rhonda D. Evans and Craig J. Forsyth, "The Social Milieu of Dog Men and Dog Fights," *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 19 (1998): 61.
 63. *Ibid.*
 64. Faron and Faron, *Complete Gamedog*, 11.
 65. *Ibid.*, 12.
 66. Vick made this statement during an interview with Piers Morgan on July 17, 2012 (piersmorgan.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/17/michael-vick-says-he-might-get-a-new-dog-certainly-not-a-pit-bull/).
 67. The experiment was done by Robert Rosenthal, published in 1966 (*Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research* [New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts]). Rosenthal's own interest was in demonstrating experimental bias.
 68. Vinciane Despret, "The Body We Care For: Figures of Anthro-zoo-genesis," *Body and Society* 10.2 (2004): 122.
 69. Stengers expresses this in "God's Heart and the Stuff of Life," *Pli* 9 (2000): 105.
 70. Haraway, *When Species Meet*, 16.
 71. Hall, *Bullyson*, 191.
 72. L. B. Hanna, *The American Pit Bull Terrier and His Master* (West Sussex, UK: Beech, 1926), 84.
 73. Faron and Faron, *Complete Gamedog*, 54.
 74. Jessica Dolce, "How I Failed as a Dog Rescuer: Lessons from a Sanctuary," the notes from a dog walker blog, July 21, 2012, notesfromadogwalker.com/2012/07/21/how-i-failed-as-a-rescuer-lessons-from-a-sanctuary/.
 75. Donna Haraway, "enlightenment@science_wars.com: A Personal Reflection on Love and War," *Social Text* 50 (Spring 1997): 123.
 76. John Berger, "Why Look at Animals?" (New York: Penguin, 2009).
 77. Jonathan Burt touches on the ambivalences of these representations in *Animals in Film* (London: Reaktion, 2002).
 78. Kimberle Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review* 43.6 (1991): 1241–99.
 79. In making this proposal, I am also in conversation with Val Plumwood, who argues for an understanding of "interlocking oppressions" as a way to think through the relationship among race, species, gender, and other categories of difference in *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (London: Routledge, 1993).
 80. This move echoes Beth Povinelli's argument in "Notes on Gridlock: Genealogy, Intimacy, Sexuality," *Public Culture* 14.1 (2002): 215–38, in which she proposes an interruption of the ties among sex, kinship, and intimacy as a way to get at a more promising queer politics.
 81. Sheila Pell, "Downtown Dogs," *Bark* (March–April 2008): 60.
 82. Tuttlemondo's presentation has been uploaded to the *petsmartcharities* website, www.petsmartcharities.org/resources/resources-documents/downtown-dog.pdf (accessed July 23, 2012).
 83. *Ibid.*
 84. Susan McHugh wonderfully documents the extensive history of connections between nonbreed dogs seen as "mutts" and "mongrels" and folks living on the edges of societies, such as Ireland's travelers and folks who live outside homes in the United States ("Mutts," in *Dog* [London: Reaktion, 127–70]).